



# 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 April 5, 2019**

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Next is request for open forum or executive session. Do we have a request for either, open forum or executive session? Being that as we do, we will move on to the approval of the March minutes.

I will pull them up here, but hopefully you have had a chance to review them. I will scroll through them and try to make them a little larger here.

(pause.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So those are the minutes from March. Would anyone like to comment or motion to approve?

>> SPEAKER: Tanya. I motion to approve the minutes as written.

>> SPEAKER: I second. Lisa.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All in favor?

(Ayes.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All opposed?

Okay. The minutes are approved.

The next agenda item is represented by Jackie Allen, and it's an update on the faculty advising model.

Jackie provided a handout ahead of time, and I will make it available on the screen.

>> SPEAKER: Thank you, everyone. I do also have with me Amy Davis, who is co-chair of the work group that was looking at the faculty advising program, and so just in case we had any background, we wanted to provide an update today on what we are doing to implement and our next steps.

Hopefully you were able to review the one-page summary. The front page really pulls out what the work group had been doing and all the work they had put in and really trying to highlight how faculty advising can move forward. The differences and clarity we wanted to provide, based on what would be different than may have been happening in the past.

So one key item in that is really looking at a student's, from

the entirety of the beginning of their experience at Pima, and continuing. So looking at the model of connect, continue, complete, and with them exiting Pima and either transferring to the university or to the workforce. How can each of the divisions and then below that each of the disciplines or departments really look at their student and say, we're providing faculty advising in all of these phases with the connect phase of beginning number of credits to the middle and the retention and persistence and then the completion efforts, as well.

So on the back of the page, we highlighted the next steps that we are looking at. We did just provide an update to the deans at their recent meeting in March. Just this morning I was able to present to the social sciences leadership faculty meeting, and to walk them through all the documents and the development that the committee created over the last year, about a year and a half.

So another update is that in the fall, there were several faculty that participated in a pilot, and they were able to utilize everything that the committee had created. We had really good feedback. They talked about having flexibility with the activities that they were able to address as faculty advising, and also that it was things that they were already doing. It was just a way to

document and track and to highlight this and collaborate with others in their division or in their department.

So that was really nice to hear. Some of them were also using Pima Connection, which is a new tool for Starfish that we are really wanting to create full scale later this summer. So that training can happen for all faculty in the fall, and they can use this as a tool for their faculty advising.

So really the next steps is we are reaching out to the deans to come to any faculty meetings they may have, whether at leadership or with everyone, so that we can present it, showcase what their next steps will be for this next year.

And then full implementation for Pima Connection, we are hoping by fall, and also for the faculty advising program by spring 2020.

And we did want to give enough time for questions.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I actually have a question. It relates to the element of accountability and documentation.

From what I understand, in addition to the conversations with deans, faculty will be required to document their advising hours to show accountability as part of this model, correct?

>> SPEAKER: So what the work group had created or talked about and discussed was adding it to your goals, the annual goals at the

end of the year, to highlight what you had done within those hours for faculty advising.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Is that a confirmed...

>> SPEAKER: I just want to add that the idea was not to have to turn in some kind of time sheet of your hours. That was up to each faculty member to track their own hours and basically report out to who supervises them, so it isn't sort of yet another number sheet that people have to do or something like that.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Is that a confirmed change or is it a recommended change?

>> SPEAKER: (off microphone.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: A follow-up question is with Pima Connection, for those of us unfamiliar with how faculty would use Pima Connection, could you provide a brief summary of how faculty will be requested to use Pima Connection relation to advising.

>> SPEAKER: Sure. Yes, there is different opportunities in Pima Connection for faculty, and what will happen is you'll have an instructor role where you'll be able to see your students in your CRNs, but the faculty advising role will open up that possibility -- this is something we were talking about this morning, can I see all students that are in my program, not necessarily taking a course

with me this semester?

So that's one of the highlights Pima Connection can offer, so you can send them e-mails to events, to club -- Student Life organization-type events and highlights that could be happening to where you can target more than just your students that are currently with you.

>> SPEAKER: And I'd like to add that the two roles in Pima Connection for instructor and then faculty advisor, that is also meant to have flexibility, because not every division or sub program in there will want to use the faculty advising role -- there may be a division or a subgroup of that division that really wants to do a very solid case management approach with the students in their programs, and that faculty advisor role would be ideal for that.

For some other areas, that may not be as applicable so someone may not need to use the faculty advisor role. Their instructor role would be sufficient in the system.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Just to clarify, the goal would be to train all faculty so they are aware of the resource, but in terms of implementation, use would depend on what seems most appropriate for each person's individual -- okay.

>> SPEAKER: I would say in collaboration with their colleagues

in that area, too, definitely.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: I really appreciated how you mentioned this new initiative is trying to take into account problems that may have occurred in the past and addressed those. It sounds to me as though the Pima Connection training for faculty may be addressing a problem that we did have in the past, which was that advising is super complex. I mean, it takes a tremendous amount of training to make sure you're not steering the student wrong.

I worry about faculty being not adequately trained and then accidentally telling a student to take some course and then the student comes back at them at the end of the semester and says, damn it, I learned the government didn't pay for that, and you steered me to take a course that was not on my rigid, narrow pathway, and do you understand what I'm saying? I don't know if you can address this concern, but I'm concerned about, like, legal liability and all kinds of crazy stuff like that.

>> SPEAKER: You bring up a great point, because one thing they did want to highlight is that it's not a duplication of what we're doing in student affairs for advising. It's really highlighting the expertise that faculty can bring in other ways. So not necessarily

talking to a student about, okay, what's your next-semester course?

But is it being able to tell them more about your own course and what they're going to learn about, and is this applicable for their large-picture idea, employment, transfer opportunities, professional development, that they can seek outside of Pima even, to help them kind of confirm their intent and their goals.

So they actually develop -- we developed a menu of items, and it's broken into phases of connect, continue, complete, to show, okay, if you're really highlighting career, here are some activities other faculty are doing as examples so that you all have a guide if you want to use that in selecting your activities.

>> SPEAKER: And that's part of how student affairs will partner together in a complementary way, not a duplication and not trying to do each other's jobs, but to be partners with each other, recognizing the expertise of both areas.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Thank you for coming today. A question about accountability in terms of office hours and advising hours. Are these in addition to our office hours, or are these included in our office hours? Because we are already doing this in our office hours on a regular basis. Can you tell me, will there be another accountability?

>> SPEAKER: This is a logic question, okay? Just holding office hours does not equal completing faculty advising, but you could do faculty advising during your office hours. So it's not additional hours on top of your office hours. You can use those office hours to do faculty advising, but just saying I'm in my office, that's not sufficient for the model of faculty advising. But you certainly could use your office hours to do faculty advising if that's how you develop your plan as a division or group.

Does that kind of make sense?

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Sorta. In a small department where there is only, say, a few full-time faculty, will there possibly be a problem with some faculty being more desired to be advisors than others? In other words, a little popularity issue?

>> SPEAKER: No, this really goes back to each division and subgroups within that division, getting together and saying, how can we best help support our students in the program? Who wants to do what? Who wants to kind of be the person to help students at the beginning? Who wants to help in the middle, and in the end? There isn't necessarily an identified faculty advisor for the division unless the division decides they want to put that sort of label on someone.

But it's really about saying how do we bring our faculty expertise and students at these different stages? And that can be in a multiplicity of ways that really people get together and do that. And the idea is really most people are doing this in great ways. It's a matter of collaborating. Instead of somebody individually saying I'm just going to do this, I'm going to just do this, let's use our resources well. We don't want to add more to people's work. Somebody may say I'm going to do my faculty advising by going out to the high schools, and then they don't realize their colleague has already done that, right?

It's really about using resources well and supporting students comprehensively with it.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Sorry to keep following up with this question-upon-question thing. How will this be organized then? Will each department at the beginning of fall start at sort of preorganization effort? You sort of addressed it a little bit already.

>> SPEAKER: We are hoping that when I go out -- or the team, any one of us can go out now, and you can start thinking about that and planning for that for next year.

If we're not able to come to you until the very beginning of next

year, we're hoping that we would have, what we are asking the deans to do, is to collect a final report for their division that would be shared out to the VP of student affairs in April of every year.

>> SPEAKER: The work group developed a division planning sheet that takes each division or subgroups of the division through the process of planning collaboratively together step by step.

So at the end of kind of going through those steps, then, as a group, people would be able to say, here's our plan for faculty advising for psychology for next year. Here is who's doing what, and here's our plan as a group.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We have time for one more question and then we have to move on.

>> ROSA MORALES: I have a couple of questions. One is related to the fact that when the students are interested in receiving the type of information, are we going to be able to input somehow in the regular assistance that we actually talked to the student and it was referred to talk to someone else just to quantify the amount of contacts with those individuals?

>> SPEAKER: Yes, Pima Connection will allow that. There is note tracking in there if you want to use that. You can signify whether it's from your instructor or faculty advising role, depending on the

type of note you want to put in if you want to use that.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you for giving us a summary of what's in the future regarding advising.

All right. Next we have our W, two items here addressing the W. If you recall within the last couple of weeks, I sent out a survey to all faculty, and so my portion here is to give an overview of results. Then Norma will come up and answer, provide a little bit more information on the W designation and address any questions.

So for the results, our overall results show in the blue section here we have 48.4% of faculty indicated that they support maintaining -- I'm not able to enlarge this. Not sure why that's showing up. What's happening? Okay, I now made it way too big accidentally.

Okay. Here we are. 48.4% of faculty indicated that they are in -- they support maintaining the ability to offer W designations during final grading. The red portion is 33.1%, and that is the percent of faculty who opposed.

Yellow slice there, a little bit short of 10%, is people who would like to know more information before voting, and then the 9.1 is having no strong opinion either way.

I did monitor these results. I felt a little bit like CNN monitoring the election, because the chart was changing every 10

minutes. I did notice that the blue area went down after the e-mail went out from the provost and the e-mail from Julian Easter went out via the provost that provided a little bit more information on the W. So just one little additional piece.

I wish we had had that information prior to voting. So tons and tons of people offered really meaningful comments, and I have aggregated them on this here. They did, though, show quite a few connections in terms of pro reasons and opposed reasons. So a summary would be, pro W would be students can feel more encouraged not to give up if receiving a W at the end is an option. A very, very common response. Students can continue through course to end date and gain competency with subject without penalty of F if they do not receive a passing grade.

Faculty who know the student and situation are in the best place to determine the grade designation. This is a very common one. Many students encounter difficulties, life, work, emergencies, health, et cetera, that merit them receiving a grade that will not impact their GPAs. And then finally, F grades can do more harm as in discouraging students, impacting GPAs, reducing retention, than W designations. So those are the main pro reasons.

