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>> MR. JOE LABUDA:  You know, we have some issues, and, again, we'll hash them out as much as we can. But since we have such a long agenda, let's kind of try to keep that in mind in terms of getting through everything while the whole group is here.

Let's start off with introductions.

(Introductions not transcribed.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA:  Do we have any announcements?

>> SPEAKER:  I'm not sitting in the front because my voice cracks, and if I have to leave it's because I have a coughing attack. So please forgive me. But I have this and it's bright, so I will pull this up if you need to state your name, please.

Thank you.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Any other announcements? We are still looking for a Senate secretary. Anybody think that over and decide they would like to be secretary of the Senate?
Okay. Pat?

Do we want to anoint Pat or have an election?

Hear, hear.

(Applause.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Agenda modifications. Open-forum items? Any open-forum items?

Good.

Now, we do have one agenda modification. Brenda Even from the Board of Governors is here, and she's going to speak to us. We will have that little bit later in terms of the reports.

Chancellor Lambert is not here yet, is he?

Okay. So I think we might have to do a little juggling when that occurs, too. But otherwise, all right, we're good to go.

Business items. You know what? We don't have the approving the minutes.

Did you have a chance to look at the minutes? We have December's minutes and January's minutes. Any additions or corrections on the December minutes?

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: We need to fix Martega's (phonetic) name. It's horribly misspelled in there.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Anything else?

Any motion to approve the December minutes?

>> SPEAKER: So moved.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Second?
(Second.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: All in favor?

(Ayes.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: January minutes.

Any additions or corrections?

Motion to approve?

>> SPEAKER: So moved.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Second?

(Second.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: All in favor?

(Ayes.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Business item 4.1. SPG 4004/AB, faculty emeritus, assistant vice chancellor, Debbie Yoklic.

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: Good afternoon. I have two things for you today. Next month I will have lots from the provost's office, but today I have two, so let's do it in the order of the agenda.

One is SPG 4004/AB, faculty emeritus. We have been working on this, what, a year? Two years? Okay.

Essentially what we have done is cross out all the old stuff and just put in the new stuff, because it's so different than what it was before.

There is no limit as to how many faculty can be granted emeritus status. You don't have to wait for three years.

The biggest sticking points were not the procedures but the
benefits. Faculty came with a list; administration cut it down.

Then we, I think, have come to a pretty good -- what I consider to be a pretty good compromise of the things that we are saying a faculty emeritus would have.

There was a lot of benchmarking done, and particularly we were interested in other schools in Arizona.

So I will just open it up to you if you have any questions or comments about SPG 4004/AB.

All right. Well, we will post it. That would be your opportunity to make comments that you don't want to make here.

Rita?

>> MS. RITA FLATTLEY: More of a question. I see my respected colleague, David Stephen, in the back. I understand that you have worked on this.

Are you satisfied with the compromises and the way this is going forward?

>> SPEAKER: Perhaps.

>> MS. RITA FLATTLEY: Do you care to elaborate?

>> SPEAKER: No. We will go forward from here.

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: Thanks, Dave.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Dave was really instrumental in bringing this forward, and I think it was long overdue.

As Debbie said, there was some give and take on this, so do you all want to wait and comment later, or this is sufficient? We can
have a Senate endorsement at this point.

>> ROB MODICA: How about a tentative endorsement?

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Well, okay. Any other comments?

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: I think we should wait. I think we should see what people have to say and then look at it in March, personally.

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: One of the reasons we are doing this now is -- okay. Let me not start with that sentence.

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: I will say red flag (laughter).

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: I was going to say HLC. The directive is that we only do things, make changes in policy that are necessary for the HLC.

So the last time I met with Joe and Dave I brought that up. The agreement is that this is important in terms of trust and making things better for the college; therefore, we do want to try to get this done before the writings so that we can say, you know, this is something that we're doing, because really, the way it was before was quite onerous.

We don't have very many faculty emeriti because of that. And if it were possible to get this done in the month, that would really be preferable. We don't want to drag things out. We have already dragged them out. I'd like to get this done.

And next month, my understanding from the provost's office, is
that there are going to be half a dozen perhaps SPGs, and then more coming forward.

