



FACULTY SENATE MONTHLY MEETING AGENDA

Date: April 5, 2024

Time: 1:00 – 3:00 PM

[Meeting Link](#)

[Sign-in Sheet](#)

Time	Item	Presenter	Time Allotted
1:00	Welcome & Introductions (Icebreaker- Spring, a season of growth/development- what PD opportunities do you like at PCC?) Review March Meeting Minutes	President	10 min
	Requests for Agenda Modification/ Executive Session	Senators	
	Requests for Open Forum	Open to Faculty	
1:10	Reports <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Provost Report President Report BOG Report Emeritus nominations Adjunct Faculty Report PCCEA Report TLC Report Student Affairs Report 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Kate Schmidt for Dr. Jeff Thies Denise Reilly Rita Lennon Kelly O'Keefe Sean Mendoza Makyla Hays Dr. Elliot Mead Jenn Madrid 	Reports 5-6 min
2:00	Business <ol style="list-style-type: none"> BP 3.22 Limited Enrollment (Selective Admission) Campus Updates Faculty Qualifications AP 3.01.01 AP/BPs - see pgs 3-4 with website links and zip files Faculty Leadership Model- see pgs 5-9 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Dr. Morgan Phillips (5 min) Dr. Aubrey Conover (10 min) Maggie Golston , Kate Schmidt (5-10 min) Dr. Jeff Silvyn, Dr. Morgan Phillips (Q&A 10-15 min) Faculty Leadership Workgroup (Q&A 20 min) 	
3:00	Closing: Adjourn		



FACULTY SENATE MONTHLY MEETING AGENDA

[Faculty Senate Charter](#)

[Faculty Senate Website](#) (find meeting schedule, Zoom link, agenda, and meeting minutes)



FACULTY SENATE MONTHLY MEETING AGENDA

The minor updates will be posted under [Notice of Minor Updates](#) (public comments *are not* accepted for Minor Updates) and the other documents will be posted on the web page for [Draft Policies & Administrative Procedures](#). These items will appear on the May Governing Board agenda.

If *after* reviewing these items there are any that your governance group feels need further review or revision, please let me know so we can develop a suitable schedule. Should you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact us.

Minor

BP 1.16: Institutional Effectiveness

BP 1.18: Receipt of Gifts – **March 4 Study Session**

BP 1.20: Data and Information Sharing

BP 2.02: Hiring of Personnel

BP 2.06: Assessment and Development of College Facilities – **March 4 Study Session**

BP 2.11: Research Involving Human Subjects – **March 4 Study Session**

BP 3.47: Student Organizations

BP 5.10: Equal Employment Opportunity, ADA, Non-Discrimination and Anti-Harassment (including Sexual Harassment)

BP 5.15: Employee Development – **March 4 Study Session**

BP 5.17: Outside (Secondary) Employment

BP 9.01: Information Technology Resource Management – **March 4 Study Session**

BP 11.01: Drug-Free College

AP 1.16.01: Mission Evaluation

AP 1.16.02: Strategic Planning

AP 1.25.02: Employee Representative Groups

AP 2.02.01: Filling Authorized, Vacant, Regular, Staff and Administrator Positions

AP 2.02.03: Return to Work and Transitional Duty

AP 2.11.01: Research Application Review

AP 3.11.01: Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), Educational Records Compliance and Procedures



FACULTY SENATE MONTHLY MEETING AGENDA

- AP 5.10.04: Americans with Disability Act Reasonable Accommodation Guideline for Employees/Applicants
- AP 5.15.01: Faculty Emeritus Status
- AP 5.15.02: Recognition at Governing Board Meetings
- AP 9.01.01: Acceptable Use of Information Technology Resources
- AP 9.01.02: Data Trusteeship
- AP 9.01.03: Security of the Information Technology Infrastructure
- AP 9.01.04: College-Issued Mobile Device Security
- AP 9.01.05: Security Clearance for College Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) System
- AP 9.01.06: Technology Hardware, Software and Service Specifications