Con reasons. W designations diminish grading integrity as an

institution. W designations are out of compliance with regulations.

And this is documented in the e-mail that Julian sent out via the provost in which he references several CODA federal regulations codes and then discusses Pima's use of them and application in terms of the W.

W designations can have negative implication on students' receipt of benefits. Not all faculty are clear on the meaning, use, or implications of W designations. And that showed up in the feedback a lot, was that some comments indicated that faculty weren't really aware of the meaning, the use, because there is a lot of vagueness and ambiguity in W designations.

W designations are used in a variety of ways, making it impossible to accurately define the meaning of a W on a transcript. Withdrawing is a student responsibility and should be initiated and pursued by students. Allowing W designations at final grading results in unclear reporting. Course completion data, grading data, et cetera.

And Pima CC has no official withdrawal policy. This also came from Julian's e-mail, as well. And that by changing it, as is indicated in the BP, the AP up for review, that would change with the approval of the new policies.

So that's an overview, and we have Norma coming up in just a minute, but in the meantime, were there any questions about the results? Lisa?

>> SPEAKER: Lisa Werner. This maybe just exactly what you're going to address, but the one question I have, the critical question I have, is how is faculty giving a W different than students giving a W with regard to basically all of the these things -- the only thing I can see is if a faculty doesn't understand it, that's an issue? I haven't actually seen that myself, but I'm sure it exists. We're all human. But I don't see the difference in the effect on compliance whether a student gives themselves a W this Monday or a faculty does it at the end of the semester.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: That's a good question. I think that's a good segue to Norma.

Norma, would you like to go ahead?

>> SPEAKER: Thank you. Hello, everyone. I oversee the office of financial aid and scholarships, which is a very heavily regulated office, and so a lot of the CFRs are the ones in which we are continuously reviewing, researching, and applying it to the Title IV programs that we administer here at the college.

So this is an introduction of strengthening what the W means as

well as the I, as well, it's also including incomplete. The strengthening is the definition of what W is. It's an enrollment status rather than a final grade.

The institutions that we have researched where they define themselves as an attendance-taking institution, which is who we are, as well, we are an attendance-taking institution. What that indicates is that when students register for their classes, upon beginning the course, then there is submission or review of the student having been attending and engaged in the classroom. Whatever type of classroom it is.

And so every 30 days the institution is reporting what is known as enrollment, enrollment status reporting. That is indicative of what the student's overall enrollment is. It's important, because students can come in, as in community colleges and other institutions, they come in as transfer students and they may have borrowed or received financial aid from other institutions.

So it's important to be reporting that every 30 days, because upon a student stopping out or falling less than halftime, then the student moves into repayment terms of whatever that student loans they may have borrowed before.

So the document is trying to put in place what is the definition

of W? Removing it from being a final grade to keeping it in enrollment status. The best way I could explain is looking at it as a timeline, our semesters, when students are registering for our courses and they are beginning enrollment there, allowing the students to withdraw at any point up to a certain designation during that semester or term.

So, yes, a student can withdraw himself or herself from a course, and this document, again, going back to wanting to solidify or put in an office in which students can do an official withdrawal.

Currently that doesn't exist at this institution. Students more commonly just stop out. Meaning they stop attending our classes. Currently, because you're submitting attendance on a weekly basis, at day 14 in which there is no attendance, then that status becomes known as registered not attending. Meaning the student is still registered in the class but has not attended. Currently we are trying to convert that to the W. Because the student has withdrawn.

Why? Because we are obligated that in 30 days, when 30 days comes around, when we know, as an institution, that a student has stopped attending, we must, if there is Title IV there, we must know when that last date of attendance was, LDA, we refer to it as LDA, and then we have to go into the calculation of what was known as

unearned aid.

Student's financial aid is determined for the bases of the semester. The idea that they will start and go through the end of the term. So all those funds are designated for that. When a student stops attending and there is an LDA, then there is a portion of aid that was not earned, and that's the unearned aid and which has to go back to the Department of Education.

That's what this document is trying to do. Is to place further definition on what W means.

At the end of a term, when all grades are submitted and with a W, and we are reporting that information back to the Department of Education, that's where it seems sometimes, okay, why are you designating a W if the student was in attendance throughout the entire term? That's the question we are trying to resolve.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Lisa, does that address your question? I think Lisa's question was what difference does it make whether, if a student still has the option to pursue a W through an advisor, what's that difference than...

>> SPEAKER: Because right now a student is not able to withdraw after a certain point in the semester.

>> SPEAKER: Okay. So right now, this is what I see. I see some

students who, just after the NA grades are in, right, they come a few times, they have come at the beginning, and then they're gone, and then some of those guys will then withdraw at the withdrawal deadline, for example, that would be this Monday, right? Okay?

And then other of those guys disappear forever, and I give them an F. If they're just gone, I give an F. But then I have other students who stay with me, and they're getting 50% on their exam. And they're working and they're coming to every class. And maybe they didn't have the recommendation or the prerequisite and somehow they got in the class against all advice or maybe they just have academic background that doesn't really prepare them for the class, but they're working really hard and they're planning on taking the class again. And they stay with the class the whole time up until the final exam, and then ask for a W, up until maybe a couple weeks before the final exam, maybe after the third exam, something like that.

So those are two different populations of people. Now, so I totally get, like, if you have someone, let's say they never attended and you're only giving them a W at the end, that's a problem. But how is that different where, if the student has never been attending and they withdraw themselves or the faculty does it?

I mean, except for maybe there is a few weeks' difference on there, but I see the same problem with both.

>> SPEAKER: It's going back to that, that using the W only up to whatever designated point in time in that term or the course, because we have many courses that are, fall into the different parts of term. But only after a certain point and that become an administrative process and then the student is referred to the student service center or student affairs or something, somebody in that entity, to be able to process that withdrawal after a designated point.

But to also define it or remove it from a final grade. Because for the student that has been attended throughout the entire length of the course, to end up with a W, the question is the academic integrity with the assignment of the W at the end of that course.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you. Lisa, does that address your question?

>> SPEAKER: I'm still a little confused. No, that person earned an F or D or in some cases a C, because honestly, I don't agree with this, but on rare occasion I have someone that they want that A. And they don't get that A, they get a W. And I don't really work that way with my students, but I know it happens.

I'm looking at people that are struggling just for that C and not

quite getting the C.

>> SPEAKER: That is what this is trying to address.

>> SPEAKER: I don't see how. I mean, I must be dense, but I'm not getting this.

>> SPEAKER: So essentially, just allowing the W status to go through up through the 45th day, where we are all reporting, and then after that, if the student is wanting to withdraw from the institution, then it becomes an administrative process at that point but not -- removing faculty from that so that you're not carrying that burden of trying to determine, okay, student, you're coming to me with whatever life circumstances you had, you have been attending, you're not quite making it there, why have to submit the grade of W at the end.

That could then be referred to this office, this entity of official withdrawal process.

>> SPEAKER: I'm still not getting it. I think, because for me, and for faculty that give Ws that way, it's not a burden, any more than any of our students are a burden, because we are working with students who are having, struggling to succeed the same way we work with every single one of our students, and we spend time in review sessions and out of class and an office hour and special time,

connecting with them in class like every other single student in the class. So that's no different.

I don't see how -- it's not a burden. So what -- my understanding is the problem is knowing the LDA and having that right. To me, that's the crux of it, right?

So how is it that -- what's the difference between, like, if you have a student who has just never been attending, right, and they decide to get a W at -- and it's not on the 45th day. It's like two-thirds of the way through the semester. How is that different than a faculty -- is it really that much different than a faculty giving a W at the end?

>> SPEAKER: It is. Because, as you commence your courses, you're taking attendance every seven days. When Johnny didn't show up to class after that first week, you're not submitting attendance for Johnny. Seven days go by. Johnny doesn't show up again the next time the class meets. 14 days have gone by. That status, that enrollment status for the student has now changed from registered not attending to a W, because the student has withdrawn, has stopped attending the course. Because then the financial aid office has to step in when a student has completely stopped attending all courses, so if there are all Ws for all courses, then we have to do the return

of Title IV, and then on day 30, report the enrollment status of that student, as well.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So we are --

>> SPEAKER: I'm so sorry --

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We have three other questions, I see. Matej had his hand up and I believe MaryKris had a question and Kimlisa and Margie.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: So what is the status currently? Am I able to still submit a W after next week?

>> SPEAKER: I don't believe this is in effect currently. This is something --

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: I had already told some students, before all this went out, that I should be able to give them a W if they request it, and we are still able to submit those Ws this semester?

>> SPEAKER: Yes.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: So then I understand the worries about academic -- you know, integrity, and I think that's valid. It would make sense to come up with some kind of college-wide definition under what circumstances it would be okay to submit a W, but so, for example, what I currently do is I try to encourage students to persist and continue and then if they come up to me, up to a week or

two before the final and say, I don't want to take the final, then I would still grant them the W if I see they kind of put in a good-faith effort. Now, there might be different approaches and philosophies that people have, but to me that's pretty important to sort of keep that prerogative and not have the student jump through some, go to some office, talk to somebody they don't know, have to submit documentation when they just have to study or go to work or be with their family.

So I'd be concerned about this kind of a change and taking that decision from the relationship between the instructor and the student within some parameters and creating some new level of, you know bureaucracy that the students have to get through.

So is that something that could be workable and that would meet your needs there?

>> SPEAKER: So as -- you have your students in your classroom, and you're aware of what their life circumstances have been developing during the time they're in the course with you. How are you notifying the folks in the counseling area, folks in advising, as well, so that we can put in a wrap-around services with these students so that we can ensure they are coming into the tutoring centers and making sure they are receiving the services they need to

become successful.

I completely agree with retention -- we have to keep the students for as long as we can, but everything you know -- you know firsthand in the classroom, that information needs to be referred out there so that all of us can start putting our arms around students, as well, and helping them.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Sure, you won't get an argument from me about that, but what does that then have to do with the W and taking away, like, making students go through more onerous steps -- with a practice like right now, if they take the final they get what they earned. If they let me know before the final, hey, I really tried, but I tried -- I need my GPA to be this because I'm in ROTC, blah, blah, is that against some federal regulations?

>> SPEAKER: The federal regulation is not on how we are going to ensure student success. The federal regulation is ultimately is the student in your class, or if not, after a certain period of time, when does the college know about that, and that information needs to get reported. That's the federal regulation.

But what we are trying to also implement in this is the definition of what that W means and be able to create systems in which we have communication. Because currently, I've gone -- I'm in

financial aid, so I see multiple students submitting appeals after the fact. When they are wishing they had services be put in place. And how do we push this to the point in which we know they're not going to be successful in order to put our arms around them and make sure that we can make it for them.