So in the interest of not taking too much of your time on these matters, certainly whatever comes forward I would bring back to Joe and Dave as the main architects of this, but the plan is not to bring it back to Senate.

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: If we endorse it, would we still be able to make changes to it? What kind of flexibility do we have at the moment we endorse it? I need to know that.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Well, probably in the short run we're not going to have any flexibility at all. But with this proposal and with a number of things that are going to come up with the Senate today.

Say, for instance, with the faculty emeritus, we did not have a faculty emeritus program before. We had an emeritus program that was essentially, you know, stillborn.

Now, we did go back and forth on this, so it's not everything that Dave and I were asking for, but it was a negotiation. This is what we reached.

You know, this is true on a number of the situations that we have. You know, keep in mind, you know, administration has acted in good faith on these issues in terms of going back and forth.

My suggestion is to the group that we endorse it so we can move it along. That doesn't mean we never mess with it again, but I think
it's important to get it established, and then we can move forward from there.

Now, you might think, all think differently, and you're entitled to your opinions on how you want to approach it. But I think it's probably a good move that we go ahead and endorse it so that it really can get moved along.

Another reason for this too is if we wait too long on this we are going to have people retiring, and it would be nice to be able to include them at the end of the year in terms of this program. We will be in that position to do that.

That's my take on this.

>> SPEAKER: I think it's a great move, and I thank Debbie Yoklic and the committee who worked on it. I think it's long overdue. This might be too late, but I think maybe the members who are chosen could be ad hoc committee members with the foundation, perhaps, because they would -- if we show the community that these former faculty members at Pima are working with the foundation, and -- let's see what other one was -- I think that was it.

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: Explain that to me more, because I don't understand.

I want to respond to Kimlisa's question. Until the 21-day comment period is over and those comment have been considered, it's not a done deal.

>> SPEAKER: Then I will e-mail you.
>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: Thank you.

Any others?

>> ROSA MORALES: I just want to agree with Kimlisa. I feel more comfortable waiting until for that period happens for us to agree, because I would like to see if there are any other changes that might be included.

I do remember that one of the things that was discussed, and it was -- the primary issue in the beginning was the retention of the e-mail address, which I don't see any of that.

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: Right. That is not possible in terms of our resources.

>> ROSA MORALES: I understand. That's the reason I would like to see how it goes after everybody has commented, and then at the end...

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: I have brought that forward three times, and every time I was given more information how it's just not possible given our resources. It takes a lot of capacity to have everybody -- to have so many different people having e-mail.

Now, we did add the access and privileges to the library, full access to the library, and that was a bit of a discussion, as well. I said, I don't know why you can't do that. They said, Okay, we'll do that.

As I say, I brought e-mail forward a number of times and it's always been rejected. So, you know, how many times do I get
rejected?

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: I'm wondering why there are so
many resources involved in something that's generated by Banner and
simply a storage space issue.

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: It's the storage space issue.

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: Couldn't there be a limit on
the size of their mailbox and they could simply archive? That makes
absolutely no sense.

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: I'm going to defer to the experts, because I'm
certainly not an expert in this area. But I have brought it -- as I
said, I have brought it forward a number of times, and I keep getting
the same answer.

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: I wouldn't call myself an
expert, but I do know how to use e-mail.

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: Well...

>> ROB MODICA: Our former chancellor one time said when we were
talking about trying to raise money said that the system has 800,000
alumni and e-mails still active. I'm sure we have the capacity to
put in faculty that opt into the system.

People opt in, opt out. You're not going to get every single
faculty. We are talking 500 faculty. Less than that currently.

That's a specious argument.

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: I respect all of your opinions. I understand
you feel very strongly about that.
I have nothing else -- I can't say anything else. I don't have anything to add.

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: Who's making this argument about storage space?

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: IT folks.

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: Who in IT would that be? It just doesn't make any sense, Debbie. I'm sorry, you heard what Rob said. We all understand archiving. Students come and go. We are not talking about an unconscionable number of people. This makes no sense whatsoever, and it's just a Banner...

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: I suggest that you send that forward in your comments, and then when we -- I'll bring it forward again, but I'm the messenger here. You have to understand...

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Yeah. You know, to be fair to Debbie, I mean, she came and negotiated this out with us, taken it back and forth to other people.

