



# 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 County Community College District Faculty Senate**

**February 7, 2020**

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Welcome, everybody, to our second spring 2020

Faculty Senate meeting. Yay.

All right. I believe we've got everyone. And let's go ahead and start with agenda modifications and short announcements. There are a few modifications mostly with some last-minute things on the president's report. But otherwise, it should be the same as the one you received earlier this week.

We do have a couple of short announcements. I believe Patty has one and Anthony.

>> PATTY FIGUEROA: Yes. I just wanted to let you know that

adult basic ed is having a health fair on February 29th at El Rio

Center on 1390 West Speedway, and all the students are invited and encouraged to attend.

>> SPEAKER: Hello, everybody. I'm the co-chair of the strategic planning team. I want to give a quick update.

Nic and I have been going around to all the campuses, centers, maintenance, District Office doing mission review study sessions. That's where we take a look at the current framework for our strategic plan and talk about what's working, what isn't working, thinking about the purpose of the college and our core values and what kind of behaviors we want to have as an institution going forward.

I wanted to say you're not going to make this one, happening right now, at West Campus but there is one at 1:30 at Desert Vista on Monday, and then if you haven't been able to make it to any of that, I would suggest going to the Futures Conference on February 28th in the morning. There is a breakfast, but it's a good chance to interact with the community members and to talk about what you want your college to be, what they want their college to be and to sort of, you know, talk about the future that way.

I find it way more exciting than I can relate in this 30 seconds, so if you want me to pep-talk you, come see me after and I will.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you, Patty and Anthony.

We will move on to business. Do we have the December and January minutes?

>> SPEAKER: Yes.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: They are where?

>> SPEAKER: February folder

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Would you be able to attach those to the agenda?

>> SPEAKER: Yep.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Then we can come back to those and then we have access to them. Thank you, Anthony.

Our next item is instructional designers. We have Dr. Jan Kempster and Michael Amick here. This is in relation to something that came up at our January 14 Faculty Senate meeting. We were made aware of changes.

These were also communicated in an e-mail this week from the provost, and because there were some questions and concerns back in January, we wanted to invite representatives from PimaOnline to address those questions.

I will turn it over to Michael and Jan.

>> SPEAKER: Good afternoon. I apologize that you received the information about the end of the instructional design deployment without some of the rationale and supported resources that are in place to help address that need, that they did not come out together.

I hope that you have had a chance to review the e-mail from the provost that helps explain some of why that deployment is ending and if you have had a chance to review the resources that are currently

in place to help address those needs.

And also if you note in there some of the continuing and future implementation of support that will be expanding with the TLC and the faculty learning centers to help with questions that faculty may have.

I hope what is compelling is that the resources that we have been working really for the last nearly five years to expand the usage of D2L that started with, by no fault of the faculty, a very locked-down and challenging-to-access tool approximately five years ago, we have continually worked to expand the ease of use, the access, and the responsiveness that you all need to really harness this tool, and the piece that I hope faculty are experiencing, instead of needing to make an appointment and wait possibly a day or two or later into the week to get your question answered, the tools that we have been putting into place allow you and other faculty to have your work flow continue as you need it when you want it.

That is the nature of the tools that we have in place, and I don't think we have time to be demoing here, but we sure can follow up on all of those.

And finally, I hope that towards the end of that e-mail that you noticed a request from the provost requesting that any of the faculty that still have concerns about their usage or maybe they are still getting started with this tool that they try to attend one of the scheduled essential D2L workshop trainings that we have. These have

been going on, in essence, they took place all of the year of 2018 to help prepare for the use of the D2L gradebook, and this continues to expand on that offering.

Do you have any questions or other concerns that we can take -- oh, and the one final item, at the bottom of that e-mail, there is an instructional support input survey. Please utilize that or have your faculty take that survey to input this is how I need help with D2L. That will ensure that the faculty resource center or our other materials are addressing whatever concern or need that you have.

>> SPEAKER: Jenny H. Can you tell us the percentage of how many faculty are not D2L trained or Brightspace trained now approximately?

>> SPEAKER: I don't think we have a data point of those that have been through the current online training that we have for Teach. When we developed that Teach training, now any faculty seeking to teach online needs to have that current certification, but we also grandfathered or whatever the appropriate term is of those that had the prior training that was more of a self-paced certification.

But again, that is listed as a resource. Faculty are encouraged to take that training to become certified to teach online. It is a much bigger expansion on the tools. It puts you in the role of a student for five weeks in an online course and has a very positive experience.

>> JEANNIE ARBOGAST: I completely understand that you need to pull the instructional designers what their job is. I've written

enough master courses to understand what's going on in there, but I am going to sadly and sorely miss, and I know on my campus, Desert Vista, having someone there on campus, I would say, once a week at a minimum, to just answer questions that pop up.

I have been doing this for a long time, so my questions might be more advanced than what a beginner does. So for me, having Chris Houser before, and then Reed filling in as he can, I walk by their offices and, one, I see someone in there a lot, so I don't think they are idle in there, and so for people that like me that have been doing this a long time, I have advanced questions that your tutorials aren't going to address or someone brand new who just needs, you know, sometimes it's just a little bit of showing. I would love to see if you can find some funding to make one traveling person hit the five main campuses one day every single week. Then department chairs have a place to go to if one of their adjunct faculty comes in.

I totally understand the need for the instructional designers to do what they were hired to do, but we need that presence on the campus. I think that's vital for your full-time and your adjunct faculty to make sure that they understand how to do all the little ins and outs.

>> SPEAKER: I agree and support that request. It's an item that has been continually pointed out, the challenge being that the role of the instructional designer is for creating the online courses and designing them, and really it's a role of an instructional

technologist or educational technologist to do that type of support which we have in Reed Dixon, but that's some of the strategy that we are looking at for the faculty resource centers is beginning to train --

>> JEANNIE ARBOGAST: No, people in my faculty resource center will not understand anything about D2L. That's not their job. They do a lot --

>> SPEAKER: The point being that in most institutions, that role is in that center, and that's what we want to try to work on is expanding and transitioning that.

>> JEANNIE ARBOGAST: I'm not asking for an instructional designer to be on campus, but I'm asking for someone in that role that is highly trained and knows a lot of the details about D2L Brightspace. The people in my faculty resource center, they are awesome, dominant, but they are not trained into anything like this, and their days are filled with all the stuff that's been dumped on them over and over and over. This is my 12th year here, and they have gotten things dumped on them and dumped on them and dumped on them and more responsibility. You can't split them any further and with no extra pay.

>> SPEAKER: Nancy H. As a face-to-face instructor, I have been trying to expand my use of D2L beyond the basics, those essentials you do in all your workshops, and it has been very helpful for me to have somebody down the hall that I can go to and say, is there some

way to do this? Is there some way to do that? Or if a glitch comes up in something I'm doing, to ask the question.

I would agree with Jeannie, I would second what she's saying, that the people in the faculty resource center, unless we have someone who is specifically trained, deeply trained in D2L, it's not going to work, because a lot of us are trying to move beyond those essentials in the face-to-face classes, not online, to get our students comfortable with this technology.

It makes our job much more difficult.

>> SPEAKER: Ken Scott. Since it is not the job of the IDs to provide that service, who is it that faculty would go to to get that service? Would it be IT support?

>> SPEAKER: Well, you can use -- there is sort of a tree here that indicates that that includes Tier 1 support will come into the D2L people we have at the Northwest Campus. They take a lot of those calls in helping with any situation you have going on in D2L.

We can still make appointments with the trainer, Reed Dixon, to help with those items, as well.

>> SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I believe we are out of time on this item, but I think important points were raised. It's clear that this is a presence that's going to be missed on campuses, and we have some suggestions thrown out there, and a good point made about the FRC staff and the workload that they have already.



Perhaps what we can do is see how things go in the months ahead or in the fall when this is fully enacted, and then we can perhaps follow up at that time. If we see any issues in the meantime, we can communicate about them.

>> SPEAKER: I would just encourage you and faculty, the other faculty, to continue to communicate about if the resources we have been putting together are functioning or if you or your faculty are experiencing gaps that need to be addressed as we try to transition this. Thank you.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you. I just want to point out, someone is taking notes on the agenda, and I'm not sure if that person knows that they are publicly viewable, so I'm not sure, but you could make a copy of them and then make your notes -- yeah. I just wanted to make you aware, Mary. (Laughter.)

I almost didn't want to say anything, because I thought, this will be nice because we'll have a record and I can call you when I'm making notes to my division.

So we have an AP review, five different APs. Some are revised, some new. First one is a personal governance and policy for Pima employees, and for that item we have Ted Roush and Aubrey Conover.

Is Ted here? We have Aubrey. Aubrey will speak to two of these. We also have an employee representative group, and these two are kind of linked together. This one is revised and concerns the AERC and matters related to that. This one identifies employee representative

groups which are referenced in this AP.

Let's do this one first, the personnel governance. Sure.

>> AUBREY CONOVER: So the change in this one we have been working out with AERC is the balancing of House Bill 2750 which talked about the recognition and payment for employee representative groups.

Basically, our goal was to find a balance between acknowledging that law but also acknowledging the fact that we had to have a process by which employee representative groups could maintain their role and communicate with the administration.

So historically what we had had was for faculty, I'll just speak to faculty, but you can replicate this toward the other employee groups. We had two members identified from the employee representative group, two members from Faculty Senate to just kind of bring some balance.

What we've tried to do in order to recognize that law is we are going to have one person for faculty that is a member from the employee representative group, and the other three are going to be selected from Faculty Senate regardless of their affiliation.

So what will happen this spring as we work through the process is that a call for nomination, volunteers for the AERC will happen. Any faculty member are able to apply and be part of that.

It may end up that we have multiple people who are connected to the employee representative group or we may not, but we will be

guaranteed to have at least one to ensure that that representation continues in the AERC committees.

So that's kind of the big change to this policy. I don't know if people have -- there is some other language in here that talks a little bit about the resolution teams, so to give you a quick breakdown, if an item comes to AERC, we try to identify what groups is it going to impact. Is it just faculty, is it just staff, is it everyone? And then those individuals, often it's a large group, meet the next meeting to talk about that specific policy. Sometimes we bring in outside experts to help speak to the policy and try and come up with a resolution that then is brought back to the full AERC for a vote.

This just talks about the fact that it is the expectation that AERC members are members on those resolution teams and that we will also add additional people as necessary.

Any questions?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I have a question. So you had just mentioned that Faculty Senate selects three faculty representatives, but here it says the AERC calls for nominations for the other three seats and holds an election open to all employees in each classification.

>> AUBREY CONOVER: So by calling for it, calling for it would be reaching out to Faculty Senate to do that process. It would be reaching out to staff council to do the staff side of it.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I'm wondering if we should include language

in there to clarify that, because I didn't see Faculty Senate referenced, and I think that would be helpful to clarify how that actually functions.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Maybe I can clarify.

So the structure up until now was that Faculty Senate appoints two reps and PCCEA appoints two reps. The new structure that you see there is that --

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I understand. I was just clarifying because

Aubrey said that Faculty Senate selects three.

>> AUBREY CONOVER: They are going to be helping facilitate that process for those three open seats.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Like the elections?

>> AUBREY CONOVER: Yeah.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: The AERC calls out -- let me know if I'm explaining this correctly from what we've covered. The AERC casts the net, drops the call, delivers it to Faculty Senate, and then Faculty Senate finds --

>> AUBREY CONOVER: Right. So we would be working with Faculty Senate to help basically find individuals -- I mean, you already have the communications that are going out to all faculty. So it makes sense that we will work with you all to say we have these openings, we'd like to get nominations, volunteers.

We haven't actually done this yet, so it's going to be a little bit of figuring out what that process looks like. But we want to

work with you all to facilitate that process, yeah.

We will work with you all, as you gather nominations and volunteers for other groups, we'd probably follow the same process.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: By "you," you mean Faculty Senate?

>> AUBREY CONOVER: Yes.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So Faculty Senate will work with the AERC to find representatives?

>> AUBREY CONOVER: Exactly.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: But we don't quite know how that will --

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: It will be an election, though.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I think those are the kind of details that would be helpful to include in the AP just to clarify how that process works.

>> AUBREY CONOVER: Yeah, we can break some of those down a little bit.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Did you have additional comments, Matej?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: What part is not clear? I thought there would be an election?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: There is no reference to Faculty Senate and staff council.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Right. So you'd like to have some sentence about Faculty Senate will help recruit candidates for the election or something along those lines?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Well, just to clarify the process. If

Faculty Senate is involved, it should be clarified.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: I don't know that we had discussed that as such previously. I don't have any --

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Well, this does not specify that Faculty Senate's involved at all. Previously Faculty Senate was.

So if Faculty Senate is still being, expected to be involved in this process, then that should probably be clarified in the language.

Because when I read this, you know, as Faculty Senate president, I was wondering, what is our role? And it's not clarified. If we don't have it in language, there is no way to stick to a specific set of processes.

>> AUBREY CONOVER: We can define some of those as we work through it.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: If we don't want Faculty Senate involved, then that's a separate thing. Sounds like you do.