So creating something like this will help us create the systems we need to communication. The moment you know in your classroom that something is going on with that student and be able to defer that, to the service that is we need to put in place for these students.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I'm seeing lots of extra hands. We really do have to wrap up. We have a few other major items on the agenda and many, many reports. We need -- we owed it to those items to give them due time.

I want to give some time to Kimlisa to ask her question because her hand has been up for a while and Margie, as well, and see if we can find a way to move forward.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: You keep saying "come in." The second-largest campus at this college is online. Those students don't want to come in, first of all. And second of all, I'm not getting the whole services thing.

I mean, we have cut student services to the very bone, and now

you're saying take all these W students and send them in? That makes absolutely no sense. I'm with Lisa and I'm with Matej. It just -- it sounds all nice, wrapping your arms around them and everything. It's wonderful.

But the reality is that the students will just leave with an F. You know, at least if we give them a chance to save their GPA, I mean, there are technological things that can trigger and say, hey, a W has been issued, financial aid, do this, that apparently we're not even thinking about. Instead we just get rid it. Sorry, it just doesn't make sense.

>> SPEAKER: So even though we are a lot let personnel, we have developed many more mechanisms to reach out to these students and being able to push things further up in the students' life cycle, if you will. Because financial aid allows to continue offering student financial aid after the first semester in which the student is not successful. So the first semester in which the student is not meeting one of the three criteria of academic progress, there is one more semester there, and those students are known as being in what's called warning. So we have put in place, and we have teamed up with other entities here, our tutoring center, so that we can begin aggressive reachout with these students.

>> SPEAKER: (off microphone.)

>> SPEAKER: Working in the same path. Working in the same path.

Being able to put in place, duplicate those services, so that -- all this is relatively new. This has become, in the last five years, a high compliance, year after year, what are we doing with these audits, how are we ensuring these things for students? And we have come a long way with that. We have come a significant of a long way with that. But it doesn't mean this isn't going to create a path in which we need to put our college towards.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: When you say "create systems," that's the part where I see a roadblock, because we're so busy teaching and doing all the 29 hours of advising and all those things, that what it sounds like is, in order to help your office, financial aid, you want the instructor now to do additional layers of more work and then how do we know whether they went to the advisors, whether each of those students got additional help, or if their situation changed or not?

I think that we have to, perhaps faculty has to decide which students they feel really deserve the W but that the option should be there, because faculty are the experts in that class, and they're better able to decide, talking to the student, what will be better, an attack on your GPA or send you to counseling, take it over again,

and those are things that your office may not know, and I know you say you want to know and we support you and all that, but the options should be there for faculty to decide what is best and how to best help the student. And that W is one of those mechanisms that we have, so perhaps there could be another way that we could both collaborate and make this better but not to take the W away as an option.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: On that last note, the Faculty Senate officers met about a week ago, week and a half ago, to discuss all of this, and we thought, you know, the compliance issues are pretty concerning. We want to show academic integrity. You know, we want to be in compliance. We don't want any issues there. I appreciate all the detailed information you provided about the processes and the time you took to answer our questions.

So we wondered if it might be possible to make this change but still allow the freedom for scenarios indicated in the comments. In other words, still allow options for students that encounter hardships or options for students in order to keep them engaged all throughout the entire term instead of discouraging them by letting them know you're destined for an F, and, you know, those kinds -- to keep them encouraged, in other words, to help our students.

And so we drafted just a simple statement. We sent it to a couple of senators to, you know, get their feedback, as well. One of them is Carrie, and she's not here, and one is Diane. I don't know if you have it in front of you, Diane.

Would you be willing to share it? Doesn't mean you support it but just so that we can hear it.

>> SPEAKER: Sure. Diane Porter.

I do support it. I think the decision has already been made, so the best we can do is mitigate.

And so, because people had ideas about what could be done to mitigate the situation -- well, here's the statement. A significant portion of faculty identified valid, logical benefits to students regarding the current W policy. Because a change may diminish these benefits, Faculty Senate recommends that the provost put a plan in place to identify and implement those benefits.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I appreciate Carrie and Diane's feedback, as well, because they helped take the original statement and improve it.

Essentially what this statement is aimed at doing is requesting from the provost a way to maintain this ability to maintain students, to address the needs they have, the unique needs they have, even if this W scenario moves forward, so that ultimately we can best serve

our students. That's the purpose of the statement.

>> ROSA MORALES: I think it's important that we consider the fact that providing the, I guess, not giving the students the opportunity to have the chance to actually engage again in learning is something that we don't want to do.

Unfortunately, for the past semester, many students were forced to take more credits than what they have taken before. I have been told repeatedly that after this semester, they are going to be looking and see rate the success of that initiative, of asking them to take more credits as to what they were taking before. But nevertheless, during this process, we are finding that some students are just dropping out because they're not able to carry the load that was given to them. In fact, in the long term, we are affecting them in doing so.

So I think we need to make sure that faculty still has the power to make those type of decisions, because we are closer to the students and we know their situations, and we are navigating some of those limitations that the students have to ensure not only to be able to be successful that semester but continue having hope for the future and continue aiming to graduate.

As it is, the organization will make the decision to, I guess,

motivate the students to take more credits than what they have taken before, and many of them unfortunately are dropping out, are stopping coming. And when wife talked to them, they said, well, I was told I couldn't take 12 credits anymore. I have to take 15. So I tried. And now I'm not able to make it. And now there is going to be that on their, you know, transcripts. It's not good.

I hope that you take into consideration the fact that faculty is the one that is working closely with the students and we get to know each of the individual situations. Therefore, we should have the ability and the power to make the decision as to what grades should be, you know, placed on the report card as opposed to somebody, you know, that is in the administration in making it, you know, based on other circumstances.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you. I think that comment reflects some of what Margie was saying and some of the other concerns.

Let's have Matej -- we have Matej's hand up. Then I'd like to get back to the statement.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: I just had a clarification. Did I hear correctly that when somebody is not marked present two times -- so for two weeks, they're not just switched to RN but they get a W now?

>> SPEAKER: No, they are RN, registered not attending.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: How long after that is that changed to W?

>> SPEAKER: Then the college has another 14 days to determine if the student has withdrawn. After day 14, then that information starts coming to the financial aid office so that we can start monitoring, is there going to be any attendance coming in for this third week? Because if not, then we have to step in and start doing the recalculations of financial aid for the student.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We need to wrap up. We are way over time on this item. What we are trying to do -- we could have endless discussions about the W. I know it's a passionate issue. I feel passionate about it, myself, but as Diane noted, the W seems like a pretty done deal, this situation moving forward and at this point we need to determine what next steps we should take, should we support this statement or should we just accept it and move on. Those are kind of the questions we need to determine now on the table. These more specific questions about the W I think could be addressed to Norma through e-mail or separately after the meeting, but in terms of wrapping up right now, we need to move forward.

>> SPEAKER: Can we hear it one more time, please?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Diane, would you mind reading that statement one more time?

>> SPEAKER: All right. A significant portion of faculty identified valid, logical benefits to students regarding the current W policy. Because a change may diminish these benefits, Faculty Senate recommends that the provost put a plan in place to identify and implement those benefits.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Tal has a comment.

>> TAL SUTTON: Since I was part of making that, I just want to sort of say -- you know, it seems like the capacity for an instructor to give a W as late as you are able to at Pima is kind of a Pima-specific thing. I haven't really seen that at other institutions I have been at.

It seems like it kind of, one, kind of looks like, you know, a sore thumb sticking out of what is the common practice against many other institutions, but it has also sort of evolved into a tool that instructors have identified as, oh, I can sort of use this and leverage this to sort of help my students in some way. I can sort of -- I can use it as sort of a carrot to get them to sort of finish out the semester or something to that effect.

So I think a lot of what we saw in the survey results is a lot of faculty sort of identify it as this sort of useful tool, and if it is this tool that sort of happened to exist because it was lying around

that for some reason Pima had this as a process, then I think it's reasonable to ask the provost saying, well, like, you might be sort of changing the rules to sort of hit some sort of compliance issue, but in the time that it's been here at Pima, we have adapted it into a useful tool. Give us a comparable, useful tool that we can use to help with our students.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: I agree with Tal, and I think I am in favor of this statement pretty much. I think one option that we have that we might consider is the P grade, because P is always an issue on the grades dropdown, and it could be used in lieu of a W where they are mostly passing, it's like the equivalent of a D, but if the provost could give us a mechanism, as Tal suggested, where we can have sort of replacement for the W thing, because we have to comply with the W, there is no choice, really.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: That's what this statement is proposing. It's not that figure out that plan, because we aren't in the position to do so, but that the provost take charge of determining a plan. That's the message that we wanted to convey when we wrote up this statement.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: If we could take that last sentence and tack on a little bit more to it to say exactly what you just said, I

would appreciate that statement 100%.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Kimlisa? We are way over...

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: Add a timeline?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Add a timeline to the statement? Diane --

>> SPEAKER: The provost put a plan, with timeline, in place to identify and implement those benefits?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Okay. Does that -- okay. So are we ready to vote on this statement?

So we have a motion to support this statement. A second. And now we are in a position to vote.

Does anyone -- would anyone like it to be read one more time with the change? One more time, and then we will vote on the revised version of the statement.

>> SPEAKER: A significant portion of faculty identified valid, logical benefits to students regarding the current W policy. Because a change may diminish these benefits, Faculty Senate recommends that the provost put a plan, with timeline, in place to identify and implement those benefits.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All in favor of that statement, please raise your hand? And we do need to count. So we have 18. Keep your hand up if you're a proxy. 23? If you're a proxy for two people? Keep

your hand up again. So 25. Opposed? No one opposes? How many abstain? One abstention. Oh, two abstentions.

All right. It looks like we will move forward in support of this revised statement.

Thank you, everyone. This was a really important discussion. I know it went way over. I appreciate everyone contributing, and I'm glad we can move forward with something tangible in our hands to present so that we can make an effort to salvage the benefits that have been noted.

Thank you, Norma, too, for being up here and providing your information.

Okay. Our next item here relates to guided pathways.

(Laughter.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Okay. The next item is guided pathways. I don't know why we're laughing.

>> SPEAKER: Because it's another tricky issue.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I have a feeling we'll just breeze through it. (Laughter.)

So this one, a little bit of context. Several faculty have expressed concerns, and we have dealt with this a really long time, as you know, but over the past couple of weeks we have received a

burst in issues that we've heard about, because particularly in relation to the curriculum e-mail sent from Jenny Conway that asked for additional recommendations for gen ed courses by March 29.

So a lot of people expressed strong opinions about this not aligning with the original vision and also concerns about, again, limiting our gen ed options. So this resulted in the draft of a statement.