Draft Policies & Administrative Procedures

- BP 1.19: Naming Opportunities – **March 4 Study Session**
- BP 2.07: Architect Selection – **March 4 Study Session**
- BP 3.36: Global and International Education
- AP 1.18.01: Fundraising Procedure and Gift Policy
- AP 1.25.04: Individual Position Review
- AP 3.25.07: Definition of a Credit Hour – **NEW**
- AP 3.45.01: Recruitment and Retention of Student-Athletes – **NEW**
- AP 3.45.02: Athletic Department Compliance – **NEW**
- AP 3.45.03: Athletic Department Code of Conduct – **NEW**
- AP 9.01.09: Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act Information Security Plan – **NEW**
- AP 9.01.10: Data Protection – **NEW**



FACULTY SENATE MONTHLY MEETING AGENDA

From: **Office of the Provost, Pima Community College** <provost@pima.edu>
Date: Mon, Mar 25, 2024 at 9:05 AM
Subject: [Pima-Faculty-All-Regular] Faculty Leadership Redesign - Feedback Needed
To: #Pima-Faculty-All-Regular <Pima-Faculty-All-Regular@pima.edu>
Cc: Nina Corson <ncorson@pima.edu>, Thies, Jeff <jthies@pima.edu>, Deans-ALL <Deans-ALL@pima.edu>, Karyza Ochoa <kochoa3@pima.edu>

This message is being sent on behalf of the Faculty Leadership Workgroup:

Dear Faculty,

On behalf of the Faculty Leadership Workgroup, I am pleased to share with you information on draft leadership models and to request your assistance.

I am grateful to our workgroup members who have worked diligently to assess faculty leadership needs, consider our new academic structures and figure out ways to support our faculty leaders while ensuring content expertise in overseeing disciplines remains a priority.

Why is the Leadership Model Changing?

Every few years it is healthy for an organization to assess how operations are running and if improvements can be made. After multiple concerns were raised by faculty and by administration, it was determined that new models should be considered. Concerns included:

- “Compensation” changes every year
- Reassigned time model is difficult to understand
- Faculty report not having enough time to complete necessary work
- Faculty leaders feel compensation is not adequate for work role
- One of very few roles at the college where the supervisor is not on a higher payscale
- 153 Faculty have Reassigned time (2023-24 AY)
- The College needs full-time faculty in the classroom
- Discipline Coordinator role used very differently across divisions/disciplines



FACULTY SENATE MONTHLY MEETING AGENDA

- There are multiple leaders in multiple roles and it is difficult to know who is responsible for critical tasks
- FTSE based model ignores needs of smaller programs with significant administrative work (industry accreditations, student recruitments, industry partnerships, advisory committees, etc.)
- Online education is integrating throughout the institution instead of a separate operation

Leadership Model Redesign Goals

- Clear, simple reassigned time
- Reassigned time aligned with responsibilities
- Appropriate compensation (Reassigned time + stipend)
- Consider multiple models
- Identify work that could better be done by others, or, not done at all
- Clear Academic Leadership for a discipline or very closely related disciplines

What models were considered?

The workgroup considered 5 different models and settled on two models to fully flesh out as options for the College to consider. Information on all 5 models is below. Further details are provided on the two selected models via prepared videos. We expect these models to continue to morph and be further refined over the next couple of weeks. We need your input to best define these models.

Which models were considered but decided against?

Associate Dean Model Only

Some schools do not have faculty department heads and simply manage all of the academic leadership via Deans and Associate Deans. In attempting to keep to a budget close to what is being spent now, we could hire each Division 2 or 3 Associate Deans, depending on the Division (Approx 22-24 Associate Deans)

Pros: All faculty would be focused on classroom teaching without need for reassigned time.

Cons: There is currently about 50 FTE of reassigned time for Faculty Leadership work. While some efficiencies are expected, reducing the FTE dedicated to academic leadership by half does not seem



FACULTY SENATE MONTHLY MEETING AGENDA

reasonable. Moreso, given the breadth of discipline offerings, 22-24 Associate Deans would not have the needed discipline-level expertise.

Provide Each Division a Budget

In this model, each Dean would be given a budget allocation and asked to determine their own structure. The budget could be used for reassigned time, stipends, and off-contract hourly rate as needed.

Pros: Division would have flexibility to determine needs.