>> AUBREY CONOVER: We already have a body that reaches out to faculty. It just makes sense for us to continue working together.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: And those members do not have to be senators, right?

>> AUBREY CONOVER: Right.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: That process is just facilitated by Faculty Senate?

>> AUBREY CONOVER: Right.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you for clarifying.

>> AUBREY CONOVER: The other one talks about the employee representative groups in general. The significant change here that is being articulated is that every two years in an attempt to make sure that employee representative groups are representing their populations, we're going to work with the individual groups to ensure that they have the support of at least 25% of their possible membership.

This does not have to be active members who are paying dues. We have talked about potentially that would be a starting point, so if we had that, for example, for PCCEA, it's, like, check, we're done. Let's say for example they only had 20%. Then we would work with the employee representative groups to figure out the best way to communicate to all faculty and say PCCEA is currently the employee representative group. Do you feel, regardless whether or not you are a member of PCCEA, that you would like them to represent you at Pima Community College? As long as 25% total say yes, they're doing great, even though I'm not a member, or I really don't care, sure let them do it, then we're good.

If we ever got to a point where any employee representative group could not demonstrate either through membership or this other process we would work out together with them that they have the support of at least 25% of their overall members, then we would start a process with the provost's office and probably with respective council, so either staff council or Faculty Senate, to develop a process to

identify a new representative group for that group of people.

It could be an external group, could be internal, whatever the case may be. The goal really is to make sure that groups have a reasonable cadre of their people that say, yes, this is the group -- we don't want to get to only 10% of an employee group saying they represent me, because it's really not representative of the whole group.

25% is kind of an arbitrary number. We talked about different numbers and different levels, but this is kind of a starting point to see how this kind of plays out.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: Can I make a clarification? I understand as a member of the AERC is that PCCEA, 25% of members or nonmembers -- is that what you're saying?

>> AUBREY CONOVER: As long as they identify as saying that they feel that PCCEA represents them, that's fine. There has to be an affirmation of support towards the group, yes.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: At this time, there is no other group like PCCEA, but the wording doesn't say that PCCEA is the only group, employee group representing faculty, which is something I brought up at the meeting, saying that if faculty that are not members of PCCEA want to create another employee group, not as members of PCCEA, they can.

>> AUBREY CONOVER: What we have talked through at this point, because there have been different groups at different times who have,



regardless of faculty, staff, et cetera, that if we were to do an overall election that the group that had the majority of support would be the one that would be meeting as part of AERC.

So if, at some point, and this happened for those of you who were around three or four years ago with staff, if a separate group or entity feels they would better represent their given employee group, we do have a process for going through that, I think it's called an election, not exactly sure, to identify where the support lies for what group.

So we would go through that process if another group felt that they had a greater representation.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: I just wanted to make sure that it's in the minutes of Faculty Senate that says that there is room for a process if another group wants to be there and not be a sovereign, autonomous PCCEA group that represents faculty.

>> AUBREY CONOVER: There is always the opportunity for any employee group if there is a group of employees that wants to start that process and identify that they would better represent their group, yes.

>> SPEAKER: Could you please state your name just for him.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: Margarita Youngo, West Campus, social science.

>> AUBREY CONOVER: Other questions I might be able to answer?

>> SPEAKER: Is this a problem?

>> AUBREY CONOVER: Yes.

>> SPEAKER: Why?

>> AUBREY CONOVER: We have a group that has struggled to gather support from a significant number of their employees. And so this is put forward to encourage groups to make sure that they are connecting with their folks so they can generate at least 25% or trigger -- right now it takes a lot of energy to be blunt for anyone to come forward and try and challenge another group. We saw that with staff, with the nonexempt staff a little while ago.

So this is a mechanism to say, as an institution, we want an employee group communicating on behalf of their employees that has the support of their employees. This is enabling a process to occur that doesn't take people standing out there all on their own saying I don't feel like this group is representing me, that gives a number to that and says, okay, we're going to start a process to at least have that conversation. So that's the intent.

Any other questions? Thank you.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Our next AP is in reference to service of alcoholic beverages on college property. I believe we have two more after that. Hi.

>> SPEAKER: I have never heard so much giggling over any of the APs. (Laughter.)

All right. Well, hi, everybody. It's me, Seth, Deputy General Counsel again. Wasn't here last month, so Happy New Year, everybody.

This is actually an extension of the existing drug and alcohol policy, which was in fact the very first AP I ever stood up here and talked to you about. Even though I didn't write it, I took a lot of heat. I have since forgiven you. (Laughter.)

What this says, it basically lays out the process by which the chancellor would approve requests to have alcohol served at certain college events on college property, which is already a part of the existing drug and alcohol policy. It just says sometimes it can happen under certain circumstances with the chancellor's approval. This clarifies what that is.

Basically that comes down to if we have an opportunity for our students who are in the culinary arts programs to -- well, we already do. We have them cater certain events. This would be when it's permissible for them to also serve beer and wine. Those are the only two kinds of alcohol that would be permitted.

The other instance would be if the Foundation wanted to provide the alcohol for an event, if we have visiting guests from another institution, another organization, then that would be another option for us to better serve people and to enhance connections with other institutions, with business leaders, that kind of thing.

So one thing to note is that the college's money never gets spent on alcohol, if you care. Well, I should say it doesn't get spent on alcohol unless it is for the educational purpose of somebody who is working in the culinary arts program if it's being used in a

classroom setting, but that's a whole different -- we are just serving beer and wine at a college function. It says quite specifically in here that no public funds are used for that.

As I understand it, those are tabs that would be picked up by the Foundation. If it's the college inviting people to it or if we have an outside entity participating and they wanted to pay for the alcohol, we would let them buy us alcohol.

Any questions about that? I mean, there haven't been a whole lot of comments yet. I encourage you if you have any, comments generally --

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: What about all those ones I received about can this be allowed at Faculty Senate? (Laughter.) Everyone is quiet.

>> SPEAKER: I would say a very well-written proposal to the chancellor probably. May or may not fall on deaf ears

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I don't know if that would be a good thing or not.

>> SPEAKER: A couple of things we get, as you probably know, hopefully you participate in this, we get comments sent to us that we respond to prior to these going to the board, and as far as I know, they are submitted anonymously, so you can say whatever you want to. You can vote beard Seth, no beard Seth, whichever you prefer to see, but what we have heard so far is just questions about how is this contributing to student success? Where's the money coming from? So

hopefully I have addressed those. Those are the two main concerns that I have heard.

It is very specifically laid out in here that part of this is providing opportunities, real-life business opportunities for our culinary arts students to participate in a very, in the same types of catering environments, food service and entertainment environments that they would be working in professionally.

Any questions? I don't know where the watering holes are on this side of town, but if somebody wants to shoot me an e-mail...

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Sure you don't, Seth. (Smiling.)

>> SPEAKER: Thanks, everybody.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you, Seth.

So we have Ian Roark and I believe I received the signal that we were running out of time. Ken, is that for the whole AP review or was that --

>> SPEAKER: When I put it up before, that was for --

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: 15 minutes we were up? We have two more APs.

This one we saw previously before it was finalized -- or not finalized, but redrafted and revised and then now it's officially in the review process.

So we already had a good discussion about it. Maggie was here. I think it was back in October, and now so we are seeing it again in its revised state. I know at that time people had lots of questions, and then I will just turn it over to Ian and Maggie.

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: Given the time constraints, we will just defer to you for any additional questions. This is the second time that we've brought it forward under formal review.

Yes?

>> JEANNIE ARBOGAST: Would you refresh us on the purpose of this a little bit more the history? It has been a while.

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: How broad do you want the purpose?

So I spoke --

>> JEANNIE ARBOGAST: Why are we looking at this? Because I remember making a large discussion last October.

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: In the vast array of 1,200-plus community college districts in the United States, having noncredit students learning in a credit course is business as normal. At this institution, it has not been for a very long time except for pockets.

The reality is there are a lot of people who come to the institution either under industry partnerships or on their own accord and audit is a version of noncredit, just to be clear, before taking the full plunge and going through an entire credit enrollment process want to see what's out there.

This allows for that to occur while not duplicating resources across the board. I think, more importantly, keep in mind the audience and the context of our community. More and more the viability of our organization is going to be predicated on the adult learner and upskilling and re-education and retraining, not a steady

stream of high school students coming to us.

So we have to have more on-ramps and open opportunities for our community to experience the quality teaching and learning that we provide.

That is the context, and this is one more step in that journey.

>> SPEAKER: Nancy H. I'm going to go back to how this is going to affect credit ESL courses. Our international students are already noncredit. We have lost half of our faculty due to FTSE in the last cut.

Noncredit students do not count as part of our FTSE. Our faculty count number is determined largely by FTSE. If we have most of our resident students choosing to take these courses noncredit, we are basically losing all of our FTSE.

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: Sure. So in essence, it is not a zero sum, and the data do not indicate that. The data do not indicate that in colleges and systems where in some cases the institution half of their foot traffic is noncredit. They are different, and there is a matriculation usually the other direction, from noncredit to credit. It's a pretty common practice, and that's why we have also gone down the road of prior learning assessment.

I think the other thing we're going to have to look at in terms of -- and Amanda is going to speak to some things more specifically, but in terms of program viability overall, program -- and we spoke about this on All Faculty Day -- just does not include the five-plus

classes and FTSE enrollment in that. Program is how is the program serving all students?

And, in addition, basically there is -- it's not a zero sum, not a zero sum game. I think in terms of program or discipline viability, in terms of FTSE counts through the FACT process, and I see Jim Craig and Amanda, those are some of the data points that the deans can and should be entering into that process.

Yes, this is our FTSE count. Here is how much revenue and/or other things are happening in this discipline or program area also.

And that conversation has already occurred already with respect to certain positions within divisions, including my own.

>> SPEAKER: And just to piggyback on that, as part of the FACT process, it was not part of the rubric for this pastime around, but it was discussed as a data element.

We will continue to ensure that we have good data to provide for you and for the FACT process and those numbers and add it to the rubric so that that can be looked at. Because that is an important part of determining what the faculty need is.

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: One more, it's not an immediate -- this other piece, this policy is a process, not an event at the state level, I mean. I'm a part of a statewide group that is actually looking at making a recommendation potentially for this session but definitively in the next session on behalf of all ten community college districts to have a FTSE weighting, if you will, for certain noncredit areas.



That's also common practice in other states. It is not common or doesn't exist in the State of Arizona.

>> JOE BREWER: It's about equal access to credit classroom learning. I'm just trying to make sure I understand what are the only barriers to that equal access?

As I read it, section 4, program requirements, is really the place where you find the barriers. Are there others there?

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: Yeah, and to be clear, there are legitimate barriers in terms of entry into any certain program of study, particularly whether it's A&P programs or levels of math, writing, general ed, nursing and Allied Health.

So that's why that last piece was put in there, because there is a recognition that there are necessary barriers to entry, although I think we should all be circumspect in terms of whether or not research bears out whether or not those barriers should actually be there to begin with. I think an example of that and how the college has moved forward tremendously is the work of the faculty that led to the Bellwether award with respect to developmental education and how we are really moving forward.

As long as we continue that, those barriers I think have their rightful place. Now -- go ahead.

>> JOE BREWER: I wanted to make sure. As long as a person gains, is accepted by the program of study, then there are no inequalities for noncredit people?

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: Right. So part of the other context was, and even this term I have received communication from a community member who even with respect to audit, and this again is intended to address all noncredit, which includes audit, and it was in a discipline area there are right now faculty who teach the same class, and they have at the faculty and section level the ability to deny somebody access to that class based on whether they personally want an audit student or not, based on how they feel about the issue.

That really sets up the institution for a lot of potential issues if somebody were to challenge that. So what this is saying is that again, I think I used the example last time, if Matej is the music teacher, you're the music teacher, and I'm the student, and Amanda is coming in through credit and I just want to audit the class, and Matej's perspective is come one, come all, and you're saying, no, that sends mixed messages to our community and sends mixed messages to our student.

So with respect to disciplines and with respect to programs of study, there should be consistency across the board with respect to how people come into courses and how people come into the programs.

>> SPEAKER: I have two things. One, what was your name again, just for the record?

>> SPEAKER: Amanda Abens.

>> SPEAKER: Thank you. My question is how do the results of the noncredit students feed into the results of our for-credit students?

For example, if we have an audit student come in, because I have audited classes, and I admit when I audit classes I don't care about taking exams, I don't care about getting a passing grade. I go in just to learn and I don't care about anything else.

But from an instructor's standpoint, if that student is on my roster and they score poorly because they don't take the exams or don't do this or don't do that, how does that impact our evaluation of the course and its materials?

>> SPEAKER: So part of the AP does include that all reporting structures will be completely separate. So right now, credit students, you're only going to be looking at what the grades are, the completion rates, your assessments. When you go and enter in eLumen, that's your credit students that are going to be looked at.

What we do want to look at in the future is really ensuring, though, that separately we're looking at if that student is assessed because there are some courses, they may take a welding course that they get assessed in pass/fail, that we see how many noncredits are passing that we do assessment data.

That's kind of the next stage is we really look at expanding noncredit and doing better for our community in noncredit. But again, data points, all separate.