So a few of us worked together to draft a statement which I sent out to all of you, and many if not most if not all of you shared it with your constituents. This statement basically provides a position that we, as faculty, support gen ed -- students having unrestricted choice in terms of gen ed options.

And then after this -- oh, shoot. This mouse is so small. I can barely see it. Okay.

So after this, Nina got in touch with me, Nina Corson who is VPI for pathways, she is now in charge of guided pathways' implementation and initiative because of Gregg Busch's absence. So she was concerned about this, and she approached me, and Tal and I had a chance to speak with her and she wanted to suggest that we do not vote to support this statement but instead assemble a work group to get together over the next month and identify what changes can be

made to address these concerns.

We asked her a couple of questions, and she said the charge of the group is to review the pathways structures and make any necessary recommendations for changes. I think there are some areas for which we can find agreeable compromises. For timeline, she said this group would meet as long as or as short as necessary, depending on the scope and issues the group wants to tackle.

She says she thinks the discussion of student choice can conclude in a month, but there are other items that it could be beneficial to have faculty input on related to milestone courses, and then there is this other part-time pathways initiative that's going to be pushed through at some point.

So she'd ideally like to find some faculty who would like to stay involved, but at least in terms of this piece, the faculty would be for a month with this group.

The last point she's making is -- that's pretty much the main points to take from her answers to her questions.

Tal and I had a chance to talk with her in person. We were overall encouraged by the points, the perspectives that she shared and the dialogue. But we did say we're still going to present this statement, and we're still going to discuss it at senate and I will

provide your points, as well.

She would have been here, but she can't because of interviews, so that's unfortunate. But we still have this decision to make of whether we want to support this statement, whether we want to assemble this work group, whether we want to do both.

Just as one extra little piece, as I did query my English DFC and I got 13 responses, all of which support this statement, zero opposition. Cory wanted me to let everyone know that the biology CDAC also supports it, and this other attachment here is a letter that the biology faculty wrote to the provost.

Here is that letter. We don't have time to read it, but basically the point is is that the biology DFC does support this freedom of choice regarding general education options.

So those are the main details I have to share, and so now we can open it up for discussion. Just to remain focused here, the main things we need to decide are should we assemble this work group? Should we support this statement? Should we do both?

I see Carol's and Kimlisa's hand, Teddy, Matej's hand.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: I support the statement still. I'd like to stay with that, because she didn't really ever tell you why, from your report, that she wanted us not to issue this statement, did

she? Or am I mistaken?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I don't want to speak on her behalf or for her, but the sense I got, and Tal can add anything if he would like, is that she's concerned of the political implications and that it would become a little bit more adversarial or contentious, that it would just set the wrong tone, where she would like a more collegial, collaborative tone. That's the sense I got. I can't speak for her.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Thank you. That's all you know.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: A lot of this is coming from -- a lot of these classes that they're talking about come off of the AGEC. And the AGEC goes through committees, and we all work on them. It gives the students a great deal of choice.

One of the things that they talk about with these recommendations is they feel that students have too much choice and they have, like, 80. But the truth of the matter is that it's more like 60, because if we switched it and put the names of the courses first, you would see the duplication, and it would be more like 60.

A lot of this comes out of the movement of pathways that comes out of the book 'Redesigning the Community College,' which is out of a think tank out of Columbia maybe? One of the institutions that is referenced as "the" institution to follow is right up the street,

ASU. ASU is one of the stellar pathways, supposedly, institutions.

At ASU, the students have 600 courses as a choice. 600.

I thought we had talked about this in committees about this recommendation thing that came from Jenny, and then it came, anyway, which was quite disappointing, but the truth of the matter is that it seems to me, and this is just my belief, that part of our goal here is to get students to go over there or up there or over there, right, where they will have choice.

If we hold their hands and tell them what to take, we do several things. We limit their exposure to things that they might love. You know, they may be in business, no offense to the business people, and then they take an anthropology class, and they are, like, wow, my life has changed. Okay?

We limit what we should be doing in general education, which is giving them a general education. The other thing we do is we eliminate possibly the option of other really good courses, because if we just go out and start doing recommendations and our advising staff, those poor guys, they are so overworked, they are just going to be, like, here's a recommendation, just take this.

Then what happens to humanities, whatever? Then we don't do them a service, because when they go over there or over there or over

there, they're going to have to make decisions, real decisions in the real life. When they go out to a job, nobody's going to tell them how to get to their desk.

So this thing we are doing -- and, you know, I'm sorry for Nina, I really am. She inherited a mess. And, you know, I'm so willing to help with this, but we can't wait because summer is coming. We have one more meeting. In one more meeting, and then it's summer, and I think all of us have suffered the summer surprises. I would like to see that we make it very clear how we feel about this.

Even if we decide to table this, I think it should be on the record that we are doing it out of a sense of good faith to the fact that Nina has been put into a bad situation and that we want to support her in a collegial fashion, but we expect to be included and we expect to be part of that process.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We can definitely vote on this statement today, and I would like to do that so we can, on the record, see who supports it and who does not.

Quickly, I'm curious, I know you had limited time, but was anyone able to gather input from constituents regarding this? We have information from biology and from writing.

>> SPEAKER: The little bit I got from the at-large people...(off

microphone).

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All in support?

>> SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Okay, thank you, Lisa.

Dennis?

>> SPEAKER: In all the sort of leadership meetings I have had, no one has ever spoken out in support of these restrictions. And we have talked at length about how bad it is for some of us.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Okay. I just wanted to get a general sense.

We are on track with Teddy and Matej.

>> TEDDY SCHNUR: I'm in favor of choice in the pathways. Let me say that up front.

When the e-mail came out from Jenny Conway, though, my understanding was her office issued that e-mail for the recommendation list to be looked at because of pathways that had too many restrictions in the general education areas and there weren't enough choices. And the departments were putting in tons of substitution requests, and her office was just being inundated with substitution requests because of the restrictions of choice.

So I'm a little confused as to -- I guess I'm confused about the nature of what was being asked of us, and it sounds like we were

being asked to, at least I was directly told from our dean's office,  
please see if you can loosen it up and give more choice.

So I guess I'm a little confused behind the intent of the  
original e-mail.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: It was to loosen it up a little bit but not  
fully. Like Kimlisa said, our offerings for gen ed are, I think, 60.

I have them in my hand. So it's still, like, a very small portion of  
the full choice, pool of courses that they have to select from.

That's the situation there. Would you like to add anything, Tal?

>> TAL SUTTON: I guess one thing to add in terms of what makes  
this a hard conversation for me is because I feel like some people  
-- some pockets of the college might be working off of information  
from one group or from one timeline and another would be working on  
something different.

So, for instance, back when Gregg Busch was in charge, it seemed  
like the guided pathways team and the curriculum office were not  
doing anything close to a good job of communicating to one another.

So when Gregg Busch was sort of pushing for restricted choice,  
this was back when Michael Parker was president, and he pushed very  
hard against that, and I thought he was successful, so I thought that  
let things go to rest. And all of a sudden, half a year later, the

curriculum office, which notoriously was not communicating with Gregg Busch and his team, all of a sudden said the same thing that Gregg Busch had been saying a half a year past. So I don't know if this was just, like, a delayed messaging issue? Or what?

So I guess that's what makes this hard for me. I don't know how -- I really don't know what to, how to make sense of Jenny's message for that communication lag or communication confusion.

Oh, yeah. And when we had the opportunity to talk with Nina, who is also, by the way, inherited guided pathways, as was mentioned earlier, didn't even know that e-mail went out. She had to get it from a dean to know that that message was even sent out. Again, I don't really know how current that message is, and so that's one concern.

But in terms of going back to in terms of working with Nina, I guess, I'm hopeful in the sense that, as Kimlisa said, a lot of the guided pathways implementation under Gregg Busch was very much guiding or following a very strict interpretation of the national trends of guided pathways as per, like, their playbook, because he certainly sort of subscribed to their newsletter, whereas Nina is not so much. I think she will be much more malleable to be able to recognize that maybe we can just sort of adjust it and find something

that will fit Pima's needs rather than sort of going with some template, fixed structure.

So that's also, I think, something positive to think about.

Anyway.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Thank you. So I would -- I'd like to second what Kimlisa said. I really think we would be doing our students a huge disservice by limiting the choices that way. This is higher education, not middle school where you're told what to take and then you grudgingly do it.

I remember being so privileged to be able to go to college and letting me be able to choose from list of courses what would be the social science that I will take. Secondly, I encourage everybody to read the letter the biology faculty sends. They make very good arguments how this just doesn't make any logical sense. Why would scientists recommend what kind of art class to take? Should you take theater or is painting more helpful for your biology major? What?

Let's see. Then in terms of -- now I forgot. Let's see. In terms of the statement that we are discussing and potentially voting on, I have a really hard time understanding, again, what the objection is. I don't see it as confrontational. I don't see it as limiting any future, really any future moves, so which ones of these

principles is their concern about? Or what is -- the pathways people, what do they disagree with about this statement so strongly that they don't think we should vote on it?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Like I said, the best answer I can give, and I wish Nina were here, but that's just the sense I got, what I conveyed to Carol.

What I'd like to do, I think we have had a great discussion of the statement, and I'd like to put forward to a vote, and then we can discuss what we'd like to do, just so we can move on.

Then we can discuss whether we want to assemble a group. Lisa and Dennis, would you like to issue your comments before we vote, or...even though there hasn't been a motion yet?

>> SPEAKER: Lisa. So I thought what Matej just said and what Kimlisa said were exceptionally well said and encapsulate at least the people that I'm interacting with and representing and certainly the biology letter.

And here's the scoop: I think Nina's a good egg. I think Jenny is a good egg, right? These guys are working really hard to try to make sense of a crazy system.

But we have had so many changes so fast, the one thing that's been consistent in all of this is something like that statement, that

Faculty Senate has consistently had this approach, okay?

Right now, as we speak, you know, as a member of gen ed committee, we are changing what courses even have Cs and Gs on them, okay? And that's going to be changed and revised. There is so much that's in flux, to suddenly be throwing out and say you have to take only this and only this, it's going to be so much more confusion, it's not going to be helpful.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Dennis?

>> SPEAKER: I am going to vote for this statement. I agree with it 100%. As far as trying to give the other side of the coin, in particular what Nina had brought up, adversarial, it says what you have done has no academic rationale and negates the whole purpose of general education, so it's an adversarial statement but one that I will still vote for.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So on that note, since you are holding the microphone...

>> SPEAKER: I move to vote on endorsing this statement.

>> SPEAKER: I second it.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Discussion?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: I'd like to not amend this statement, but I wonder if we could amend it with just recommending or, you know,

agreeing that a group should get together to then study and further address this issue and report back at some point?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: When we present it, I think we could suggest that.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Or can it be a separate motion? Okay. I take it back.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I think that's a little bit of a troubling piece to just tack on.