This doesn't preclude us from going back and addressing this issue again if we want to address this issue again.

So I think the thing to consider is do you think that's a deal breaker that we can't accept the whole rest of the package? In my point of view it's not a deal breaker. That we should get it while the going is good and, you know, deal with that other part later.

>> SPEAKER: I have to agree with my colleagues here. That makes absolutely no sense whatsoever. We could do it. Kimlisa suggested a
limited amount of space that (indiscernible).

Also, No. 5 right here says that faculty emeriti may be...

(reading). If that is the case, the college then should provide those individuals with a college e-mail address.

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: And they generally are, the community members who serve on our various committees are provided.

There was a hand over here. Maggie had her hand up.

>> SPEAKER: I was wondering whether there would be -- I mean, and this is just such not a question for this body; it's really a question for IT -- but would it make a difference if the emeritus e-mail were the gmail-based student e-mail rather than the Outlook-based active employee e-mail? Would that change the storage -- I would think because it's all -- I don't know.

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: I wrote these things down. Okay?

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: You've got a good point, because I happen to know that we are looking at putting -- giving faculty the gmail address which is attached -- I mean, when I use mypima.edu e-mail it goes to a gmail. Perhaps that should be brought back to them and say, Look, why don't we go with the gmail route? At least they still have the .edu.

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: I wrote that down.

Something new maybe?

>> SPEAKER: Would there be a way for the Senate to maybe tentatively endorse it and request that this e-mail issue be given
some further study?

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Well, I don't think we get a tentative endorsement. I think we can make the point that that's an important issue for us, too. I think either, you know, we go forward with this, acknowledging the fact that's an issue that we want to pursue, but I don't know how, like we say, tentatively.

Again, I get back to the issue. Is that part a deal breaker?

Consider what we have had.

>> ROB MODICA: It looks like there is an awful lot of sentiment to make sure this issue gets resolved. Doesn't necessarily have to be tied to the emeritus program. If we approve a package as it is and then just don't drop this -- and the idea we send in comments and that's going to give -- now, you send in comments, you talk to people.

If Mack is the guy in charge and he has a problem with storage, we should ask Mack to come here and explain to us what the deal is, give suggestions, and do this.

So right now I would say endorse the emeritus program as is, but not forget the e-mail issue.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: That was a motion? Any further debate?

All in favor of the motion?

(Ayes.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Opposed?

(Show of hands.)
MR. JOE LABUDA: Abstentions?

One abstention.

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: Thank you.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Sterling?

>> SPEAKER: I am concerned about what we're advised will be a flood of things that we have to pass next month or the following month to please HLC.

The tone that the discussion this SPG has taken is that we don't want to look at it too closely; we don't want to make too many objections; we just want to go ahead and pass it to keep HLC happy.

It seems to me it would be possible that SPGs, policies, inimical to the interest of faculty and staff could be railroaded through by administration without deliberate and informed consent from faculty and staff.

That's a concern I have. It's an overarching issue beyond any one policy.

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: There is no requirement -- I mean, it's always a good idea when things are so -- of course, you know, the emeritus status is of course mostly -- is almost entirely about faculty.

Some other people have to approve it, et cetera, but there is nothing, a priority about the Senate or the staff council approving SPGs.

It is part of prime policy, how we get things approved. How we move things through is we ask for input from the various governing
bodies, including students. It's not necessary if you didn't -- I would never ask you to vote to approve. Because it's not required, and I'm not going to ask you something that's not required.

If you choose to do that, that's great. But you don't have to. The comments are being looked at. We are trying very hard to respond to comments, to really look at them.

And really, this process for this particular SPG has had a lot of thought put into it on both sides and a lot of discussion. And so I really don't think this is an example of something being railroaded. That, of course, is my opinion.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Sterling, you know, I think that's a real concern. I think this is -- if we remember the situation, this came before the Senate originally I think in October of 2012.

So this has been percolating for over a year. But I understand your point, and I think the Senate always reserves the right to make comments on anything that comes before us.

Yeah, I'm not expecting anybody to just, you know, sit here and listen to something and not comment or point out the errors of something.

Point well taken, Sterling. This is one of those situations where I think we did have a lot of input, and it was a long process to get to this.