>> SPEAKER: Because isn't our other goal is I have students take a noncredit course and they can try and get credit for that? In order to do that, we had to evaluate them at some point?

>> SPEAKER: Yes, exactly. Through prior learning assessment, we can do the noncredit to credit, but they do have to have been assessed and have passed that class.

>> SPEAKER: Thank you.

>> SPEAKER: Yeah.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We are kind of behind on time. So this is going through the review process, and so we can submit public comments. Maybe we can take one more comment from Nancy and then we can move on.

>> SPEAKER: Nancy H. Just one more concern related to those audit students in classes, because a lot -- they are auditing, they just want to learn. A lot of the activities in my class are based on going through homework together, discussing things. If an auditing student is choosing not to do any of the work, they can't participate in the class, and it really throws things off.

Is there a way to deal with that?

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: Yeah, and I do believe this came up and it's an excellent question. I think it's addressed in the AP, as well. And that is that at the end of the day, you are the purveyor of your classroom, and so the answer to how you would deal with that noncredit student, and let me reframe it in the language actually -- I catch myself on this, the language in the AP, the student choosing the noncredit modality is the same way you would address the student who is earning college credit for your class.

So the essence of this under the strategic plan, which was the other context, is that at Pima Community College, whether they chose a noncredit offering, clock hour offering, adult basic education offering or a credit offering that a student is a student is a student, and they have the rights and responsibilities of students across the board.

So it would be handled the very same way and also the noncredit team started with Maggie would want to know about that and be there to support you.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Okay. Thank you, Ian, Amanda, Maggie.

One more AP. Accounts receivable, I believe Cecily?

>> SPEAKER: Hello. I'm Cecily Westfall, director of accounts receivables services. Hopefully this one is pretty straightforward.

This AP is intended to just kind of define the role and responsibility of my unit to kind of oversee the receivables for the college and how we handle things like refunds for students and establish policies and procedures on the handling of payments and receivables.

And I'll leave it at that. If anybody has any questions?

>> SPEAKER: Sounds really interesting. (Laughter.)

>> SPEAKER: It's not.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Well, no questions. Thank you for making the trip. Thank you for being here to represent it, at least.

So we need to go back in time and approve the December and

January minutes.

Do I need to pull these up for anyone, or has everyone had a chance to review them? Anthony?

>> SPEAKER: I just want to say there have been secretaries in the past who watched the video to find out who's here and who is not here. I will never do that.

So if you want to be here, please sign in. I'm just not going to watch the video of a meeting I have already been at.

It's okay. If you're missing, we can amend it, but just for the future -- because there were some people I knew I had quoted them but they didn't sign in. I won't be looking very carefully for that.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So there's December. Here's January.

Ken? Do you have a comment or a modification?

>> SPEAKER: Motion to approve both December and January.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We have a motion on the table. Do we have a second?

>> SPEAKER: Second.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All in favor?

(Ayes.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All opposed? All abstain? We have approved the minutes.

>> SPEAKER: Do I need to know who seconded things?

>> SPEAKER: Dave Parker.

>> SPEAKER: Thank you.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So our next item is digital literacy and the future of tablet use at Pima Community College.

For that item, we have Jim Craig.

>> SPEAKER: Hi, everybody. Jim Craig. Dean of business and information technology. While she's getting that set up, on behalf of hospitality and culinary, I'd like to introduce the culinary students that are going to come in and practice their wine opening and serving skills.

Come on in, if you can.

No, not yet.

But I think we should all give the new AP a standing ovation, because that's going to happen. (Laughter.)

Okay. Very quickly, there is a lot going on in terms of digital literacy. If we can look at the mission, this is what we're trying to accomplish right now is really to look at the equity and skills gap with many of our students who don't have access to mobile technology, some not any technology at all.

We had a young lady at the board meeting this week that stood up and was complaining about the lack of financial aid support at Northwest Campus. One of the things she pointed out was that it went from a face-to-face person at Northwest Campus to now an online support, you know, through Face Time and other technology pieces.

She said, I don't have technology at home. I can't get to that.

Many of my student friends can't get to that.

So it's a very poignant example of, you know, we're doing so much as a college, all of you are doing so much as a college with digital content and digital textbooks and OER resources, and really saving a lot of costs to the students and giving them great access to all of these digital materials, but many of our students still don't have access to them because they don't have access to the technology and they don't understand how to run it or how to use it.

That's the point of this initiative is to really take that on and figure out what can we do as a college to make a difference to each and every student in that venue.

There is a lot of problems here I won't go into, but you know that there is a lot of workforce-related problems. We're already in industry 4.0, there is a lot of industries that require and expect new graduates and minimum wage or one or two dollar over minimum wage employees to know how to use a mobile device.

So that's typically required first day on the job, and it's one of the things that they hand them a device and say our app is on it, it should be self-explanatory, and go. They are not given the time or the training to figure it out much about the device itself. They are already expected to know how to use it, whether it's an Android or iPad or something else.

We have spent a lot of time on talking about this just which is better, which way to go, can we have a little bit of everything, and we have had a lot of smart people looking at this in the last several



months.

There is lots of tradeoffs, I have a tradeoff document I have already shared with Josie that all of you will have access to that can see the longer laundry list of pros and cons. At the end of the day, we believe going with an iPad is a better solution because we can support it much better to scale. Apple Computers has spent billions of dollars just on education using their technology, and there is a lot of resources available for us as faculty as well as for our students to make that happen.

So really the point of this is to give an iPad to each and every student. There is a lot of promising things that we think will come out of it. There is some best practices in cases in different areas that we're studying. For instance, one of the community colleges I just talked to this week, they rolled this out to scale. Smaller college than us, about 8,000 students. In their first full year rolling out an initiative to Apple in this way to each and every student, their retention increased and completion increased by 27 and 30% respectively.

They were the lowest, worst in the entire state of Iowa before they did that. Now, many years later, in continuing do that, they have the highest retention and completion rates in the state.

I'm sure that's not the only thing they did, but the year they rolled out the iPads, that was the only major initiative they had going at the time that had to do with student success.

Again, this is focused around the student and student success. Not just handing them an iPad and saying good luck with that, I hope you can figure it out, but giving them the support and training and the wraparound help that they need in order to become competent in it.

So think of it this way: It's a STU 100 course but it's revised to say here's how you study for college using your iPad. Here is how you organize your work using your iPad. That kind of thing.

Tie it together. Obviously they take it home, use it for their personal needs. They get more immersed into the technology and using it to help their everyday lives in communication with family, friends, and of course their schoolwork.

This is a huge alignment with all the things we are already doing in terms of the statewide initiatives and in terms of the centers for excellence and just overall what can we do to better serve our students.

Really, in the end all we're really doing is just giving students a pencil, a new pencil, but a pencil that they may not already have and may not know how to use.

That's the real piece here.

Ultimately the goal here is to start small and get ourselves used to the technology and the students to use a thing like an iPad in and outside the classroom and then to scale it up to all students college-wide.

As far as timing and milestones is concerned, we are looking at an implementation phase starting with something next fall. Starting small enough so that we can try to figure out the funding model, we can try to figure out the distribution model and the support model and maybe most importantly so that we can figure out the faculty professional development pieces and places that we need to put into place and how much that have training we need to do and start that right away so that we can really figure out what's the best way to support students with this. Not only every student getting an iPad. Think about every faculty getting an iPad that they can use for anything they want, as well.

We are putting together the initial project plan now, the initiative, and presenting that hopefully in a week or two to the leadership team and talking about how we can really implement this, again, early implementation in fall but then plan out to scale how to get it to every student.

This is the vision is really PCC students, all of them will have the mobile technology, tools and training to overcome the equity and access barriers to digital literacy and student success.

It's a draft, so if you have any ideas on changing that, I appreciate it. I do have a huge favor to ask Faculty Senate, though. We don't have a name for this initiative. I apologize, but we do not know what the name of it is. We have been calling it the digital literacy initiative, and frankly, that's just horrible.

We need a real name. What I would like to do is to ask faculty and Faculty Senate would please name this and come up with a more appropriate name of what we should be calling this and how we should be branding it to students, to the college, to everybody else.

This is an eye chart, but it's a list of proposed programs that we might focus the first phase implementation with. It's a smaller list, it's about 730 to 750 students to start with. You'll notice it's focused a lot on programs that have cohorts and things that are a little bit more easier for us to organize to start with just to get our feet wet on this.

Of course the expansion would be to scale. We are just finalizing this list in the next week or two, and once we have that, we'll be able to figure out what immediate faculty need to be involved in this and what training they need, as well.

A lot of things that we are doing to plan for success in terms of the project and the initiative in terms of all of these pieces.

I'll take any questions at this time. I'm probably out of time but if you have any questions I'd be happy to answer them and again a big ask of can we please have a name for this?

>> PATTY FIGUEROA: I just wanted to ask if this is inclusive of adult basic education students such as the noncredit students? How does it impact their learning?

>> SPEAKER: Yeah, the to-scale version of this would include those groups, as well. So a lot of the nuances involved with that,

and we have to figure that out, as well.

Even as we're rolling out just the initial phase, we're going to be working just as heavily on how do we do this to scale and how do we get there fast?

>> PATTY FIGUEROA: Thank you.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We are out of time, but I know that I have seen at list I think four or five hands, and I do think this is an important item to take questions on. So let's add some time to this to the agenda we can put on additional maybe five to seven minutes, and then we'll take as many questions as we can. Tanya?

>> SPEAKER: Hi. One of the questions that I have, I think this is fabulous, because I run into issues with students all the time with the digital textbooks, and they don't have a way to read them at home and they can't go get Wi-Fi at McDonald's because they're going to have to take their three kids along with them to go read.

I think there are lots of levels to different access, just saying, well, once we have given you this technology, you should be able to use it.

You know, are we working with the community out in, you know, Tucson or whatnot to get Internet availability for these students? I know that at one point I was working with somebody with the math department, and it came up that every single textbook, how they hand in their homework, everything is all handled online.

So we were running into students who work 9:00 to 5:00 and they

are parents and they are choosing a math class and trying to come in and do things, but then they can't take advantage of all those, can't do their homework at home, can't submit it at home. I think homework really needs to be able to be done at home. Otherwise it is totally an equity issue, because people should not have to go loiter in McDonald's with their three kids and do homework.

>> SPEAKER: I absolutely agree. That problem, that issue, is a huge community-wide problem that we need to address through government, through our relationships with some of the major Internet providers and come up with some ideas on how we overcome some of those problems.

Having a mobile device itself does help our students significantly anyway, because if they can download all of their electronic content, whether OER or textbooks or whatever, at least they have those at home and maybe can work offline and run out and get the three kids French fries and submit and get back home or something. Matej and Sean and Ken.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Ian, did you want to follow up?

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: I just had an answer on that community question that you asked.

If you're not familiar, and please visit their website, they have a lot of excellent initiatives, the Pima Association of Governments, and I serve on the economic vitality committee for PAG on behalf of Pima Community College, one of the initiatives that's being run by

the Pima Association of Governments is what's called Smart Cities Tucson or Smart Cities Pima County.

Our own IT department represented by Dr. Raj Murphy was represented on a subcommittee of the Smart Cities initiative, which is looking into the very issues that you discussed, which is that the digital divide is real in Pima County and in Tucson, and that the metro governments, plural, are going to be looking to invest significant resources to address those issues, just for a bigger -- it is being looked at.

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: Also, I have been in conversations with one of the librarians at West Campus, I think it's Chris S, and he did something similar in rural communities in New Mexico and was able to supply Wi-Fi to students in rural areas.

So I think if he gets connected to Raj and what you're representing too, that would be great.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: As someone who teaches yoga and cycling at the YMCA, I have to throw in a pitch for the Y, because they offer free Wi-Fi and daycare. You just have to be a member. But they do work with people on a sliding scale, too.

I think we had several more questions. Matej, Sean, Ken, Arlo.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: I had several questions about this. As I recall, this was something that Board Member Garcia expressed interest in or made sort of a direction? You can correct me if I'm wrong.

Since then, this seems to have moved very, very quickly and I haven't heard of any wider conversations with the students or the faculty about their needs. So I was just wondering about that. This seems to be very advanced.

So some of the things I'm wondering about, why not a laptop versus a tablet for things like where you're actually creating something which we have to do in college, right? Writing, programming, CAD, any kind of thing like that. It really seems like a laptop would be a better tool for that, although there is other advantages.

The whole Apple versus Google thing, this is a huge expense. Doesn't there need to be like an RFP? Have you asked students what they prefer?

What is the cost? How do expenditure limitations factor in here?

>> SPEAKER: So, yeah, this initiative is moving as fast as it can. I think the chancellor and many of the Governing Board would like us to take it to scale as fast as we can, but we do have issues and concerns that we have to work out. One of them is obviously the device we pick.

Some of the best practices that we have studied so far, they will have more specialty devices like a high-end laptop for engineering students or programming students that actually need to do some more heavy extensive things like that and use the iPad, for instance, for most of the other students who can do papers on it, they can write,



can get their assignments and that kind of stuff, especially if that's the only device they have. Maybe not the most ideal device, but if that's the only one they have, it's a huge difference.