Cons: It is difficult to determine appropriate allocations based on metrics such as FTSE or sections. Without strong guidelines, there is concern Divisions could make very different decisions and compensate for similar work very differently.

Keep our Current Structure but Simplify the Formula

Many Divisions have used their reassigned time budget to create different positions not documented in the Leadership Handbook. One model considered was to codify the current structure and simply round reassigned time to whole numbers and keep the structure as it is currently.

Pros: This model would bring little change for the institution and wouldn't require a whole new structure to be implemented.

Cons: This model does not address many of the concerns that brought about the decision to develop new models. This model also does not address the shift of online education into the division structure.

Which models are being considered?

The Faculty Leadership Redesign Workgroup settled on two potential models. Suggested details have been designed and these are the models we are asking for your feedback on now.

Department Head & Lead Model

This model defines different levels of Department Heads and includes additional reassigned time based on identified complexities. The philosophy behind this model is that a Department Head will be a true Academic Leader for their department in terms of continuous improvement, curriculum development, faculty oversight, etc.



FACULTY SENATE MONTHLY MEETING AGENDA

Compensation includes reassigned time, a stipend, and off-contract days. Additionally, for some areas, a 12-month position is proposed.

General Education, Health Care, Applied Technology, and Career & Technical Programs all have different leadership needs and thus, the Department Head structure is set up slightly differently to address those needs. An attempt was made to ensure each program or discipline has their own Department Head (except in cases where there is no full-time faculty member or when programs/disciplines are very closely aligned).

See [this video](#), [powerpoint](#), [spreadsheet](#) and [draft job description](#) created by one of our subgroups for details and please provide feedback on [this form](#).

Associate Dean, Faculty Academic Director & Department Head Model

This model provides an Associate Dean to most Divisions to take some of the load from General Education Department Heads. Department Heads are included in general education areas but with minimal reassigned time with the idea that the Associate Dean takes on much of the workload.

Given the intense needs of leadership in Career & Technical Education Programs (industry accreditations, student recruitments, industry partnerships, advisory committees, etc), it was determined the Associate Dean model did not fit. Instead, Faculty Academic Directors were used by shifting the faculty member to a 12-month contract and ensuring reassigned time is sufficient to complete the leadership responsibilities.

See [this video](#), [powerpoint](#), [spreadsheet](#), and [draft job duties](#) created by one of our subgroups for details and please provide feedback on [this form](#).

What about the recent decision to move Online classes into Divisions?

It is important to note that both models incorporate the recent shift of online courses into the division. In both models, most Department Heads will now have oversight of online & face-to-face classes to ensure consistency and coordination within all modalities. There are some disciplines large enough that the Dean can decide if dedicated online Department Heads are needed or if the online classes should be combined with in person classes (for example, in Writing they could have a dedicated Department Online Head for all of Writing, or they could decide, for instance, to have a WRT 101 Department Head that oversees both in-person and online courses).

What this means is that more faculty leaders will be responsible for online course processes. We anticipate training to be developed and those interested in Department Head positions will be expected to participate so that we can continue to ensure high quality online course offerings.



FACULTY SENATE MONTHLY MEETING AGENDA

What about our Faculty Librarians?

Our Faculty Librarians will receive stipends similar to the Department Heads to honor the leadership work and level of responsibility taken on by these individuals. I am presently consulting with the Library Director to ensure the stipend is in alignment with the rest of the faculty leaders.

What's Next?

We need your feedback to better define these models. Please watch the videos, provide feedback and attend any meetings your Division is able to hold over the next couple of weeks. In early April, your feedback will be used to provide updated models to the Provost who will determine the final leadership model. We anticipate your Deans starting recruitments in early to mid April.

One last note

This work would not have been possible without the dedicated Faculty Leadership Workgroup. Each of these individuals contributed and I am deeply grateful for their time, expertise and interest in making this project a success for the College: Ginny Harmelink, Kelly O'Keefe, Makyla Hays, Mischala Grill, Rita Lennon, Robert Foth, Skylay Webb, Steve Salmoni, Vivian Knight.

Nina Corson | Downtown Campus Vice-President

(520) 206-7053

ncorson@pima.edu