I definitely appreciate your comments, Sterling.

Debbie?
DEBBIE YOKLIC: Are we ready to move on to the next one, which is going to be equally good? Board policy 1401, governance. I'm not sure that I sent it out -- I know I sent it to staff council; I'm not sure I sent it to the Senate.

This went through so many different changes. I have never seen one with three colors. I have only ever seen one -- in fact, when I was talking to the assistant in the chancellor’s office, I was saying, Maybe we need a third color. Maybe we need green.

She said, Oh, look at that. It's green. Great. And didn't pay attention to the fact that somewhere in her click, click, click she undeleted part of the sentence in the first paragraph. So the version that you have should have the first paragraph and the second paragraph completely deleted, and it begins as the legally constituted and final authority.

Everything on the first page on the top -- and the couple of lines on the top of the second page, they are gone. Okay? So it was a Word thing and my going, Oh, green, and not paying attention to the fact that the blue one with all of its lines didn't have a line through it. It had two lines under it.

Those of you at the board meeting this week, we projected it to the audience and it was correct. So the version that the board -- this has gone to the board once for the first reading. The version that the board had is the version you have with that first paragraph completely deleted.
It's gone to the board once. We are now taking it around. We have worked on this a lot. This belongs to the board and the chancellor. The board has worked on this at several of their working sessions. Essentially what this does is establishes the framework for what is Pima's governance. We're not calling it shared.

And according to -- I have read and reread that HLC document, and nowhere does it talk about shared governance. It talks about participatory, collaborative input, various constituents of the institution having the opportunity. Never talks about shared.

But there are very few places that have true shared. Most of the places that have shared, this is what they have, a real method for having participatory governance.

We're not calling it anything. We're calling it the Pima Community College governance model.

So you have the principles of it; you have the governance council; there will be three faculty -- there will be 12 members, 3 faculty among them. One will be the board rep; another will be the adjunct faculty board rep. And I think you're coming to that later.

And then a third faculty member, and that third faculty member is selected by the Faculty Senate. It's free. There's no -- however Faculty Senate chooses to select that third person.

There is also a group of people who are meeting regularly. Joe is part of that group. We have past chair of staff council. We have a student. We have Dr. Even from the board. We have Sheila Ortego,
president of, current president of Community Campus, and the general
counsel and I are there to facilitate things.

That group is talking about how will this council actually work?
What are the nuts and bolts? What are the parameters? What is okay?
What is not okay? Should there be term limits? No, there isn't.

That was just something that came to mind.

That group is coming, and what will come out of that group is
what we currently call an SPG that we will probably later call
administrative procedure. But it's the same thing,

So we are working on that piece, and it's probably going to take
us another couple of months to do it.

So any comments that you wish to make now about board policy
1401?

>> SPEAKER: I'm wondering how the representatives will be
selected? Will that be addressed in the SPG or...

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: Which representatives?

>> SPEAKER: Those 12 people.

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: It's actually specified. It's also -- yeah.

>> SPEAKER: So will they be elected or appointed or...

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: Mostly they're elected. The three faculty are
selected by Faculty Senate, and it is up to Faculty Senate to decide
how you're going to do that.

It's up to the student government to decide how they are going to
do that.
It's up to the administrators.

Well, we have a president that will be selected by -- we're talking about maybe the presidents will select one of their own. We haven't really worked that out yet.

But in each case it's selected by the group, that particular group. So there are four groups: staff, faculty, students, employees. Everybody gets three representatives.

For instance, do you decide as a group how to elect your board representative, or do you appoint your board representative? It's up to you.

How do you pick that third one? You figure it out. I mean, it's supposed to be selected by Faculty Senate, and it's up to you.

>> SPEAKER: Thanks.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: If you remember, at the January meeting we discussed how we were going to do it for the full-time faculty. We did have to massage this a little bit because we have had two representatives on the Board of Governors group. That's been changed to one. So Kimlisa is going to be our representative, or is our representative, to the Board of Governors.

In January we also decided that -- well, what we decided was whoever is going to be our Board of Governors rep will be one of the people that serves on this governance council.

And I mentioned at the time too that it probably made sense since I'm dealing with so much of this how this is getting formed that for
this year that I be that second person.