The other question was?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Apple versus Google and expenditure limitation.

>> SPEAKER: This model, we're still looking at the financing options for this to begin with for this first phase. This may show up as a program fee, for instance, for nursing students, so it would be a program fee. Then they'd have access, they'd be given that device to use.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: But ultimately all students will have to pay this fee, or...

>> SPEAKER: Different best practices across the country. Some colleges use a tech fee to pay for it, so, you know, take the cost of the device, divide it by 60, and that's the tech fee per credit hour.

Then they will use, some will use college reserves to pay for part of it, that kind of thing, too, especially as a start-up or a ramp-up.

>> SPEAKER: So it really wouldn't be free for the students?

We'd be charging them to force them to use a tablet?

>> SPEAKER: Right. Be part of their package.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So the college would supplement part of it, but the students would also pay for part of it, and we don't know how

it would be for faculty at this point?

>> SPEAKER: Yeah, I don't think we're going to have faculty required to take classes to get...

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: The technology will be provided to faculty?

>> SPEAKER: As well as training, too. So one of the things we are trying to plan and design now is professional training for faculty in terms of there is a number of different pieces involved. Apple has an academy, and we would have specially trained people to come on-site to PCC and train faculty at about 20 at a time, and then we'd also -- they also have a lot of free resources for us to get access to.

And we would also send a few people, several people to Cupertino to get train-the-trainer training, so we'd send faculty there for extensive week-long training and they'd come back and be able to conduct those same types of orientation and ongoing training for faculty, as well.

>> SPEAKER: Would students be able to opt out if they already had a laptop or if they don't want that tablet or --

>> SPEAKER: Yeah, we're looking at that too, what would the opt-out option be and the criteria we'd have to follow to grant that.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We started with Matej here. I don't know if you got your question complete?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Well, the one about --

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Arlo, then Sean, and we have Kimlisa, and

then we need to -- we could discuss this for a long time but we have some important items still.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Who decided it would be Apple and iPad as opposed to another tool? Have you asked students and faculty what their needs are as far as software and the tools?

>> SPEAKER: Yeah, we've -- we haven't done a broad survey. We are going to actually be doing some of those broader surveys this spring, so we are going to be asking our industry partners to weigh in on that, do they really care which device it is. A lot of the research we did pointed to a lot of our employers are using Apple products more than they are Androids, for instance.

Then of course we have the internal issue of can we support that many Androids to scale. The management tools are so much stronger with what Apple has to offer.

But we are going to be asking industry, going to be doing focus groups with students and asking them, as well. We have already been reaching out to a number of faculty and IT experts to get their weigh-in, as well. We have talked about this at All College Council already, just to your point, and we have brought this up at the deans' meetings as well as the cabinet meetings for the, combined cabinets meetings for all the campuses.

So we're getting the word out there and we're going to keep that dialogue going. I mean, it's certainly possible we get going on this and we decide, no, for the major rollout we don't want to do Apple,

we want to pick this Android and we think we can do it to scale.

Part of this initial phase implementation is to give us time with that, too.

>> SPEAKER: Sean Mendoza. Going back to what Matej had said, really, looking at maybe the possibility of having greater, like, greater flexibility between the platforms, I know that there are some -- there are probably some industries probably in this room that don't use Apple products. And it's going to really kill that group. Also, another thing, too, that I want to mention is that I think -- I don't know whether or not it was on that list, but really, making sure that disabled student resources, I don't even know if they are still called that, disabled student resources is at the table primarily there are some people that have disabilities that -- I think just down the street, ASU, I think it was ASU, got into trouble because they all agreed that they were going to be on this one platform and people who are blind now can't have access to their books.

So I think that's something really important for us to be mindful of, as we move into this environment. And, yes, technology is a central part of what it is that we do, but having us put all our eggs in one basket I think is not very smart. We need to have a broader look that would be able to fit everybody's needs, because everybody -- I mean, there are some that definitely do not use Apple products and some that use just Apple.

So I think we need to have that kind of strategy moving forward.

>> SPEAKER: We're definitely looking at that, too. By the way, from pro and con comparison, Apple wins the day as far as accessibility, in terms of ADA and accessibility, there is nothing even close.

>> SPEAKER: And before I go to the next person, I just want to make sure that we also look at what research and what experiences have been done when it comes to rolling out these kinds of programs.

I know that K12 has done this, and I know there are a lot of education people in that arena the reason why that had failed in their school district is because there was not any training. Because there was not enough training.

So where faculty were given computers, go there you go, run with it, well, okay, I didn't have any training. So it's very important we identify those people and it goes back to, actually, it goes back to what was just said earlier, that we want to make sure that there are people on the campus that could help support the faculty that have questions, not just full-timers, but also adjunct faculty.

>> SPEAKER: FRC and TLC is actively involved in this, and so they will be providing a lot of the whatever it is train the trainer or whatever that looks like, as well.

And also, the entire library organization we feel is going to be a very huge strategic partner in making this rollout successfully.

Library services is heavily involved in this, too.

>> SPEAKER: Josie, since we are significantly over time, would it be possible maybe to invite Jim to come back to our next meeting?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Let's have Arlo, you, and then we will conclude.

>> SPEAKER: I think a lot of people have questions. You brought up a really great topic, Jim. Everyone wants to talk to you about it.

>> SPEAKER: Are you talking about the wine or...

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Arlo and then Kimlisa.

>> SPEAKER: Arlo. One, I wanted to put out a suggestion for the name of this. Teaching Through Tablets. It has an alliteration to it. Might be nice. But my other question was -- dang it.  
(Laughter.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We can go to Kimlisa and can come back to you?

>> KIMLISA DUCHICELA: David, when did we have that Apple presentation?

>> DR. DORE: That was in fall semester.

>> KIMLISA DUCHICELA: We had that Apple presentation and you invited a bunch of faculty to it, and we specifically asked if you guys were going in this direction. We were specifically told that you weren't, that it was just informational, that they wanted to do something, and now you have said Cupertino about 10 times.

So I'm wondering when this started, first of all, and second of

all, I'm wondering if you guys have thought through the security and the infrastructure. As it is, the Internet on the campuses is sad.

I don't know how else to put it. And now you're going to add all of these tablets?

I mean, this campus had a major upgrade about 10 years ago with the Title V grant. I know Northwest has had some upgrades. You don't have enough nodes. You have 15 students on a laptop in a classroom, and it shuts down the Internet.

I mean, not to mention the security. Because it is an open Wi-Fi, which means there has been ample times that students and others have had their information attempted to be stolen.

I feel as if there is a lot of things here to be moving so fast when we barely have Wi-Fi to cover what we have now.

The other thing is a lot of students already have their devices. They already have their pads. They have their iPhones. Most of them, many -- I mean, we did, have you done a survey to find out where our students really are? Because we did a survey about maybe five years ago, six years ago, that found that a large variety of, many of our students had access.

So I'm wondering where you are on all that. And I'd also like to know when this started, because if we were told that it was just, they just wanted to present to us, and now here we are, I feel a little duped perhaps would be the word, surprised.

So if you could please answer those, I'd appreciate it.

>> SPEAKER: This started before that, you know, actually before that info session we had Apple here to do, so we have been looking at this even before that.

In terms of a commitment, either commitment to Apple or to even doing this, we're still not there yet. So that decision to actually move forward with this has not been approved. So we're not trying to dupe anybody or not include anybody. As a matter of fact, we have already had a number of people included, but the key thing of me being here today is a plea to please get involved with this now as we really start to think through the details and come up with things.

One of the great points you made too is WiFi access. One of the key tasks that IT has before it in terms of this initiative is to do a very comprehensive, probably an outsourced analysis of every building and every piece of the campus and find all the gaps and then come up with a plan at how we're going to remediate those gaps so that we can roll this out to scale. You're right. We can't roll this out to scale until everything is accessible, and security is a whole different topic that we will probably put off to a different time, but we do need to make sure that things are secure and that we can protect students as best we can, you know, with the tablets or iPads that they get too. That's very important.

But that is at the front of the plan essentially before we roll anything out to scale is we need to remediate any IT and Wi-Fi capacity issues, because that's huge.



>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Arlo? Did you recover your lost page?

>> SPEAKER: Yes, my question was what about maintenance for these devices? Are we providing any sort of insurance towards the tablets we are providing, or are they on their own to cover costs for anything that might break?

>> SPEAKER: The cost of the device would include an Apple care, which is kind of a comprehensive wraparound support that would include break fix and technical support, too, how to use things and how to set things up, that kind of thing.

>> SPEAKER: At some point, are we, as faculty, going to be able to weigh in and provide input? For example, in our business area, Apple is not going to work. They don't even make the kind of software that we use for Apple.

So I just want to make sure at some point we'll be able to weigh in on that, not just be forced to work stuff that doesn't work and hinder our ability to teach.

>> SPEAKER: Absolutely. Yeah.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: This timeline suggests that the presentation to the ELT is probably going to happen towards the end of this spring semester, correct, not in the summer?

>> SPEAKER: Correct.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I do think -- because there are a lot of questions and concerns and there are a lot of questions that you don't quite know the answer -- this hasn't quite taken on a tangible

shape that we can really see and visualize, and so I think it would be valuable if you could come back before that presentation happens so we can just get a better sense of how this plan that's going to be launched in the fall.

So can we perhaps -- April, tentatively April, would be a good time?

>> SPEAKER: Yeah.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: And then I did want to ask about the, Matej asked about the expenditure limitation question. I think we have questions about how that, how it relates to expenditure limitation. Is it subject to that, or is it separate?

>> SPEAKER: It would be separate.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: It is separate to that. Okay. Thank you.

Well, we still have many more questions, but I think we had a good discussion and expressed support in many ways that it's an exciting thing. We recognize digital literacy is now, but also that in terms of implementing at the college, there are some things that need to be ironed out, clarified, elements of that nature. We will come back to this later this spring.

Thank you, Jim.

>> SPEAKER: Thank you.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Okay. I think we might be at the TLC topic.

I just have a few -- this won't take ten minutes, so we can save a little bit there.

This relates to -- I'm speaking on behalf of Mays Imad. She couldn't be here because there is actually a presentation going on right now at the TLC.

But Mays wanted me to highlight the news we already did receive through e-mail about all the events this spring and to particularly highlight the one happening tomorrow.

I have a link to those fliers here for your easy access, and so I'd encourage anyone who would like to attend the presentation tomorrow. Also, an additional request Mays has is we had a professional development committee through Faculty Senate, and that committee was going to be the advisory committee for the TLC, but that committee has kind of fragmented a little bit because of the previous purpose of it was kind of to help out with the All Faculty Day.

So what we need are people who would like to be a part of that advisory committee, and I know that Lisa G volunteered, and we have Tim Cruz who volunteered. I reached out already to the members of the professional development committee. Does anyone know right at this moment that you'd be interested in serving on this advisory group for the TLC?

Okay. They don't have to be faculty senators, and so perhaps what you could do is, in your information that you provide to constituents is to just ask if anyone would like to be on that committee, then to please contact Mays Imad.

Any questions about that item? Okay.

So our next -- we are moving into the president's report. We have the academic leadership handbook. Robert F contacted me and noted that the handbook has been revised.

The revisions are not major. There is nothing revised in terms of division structure and things like that. So Robert would like for people to fill out the feedback form, and then if, after reading and reviewing it, any questions.

This is basically your opportunity if you have any comments or questions about the leadership handbook to send them along. Any changes related to allocation of release time, those have not been integrated into the handbook, because divisions are still making decisions about changes.

So those kinds of things, that content level stuff, has not been added yet. That will be added later this spring with the goal for the end of March.

Ideally, although we don't know for sure at this point, the timing will be prior to the call for new leadership, because three-year terms are ending.

Any questions about that?

Academic freedom AP. So I do have a date here, and it is February 28th. If you have handbook feedback, please get that in by February 17th.

Kate has -- this is an item that Kate has worked on with a group

of senators, and Anthony and Ken, do you have a question or...

>> SPEAKER: Did you say it was 17th for academic leadership handbook feedback? It says the 7th on the minutes.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Yes, it would be the 17th. Thank you. The 7th is today, so that would be a little bit asking a lot (smiling). Giving you homework for the night ahead.

So that's the 17th. Thank you, Anthony, for correcting that.

Was that your comment, too, Ken?

This relates to the new AP on academic freedom that Kate has presented on a few times. We have a draft that's written, and then we have a feedback form. Then Ken, I believe, is coming to speak in March -- Ken is going to speak to this item in March. We will look at it in March and offer any other final feedback.

>> KATE SCHMIDT: (off mic.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Where does it say AP?

>> KATE SCHMIDT: (off mic.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Oh, BP. Okay.

Okay. So this item, several faculty contacted me about testing center concerns. In the fall semester there were some issues with students and long wait times.

So I contacted Chelsea James and Jeff Thies to see what was going on with that, and so I wanted to share what they responded in terms of what's being done to address the issues that surfaced in the fall.

Apparently some students waited in long lines and then had to be

turned away during finals period and it became very difficult with students, put them in a very difficult situation.