Any other discussion before we vote?

>> ROSA MORALES: I want to let you know that in the social services department, we had a hard time working on a couple of occasions for long hours trying to limit the amount of choices for those students. For the social work profession, it's actually something contraproductive to do, and we worked very hard for many, many hours trying to decide which were the classes that we will select to be offered, and I'm so happy that we're going on this direction, because I think providing the freedom for the students to guide their own pathway, their own, you know, interest on the areas that they are, you know, meaning to work and to, I guess, offer their experiences, you know, is something that we should be doing instead of limiting.

I also want to let you know that limiting the options looks pretty much like a third-world country approach. I went to school in Mexico and I have a degree in social work, and I remember that the classes were prescribed specifically, you know, the ones that I had to take, and there was not a lot of choices.

I came to this country precisely because of the fact that it's a richer country with a lot more resources. I was quite surprised when we were moving back to this third-world mentality, as this is a prescribed list and this is what everybody should take.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: And this isn't much of a discussion. I'm 10% first serious and 90% joking. But I swear we had this conversation when Michael Parker was president. I almost feel like we could amend it to Faculty Senate still feels that students on guided pathways should...

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Although I don't recall that we endorsed a statement. So we actually have an admin meeting on Wednesday, so this is perfect timing, whatever happens to present the outcome of this discussion, and to, you know, provide some information regarding faculty concern about this issue.

So are we finished with discussion and ready to vote?

All in favor? Keep your hand up high. It's going to take a little bit -- got it? Keep your hand up, please, if you're a proxy. Keep your hands up if you're a double proxy. We are 29 in favor. And all opposed? All abstain?

Okay. Thank you for that discussion, and thank you for helping to move forward with it. I think it feels like we have done something productive. Not that it normally doesn't, but I'm just saying it feels like we are moving forward in a positive way with, you know, this passion that we have regarding the need for options in general education.

And then hopefully this will make an impact and hopefully it won't cause -- I feel confident that it won't cause a rift, and that we can also work in collaboration in a collegial tone to offer input on the framework and make positive changes moving forward.

So thank you. Now, regarding that issue of a work group, do we need a discussion, or are people in favor of creating a work group? I know we have several volunteers already. Some wonderfully informed faculty voices have already come forward. Do we have any objection to that? Can we just go ahead and move forward with it? I'm seeing lots of nodding.

Is there anyone in this room who would definitely like to be

among those group members? Lisa, Kimlisa, Rosa. Anyone else?

What I'd like to do is not limit it to senators, too. I'd like to ask everyone to query your constituents and see if you can find anyone else who would like to participate in this group.

It sounds like work will begin quickly, and so we need to decide this pretty quickly. But I'm glad to have at least a handful of wonderful faculty to participate.

Kimlisa had a comment.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: One question. I'd like to formally request that we ask if Michael Parker can serve on this? Because he has the history both as a faculty and now as dean of social sciences, and I think he is a must for that.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I will definitely make that recommendation and submit that request.

Thank you, Kimlisa.

Are we ready to move on to the next item? Okay.

Tanya is going to come up and present on educational support faculty concerns, and we have a statement related to that, as well.

Tanya can take over and provide information on this statement.

>> SPEAKER: Thank you for letting me speak today. I was nervous about two things: My bosses being in the back of the room and being

able to see over the podium. I at least can see over the podium.

My constituents have asked me to come forth as their senator today to bring forth some concerns that have been facing the counseling faculty and request the senate endorsement.

So the statement we will show for you here in a minute is what we are asking you to endorse, but I feel like I need to give you guys some background information and clear context. I want to make sure that if the movement goes forward to endorse it that you guys know truly what you're endorsing and what our roles are.

Counseling faculty at PCC currently wears multiple hats. We work 169 days a year or 221 for our counseling coordinators or our department heads. These days are stretched throughout the year, so we have flex days versus being offered the summer to ensure that we have year-round coverage. Counselors on average work eight hours per day when they are on shift at the center. Therefore, the bulk of our teaching requirements, grading prep are done on our own time. We get one hour per week per credit for reassigned time.

We are considered part of student affairs and are housed in the student services area. And this has often led to a lot of confusion between the differences between a counselor and an advisor. I will go further into definition of the professional counselor definition

in a few minutes, but for now please understand that PCC counselors have Master's degrees in counseling that have included specific coursework in relation to career counseling, diversity, mental health, amongst other different types of counseling backgrounds, as well as part of our degrees, to be eligible for this position, we have to have done actual practicums.

So there are a lot of people out there with counseling degrees that do not meet the minimum qualifications to be a counselor at Pima Community College. They are very strict and very specific.

As counselors, we teach STU courses that are now required in all transfer degrees and most of the programs of study here at PCC now. In addition, we provide career counseling, academic counseling, short-term personal counseling, intermediate crisis intervention and stabilization and referral.

Like the program advisors, we also have a caseload of undecided students that we guide through the career counseling process to be able to then hand them over once they have decided to a program advisor. And we are also responsible for the mandatory NSOs and other co-curricular activities, like healthy relationship workshops, suicide prevention fairs, we do this in addition to the committee work, professional development, mandatory trainings, and other

activities that faculty are required to participate in.

So we have a big umbrella. But we teach fewer classes to try to compensate for that. I want to point out that the role of advisors and counselors are very different. As career counselors, we work with students in the career exploration process that includes administering and interpreting career assessment such as the MBTI and strong interest inventory that requires a counseling background, requires that Master's degree. We guide them through the exploration process based on these assessments. We help them then determine their long-term goals and then ultimately the paths that they need to follow to get to those goals.

At that point, then, they are turned over to a program advisor. Advisors work only with students in relation to their program of study, and any career advice that can be given is based on that advisor's expertise in that program of study.

The primary responsibility is helping students navigate through the graduation requirements for that specific program of study. As part of our jobs, this is something we can also do, because it's a natural progression of the explanation process of how do you become a doctor, how do you become an air mechanic, how do you become a kindergarten teacher?

But this role and this portion is really technically a very small part of our daily responsibilities. Since the reorganization of the college began, student services department has been hit hard, as we all know, and has not been filling positions for at least two years in anticipation of the fiscal cliff. As a result, student services as a whole has lost one-third of their personnel either due to retirements, attrition, or RIFs. The counseling program alone has gone from 38 counselors to 19. That's almost a 50% drop.

During this time, guided pathways has also been implemented that is resulting in anywhere from one to two STU courses being required in almost every program; therefore, increasing the demand of our faculty to teach. As we know, students also have -- their stressors and barriers to education are continuing to increase. Therefore their needs for counseling services are needing to increase.

So the reason that we are coming to the senate is as a result of loss of manpower in this SSCs, counselors are being pulled away from our teaching and counseling roles. This has been going on for some time. We have been told to teach only one class per semester with the rationale being given that reassigned time would put a burden on the SSC.

This results in larger amounts of adjuncts, which do a great job.

Statistics do show that classes taught by full-time counselors have greater persistence and retention, and we also are able, through those 8-week and 16-week time frames, to build relationships with students who then feel comfortable themselves, are referring other people to us to come forward and ask for help.

So it's also a great building experience when they talk about people needing one person at a college to help them get through, whether it be an advisor, counselor, faculty member, program advisor, you know, we are at the top of that list for building those relationships.

We are currently being worked as advisors doing program-specific and transactional work at a much higher rate, helping people with things such as address changes, helping with their payment plans, et cetera.

Again, we have always provided these types of services. However, now it's becoming one of our primary responsibilities. During PEAK, right before school started, we were working 30 hours a week as advisors. We did not have time to prep for classes, did not have time to see career counseling appointments. We were doing those transactional pieces.

We continue now to do that eight hours a week, and we have a

backlog of people who need to see us for counseling. They are now waiting three weeks or so to be able to get in to see us. It created a backlog. The counselors have been trying to be team players. Many of us working off the clock, trying to balance everything, being advisors by day and counselors at home by e-mail.

But it shouldn't be expected to be long term and it shouldn't be -- it's creating a lot of burnout. We have not been brought to the table by college leadership and administrators, and have frequently requested to have the vision and implementation of plans for the student affairs and counseling departments.

But like I said, we are not being brought to those tables, and we are often being told that "what we can share with you is" versus having open discussions.

We actually this week met with the provost to address our ongoing concerns and to take things up the chain of command. The provost, HR, our immediate leadership team, PCCEA, and consultants with the staffing analysis were actually present at that meeting.

You know, like I said, we have been playing as a team, and we really want to ensure that the students are best being served. However, now it appears that administration is looking to move away from professional counseling to professional advising. That was

pointed out in the March board meeting. And so as a result, they are also taking a look at outsourcing personal counseling and crisis counseling. It would be very similar to our EAP program. If the student had an issue, here's a phone number.

We have done some personal benchmarking through our personal counseling team, and they have teams they have contacted at schools and say, How did this work? They say, We give them a phone, we give them a bottle of water, and we put them in an office and have them make the call.

So as a result of these types of changes, you know, we believe that the college may save money as a result of this but could negatively impact the students, faculty, and staff at PCC in terms of persistence, retention, and safety.

Like I mentioned earlier, we elevated things with the help of PCCEA to the provost and HR this week and are hoping for positive results. However, we're also preparing to take it further and take it to the board, if needed. So as a result of all of that, we're humbly asking for the Faculty Senate's endorsement of the following statement to be pushed forward.

I can read this out loud because you haven't heard enough of my voice, but this is what they have on the screen.

As defined by the American Counseling Association, professional counseling is a professional relationship that empowers diverse individuals, families, and groups to accomplish mental health, wellness, education, and career goals.

In particular, in accordance with the college's goals for diversity, career pathways, student persistence and retention, we affirm and uphold the role of educational support, faculty, counselors in this organization. We assert and recognize the vital and unique professional services and instructional needs that are met through this faculty role, understanding it addresses essential psychosocial, learning, career, and academic developments and retention processes for students through curricular and co-curricular teaching and service provision.

Teaching knowledge and skills crucial for these domains fosters learning application and behavioral change for achieving goals. Furthermore, we value the advanced training and expertise of this role and how it contributes to college and student wellness and safety through classroom and behavioral consultations, student linkages with community resources, and other campus and college-wide complementary leadership endeavors.

The role of educational faculty, counselors, is a necessity in

facilitating student success. A premier college ensures high student retention and graduation rates through using comprehensive counseling supports, resources, and teaching, to proactively meet emergent, developmental, and long-term needs.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you, Tanya. Tanya provided a good overview of ESF support -- educational support faculty and then the current situation regarding what could potentially be moving forward.

Now we have a statement to possibly vote on. Do we have any questions or comments for Tanya?