Now, I think we do have some decision-making about how we want to handle that long term.

Now, the other part of this is the adjunct faculty representative, and we will talk about that later. We have a way to massage this within our charter for the full-time representatives.

But for the adjunct faculty we've got some decisions to make. So we will reserve that. But, you know, this is one of those situations, too, where this is a good situation for the Senate in terms of determining who our representatives are going to be.

So on that level at least we have the full-time part being taken care of.

>> SPEAKER: Debbie, board policy 1401, do you have terms and term limits? Are you thinking about those?

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: Well, that will be decided by this, I don't know, for want of better words, steering committee.

The board representatives have a one-year term, so probably -- and we may put it in the board policy. Since the Board of Governors representatives have one-year terms, it makes sense for the other people to have one-year terms as well, so that all 12 would have one-term terms but with no term limits. So you could be re-elected 20 times.

But just to make it consistent, since the board reps are a year -- did I get that wrong, Brenda?
>> DR. BRENDA EVEN: (Off microphone.)

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: Okay. Does that answer your question, Margie?

>> SPEAKER: But that would be a problem, though, if we have no term limits. Then it would be the same person every year.

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: That's the decision of the steering committee.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Also, this is going to be a Senate decision.

So, you know, we can structure that as we see fit. Now, my suggestion is going to be, since the board rep for us has a yearly term, that we maintain that. So, say, for instance, well, next year Kimlisa is going to be president, so we're going to need another board rep.

So by definition, at least that one position is going to change. So in effect, we already have our term limit built in.

One of the issues with this is can you have one size fits all for all of the groups? Not really. The staff council will have to decide how they want to handle their situation, and the students will have to decide how to handle their situation.

Later on we are going to talk about how we are going to do it with the adjunct faculty.

I think right now we are in a situation where we are essentially selecting the person we want to be there.

So in the future, the issue might be the second person, how you want to do the second person. So basically one person is going to be the board rep and also on this council. The second person is kind of
up for grabs.

I don't know from the future you're necessarily going to want the Senate person to be that person. It doesn't have to be. Like I say, this time I think it makes sense for me to play this out. Keep that in mind.

Any other comments or discussion?

>> DEBBIE YOKLIC: I look forward to your comments. Thank you very much.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: 4.3, governance. I think we have a couple different things going on. We have this board policy, and then we have our committee meetings.

As far as this structure goes, of course the board is going to set up the structure that they want to. I think by and large we can live with the structure. The issue will be what this council does, and that's not spelled out.

So, you know, these meetings are going to be a way of figuring out exactly, you know, what the role of that council is going to be. I think that could be a useful structure for the faculty.

But also, I have made it kind of plain from the Senate point of view is the Senate is important. Things are going to still have to be run through the Senate. The Senate is a body that represents all of us. That person or persons represents the Senate.

So, you know, we can, you know, kind of hash that out and give me some ideas. But like I say, that part is in flux, and I will, you
know, get back to you in terms of how I think that is going.

In terms of the board policy, you know, I'm kind of agnostic about it. In terms of what we do, though, with that, that's going to be the importance in terms of how we -- you know, what we are able to do with that council.

Anybody want to comment? Kimlisa?

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: I think it would behoove us, because of the nature of the board and all of the many things that come before them and flow through, that this body consider having a rep and then a backup rep.

The reason that I say that is I think it would be very hard for somebody to come into this position. For me to leave it and then somebody to come and completely new and not have that background and that history and know kind of the things that were going on.

Plus, you know, life happens sometimes. I might get sick and I might not be able to go to a board meeting. You never know.

But I would think that one of the things we could look at, and it would work out very viable at the moment, is if there was a backup or a second -- my second, like we are doing a duel -- that basically came in, you know, that helped me out and was there.

And then when I leave that position, that person takes over with knowing where they were, the history and things, and then another person come in to backfill them. So you always -- and do it in a two-year cycle so there is always somebody coming on and you never
have that gap in the history and the knowledge of what's been going on with the board and all of the things behind it.

That's my two cents on that now. How you decide to structure it -- I would really strongly recommend that whoever that person is going to be come on sooner rather than later, because it is a very tumultuous time. I'm not going to be president and board rep. That would kill me.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Kimlisa, do you suggest we make a charter change? Have something like a board rep elect?