So Chelsea responded, testing in placement centers administered over 62,000 exams in 2019, and as online enrollment increases we expect this number to rise. Staffing continues to be a major concern for all. We are doing our best within the existing constraints to deliver quality services, provide access and maintain the integrity of tests.

These are the things we are doing and have done to improve testing centers for students, faculty, staff, and the community.

No. 1, extended weekend and evening hours to serve more nontraditional students. 2, centralized services for efficiency, consistency, and improve student services. 3, asked online math to stagger deadlines so students don't show up at testing centers on the same day.

Apparently a large part of what contributed to the situation in the fall was the same day was required for a huge number of students, which obviously caused a backlog.

No. 4, asked hybrid and in-person science classes to assist in proctoring their own finals.

No. 5, will open at all campuses Monday, May 18, the last day of finals. The next is piloting a test management system with math faculty RegisterBlast to encourage -- that is the software, RegisterBlast, to encourage student scheduling and improve check-in

and checkout efficiency.

Next is streamlined virtual testing services. Finally, centralizing and improving internal and external communications.

Jeff basically had said the same things, and he also asked to correct a rumor that the long lines felt at the testing centers in December at West and Downtown Campus were a result of the increase in proctored exams from online and hybrid courses, allowing students to utilize the last day, Monday, December 18, the myth is that it was a change in hours that caused these difficulties, but it was just scheduling issues.

So I hope that clarifies some things and gives you hope that these issues are being addressed. I would say that if concerns continue to arise, let's continue communicating about them with me, and then we'll see if, you know, what further steps we should take.

I did just want to note one more thing is that Jeff noted is that if the senate wants to be involved, we'd love their support when we ask for more human resources. Yet it is recognized that asking for more resources is a challenge right now.

That's one way that Faculty Senate could get involved.

I believe Nancy has a question.

>> SPEAKER: Nancy H. The lines were horrendous at West Campus.

You've got two to three people working in there. It's a very large campus. Since they are asking for help, can we put out a statement from Faculty Senate, can we put together a statement saying we

support the idea of more human resources in there?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Would you like to motion for us to vote on that statement?

>> SPEAKER: Okay. I move that Faculty Senate write a statement supporting hiring more staff to work in the testing centers, particularly those which are experiencing long lines.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I think the way you said it before -- is that the language, or -- basically you'd like senate to vote on a statement in support of increased human resources for the testing centers? Okay.

Is there a discussion of this item? Tanya, and then Anthony.

>> SPEAKER: Tanya. I just wanted to throw into that is part of the challenge also is the space only can hold so many students at one time. So it's not necessarily always just a person issue. It's a -- we have 30 seats in here, and they are all full of people. That's something to keep in mind, too. Maybe we just need bigger testing centers, period.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: More use of virtual testing?

>> SPEAKER: Or something. But I mean, right now -- I work at the West Campus, and it only can hold 24 people. So if 50 people show up and the students before them take an hour and a half to take their test or whatever, then they're going to have to wait an hour and a half. Some of it is just physical logistics, I would think.

Not only just having the people to process them, but the physical



space for them to sit in and take their tests all at one time.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Okay. Anthony?

>> SPEAKER: Yeah, I think this is an important issue. I'm not sure that I would necessarily -- I think the way you phrased it, I wouldn't necessarily agree with that at the moment, but I do think, understanding what the physical constraints are, from what I understand, because I had talked to Chelsea privately about this, that online was a huge part of that, and it was, just, a deadline issue should fix a lot of that.

So I would like to see how that plays out before I would support that.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Jeff did say when we ask for more human resources, so a thought is maybe we don't have to do this at this point but we could always come back to it later, and we do kind of want to see how things roll out this spring, too.

>> SPEAKER: I'm willing to rescind the motion. I just think that we need to be supportive of the assessment centers, because it was a mess.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Okay. Would you like to take back the motion for now and perhaps bring it back? Okay.

Are we ready to move ahead? Okay.

If you'd like, you know, all of the steps that I wrote down, these are all from the e-mail, so if you'd like -- if you would like a copy of those, just e-mail me and I can send them to you.

The next item is meeting highlights between our last Faculty Senate officer and administration meeting. The topic of instructional models came up on January 14th in reference to a comment the chancellor made in a December 7th special session on the budget with the board, and it was in reference to moving towards a three-piece model.

We did bring it up at the meeting. There wasn't a lot of time to discuss it. We didn't really get clarification except I believe -- and I believe that our provost will be touching on this in the provost's report? And provide more insight about it there.

I believe there is a group working on it. I will talk about it a little bit again too when I deliver the board report on behalf of Brooke.

Guided pathways, I believe the provost has a, will provide a little bit more information on this, as well. Basically the course offerings will shrink down and Julian Easter will be at our March Faculty Senate meeting to address in more detail guided pathways and what we can expect for the future.

So this is a -- I think this one may take a little bit of time. This is our compensation topic. This relates to discussions we had in January and December related to compensation, and it came up again because of the chancellor's remarks on All Faculty Day and other things.

I asked everyone to reach out and see, gain a better sense of

what faculty as a whole feel about this topic. I just wanted to maybe give us some context. I made a little, a few slides here just to allow for some considerations to keep in mind.

So just be aware that last year the board in March of 2019 approved a \$2 tuition per credit hour increase, and so that's effective this year. So basically tuition was raised very recently \$2.

Here is a comparison of the fiscal year 2020 tuition and fees for all Arizona community colleges, and you can see Pima's, you know, not the -- it's up there. These are faculty salary comparisons. I wasn't able to find -- this is from our IPEDS report, and IPEDS report contains all sorts of very useful information, so I'd encourage you to all access that link and look at it.

I didn't find any comparisons for medical faculty, but this is for full-time nonmedical. You can see where Pima -- my vision from this far, I'm not remembering which bar, but which one are we? The bottom. So Pima is down did here. So that just gives you a sense of how we compare.

So in our meeting with administration, we got down to some more specifics about how a tuition increase would actually impact salary, and the basic formula, and this is rough, but you can think of it as a dollar per credit hour increase in tuition equates to about \$450,000 and a 1% pay increase costs \$1 million.

So a \$2 tuition increase is enough to increase pay 2%. That

basically roughly translates to a \$2 tuition increase -- this should say 1%?

>> SPEAKER: 1% would be for the salaries. It takes 2 per credit to get to 1% for our salaries.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Okay. Got it. So this equates to roughly tuition increase for someone making 50,000 a year would result in an increase of about \$500 for one year.

That's the figure that I provided in January. This doesn't account for things like would it be scaled or anything like that. But I just wanted to give you a sense of how a tuition increase, if it were devoted to compensation, how it actually translates.

There are things to keep in mind it would not just be for one year but it would stick with the salary in the continuing years, but it wouldn't set in stone a process for this amount this year, this amount next year, and continual. It would be like a one-time, you know, change, a lift.

So those are some things to just, you know, keep in mind. With that, I did get lots of feedback through e-mail. I discussed this feedback -- and in person. And I discussed this feedback with officers. We did craft a few statements, and we got some feedback on those.

But I will wait to share those until we have a bit of discussion. So I will open it up to discussion and see if anyone has any comments, if you want to share what your constituents said, please,

this is the time to do so.

I think Joe and then Anthony or Joe and then Ken.

>> JOE BREWER: Mike and I shared an e-mail with our faculty in which we talked about sort of the offer the chancellor had made to get our support to help the board see clear to raise tuition and help with this, and talking about OER.

So we crafted sort of a resolution and formal resolution along that line. And then did sort of a minimal one which just said if the board sees it's appropriate to raise tuition, the faculty would support this decision.

The first one, the one that went along with what the chancellor was saying, of the people that responded, six of nine agreed with that. Three disagreed with it in some form or another. We did have some comments.

In terms of the one simply saying that if the board sees fit to raise tuition that we would in fact support that, everyone supported that minimal resolution.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Okay. Thank you. Ken?

>> SPEAKER: So from the slide that was in there, it was said that increasing salaries by 1% would be a million, but there wasn't any breakdown of which salaries. One of the topics we discussed as a faculty would be who is going to get those raises, how is that going to be spread out.

Of course, as you mentioned, that would be a one-time increase

--

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: That's the understanding I have been, that's been communicated to me.

>> SPEAKER: While that is better than nothing, we still, as people who work for a living, need some kind of stable and ongoing system to ensure that we have opportunities to make more money as all of our costs are going up as we all thought we were getting when we took our jobs here and have not been getting pretty much ever since.

So I think that's really what everyone is looking at is what kind of a mechanism is in place or will be put in place either for this one-time thing or on an ongoing basis to ensure that we are competitive in the market?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: And that reflects a lot of feedback I have received through e-mail and in person. Just to add to that, the administration has stated that we're going through -- we're moving to a classification in compensation study, which will be done, and then at some point a new compensation model will be devised from those findings after they are assessed.

But that's a good three to four years away. The last raise we got -- this is all in Brooke's e-mail, was 2014, which brings us to about 10 years of the same, you know, hiring placement.

I'm just adding on to what you're saying.

Anthony? Do you have a comment?

>> SPEAKER: I do. My discussions with faculty have echoed a

lot, but I was at the Board of Governors meeting on Wednesday, and I know you will talk a little bit about that.

But one of the things that I found encouraging was hearing from our lobbyist about the progress they were making in Phoenix, and he, while obviously didn't say anything for sure is going to happen, it seemed pretty positive to me.

However, in conjunction with that discussion, there was another discussion about how do you finance a building at West Campus? And one of the options the board is looking at, not to get into too many details, is putting aside some money every year for now and the next four years and paying cash for it. What they'd be doing is using the volumes of reserve of tax money to do that, which got me thinking, wouldn't it be a great gesture on behalf of the administration, even though they can't actually give us that money now, but wouldn't it be great if the administration and Board of Governors put aside \$5 million for 5% increase when they can use that money for salary, which is to say let's earmark it now, put it aside, it's there, it's not going to be spent on iPads, not going to be spent on buildings. When we can give all of us, everybody, that 5% rate, we'll do it. That would just be an acknowledgement, we understand we can't -- 5%, that's \$10 in tuition. We can't do that. But this might be at least something where it says when the doors are open we can just walk through it. We don't then have to sit down and negotiate at that time.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Like an act of good faith? Saying when we're not restricted by these limitations, this is here for you, we have set it aside, strategic planning. That's a good thought.

>> SPEAKER: Exactly. And the numbers can be flexible, but I think anything would just be an acknowledgement from higher administration, Board of Governors, that we understand this is how, we don't want this to be the case, and I think that would improve morale and really, I don't know, bring people back to the table.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you. One way to communicate that would be through public comment if you attend the March meeting, or we could communicate it through Brooke. I don't want it to get lost, though. I think it's a good suggestion.

Ken?

>> SPEAKER: Sorry. I remembered my other two things.

Overall, faculty were really disappointed that it was put out there that they would basically be advertised that tuition would go up to pay for faculty salaries, so faculty were very kind of disappointed that we're kind of being made out to be the bad guys here.

The college has plenty of money to pay for faculty salaries. It's just being spent elsewhere. So it's not really that tuition -- from our perspective, tuition would not be going up to pay for our salaries. Tuition would be going up to pay for the expenses of the college, which include, among other things, our salary.



We just don't want a picture being painted that we're bad guys.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Okay. Was that one of those two things or both? I think you said you have two things.

>> SPEAKER: Yeah, I have two. I forgot the other one again.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: That does also reflect a lot of feedback I have heard and also that the senate shouldn't really be involved in this conversation. I heard that a lot, because our main -- you know, we are curriculum academics governance, so there is a little bit of some area there, and then it's been argued too that because morale and instruction play a part in teaching. In terms of these specifics, though, these specific recommendations, there have been a lot of views that this isn't something that we should, or it's in our purview to develop a statement to support.

Kimlisa?

>> KIMLISA DUCHICELA: Yeah, that was kind of the consensus. I had sent out an e-mail to everyone, and it's just not our purview. I mean, I have been in senate for a long time, a few years, anyway, and I never remember anybody coming to us and asking us about supporting or asking or any of those things for tuition.

So I have a couple of questions. Was staff council asked the same thing? And if they were, did they have comments on it? And if faculty goes forward and says, yes, raise tuition, would staff council -- would staff also be, would it just be faculty that got raises? Which would be unconscionable.

And if we don't go forward, would staff think that faculty didn't support it and now they weren't getting anything?

I feel like this is a kind of a rabbit hole that we should not be going down at all. I feel a little like Alice in Wonderland, which is a bit of a rabbit hole. It's the board's responsibility to come up with a budget based on their information and come up with something that is viable for the institution not on a month-by-month basis but on a strategic planning, long-term basis. I believe that's an HLC thing, too.

We are curriculum. We are teachers. We do those things. I'm very uncomfortable. And the people that responded to me were also very uncomfortable with even having this conversation.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Okay. Let me move to -- one more comment, and then let me get, I will share the statements that -- I think the statements that the officers created reflect the comments expressed so far.

>> SPEAKER: Cory. I surveyed the science division and was just trying to get a general pulse, and we have well over 25 faculty in our division, so there is a large diversity of comments that we received, and it was pretty clear that people are desperate or really in need for pay increases.