>> SPEAKER: And I have a few of my co-workers here today, my constituents who have shown up in solidarity. They can also take questions, as well.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: So the statement is kind of -- I know it's very precise for you, but for others it's sort of generic. Like, I looked it up, and so I think that it needs something strong. What is it that you want? What is it exactly? Do you know what it is exactly that you want?

>> SPEAKER: Remain counseling faculty.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: In other words, the title is moving to something else, is what you're telling us?

>> SPEAKER: Not the title. The positions themselves could be

going away.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: So you're requesting a certain number of positions to be in place for a community college this size, or...

>> SPEAKER: Do you guys want to come in and join up?

>> SPEAKER: Melania Federico. There is a possibility, as we were told at our meeting by Dolores, that positions might change. Titles might change. Compensation might change. If there is outsourcing for crisis, as Tanya explained, that means for those of you that have come to us in the past, you have a concern in your classrooms with one of your students, we won't be available to help deescalate that situation. Students will be given someone from an outside agency to sit tight and wait for.

So we are asking for your support. We are asking for you to support where we currently stand as that support faculty.

Already, what has changed so far, as Tanya explained, is the fact that our time and us as resources has gone out to provide the help in the student services center, which we remain flexible and have always been willing to assist in the center. We will continue to do that.

But what has happened, because of the fact that student affairs, as a whole, has taken such a hit in the reduction of staff, they are using us at this time to come and step in and take over their role

and then we suffer, or our students suffer in terms of not having us available to provide what they need.

Again, we are looking for that support to keep the status where we currently are at, because we know that obviously there has been tons of change for everyone in every area and every department and every discipline, absolutely. The main concern is if and when that happens, we're asking for a timeline. We are asking for a firm answer of, yes, this will change, or no, it won't.

What's happening at this moment is a lot of uncertainty and not the clarity. And if those changes are coming, then absolutely, we have to accept it, but we are looking for that timeline and to continue to do what we do in serving our students. And retention is the key. Retention is that end result.

So, yes, the statement might be very broad, but what we want folks to understand is that we are professionals in our role. If our role changes, as we were told by Dolores it's very possible that it will change, then you will not have that support on the campuses to help your students through.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Matej? Did you have your hand up? Then in the back.

Just as a little context, as well, I know this is a lot of

information to absorb. I first became aware of this issue exactly a week ago, and then I did my best to become educated and move forward from there. Basically, my understanding is it simply comes down to the current role of our counselors is our educational support faculty is in jeopardy.

Nothing has been decided yet, but a lot of things are, to use a term I've heard quite a lot lately, on the table. So I think this is a proactive way to present a position in support of educational support faculty to inform those decisions going forward and just express that there is support for the current role that the support faculty have. So that's my just general kind of contextual summary of my understanding at this point.

So I believe we had Matej and then in the back and then Rosa and then Carol.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: If I understand this correctly, this is to sort of show support and agree with the importance of the services that we currently provide, such as, you know, in-person, you know, available counseling in a crisis or some kind of situation, as opposed to 1-800 number where you may or may not be able to see somebody in a couple of weeks.

But we're not saying there is no need for academic advisors,

there is no need for program advisors, or professional advisors? I'm leery of these buzzwords all the time, right? We're just saying we would like to see a continued role for the kinds of services you provide us at support faculty as counselors?

>> SPEAKER: Absolutely. Absolutely. And like Kimlisa has mentioned multiple times -- yay to Kimlisa -- we are extremely undermanned. They took us out at the knees. We're trying to provide that holistic wraparound support. However, the people who provide the holistic support have been laid off in large mass.

And we have not been brought to the table. Things are on the table, but we aren't coming to the table. We are getting told things after the fact. We are finding things out afterwards. Other people are making these decisions. Other people -- administrators are benchmarking things without us helping in that benchmarking process.

And so otherwise it would have not come to you. This has been going on for a year and a half, two years. We are slowly bringing it up to the point, but as of last week when the chancellor made the comment that they were moving away from counseling and moving towards professional advising, you have to understand that professional advisors are not counselors.

So they're considering taking away our numbers to fill another

gap, which is desperately needed, it's desperately needed, but at what cost? That's our concern.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: In the back, you have a comment?

>> SPEAKER: Cory L. Desert Vista science and fitness. I also share these concerns you're bringing here today. Based off the statement I see, it does focus on the counselors, which I don't want to divert attention to, but I can't help but wonder, could this impact other support faculty such as librarians?

>> SPEAKER: There definitely is that concern from the librarians, as well.

>> SPEAKER: They have approached us, as well.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We had Carol and then Rosa. I'd like to note we are at 3:00, which is our designated end time. I knew this would be -- I knew we had a lot of weighty issues today, so if you could please just continue with us through these next, the final items today, this would be great. If we do have comments, if we could ensure they are succinct and on point, that would be fantastic, as well. Thank you.

>> ROSA MORALES: I just want to say that one of the things that have been happening in a lot of community colleges is precisely they have been strengthening the areas of support for the students,

knowing that more and more they are coming to college sometimes facing enormous challenges.

In addition to counselors, actually, they have added social workers, which some of them are finding that are extremely helpful because of the knowledge of the organizations in the community, they can provide, you know, those type of referrals.

So as the college progress and is trying to achieve success on teaching individuals who are coming from communities that have faced enormous challenges, we need to reinforce more support to them. And I do believe the counselors as being one of those individuals are essential for all the students to be able to succeed.

So while I'm interested in continuing having access to counselors in the future, I have been praying, you know, to get also social workers on board, because for your information, several of the community colleges not only have counselors, they also have social workers that can actually refer students to the proper agencies in the community that can assist them.

So I'm glad that you're mentioning that this is happening, because it doesn't look to be congruent with our future interests on providing wraparound services to ensure student success if we are taking away counselors.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We have already lost four people, and I'm concerned about losing quorum. We do have the statement that the faculty have provided for us. How many more people wanted to speak? Matej? You're okay?

Okay. What would people like to do at this point? Would anyone like to make a motion to support this statement? Cory?

>> SPEAKER: Cory L. I support the statement, but I'm a little concerned that we are perhaps not including all of the support faculty here, and so I just don't know. Are we going to come back and have to go through this again for librarians or other individuals who maybe aren't being included in the statement?

>> SPEAKER: Right now, unfortunately, I think things aren't on the table for them either, or they are on the table that they are not invited to, as well. So all we know is just based on recent statements that have been specific to counseling faculty, which is why we brought this forward, because we felt like time was of the essence before -- they have actually got RFPs out looking to outsource right now.

>> SPEAKER: I would like to support all of them.

>> SPEAKER: I vote yes.

>> SPEAKER: The RFPs are out.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: You would vote in favor of the statement?

Carol?

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: I vote in favor of the statement. I sure wish if you could boil it down, really nuggetize it more so it packs a punch. But I support it right now.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Perhaps when things move off the table, and we see what happens when things move off the table and into a plan, that might be a point where a stronger statement is necessary. So that's a good point, and then a thought to think about moving forward.

So we have a couple of people who have already indicated they would definitely vote in favor of it. We don't have a motion yet. Tal would like to offer a comment.

>> TAL SUTTON: I want to make a slightly specific motion, and feel free to reject it. I put forward the motion that we endorse the statement as written, as well as request that -- this may be going too far, if this gets rejected, it's cool -- that we do have a condensed statement that is brought forward to the board in the April board report that summarizes this.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: I second it.

>> TAL SUTTON: Since Brooke is not here, I'm going to throw her

under the bus. I mean, perhaps Tanya can -- perhaps the counselors can come up with a condensation, condensing it, and then Brooke is responsible for creating the board report.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I think that that would be given, anyway, like if we support the statement that she would do that.

I was going to say I think that piece would be included, anyway, since Brooke includes everything that occurs of significance and more in the board report. I don't know if we need to attach it, but...

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: I think she would give them the entire statement. As a former rep, I would say she would give them the whole statement.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So we could support it, and then we could say as part of our endorsement we will put this in front of the board in a condensed version. Is that understanding correctly?

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: I would point out that RFPs are out, and it is the second-to-the-last meeting. Summer is coming, guys.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We have a motion on the table to endorse this statement with the additional note to put it on the board report in a condensed version, and so do we have a second?

We have quite a few seconds.

All in favor?

(Ayes.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Please keep your hand up so that we can count. Keep your hand up if you're a proxy. Double proxies, keep your hands up. We have 19 in support of the statement. All opposed? All abstain? Must have had quite a few people who left.

Did we get Tanya?

>> SPEAKER: I'm not proxy for three people.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So we have 21 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstain.

The motion goes forward and we officially endorse the ESF faculty statement and we will submit a condensed version of it to the board.

We have endorsed three statements today? Yeah. Right. Very productive.

All right. Where are we? I think we are at the election update. As you know, today at 1:00 p.m. was the deadline for submitting nominations for Faculty Senate. Tal would like to present on that.

>> TAL SUTTON: I'm trying to summarize the results of the survey, and so unfortunately there weren't as many nominations as there are available seats, so I'm going to wing it in the next coming weeks. Any additional insights or input would be most welcome. This is essentially what we have right now.

For adult education, there were two candidates for the full-time

seats. There are two available seats. That's promising.

I think they have part-time seats, which would mean -- I think they have part-time staff instructors, so I think this is one, but there were no potential candidates.

Applied tech there was one candidate for full time out of a potential three, so there is a deficit there. No part-time candidates came forward.

Arts, there were one, possibly two, but the second one didn't include their name, so I don't know how to track them down. Out of two potential full-time seats. No part-time candidates.

Business and IT, there was one full-time candidate for three available seats. There were two part-time candidates willing to go. The asterisk means that they answered, at least one of those people answered that they would be willing to serve and represent a different division. Even though there are two candidates there, it could easily be the case that the one who is willing to switch could go to one of the divisions that is currently vacant.

Communications, there were four candidates putting their names forward, plus Josie and Brooke. Gives us six potential -- two definite and four potential candidates out of six. No part-time candidates out of one.

Critical care, no one came forward. Out of three, there was a part-time faculty wanting to serve.

For education, STU, and biomedical sciences, the most messed-up division in the world, there were two people putting their names forward. We have Tanya and Rita staying on as officers.

And then I'm pretty sure they have four but I have to get a double count because the information I got was a little weird with how -- I don't know if STU got double counted or not. I have to double-check on that. If they weren't double counted, I think we have four. And then there were no part-time faculty nominations.

Fitness, no one came forward in either regard. Librarians, Joe is staying on, and there is one candidate for two positions. So that seems promising. I don't know if fitness or librarians, if they have what would be considered part-time faculty? Okay. It's okay that no one nominated themselves, because that is the empty set.