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: I do. At the pleasure of the body, of course. But I think that's something we really need to look at. That way we always have somebody who knows what's going on. In the case that, you know, something happens or I can't be there, or whatever, we're always covered with the board.

And then when I leave, that person is always up to speed. There is no explaining, this is how it goes and this is what's happened, any of those things. They're there.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: How about this: Between now and the next meeting send me your comments, but I will also draft some language.

Now, since we did discuss this in executive session, the process for the adjunct faculty representative too, we have met that as a charter requirement. So if we want to come back at the next meeting and formalize this, we can go ahead and do that.

So it's up to the group. Would you like me to draft some
possible language and send that out and make comments on it?

Okay.

>> ROSA MORALES: I really want us to think closely about the process, because I want to state publicly that I was not very comfortable with the process that we used last time in the last meeting. I think when I look at the minutes it was, you know, you proposing, somebody else seconding, and it went so fast.

The issue was that I really would like to have time for the group to make nominations and to allow for people to ask individuals that are willing to do, you know, whatever job is going to be available or whatever. Inform that there are going to be elections so people will come ready, you know, with the information on who is nominated, and, you know, at least ready to vote.

I know we are doing a lot of things, you know, fast, but I would prefer the next time that really that's a little bit more input from everybody and there is consensus and there is a process. Because to me, it was quite fast. I didn't really like it, and I really wanted to mention it to everybody. I heard from other people they have also the same concerns.

And I totally agree with Kimlisa, that it's very, very important to have somebody that will be aligned so they can step in and they're ready to move forward, because we don't have a lot of people with the type of information and experience. There needs to be more.

Thank you
>> ROB MODICA: With all due respect, Rosa, after many years on
the Faculty Senate, I never remember a contested election that went
down to the nitty-gritty.

If memory serves me, last time we called for nominations and
there was one, that was Kimlisa. I mean, it wasn't like people were
fighting for the position.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Anyone else?

Okay. This is, again, a similar topic.

Now, as I mentioned, I think probably we could live with our
current charter in terms of the full-time faculty member on the
board, but I think probably it's a good idea to change it.

But we do definitely have a problem with the adjunct faculty
representative. We don't have any language at all to address that.

Now, beyond the charter change, I think we have to make a
decision in terms of how we select that person. You know, again,
this is, I think, by and large I feel -- essentially I'd like to
defer to the adjunct faculty in the Senate to determine how they're
going to pick their person.

I know that Dr. Even has mentioned she thinks it's a good idea
for it to come out of the adjunct faculty committee. You know, we
have some options. We could do it as a Senate as a whole.

Again, my preference is the adjunct faculty determine their own
fate on this.

We could do it out of the committee itself, the adjunct faculty
committee.

We could expand it into all the adjunct faculty in the Senate and work it out that way. I know there was a suggestion to take it out of the Senate, but my opinion is that would be kind of unwieldy and we will be kind of working on that one for a while.

The adjunct faculty that are on the Senate have shown their commitment to be leaders in this college, and I think that makes sense for those people to have the most input on this.

Any other suggestions or comments?

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: I want to point out that at the Board of Governors, at the end -- and Dr. Even, please correct me if I heard it wrong -- but I believe that when you voted, you stated very clearly that that person would come out of the adjunct faculty committee.

Was that correct? Is that what you voted on? Representing all that would come out of that committee.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Well, you know, here's what we could do. We could pick that out of the adjunct faculty committee, but essentially what we could do is make everybody who is adjunct faculty member in the Senate a member of that committee. That would take care of our requirement there.

Matt, did you have a comment?

>> SPEAKER: We just had our meeting (off microphone).

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: So to meet the requirement that somebody come
out of that committee, are we comfortable with the fact that all of
the adjunct faculty members are now members of that committee?

>> ROB MODICA: One thing we might want to make sure we have
language to cover, is although many and perhaps most adjuncts teach
from fall-spring, fall-spring, it's a semipermanent job, there is an
occasion where somebody might not have their class make, and then
they would not be an employee of the college. We have to have
language to sort of cover that somehow.