We are such a large division. I wish there was more time to meet with people face-to-face to really talk about this, because I think there was misinformation about when the last tuition increase actually occurred. People say it's long overdue, but then I see it

was somewhat recent. I feel more person-to-person conversation would have helped, but it was really echoed that it was perhaps inappropriate for faculty to have this on their backs, which is what we are sort of talking about here.

What I heard personally during the chancellor's proposal, and I'm just trying to bring it back to that, was that if faculty decided to go more OER than we even currently are now, it would be more likely he could go to the board and perhaps advocate for our raises.

And I keep hearing everyone talk about faculty, but I saw lines for staff and admin, as well. So then conversations came up about, I would support a tuition increase but not for raises for admin, et cetera. So there was just a lot of points that went into it.

I think if we're going to create OER, we should be compensated for doing that work, not after the fact. And staff should not have to get a raise. If faculty decide to create OER, they need a raise. It shouldn't be on our back to do work to ensure that.

So a lot of interesting comments, but I wanted to share some of those with you guys.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you.

So the statements that we wrote, we saw it as there are two separate items, two separate conversations happening. One of them is related to tuition for compensation and the other one is related to a long-term compensation plan.

Item 1, the two sentences of it, No. 1, the Faculty Senate

supports compensation increases for faculty and staff, but item 2 -- not item 2, but the second part, Faculty Senate feels it is not within their purview to support tuition increases for the purpose of raising salaries. However, Faculty Senate trusts the administration and Board of Governors will make the most appropriate decision for Pima Community College at this time.

>> JEANNIE ARBOGAST: We don't trust them.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: At the risk of getting into wordsmithing, is there another --

>> JEANNIE ARBOGAST: I don't know. We hope, we advise, we hope, that's a good word, but trust? That's a whole different game.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Okay.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: I agree.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: You agree? So if we changed it to -- let me read the whole thing.

The Faculty Senate supports compensation increases for faculty and staff. Faculty Senate feels it is not within their purview to support tuition increases for the purpose of raising salaries. However, Faculty Senate hopes the administration and Board of Governors will make the most appropriate decision for Pima Community College at this time.

>> SPEAKER: (off mic.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Should we say it is not within Faculty Senate's purview to support tuition increases? Is that --

>> SPEAKER: Yes. Thank you.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Or do we change it to believes?

>> SPEAKER: Say it's not. It's not our job. So don't give any hint that it is our job or that it's opinion. It's not an opinion. It's a fact that our job has to do with curriculum and academic things. Not fundraising.

Does that make sense?

>> SPEAKER: Nancy H. I agree with that. I think if we -- I don't like the word "support" in there because we actually do support having more money, but if we just make a statement that it is not within Faculty Senate's purview to determine tuition and salary? And we hope that the college will do the correct thing?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: The Faculty Senate supports compensation increases for faculty and staff. It is not within the purview of the Faculty Senate to support tuition increases for the purposes of raising salaries. However, Faculty Senate hopes the administration and Board of Governors will make the most appropriate decision for Pima Community College at this time.

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: Just to give you some context, how this came up. So as you know we have monthly meetings with the senate officers and administration. Then we request agenda items that the officers provide and that we think would be pertinent for discussion.

Compensation came up on the agenda from the senate officers. We

were debating, well, maybe we shouldn't put it on the agenda, because it's not really -- it's more having to do with the workplace issues.

So we kind of said we're not going to talk about it, but we ended up talking about it, anyway. It just kind of evolved.

So the chancellor wanted to have a dialogue with faculty about this and wanted input, feedback on what your thoughts were, if I'm remembering correctly, those of you that were there. That's how you are involved now in the conversation.

So it wasn't something that was imposed. It was opening the door for conversation. I just wanted to clarify that.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: And when we put it on the agenda, it wasn't because we were asking for the specific tuition increase for the purpose of compensation increase item. We put it on to make a more general point about -- because it had been a concern that had come up in Faculty Senate meetings, compensation had come up in our meetings, and we wanted to communicate that, because it relates to the quality of instruction.

Faculty have made it clear to me that they are stretched thin getting other jobs, and this is clear from the PCCEA report. So it does impact student success, it impacts the ability to do jobs, and from that end, it is a Faculty Senate concern.

So from there, it just kind of evolved. And this is definitely -- my sense is there is no malicious intent in involving faculty. I think we just want, we had the discussion, and so now our job now is

to simply respond and say what's Faculty Senate's view and then so based on the feedback we have, we have some statements, and then we can move forward.

Sarah?

>> SPEAKER: Sarah J. I'm just curious why adjunct faculty raises aren't part of this conversation? I understand full-timers are important, but I don't really know the history. I'm relatively new, so how did this come about?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I don't have the answer to that. My only answer would be I think the statistic that I showed probably would reflect lifts there as well. It encompasses all employees of the college. But Faculty Senate has been asked specifically to communicate a perspective about this.

>> SPEAKER: Could that be like part of our statement then, staff and faculty including adjunct faculty?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I think it's implied with Faculty Senate in terms of the fact that we represent faculty. Does that address that? I mean, we don't have to do anything. We can, you know, not -- we can support, you know, nothing and just basically say we didn't support any statements, but we're kind of in that position, so...

>> SPEAKER: Just a quick comment. Hernan. Just a quick comment to clarify this. In the new handbook, the definition of faculty includes both full-time and adjunct faculty.

So any time you use the word "faculty," it's both of us. Unless

you specify full-time faculty, then when you use the word "faculty," it includes...

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: And we have been asked as a Faculty Senate, so this is, our representation is for all faculty. But it's a good point, Sarah. Thank you. I agree with you. You know, part-time salaries are important. Part-time compensation is important. So, yes, we need to include that in our discussion. I know that there is a procedure moving forward based on that, the tiered structure that Hernan worked on and has moved through the AERC.

So we have a revised version down. Does anyone want to comment on it? Ken?

>> SPEAKER: I remembered the other thing. After you said the part about -- I don't know.

So in regards to salary, one of the conversations that I have been having, I hope everyone will bear this in mind, although I know it goes against popular belief, as faculty, we don't work year round. Most faculty get three months off during the summer, and so one of the comments that I had was people were comparing our salaries to other people with same level of education in the industry, and my comment to that is of course we're not making as much as them. They get two weeks off a year. We get three months. Some faculty can make extra money by working classes during the summer but it makes sense people go get a second job because you're off for a quarter of the year.



So kind of bear that in mind, too, that that kind of makes sense why we don't make as much money.

>> SPEAKER: Just as a follow-up, we are not off. We're just not working. So getting two weeks off is your paid vacation, we don't get that -- what I would say is I don't know about you guys, but there is, like, four conferences I go to every summer. I'm not being paid but I'm going to them. I would hesitate to go down that. Maybe I was the person you were thinking about.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: And you work all summer because you're department head.

>> SPEAKER: True. Actually, I do get a little bit. Yeah.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Well, we are running low on time. I said some statements. I hope someone recorded them. What's that?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Could we display the statements? Any chance?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I guess I could write it on here. If I can get the, if I can see.

And you have them in your e-mail, right?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: That's fine. Are we going to vote?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Since I need to type, can you -- do you have it handy? I believe...

Okay. I think I've got the first part. And now I'm stuck. So it is not within the purview of Faculty Senate to...

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: (off mic.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I'll correct the typos later.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Then there was the Faculty Senate hopes the administration and Governing Board will make the most appropriate decision for PCC at this time.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: What did I do?

>> SPEAKER: While you're typing. I just want to say --

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Hold on. The Board of Governors will make the most appropriate what? Decision?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: For Pima, PCC, at this time.

>> SPEAKER: So whoever doesn't think I'm a terrible person, my point was that when we are comparing our salaries to other salaries, that we should compare our salaries to other educational institutions and not industry.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: That's what that one comparison in the slides allows for.

>> SPEAKER: That was really nice. Yeah. Just throwing that out there.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I don't think that's enough to redeem you, Ken, for all of the things, but in terms of today... (laughter). We can give you a pass. You can have it.

Okay.

>> JOE BREWER: Clarification. This is a resolution being sent to whom?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Brooke will put this -- if we were to vote for this, Brooke would put it in her March board report, and then it

will go before the board and be delivered to the board at the meeting on March 2nd or 3rd, it's a Tuesday. I think it's the 2nd or 3rd.

It's the first Tuesday in March. So that's how it will be presented.

>> JOE BREWER: I'm just wondering if it's really appropriate

going to the board. It seems that this is the faculty's sense about the proposal that the chancellor put to us.

Could we sort of commit to doing OER and therefore help the board see that they are not really raising money? And we are saying we don't feel we can do that. But we are saying that to the chancellor. Are they part of the conversation?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So when the chancellor presented on All

Faculty Day, the chancellor explicitly referenced Brooke, and he said he would need Brooke to deliver this message.

That kind of puts us where we are right now a little bit. And then also part 2 is that at the board meeting on Wednesday, after Brooke's board report, the chairman, Demion Clinco, explicitly said to Brooke, I'm particularly interested in the faculty's view on tuition increases.

So that's a little bit of context. So good question. I'm glad you asked it, because it allows me to clarify a few things.

Anthony, did you have your hand up? And then I see Dean Craig has his hand up, as well. And then Sean.

>> SPEAKER: I'm curious, because I'm a new secretary, do we

still have a quorum if we're voting on something?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Someone else will have to help me on that. I

believe we need at least 30 and we have several proxies here.

>> SPEAKER: I'll start counting, I guess.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I think we're still there.

Some people are proxies for two people. I'm a proxy, as well.

>> SPEAKER: Can you hold up the number of fingers of people

you're proxying for?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Sean?

>> SPEAKER: Sean Mendoza. I know the word "hope" is in there.

It's always -- it's hopeful -- and that's why maybe I want to have a

word that says or have it say we have the -- Faculty Senate has the

expectation that the Board of Governors will make the most

appropriate decision for PCC at this time in place of "hope."

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Makes it a little bit more neutral. Thank

you, Sean. That's a good suggestion. We originally had "trusts" in

there, and there was some concern about that.

Anybody want to suggest anything about this statement? Jim, I'm

sorry. Jim had his hand up from earlier and then we can go to you,

Margie.

>> SPEAKER: Jim Craig. Just to be clear, too, the Governing

Board specifically Chairman Clinco had requested that each of the

representative groups say something at the March meeting about the

budget, including obviously the potential issue of tuition increases.

So it's not just a focused request for faculty input. They

really want to hear it from all the representative groups. We're all in the same predicament in terms of drafting what we want to say.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you. Margie? I believe that's you.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: I just have a question in wordsmithing right there where it says last line that the Board of Governors will make the most appropriate decision, and then at that point, decision, then I'm thinking about salaries or about increasing tuition or about both of those being connected?

Because the board then could make a separate decision about salaries and a separate decision about tuition increases.

So I'm wondering if perhaps right there where your cursor is, decision regarding -- let's see. Regarding the connection between salaries and tuition -- I don't know. Right there. Regarding the --

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Does that capture it?

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: I think so. We could do it later.

Decision regarding salaries and tuition. Regarding the association between salaries and tuition. Maybe the association between salaries and tuition. Relationship? Yeah.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I'm seeing people shake their heads no.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: I thought it just needed to be clear.

>> SPEAKER: No. We don't want there to be a relationship between...

>> JOE BREWER: A simpler way, you might just, the most

appropriate decisions, knowing that at least two are mentioned there,  
decisions.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: That's clean.

>> JOE BREWER: Okay.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you. Are we ready to move this item  
along?

>> SPEAKER: Motion to move it along.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: It has to be -- are you motioning that we  
support this? Are you putting a motion out --

>> SPEAKER: Motion to support this to send it off to the Board  
of Governors via Brooke.

>> SPEAKER: Second.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We have had a discussion. Any other  
discussion before we vote?

All in favor? Can someone -- Tal is not here. We're still doing  
our fingers? Senators have your hands up for yourself now and then  
we will do another one for proxies.

>> SPEAKER: Now if you have one proxy, one hand. If you have  
two proxies, two hands. That's 32 for.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Anybody oppose? No one opposes? Anybody  
abstain? Two abstentions. You have that, Anthony?

>> SPEAKER: Yes.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you. So it passes. Faculty Senate  
endorses this statement, and we will present it at the March meeting.

The second item -- I mentioned there were two statements, and perhaps this is too much to get into today, but there was a second one that because I mentioned there was a separate conversation. Do you still have that e-mail up? Would you mind saying -- the second one is shorter, but let's see what we can do with it at this time.

I'll type it up here so we can take a look.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: I'm just the reader here. Didn't have any hands in this. The Faculty Senate urges the Governing Board to reinstate the Step Progression Plan for the interim time between now and the completion of the classification and compensation study.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Did you say urges? The Board of Governors?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: To reinstate the Step Progression Plan

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: In the interim time --

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Between now and the completion of the classification and comp study.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Now and the completion of the...

Any initial comments? There was a discussion that -- Kimlisa, please.