Mathematics, I'm staying on. Then there was one candidate out of a total of four seats. No part-time faculty. PimaOnline had two full-time faculty. One was willing to represent a different division for the one available seat. I don't think PimaOnline would technically have any part-time faculty that are -- okay. So I think that's also going to be zero.

Then for science, there were six full-time faculty interested in running for five seats, though at least one of them was willing to serve and represent a different division. Then there was one part-time faculty.

And then down in social sciences, only one full-time faculty for three positions. There were two part-time faculty that wanted this position. Both wanted to specifically represent social sciences and humanities, so that will be certainly a runoff election or an actual election with choice.

Workforce is zero and zero, but I also discovered this week that for whatever reason staff instructors, though defined as faculty by HLC, are not on the faculty LISTSERV, so they never got the e-mail about the survey. The only reason that adult education got that information is because Lisa G knew the survey was coming out because she's a senator, and she contacted me wondering when the survey was going to come out when it had already gone out. She was nice enough to forward it on to adult education for me.

So I need to sort of work on this, so the fact that there are no candidates is because that division doesn't know that we are having an election right now. That is something I will have to remedy.

And hopefully we can also fix the fact that not all faculty are

on the all faculty LISTSERV, which is just a very weird sentence that I just said.

Anyway, moving forward, what I want to do, and again, this isn't the perfect process, I'm kind of inventing it as we go along, because this is the first time we are running elections this way, so I welcome input, is again, for instance, in science, it looks like we are covered, but the one thing that might end up being true is what if all of those science faculty are from West Campus? So I want to send out a summative e-mail to everyone saying these are sort of like the information about the candidates, because I won't put forward their names yet, these are the campuses from the candidates, these are the specific fields, for instance, in that really bizarre division. If these two candidates are biomedical, then that would mean technically none of those four people would be from education, so they might -- once that division sees it, maybe an education faculty might say, oh, I will put my name forward.

I don't know fully what the spread is. I will send out an e-mail that sort of summarizes the spread of discipline representation, campus representation, and once that's out, I will sort of leave the survey open for maybe another week to see if that will garner additional people saying, Oh, currently my discipline isn't being

represented. I will step forward.

And then after that, take all of that, any new additional candidates, put together ballot, actual election surveys to be sent out to each individual division.

Since I think it's the deans that have those lists, I would create the surveys, send them to the division deans and say, Please send these to your faculty, and then you'll receive the survey from the division deans saying these are your candidates, this is where their campuses are, this is what disciplines they are representing, please vote on, and this is how many seats you have to fill.

It might be the case that you have three candidates for three seats, in which case it might be a very easy election, but I guess I still don't -- it is shaping up that way at the moment, but hopefully we can get more people, because if you look at the sum total, we do have 40 potential full-time seats with only about 28 or 29. So we were looking to -- I'm trying to get 10 more or so.

Diane? Joe?

>> SPEAKER: So sometimes I think the only way to get people to volunteer is to ask them to. So I think we should all look at our colleagues as we walk around campuses, and if we see someone that we think should be a senator, just ask them to be.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I would agree with that. I think this is a lot of information to sort of absorb from the graph, but if you could -- maybe one thing is to, if you could summarize it and provide it in an e-mail that we could understand the areas that are particularly lacking so that we know which ones to particularly hone in on when targeting faculty, that might be one approach to take, as well.

Otherwise, to me, the approach that you stated and described sounds very logical. I feel like we all trust you and feel like you're in the best position to determine how to move forward at this point.

Joe? Did you have a comment?

>> SPEAKER: I just know with the library faculty, people have been used to having one representative for as long as they can remember, and I ended up sending out a reminder to them about this quite late and I emphasized there are two positions.

I don't know how many groups might have looked at this and said, oh, I already know we have a representative. It might have been new to them and it might not have gotten across that there is more representation in many cases.

>> TAL SUTTON: That's a fair point. That's also something I discovered. I'm a little too close to it, and so I know it kind of

backwards and forwards, so when I write my e-mails I try to be as informative as possible, but I might have these blind spots of saying, oh, that's not an obvious piece of information, and I'll get an e-mail saying, did you mean this? Holy crap, of course.

So, yeah, that's something -- if you guys sort of see something in my e-mails that I send out, like, oh, that could be confusing or someone might be making that type of assumption, that type of information is helpful for me so that I know how to adjust my sort of messaging.

So maybe the additional thing I might do is maybe I will sort of send an e-mail only to faculty senators saying, like, please go and sort of like knock on doors and tap shoulders of people that you think might be, or in that e-mail really sort of highlight the particularly vacant disciplines like critical care, math, business and IT I think are sort of like the standouts, and applied tech are the standouts right now.

Essentially if you're missing -- I feel like if this difference is two or more, we definitely -- so full-time candidates to full-time seats, so we have three seats but only one person is running right now. Applied tech, business and IT, critical care. Fitness has one with no candidates yet.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: And I'd be happy to send another, if we could highlight those areas in an e-mail, I'd be happy to send another e-mail out to all faculty and say we extended the deadline because there are some areas where we severely lack representation, and we would like to give everyone an additional chance to volunteer.

I think maybe if we can make the work we do feel real exciting and meaningful, too (smiling)? Talk about how our meetings are action-packed (laughter), engaging and entertaining and exciting. Lots of cookies. We had three motions today, and we always move from these meetings with a real happy sense of fulfillment as we move towards the weekend. That's another thing we could use to generate more interest, as well.

Just some thoughts about really recognizing the exciting opportunity this really does prove to be.

>> ROSA MORALES: Let's take a group picture, and...

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I would second that but I would also add, could we please do it as a pyramid? (Laughter.)

Another comment and then we need to move on.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: It seems to me that part of the context here is that people are utterly overwhelmed by e-mails, and because of that, the title of the e-mail really matters.

When I saw Tal's e-mail, to me, of course it's very salient because I have been a senator for years on end, but sometimes what's lacking is in the title of the e-mail and also in the content in the e-mail telling people the big picture, like why should we care, right? I mean, Tal, you're very close to this. You and I know the importance of faculty being represented. But that needs to be stated explicitly. And I don't think that you should feel like a dork or whatever to craft a title of an e-mail that's very in your face, Hey, do you not want to be represented? Do you want admin just to run roughshod over all of us indefinitely, forever and ever, amen? I mean, I know that's a long title for an e-mail, but do you understand the spirit?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Maybe a more diplomatic way?

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: Yeah, well, I'm so done with being diplomatic. But you understand the spirit of what I'm saying?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: You want Clickbait?

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: Yes, think Clickbait. Thank you. Yes, good concept. You need to grab people by the lapels and just shake them.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All right. Are we ready to move on? Okay.

So we have reached what I like to think of as the seventh-inning

stretch, the report time, and I have listed all the items here.

They're not long. I just didn't want to forget anything. I will just tick through them as quickly as I can.

Fact charge update. Matej has a wonderful little writeup in his PCCEA report. Basically, the FACT charge implementation team has begun meeting again for changes that will impact academic year '20/'21. The first meeting was Wednesday. Tal and I and Matej were there. And 269 positions and 263 is the goal to get them down to, and there are vacancies.

So that's the big picture. Nothing else is determined at that time. There is an additional meeting in two weeks.

Standing committee update. I think it was Margie that asked about standing committees last time. We brought this up with our admin leader at our admin leadership meeting in March. The minutes are posted down -- they're posted, and I think they are linked here.

But they are linked somewhere, right there. Essentially, what is going on is that, yes, faculty will be given the opportunity to join standing committees this year. It's coming down to the wire, so I'm not quite sure how that will roll out. Julian Easter said, yes, it will happen. What is being determined is whether or not the membership of the academic standards committee, the curriculum

committee and the gen ed committee should be determined by divisions, given the new structure. So we did say, as officers, we do support this, but we recommend that at least one senator be present on each committee.

So that's something to be alerted to, is that committees, that information will be coming out apparently about soliciting membership.

The officers meeting and administration, here is a link to the meeting notes. It is still in draft form, so I will update it with the actual finalized comments when I have them available. Standing committees, we talked about. Mandatory training, we provided the letter and the support that we gathered and we voted for last senate meeting.

We got a promise from Jeffrey Lanuez that he would issue a new e-mail with a revised training plan described in the e-mail. That e-mail has not come out yet. He did say Faculty Senate officers could review it before it was sent out. We're not sure what the holdup is. I know we have our Eric Aldrich who was one of the key people who composed the letter is kind of pushing for that, as well. He's been contacting Jeffrey, so we're continuing to push for, you know, when is the e-mail going to come out? If necessary, we will

bring it up at our next admin meeting on Wednesday.

W grades, we talked about that. Basically everything that we contextually that we discussed today. CDAC evolution, we discussed how the final draft was presented at the end of March, and we discussed that we had a recommendation to include an FAQ supplement that addressed concerns that were valid that the handbook does not address, and we also recommended that the handbook be directly combined with the -- what's the other book? I'm blanking on the name. The leadership handbook.

So that recommendation is going forward and a work group is going to be assembled. Jenny will get back to us when the time comes to assemble that work group.

BOG accomplishments, Brooke just noted that areas are lacking. We tend to get a lot of communications in other areas with faculty accomplishments, but other areas, please do let Brooke know about the accomplishments and query your constituents so we can have a wide, diverse representation of faculty accomplishments on the board reports.

CDAC evolution update, I don't think we need to go into that. AD ASTRA work group, Lamata just stopped by my office briefly yesterday to ask that I let everyone know that there is a work group assembled

with two faculty working on implementation of the AD ASTRA software, and she wanted me to specifically note that it's the platinum analytics version.

New pharmacy vendor and wellness update, these came from Tim, and I believe Matej also has a write-up of this in his report. Healthy rewards, just be aware of the healthy reward updates and schedules that we get via e-mail.

The biometric mammogram schedule for open enrollment that was sent out, flu shot participation, remember that the Pima healthy rewards deadline is May 31st.

And the RFP, this is a big one, that you have probably, may have heard about, is the RFP process has been completed regarding pharmacy benefits and there is a new pharmacy vendor. The buzz I have heard so far is it's of great cost savings to the college. I know there is always concern when we hear cost savings with benefits, because we always worry that that's going to mean that we pay more co-pays, or it makes things more difficult.

But the perspective I have gotten so far is this is a positive change and that this will be a better -- Matej, would you agree with me, that Magellan, this move, people are saying it's a positive move?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Yeah, that was my understanding.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We will have to be mindful of it. If we do encounter obstacles, to make note of them.

That's something to be aware of moving forward.

Senate committees. Just a reminder to keep your, this document updated with current information. That's all I will say about that.

Any questions about the notes I have just gone over for the president's report?