>> SPEAKER: What I was suggesting is having also a backup.
Because just as Rob is mentioning, we asked department chair -- I
also have adjunct faculty that in the middle of the semester will
tell me, This is my last semester; I've gotten a full-time job. Or
maybe sometimes unfortunately they get the full-time job during the
semester.

So I think that maybe if we have an adjunct faculty represent
elect, just like with the Board of Governors, rep elect for Faculty
Senate would be a good idea, too.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Brenda, does that make sense, that we have
essentially a backup person if the adjunct faculty can't make it for
some reason?

>> DR. BRENDA EVEN: (Off microphone.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Okay. So are we good with I will draft some
language? I will try do get that out pretty quickly and you can make
comments, and then we will try to resolve this in the March meeting.
With that being the case, would we want somebody to temporarily step in to cover the next meeting, next board meeting, before we have a chance to have an election?

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: This is a fun time, these board meetings.

>> ROB MODICA: I have a question here. On the policy, BP 1401, it says faculty members, the two governing board representatives. They just change it to one representative. Right? Or are they talking about a different governing board?

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: They are talking about the adjunct faculty representative and then the Faculty Senate rep or the other faculty representative, and then a third.

>> ROB MODICA: So for the Board of Governors there is a Faculty Senate rep?

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: A Faculty Senate rep, and then there is the adjunct committee rep. Those are the two reps. And then for the other group, what are we calling that?

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Governance council.

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: It would be those two reps and a third rep.

>> ROB MODICA: Okay. Thank you.

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: I'll buy you Starbucks if you come to the Board of Governors meeting.

>> SPEAKER: The whole company?
> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: No, not the whole company. Just one person. Even a Frappachino. Even venti.

> MR. JOE LABUDA: The people in the adjunct faculty committee? Any other comments? Matt?

> SPEAKER: Any adjunct faculty here, member of this community, who wishes to attend, our meeting starts at 12:00 right around the corner in the Copper Room. Please e-mail Mary Mitchell.

> MR. JOE LABUDA: Matt, would it make sense if someone wants to be considered but can't make that meeting that they could e-mail Mary?

> SPEAKER: Certainly.

> MR. JOE LABUDA: That's still up for grabs? Yeah.

It's 2:00 and Chancellor Lambert is here. I know he's got some time issues. Why don't we make sure we get to hear him.

Lee, do you want to...

> DR. LEE LAMBERT: Good afternoon, everybody. So for those of you who were not able to make the board meeting the other night, I wished all of you could have been there, because we're starting to see how all the work we have been doing from last year is starting to come together in moving the college in a very positive, forward direction.

So the work of the student concerns group, the student services review piece, the dev ed redesign enrollment, the strategic enrollment management, focus, strategic planning, and of course the
HLC work are all starting to come together, moving us in a positive direction.

So I just wanted you all to know that we should all be proud of what we have accomplished in a very short period of time.

I know that we are all under a lot of pressure given the current state of affairs here with the HLC probation looming over us. But I also want us to realize to not look at that as a negative but to see that it's really about us moving in a positive direction.

Unfortunately, we have that over our head to help push us forward.

The other piece I'd like to emphasize is HLC is really about evaluation, review, and then ultimately taking what you learn from that and putting it back into your processes to keep improving.

So we need to look at a way, whether it's policies, procedures, how do we look at those things on an ongoing basis? So they should never be static.

What's happened is a lot of our policies and procedures have been static for so long that it's not really serving the needs of the institution in a more robust way.

That's why, when I heard the earlier comments about the emeritus status, I wouldn't look at that as a static thing long term, but we should continue to look at how we improve, how we honor the contributions of our faculty to Pima Community College. I'm very open to that, but I'm open to that for all of our policies and
procedures.

With that, let me first talk about what's happening on a national level. So the board and I and a few staff and some students will be going to Washington, D.C. next week. This is a very important time in the history of higher education, because our congress is looking at the reauthorization of higher education.

Also going to be looking at workforce investment act. A lot of resources tied up in that for us as well as a college. Immigration, although I think Speaker Banner recently said that's not going to come out of the House, but as you know, immigration looms large for us at Pima because our board has taken the position of supporting our students so that they can receive in-state tuition.