>> KIMLISA DUCHICELA: I think you should either request it or not request it but not just urge. Just say Faculty Senate requests that or not, one or the other.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: There are also four more words at the end of the sentence. And subsequent policy development.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thoughts? Is this something that senate

should hold off on advocating for, given discussions that we have had about senate's role? Just a few comments perhaps? Joe, Kimlisa, Nancy. If it seems like this is too gritty to get into today, we will hold off and move ahead with our final reports.

>> JOE BREWER: I think that asking to implement, reimplement the Step Progression Plan is just too specific and probably unlikely to work anyway.

However, having Brooke talk about we now expect three to four years of no plan continuing for increases, and they could happen ad hoc, it seems like good-faith effort for the board to aim for continued COLAs through this period in which we can't count on anything, because the whole new system will happen in three to four years, but some sort of commitment that salaries do need to be increased if revenue is available, some sort of commitment there, but asking for the Step Progression I think maybe is too specific and probably would just be swatted away.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Okay. Suggesting this is too much for today.

Nancy and then Kimlisa.

>> SPEAKER: Nancy H. I think just to make it clearer when Brooke presents this, I don't know that we would want to put it in a statement, but to tie this in with how the lack of salary progression, Step Progression, is affecting academics. We are not able to hire good teachers, we are losing good teachers, we need to make that connection.



>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: That's the connection -- thank you, Nancy.

Because there is that question of is this something Faculty Senate should be involved with? That's an area where, yes, this does involve faculty in those matters, because it does relate to academics and instruction, the quality of instruction.

And if you saw Brooke's e-mail, please communicate that to Brooke. I believe it's related to the points that she brought up, but Brooke is planning to contextualize these remarks with some additional points.

So I would just suggest all of you -- that's part of the report I'll provide later, but just a reminder to respond to Brooke's e-mail.

Kimlisa?

>> KIMLISA DUCHICELA: At the risk of ending up with Ken in the doghouse, I feel if we are going to couch this in we're not able to hire or we are losing faculty or there's an issue in the classroom, I think that we should have numbers and statistics to go with it. Otherwise we're just doing the same thing that others have done with regard to saying things like many people feel.

We should have -- if Faculty Senate is going to say these things, then we need to have all of our ducks in a row to really truly go to bat for that. Otherwise I feel as if we are getting into the territory of representative groups and AERC or -- what is the name? Whatever that group is that talks about these things like

compensation --

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: AERC?

>> KIMLISA DUCHICELA: Yeah, them. Because I think it's really important that we don't dilute what we said in the first statement, which is this isn't our purview, by saying, oh, by the way, we also do want this. See my point?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you. I think we can just move on and say that we did create this because of the fact that this is something that people really expressed concern about, but I do agree. I think that we should hold off on that at this point. And Brooke will communicate the essence of it in the context, but we don't need to support a statement about it or we're not ready to at this time.

Is everybody comfortable to move on after that? Okay.

I think that is it for my president's report. There is one item that a senator communicated with me about, sent an e-mail about last night, sent it to both me and Matej, and it relates to a House Bill moving through. I think it's HB 2258.

My reading of it is mostly that it concerns universities, it's related to -- it's a proposal to have a public policy institute be implemented on each university campus in Arizona overseen by the Board of Regents. And at that institute, the main goal is to ensure that debates happen and are represented by all sides.

If you read the language of the bill, it is very specific about what must be done, like recordings must be made, like all of these

different kinds of things.

So I just would like people to have it on their radar. Did you find it yet?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Number?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Is it 2258? That's okay. I can look too.

That's okay.

I will include a link to the actual bill in the agenda, and so anyone who is concerned can look there.

Again, my reading of it is it's just the university system, but if something like that were to pass, you can imagine that the implications of it might filter down through colleges, because we are all in the same kind of area.

So something to just be alert to. 2238. You can find it on the Arizona legislature website.

We have finally moved into reports. This is our 7th inning stretch. I had a feeling today would be a longer meeting because of all the weighty topics that we have discussed.

So I appreciate everyone being here and being attentive. Thank you.

Brooke wasn't able to be here, but I have notes from Brooke.

No. 1, I sent out an e-mail, this is in Brooke's voice, with information about compensation on Wednesday and have requested feedback from senators. I plan to include the more detailed description of some of the concerns faculty are expressing in the

March board report.

So please respond to that e-mail if you'd like to add things to what Brooke noted in the e-mail.

2, March is going to be an important board meeting, because it is budget-focused. I will be sharing the senate's tuition increase recommendation as well as details about what we discuss/decide regarding recommendations.

So basically, she's going to pass forward what we discussed today.

As for the February 5th board meeting, few days ago, the board extended the chancellor's contract for another five years until 2025, and they increased the chancellor's car allowance to 2,000 a month.

Senators are encouraged to watch the chancellor's report, which comes after the representatives' reports. It's at 1 hour 41 minutes into the meeting.

There is a link to the meeting on the agenda.

In response to comments about faculty concerns about implementing a new instructional model, the chancellor did not frame it as a cost-saving measure but rather framed the current system as undated and unresponsive to student and employer needs.

The chancellor referred to it as a matter of teaching and learning best practices.

It's noted in here because it kind of addresses the model that we have been, that's come onto our radar.

Brooke recommends staying on top of this by making this a regular item we respond to each month in Brooke's report as well as something we need to continue to bring up in meetings with administration.

Brooke is thinking two things. What about student success and retention? Is there data to show these other models are better at this? Brooke also sees the need for faculty to provide the chancellor with some real evidence for the ways in which our models are failing faculty. Adjunctification and deprofessionalism is turning higher ed teaching into a side job, not a career. This is not good for students, employees, or this college.

Next item related to the board meeting on Wednesday. During public comment, the board celebrated the Bellwether award, and no faculty were part of that celebration. Nor were they recognized. Brooke would like to point this out in the next board report by highlighting faculty that were behind the work being awarded. Several faculty have mentioned that faculty are not recognized when they should be. Administration is taking the credit.

Brooke can make this a focus under notable accomplishments.

So please, senators, please let Brooke know who was involved in this work, faculty who were involved in the work related to developmental education that helped contribute to the awarding of the Bellwether.

Then Brooke will share these with other notable accomplishments, so any other notable accomplishments that you have to pass along from

you or your constituents, please pass them along to Brooke, and Brooke will be sure to include them in the March board report.

Final item for Brooke's report is the next board report is due Tuesday, March 3rd, before senate's March meeting. Here it is. The next board meeting is March 11 at 5:30. I had said the wrong date earlier. The report is due March 3. Next board meeting, March 11.

Are there any questions related to Brooke's board report?

Anthony? Comment? Please go ahead.

>> SPEAKER: Thanks. So I was also there, and just in terms of what the chancellor said, like, my impression of what he said was in the larger context of change, and he seemed like he was open to what that structure should be, where we should go.

Seemed to me like the way I read it, it wasn't like he was, oh, that particular institution right there, we should do that, but that what's going on and even Brooke's own observation that it's not working so great from our end, either, I don't know, I didn't get a sense of dread when I heard it, for whatever that's worth.

They did call out Carla Agular for the Bellwether award. There were probably a lot more who probably should have gotten more recognition.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you. That's at hour 41, at one hour and 41 minutes into the board meeting is when those comments are.

And I think -- yeah, I think we basically just want to have a better sense of what the instructional methods is. So that's why

we're going to stay alert to it.

It could mean so many different things, and I do understand and appreciate the recognition that things are changing, you know, and we need to know and we need to know what other institutions are doing and we need to, you know, be aware.

Thank you for your comment.

Any other comments about Brooke's board report? Joe?

>> JOE BREWER: Yeah. Just there is a lot of change coming up, and if there are going to be changes to instructional models, we ought to be the ones proposing them, because we are talking to other institutions or we're reading things.

I mean, we ought to be part of that early conversation on where we might want to go.

We can wait for the administration to come by and say, okay, we got this wonderful thing from XX college and it's going to be great, and then we can have problems with it or love it or whatever, but if we're the ones that find it first, then that, you know, hopefully we could recognize that it will work.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: There is a team that's going to be working on this investigating models, and so I think this is a good opportunity to get faculty involved in that work.

We don't want any surprises, and so -- but I also agree with you that if anyone is aware of instructional models or changes or things like that, to propose them, to communicate about them, because

ideally, yes, they would be emerging from the work that we do and then communicated beyond.

And that goes not just for instructional models but anything, like any changes to instruction and curriculum and things like that emerging from senate.

So are we ready to move on to the other two reports?

>> SPEAKER: Yes. Forward, I move.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Then we will. It's getting to that time.

We have the provost's report and then we have the PCCEA report.

Provost, welcome.

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

Thank you for hanging in there on a Friday afternoon.

It's good to see you, and excellent conversation and discussion.

I have taken note of your concerns, so I thank you for that.

As far as the Bellwether award, we are truly thankful to the faculty, because it is the faculty that worked on this. This is the math faculty and the writing faculty, too.

I'll tell you, we demonstrated a 20% increase from 2014 in students earning credit in English composition, so that's the writing faculty, and 90% increase in student earning credits in gateway mathematics courses. So the math faculty, we're very, very grateful to, too.

So I wanted to thank DeLisa Sadal who was a major contributor to this effort, as well as student Taylor Bailey, and then Jeff Thies



and Nina Corson, and Morgan Phillips who helped with the actual application. So student success faculty, as well. So thank you.

Also, I wanted to share that the chancellor had talked about the developmental education redesign that started back in I think 2014/'15. Our own Nancy H was part of the steering committee that worked months and months on that.

So there were several faculty, but I wanted to recognize her because she's here with us at Faculty Senate. Thank you for that.

(Applause.)

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: Yes. Regarding your questions about the instructional model, so we had a conversation in our monthly admin and senate officers meeting about that. It's only in the initial -- it's in the conversation aspect. It hasn't gone any further. We haven't identified a group. We will, and it was said that faculty would play a major part in the conversations and in finding solutions and looking at instructional models.

What the chancellor did express is something that was expressed at the future of the work forum that took place at the University of Arizona about a month ago or so. All the people, business and industry people, said for high school students, they were gearing it more to high school students, what advice would you give them? And I mentioned this at All Faculty Day. They said, you need to be adaptable and flexible with your with your learning and the tools and what's expected from employers, so when they graduate and get their

degree or certificate and go on to the workforce, they need to be ready.

So we need to know what they are looking for so our students are successful. Just keep that in mind. There are some reports that I'll send to you, I shared it with Faculty Senate officers, the Gartner Report for 2019 and 2020 of what all these leaders are looking at for the future, national leaders, in the workplace. So I'll send those to you. So that's kind of a starting point for our conversation, and of course we will have a group of faculty, staff, administrators, working together collaboratively to figure out what are these best models.

As far as guided pathways, we're going to make it a standing item in our Faculty Senate officers and admin meeting agendas, so you know at every point how things are progressing.

As I mentioned at All Faculty Day, and Julian did too, guided pathways has moved under my office, and he will be the lead on this, working with our team, as well.

Things are going to be looked at as far as data is concerned. So when we talk about choice of classes, we're going to be looking, and this is faculty, too, not just administration, we are going to be working together on student data. What classes are students taking? What do they find interesting? What are the most enrolled classes?

So that's what we're going to be looking as a starting point for selecting courses. There is going to be, and mark your calendars, on

February 24, a board study session dedicated to guided pathways, update on guided pathways. It's a two-hour meeting but I think we have one hour portion of it. I think finance and budget is going to be part of it and something else. But guided pathways will have an update there, so please join us then.

I know we have a long meeting today so I don't want to go through everything on the report. But I do want to recognize on page 2, if you have it on your devices, the Library Research Award winner, so this is the first annual PCC Library Research Award that the library and faculty have proposed, and they had several winners for students. It's to help with information literacy. They had a panel of judges. We want to thank the librarians who participated in this. A special thanks to Chris S, Danny S, Emily B, Monique Rodriguez, Susan C, and Theresa Stanley.

So thank you to these librarians who worked very hard in getting this launched for our students. The students, they got scholarships up to 30 credit hours of tuition. That's just fabulous for our students. So thank you for that.

Another thing, and this is open to all faculty, full-time, part-time, and staff instructors, the chancellor is going to be reinstating the faculty pizza nights. When he first arrived, I believe he did that and talked to -- it was more geared to department heads. Now he's opening it up to all faculty who would like to talk to him, express concerns or ask questions about updates on

initiatives, et cetera.

Then Dr. Dori and I have been invited so we will be there, as well, if you have any questions for us. So there is a link there where you can RSVP if you are interested in participating, and as you see, they will be at the various campuses.

Quick update about faculty resource centers, so they are now under the purview of Kate Schmidt, our executive director of faculty affairs and development.

The Northwest Campus one will still continue to report to that manager because it has multiple features to it. It's not only faculty resources but student computing and the student learning center.

But everyone else, the faculty resource centers, will be working with Diane Miller who now also is reporting to faculty affairs and Kate Schmidt. We are happy about that alignment. Because there had been some discrepancies and not standardizations among the campuses and the faculty resource centers, is that way everything is standardized and everything is expected what you would expect from those resources.

I think I'll end with Black History Month, some historical facts. Again, this is not just because it's Black History Month. We want to be thinking about all voices, all background throughout the year. But because it does happen to be Black History Month, we put some historical facts here for you and maybe you can share with some of

your students.