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Regarding the mandatory training letter from Jeffrey Lanuez, could we please bug him? Because time is really getting -- and after graduation, I'm leaving. So if we don't get a triage -- I need to be able to finish my stuff before I go out of town, because we have a deadline of June 30 to finish that training. Isn't that correct?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: June 30 of next year.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Not this year, next year. But it's -- that's not -- there are little deadlines in between. He sent a whole chart. But it's going to be revised.

I will, yes, Carol, we will do our best to bug him. We will bring it up to the leadership meeting and say no movement has been made on this.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Yeah, call it on him. This is getting

old. We have heard this so many times.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I'm not sure what's going on.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: But we have to have it done by tomorrow  
(laughter).

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Can we move forward to the provost report?

Provost report, that person is not here, and Norma who was going to deliver that report, is not here. We don't have anyone to go over the provost report. I would say it's linked here. We will get it via e-mail.

Is everyone okay if we move on to the remaining two items? We are way over time. I think we all feel okay about that.

Yes. We will now move on to the Board of Governors report followed by the PCCEA report.

>> SPEAKER: Brooke prepared the Board of Governors report, and I was there to present it to them. I think they'll be glad to have her back. The report is linked. If there are any questions on it, I could answer them, or if there is any questions about the meeting, I'm not quite sure what I'm reporting on here.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Any summary items you want to note in particular? About the report? Or the meeting that you want to draw our attention to? Otherwise we can move on. Because the report is

linked here.

>> SPEAKER: There was a risk management report that is quite wide-ranging that was presented, and I think the person who presented it kind of works for the board, and maybe partially also for the chancellor, and had areas of the college prioritized by how risky they were.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: What kind of risk?

>> SPEAKER: Risk of all kinds, to the college's reputation, sustainability, all that. And the first one, as I recall, was something like advising and academic support. Up there along with IT. And no questions were really asked about that.

I did not know what that meant. But the report should be available through the Board of Governors' agenda, and there was the report and possibly also a PowerPoint that went along with it. I can't tell you much more about that, although it's kind of intriguing and a little strange.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Sounds like a vague item.

>> SPEAKER: It was vague, but it was a big part of the report when you looked at how things were presented.

So that was one of the main things there. Probably the main thing of interest.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you, Joe. I just want to -- we don't have very many people here left. Unfortunately, Matej -- I just want to note one other thing with this talk of advising and changes being made with the whole presentation Tanya provided and the statement, is just to be alert to the fact of what's being asked of faculty in terms of advising. You know, the advising group provided this new model and it's going to require more work, advising, substantial work from faculty to organize it, to get with the visions, offer training, and, you know, with this shift that's being, that's on the table regarding advising and counseling, we just should be mindful of what's getting shifted on to faculty, and to ask, is this typical in other colleges and institutions for faculty to be asked to do advising?

It seems that I have had some conversations with others and a sense that Pima is a very advising, student-advising-focused institution. We feel a lot of that as faculty. I just want to suggest that we be a little bit alert to that moving forward and alert to what is our role, you know, what is our role, faculty, educational support faculty, and librarian faculty, whatever our role is and how much of it should be this advising piece and how is it getting shifted and how is that changing and is it doing so in a way

that benefits our students. Just something to consider before we move on.

So to the final piece of our meeting today, which is our ninth inning, ninth and final inning, last batter up at bat, Matej steps up to bat to close.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Hello, everybody, who is still here.

Just a follow up on Joe's comments, the board meeting was pretty uneventful this month. I expect May will be much more eventful. My impression was that was the internal auditor who gave that risk assessment, and it seemed like a long, you know, interesting read, if you want to dig it up, it's in the board documents. It's posted.

I think the plan is to kind of give recommendations on where to do the audit, so in these areas that are identified as high risk, that's where they would be doing additional audits, and it sounds like they are understaffed like everybody else right now at the college, but that, to me, was also the most interesting item of the whole board meeting, I think.

Regarding PCCEA business, so in Meet and Confer, we are working again on these revised personnel policies. It's a really broad project. Cohort 2, calling them cohorts now, the second group of policies, set of policies, as Tal would like to say, is out and

closes for comment April 15. It's at noon, not 5:00 p.m., just in case you're waiting for the last minute.

And cohort 3 was just released today. I haven't checked my e-mail extensively, but I hear it's out there. So PCCEA will send out that document for guidance again with those smileys, just to kind of summarize each policy, since they are not doing track changes as we traditionally do so people can see what changed trying to provide these summaries and trying to point out anything major that's changed in a good way or a negative way.

Please do continue to comment, especially on the policies that we sort of flag as problematic. The administration is reading the comments and they are reacting to them. We have had some discussions where, after the fact, for example, it was unclear whether jury duty was still a paid leave and that was never intended not to be. So we were able to clarify that.

They are taking your comments into account. It might even be that they are weighed even more heavily or just as heavily as the feedback we are giving, because sometimes the people who always speak out and are the noisy wheels, they get kind of tuned out. But if they hear from everybody else, that does have an impact.

So please continue, I know it's really busy, but please continue

to provide feedback as you see as far as what's important.

We are asking -- so we've got six weeks left in the semester. So we are asking that everything be sent out before, you know, finals begin and faculty go off contract, and I really am concerned that we are not on schedule to do that, to wrap everything up. There is lots of policies -- the report has more details, but there are lots of policies to be sent out. None of the really big sort of more controversial consequential ones have been sent out. So we do remain moderately concerned that we are behind schedule. You know, we will do our best, but PCCEA is definitely going to advocate for some kind of slowdown or pause, adopt what you can, bring in the rest as is, and then we will continue next fall as needed.

Regarding the two issues that PCCEA made a comment about at the last board meeting, so we had an all faculty meeting maybe a month ago where we discussed this on representation, allowing faculty to bring representatives to meetings, the other one is about what we saw some misguided budget priorities, and the comments I think were well received. The board directed the administration to follow up.

We have started discussing the employee group policy as far as what the role is of representative groups at the college. And administration does seem more open to allowing, you know, allowing

representatives, if somebody has a concern they'd like to bring with their supervisor and they're not feeling comfortable for some reason, that they could bring a rep.

They just want to put some more parameters on it where there could be some cases where conversations should be more private or, I mean, we are still working on those parameters. But we do seem to have some movement.

Regarding the budget issues and the kinds of, you know, lack of -- any kind of reinvestment into the faculty salary line over the last many years, those discussions are still ongoing, so we are back at the table. I really wish I had something better to report. But we still don't see eye to eye. The provost gave us a big sort of document on Wednesday when we met, trying to outline their perspective and their argument and showing some of their numbers, but we already see a number of issues there where we just, where we just really take issue with how the argument is being made.

So I wish I had something more concrete, but those discussions are ongoing. The board did approve a \$2 tuition increase at the March meeting, which should be sufficient to provide some kind of 1.5% probably cost-of-living increase to the employees, so that's one item, in case you haven't heard about. And we really do seem to be

getting a little traction or at least understanding about that leapfrogging problem, bringing people from the outside, same years of experience as our current people and then placing them higher.

So I'm sort of hopeful that we could do something about that, and I'm pushing for, like, this year so we fix it for next year.

But again, in terms of getting any kind of, you know, Step Progression for all faculty, that's really out of question for this year, but we will continue to have those discussions.

Let's see. So you have heard about the counselor issue. The counselors really have been through a lot recently, and I encourage you -- you know, talk to them, support them. Let's really figure out how we can keep this vital, you know, counseling role here.

There have been issues with (indiscernible) contracts that comes up every few years of people not being paid on time. I hear there is some committee being put together by Dave Bea. If anybody is interested, if you have expertise, haven't gotten paid on time, feel free to contact him directly.

Benefits committee, Josie already talked about. PCCEA checked. Every March there is a list of people, list of faculty whose contracts are recommended for renewal for next year. We always check that over to make sure everybody is included. We are following up on

a handful of people that weren't there, but we just weren't sure if maybe they had already retired, so we are following up with HR to make sure everybody has a contract for next year.

Josie talked a little bit about that faculty allocation team.

The only thing I would add is I will take another look at the rubric, try to improve it, but the enrollment numbers do not look very good, particularly for this year. So there may be a few position reductions that we hopefully can manage through attrition for this year best of your recollection once we do it a year from now, looking at the 2019 enrollment numbers, it's not looking very good. If we just continue using that 50 to 1 ratio, it does look like they will be asking again to cut several more positions.

You know, that's just the reality right now. Our role, as I see it, is just to continue to advocate so the appropriate budgetary resources be devoted to our mission, which is instruction and support.

Anyway, on that happy note, any questions? I don't want to keep everybody from Happy Hour.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: That last thing you were just saying about budget priorities and how, when the window captures our abysmal stats from 2019 in terms of enrollment, that expenditure limitation

is going to hit us with even more force, I just want to give an impassioned plea and have it be on the record with senate, and I know you are on board with this, I'm just saying it into the mic so it goes into the record, please, please, please continue to, every opportunity, whenever the word "enrollment" comes out of the mouth of any administrator, it should be like a call-in response, and the word that should come out of our mouths is the registration interface. Because if the budget doesn't have a massive increase in the amount of money devoted to that, we are going out of business. Because there is no way that, with the conversion rate being what it is, where 60% of the people say, Screw this, I give up, this is impossible, I want to take classes at this place, but they apparently don't want my tuition dollars because it is so, damn hard to register, please, please, please, I'm just saying this to remind us all to keep up the drum beat. Fix the registration interface.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you, MaryKris. We do try to emphasize that, I think, but it is a good point to continue to emphasize it.

Can we have -- we need to wrap up, so any remaining comments could be addressed to Matej afterwards, but Tanya, do you want to --

>> SPEAKER: It's more kind of along the lines of what MaryKris just said. Right now, student services is going through a staffing

analysis, and so one of the things that the staffing analysis people have told us is that they keep coming back to telling people the problem isn't customer service. It is systems.

One of the exact things they said the other day was in the meeting with HR and the provost and all that when we were explaining all our concerns, is someone in IT needs to roll up their sleeves and get it done, then that's what needs to happen, so I think things are moving in that direction.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I once attended a baseball game that went into 18 innings. Mariners game. I'd say this counts as 12, 13? Definitely extra innings today. For those of you still here, thank you for -- I don't want to say sticking it out towards the end, but for being here and for caring and...

>> ROSA MORALES: For your service?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: For your service and everything. Yes, please drive carefully going home and see if you can generate some alertness. I know sitting here for three hours gets you particularly bleary, almost to a post-happy hour state.

On that note...

>> SPEAKER: Motion.

>> SPEAKER: Second.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I think all in favor of whatever was just

said?

(Ayes.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All opposed?

The motion goes forward. That is our fourth successful motion.

Have a wonderful weekend, and I will see you back on May 3rd.

(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.