Any questions? I didn't go through everything, but I know we are running out of time.

David wanted to come up and elaborate a little bit more about the presentation that Jim Craig gave about tablets, so he has to give some context.

>> DR. DORI: I think both Dolores and I particularly wanted to follow up, Kimlisa, on your question, which I think was a very good question.

Just to recap, when we had that visit, the intent was, you know, multifaceted. One was to begin a conversation with faculty about how to better leverage mobile technology into teaching and learning. So that's one piece of it.

The other piece was to begin a conversation with student affairs, staff, and administration about how we could better leverage and serve students in our student support services, particularly on the student affairs side with mobile technology. And we have a lot of work to do there.

And then the third was to begin that conversation with our student leadership.

So I think both Dolores and I want to clarify that when it comes to the integration of mobile technology and to teaching and learning, it's the faculty that are driving that, right? And so there were some deeper-dive conversations back during that visit with specific

program faculty who wanted to be early adopters in integration and so forth.

So that's really the group that we're looking at in terms of teaching and learning.

And then since the reorg obviously, that's really in Dolores' purview, so we're looking at which of those faculty want to be part of that Phase 1. And then what I'm really focused on now is we have multiple platforms, we have over 30 platforms that we are using in student affairs, so what we are really trying to do is to have a very simple student-focused single interface for students where all these platforms can work better together to serve the students.

So I just wanted to kind of clarify where we're going with that, and I think it's really incumbent upon each of the division deans to be really identifying those programs that want to participate in a Phase 1.

So I hope that better answers your question.

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

Any questions about anything else we have talked about? Anthony?

>> SPEAKER: Will there be gluten-free pizza at these meetings?

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: I will talk to Gabby and request it.

(Laughter.)

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: The board study session is February 24?

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: That's correct.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: It's not posted on the board calendar. Could

we get that posted?

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: Yeah, I'll ask Andrea in the chancellor's office to make sure it's posted.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Do we know the time for that?

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: I think it's 4:00 to 6:00. They usually start at 4:00. They are in the community boardroom at District Office.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Two items?

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: Three. I'm not sure if guided pathways is first, but when they do post it, they'll give the order. I have a feeling we're first and then finance budget, and then I think there is something about virtual advising or something like that.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Community boardroom?

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: Yes.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you.

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: You're welcome.

>> JOE BREWER: This is a little bit outside my area but I'm interested that the guided pathways will be looking at data about which classes were attended or enrolled and which ones weren't and making some decisions on that.

I'm just wondering, are you guys looking at that data and looking a little bit beyond, simply the fact that, oh, these all filled up, so they must be really good? There may have been some other

variables that caused people to enroll that had a little less to do with just straight-ahead interest. And if they are presented in another one and all these other classes have been pushed away from their ability to enroll, I'm just wondering how do you really predict from that data what people in the future really will want.

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: That's a good question. That's something that we do need to look at, not just what's most popular, but what are their motives for taking certain classes.

But remember what the end goal is, we want to make sure our students finish on time so they can either, if they decide to go on to a four-year institution or get a job. That's our main goal.

All of our classes are wonderful. I remember classes that I personally had studied in grad school and wanted to teach here, more advanced classes and not regular Spanish 101, 102.

But we need to focus on what our students can do so they can finish. But of course all different lenses are going to be looked at.

Thank you. Other questions? Denise?

>> SPEAKER: Please, please, please, as you're looking at guided pathways, to note that semester pathways are still not on the website. And to work in advising and to work with students who don't have chemistry as a concentration or applied technology that are all nicely posted there, it's very, very difficult for a student to find that information and to know what order to take those classes in.



I know there are changes coming with the website, but make it accessible for students to find or those working with students to figure out the best order.

I know that guided pathways were created by all the different deans and divisions, but they are not accessible to everybody. If they can be accessible, that would make life much easier for everybody working with students to say, if you're full-time, this is the exact order we'd love you to go in. It changes, it won't always happen in that order, and here's the developmental classes.

It is so much easier to hand that out to a student, and we should be doing that every day all the time with students, and we can't when it's not available.

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: Thank you so much, because that's been a major concern for me particularly, and it's not accessible. It's very hard.

Hopefully with the new website which I understand will be launched in March, but we're also looking, that's going to be part of the update, all the technology pieces that are missing right now, and we are working with IT and we have a timeline of when this going to be done, because I know it's so hard for you guys to help our students.

So, yeah, point taken, definitely. Yeah. Thank you.

Any other comments or questions?

Before I came here, that's why I was a little late, I was in the

library listening to a little bit about the teaching and learning center speaker today on equitable, inclusive assessment practices for diverse writing intensive classrooms. I was only there for 20 minutes, but it's fascinating.

I know this is at the same time as Faculty Senate, but there is another one tomorrow that if you have time or future teaching and learning center workshops, please, please, go to them, because they are true truly fascinating and helpful, and we have adjunct and full-time faculty there participating and some administrators were there, too.

Okay. Well, thank you very much, and have a nice weekend.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you, Provost.

We have one more report. We have the PCCEA report with Matej.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Good afternoon, everybody. Ready for one more.

So a few items here. Aubrey has done a good job already highlighting some of the changes to the AERC group, and those two administrative procedures are out for 21-day comment.

PCCEA supports those changes. We work pretty closely with that group. So just so you know I think we are all on board with the changes. Some of them are as a result of that new legislation that was passed last summer in terms of how the college works with employee groups.

The list of faculty receiving contracts for next academic year

went to the board on Wednesday. PCCEA is in the process of reviewing it like we do every year to make sure nobody was left off, and following up on individual cases.

That list should also show who were the faculty that did not get their contracts reviewed and were laid off as part of the FACT process last fall. We still have not heard any information from the administration about the reasons for why the disciplines were selected. Now the information is out there, and so we look forward to hearing some explanations.

The faculty workload policy, this is one of those main policies that kind of outlines how much we teach and what all the calculations are.

It is finally posted in the employee handbook. That's the one a lot of people often refer to. I think there is some redundancies in there. I haven't seen it since last summer when we last talked about it and agreed on it.

There aren't any big changes for instructional faculty. There are changes at support faculty that we weren't able to avert. You know, all of our counselors won't be faculty starting next year anymore unfortunately. So that was a big loss in that area.

Finally, I'd like to say a few words about this whole compensation discussion and the Step Progression Plan and so forth. So as you know over the last month, since All Faculty Day, the chancellor has been having conversations or asking the faculty on

feedback regarding this idea of explicitly linking tuition raises and, you know, salary raises for employees, COLA specifically.

His argument went something like this, right, since tuition is the only source of revenue that's not subject to expenditure limitations, that's really the only way that we could then go and increase expenditures on salaries. It's the only viable way to raise money like that.

And so I really have to take issue with tying those so closely together. You know, I would say that a characterization like this, that one is linked to the other, is, at best, you know, misconceived and at worst deceitful as one of my constituents said when they were asked about this discussion. As Ken says, there is the revenue side and then there is the expenditure side in the budget and that all has to be taken as one big picture, and so there are lots of other factors, right? Raising tuition isn't the only way, right?

So what else should we be doing? I think we can all recognize, right, that modest or small ideally right periodically tuition increases they're just going to have to be part of the picture but they are just one part of the solution, and we shouldn't be pretending that's this quid pro quo here, please raise tuition so we can get raises.

So what else is there? Definitely in terms of the lobbying, it sounds like we have efforts, the board last month extended Jonathan Peyton's contract and his group for our lobbying, that's the very

smoothly spoken person that Anthony mentioned was at the board meeting. This really should be their No. 1 priority to try to change those expenditure limitation laws, try to advocate for some continued funding from the state again which used to be a really important source of revenue for the college, and that's going to be an uphill battle, but this is going to be our only way out of here.

So I think we need to sort of again make that their No. 1 priority.

Regarding -- then there is of course enrollment, right? That's really what expenditure limitations are tied to, and I think we still haven't done enough and fast enough to remove these kinds of self-created barriers that we have to enrollment and registration and finding the right kinds of classes and that are offered at the right time and location. You know, then keeping students around, making sure we have that support for them here and improve persistence, and so there is still work to be done there, and we shouldn't just pretend like that's not something that we should continue working on.

Then there are of course there is the expenditure side of the budget, and I think that's going to be the most difficult but probably the most important part, right?

I think we don't need just a budget for next fiscal year, but we really need one of those three- to five-year plans again in terms of where we are going to be going. I think most of us recognize that enrollment really isn't turning around. Part we are not capable and

part there are those external factors that the chancellor always likes to emphasize.

Remember how like four, five years ago, David presented these three scenarios and do we revolutionize the college or rejuvenate the college, and then the board chose, you know, the sort of middle road plan.

That got us here to that cloud and lightning bolt place where we are right now this fiscal year or next fiscal year. We really need another plan like that, I think, where we just have to recognize that there are going to be -- you know, we have to plan for further expenditure reductions, and I hate to say this, right, but I think that's just the reality and we should be planning for that now.

You know, there are things like, okay, so why do we still have the District Office, right? Why are we not planning to close another campus, like at least start planning on it. Seems like that's inevitable. Again, it pains me to say it, but that's going to probably going to have to happen. Then of course that also means some folks we can transfer, but then some folks' jobs actually have to go away.

Let's start planning on that so we can do that as much as possible through attrition over the next three to five years, retire people out, restructure some of those positions so it's not so painful later on.

You know, it's again the planning.

I think is there really no more waste and bloat? I think we could find some more.

It's of course really difficult, because we have been at this now for a few years, these like really trying to cut to the bone, and we have cut the bone. Next year it looks like we'll be laying off a number of faculty again, probably a lot more than this year. So I would expect that similarly appropriate measures be done in other areas, too, so that this is again some kind of comprehensive plan if we are going to just accept this process as moving forward every year.

Finally, I'd like to say that it's PCCEA's role, speaking with that hat on again, it is not the faculty's role to recommend specific things, make specific recommendations about these budget items or how much you should raise tuition, right, but I think it's not unreasonable for us to expect that the college be able to create and prioritize and fund some kind of competitive salary structure here for our employees so that everybody can have some expectation of salary career progression.

That's not just COLAs, but that's steps. Again, so since 2014, nothing's going to happen this year, we will go into a seventh year with no steps now and the chancellor is talking like it's going to be a decade easily.

That's just a failure, right? And it's costing us. It's costing us already right now. It's going to cost us more as we start losing

more employees. I have talked to too many people who are considering leaving. You just have to do something.

So I think, you know, we can try to have more discussions. This budget development process is going to take place over the next couple of months, and so I think it's important we make some kind of longer-term plan, because I'm worried about how all of this looks.

As you have heard, so Faculty Senate is having those conversations with the chancellor. PCCEA will continue working through the AERC and so on. The chancellor doesn't really meet with us anymore. But yeah, and so this classification and compensation study will really be a big thing over the next two to three years, and it would behoove us all to keep a close, close eye on it. There is some interesting ideas out there.

I hope everybody has a great month of February. Any questions?

Chuck?

>> JOE BREWER: You talked about the comp class study, and at the end of our meeting, which there was a lot going on there between admin and senate, someone asked if the new sort of instructional models, which have not been devised yet, but are assumed to be responsive to how people are learning in the future, and the chancellor said, oh, yeah, those are definitely going to be involved in the comp class.

So in other words, I think he's envisioning a very forward-looking comp class to say what kind of jobs are we going to



need in the future? Not simply looking at how much this person should be paid versus what they're paid now. Yeah. So there could be a lot of things involved in that.

We should pay attention.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Yeah, thank you for that. I hear repeatedly these sort of assurances, oh, we have no plan, no vision of this class and comp study. We are not giving them marching orders to start saving money and restructure positions. We're just going to make sure to compare ourselves to make sure we have reasonable positions, competitive positions.

Well, sounds very much like they have some ideas about how we should be restructuring instruction, and I have to say in the December meeting the chancellor was very clear, this was about cost structures and cost savings. That was the context. And that's only going to be achieved if we do this for everybody, not just a couple of small divisions here.

So I'm not sure -- I was unfortunately not able to make it Wednesday at the last minute so I'm curious to watch the video of how he's followed up there, but I'm very concerned about that kind of model for instruction.

Thank you, everyone.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you, Matej. Ken, do you have a motion?

>> SPEAKER: Motion to adjourn.

>> SPEAKER: Second.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All in favor?

(Ayes.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All opposed? All abstained?

All of you have a wonderful weekend.

(Adjournment.)

\*\*\*\*\*

DISCLAIMER: This CART file was produced for communication access as an ADA accommodation and may not be 100% verbatim. This is a draft transcript and has not been proofread. It is scan-edited only, as per CART industry standards and may contain some phonetically represented words, incorrect spellings, transmission errors and stenotype symbols or nonsensical words. This is not a legal document and may contain copyrighted, privileged or confidential information.

This file shall not be disclosed in any form (written or electronic) as a verbatim transcript or posted to any website or public forum or shared without the express written consent of the hiring party and/or the CART provider. This is an unofficial transcript which should NOT be relied upon for purposes of verbatim citation.