So these issues will still be played out. So we need to have a presence. We need to be advocating for Pima Community College with our congressional delegation and with the overall national piece.

So that's what we will be doing next week.

Also, on a statewide level I will be going to the State legislature the week after next to testify before the House higher ed committee, and I have been asked by Representative Dial to come and speak to the committee.

The focus will be on workforce. Should be no surprise. Right? From President Obama's State of the Union address to the things hearing out of the state of the Arizona, big focus on jobs. Jobs, jobs, jobs, and that's been the mantra for quite a while now.
But what are we really doing to align with that? That alignment is growing and growing, and we need to continue to keep that push there.

As you all know, Pima Community College and Maricopa have been left out of the governor's budget. We have been left out, folks. We need to think about how we get our voices heard so that the State of Arizona starts to reinvest back into our two biggest districts in the state.

We serve the lion's share of all students in the state of Arizona, but yet we are being left out. Also, when you look at the actual investment into community colleges as a whole, it's almost zero. They are moving money around, but they aren't really adding new money into the pot to help us grow our institutions so we can serve our students and our community appropriately.

So I hope that you lend our voices where you feel appropriate to make it known that we need to invest in our community colleges, because we play a vital role.

So on a more local level, we're going to begin search processes, and it's already underway for the provost position. We are going to be doing that for the campus presidencies, obviously here in Downtown, Community Campus, and Northwest Campus. And moving forward with a number of other administrative positions -- and a number of other positions in general.

So that's all underway now. Some of the postings will be coming
out -- I believe a message has gone out as well to that effect. I just want you all to know that.

Also, last semester I went around and talked to a lot of people here at the college and outside of the college, and as I have done that I've gotten to know a little more about Pima Community College.

So the next iteration of this is I'm now going to start holding office hours at the respective campuses and I'm going to try to get out to the senators.

What that means is I may be lucky if I can get to each campus twice in a semester. And some of you from West, I was just there earlier this week. So that's my next step forward in doing that.

I met with a number of faculty during that visit. Met with students. And that's separate and apart from if you want me to come visit your classrooms. I'd love to do that. Want me to come see your labs, I'd love to do that. That's separate and apart from that.

But the other thing we are going to be doing, and I have been talking to the campus presidents about this, is the campus president and myself want to sit down with the department chairs, and that concept of dinner for 8 concept, and so that will also begin as well this term.

I believe I already have dates set up for West Campus for that to happen, so. I really want to hear from you what's working, what's not working, what can we do better, and how do we continue to move Pima forward in a positive way.
So we will beginning that process.

Questions?

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: At the Board of Governors meeting you mentioned that you met with Karen Solomon.

>> DR. LEE LAMBERT: Yes. Thank you for that reminder. Last term I went and visited with Sylvia Manning of the Higher Learning Commission, and recently I went and visited with Karen Solomon. We talked about a number of items, and so let me just share with you a couple of things that we talked about.

One was the process of what's going to happen with the probation going forward.

So you all know about the submittal of our self-study by the end of July and the site visit that's going to happen in mid to late September.

What's probably lesser known is that there will be a hearing, and so I will take a group of individuals to Chicago to give one last set of input in terms of our progress in addressing the concerns that the HLC has revealed, especially around the red zone areas, at that hearing.

So the site visit team is different than who's going to be in the hearing group. Our inputs from both the site visit team and the hearing groups come together, and they go before the full board which will occur in February.

So putting aside the probation piece for a moment, I want to
think positively that we're going to come off probation. But here's what it's going to look like when we come off of probation. We can go down three avenues, if you will.

One avenue is what we call the standard track.

The other track is an open track.

The third track is an AQIP track.

When you come off probation you're going to go into the standard track. Let me just kind of describe what that means for a moment.

The review cycle for the Higher Learning Commission is a ten-year review cycle, but in that standard track there will be a review at year 4. Because we are coming off of probation we will have another review at year 2.

So come off of probation, two years later we have another review. Then two years after that we will have another review. A few years after that we will have another review.

She said about 20% of the institutions of the Higher Learning Commission are in that standard track.

I think that would be a great achievement on our part to be able to move into that standard track, but also what it reveals is we are going to be constantly in this process of review and a constant need to continue to march forward with continuous improvement.

That's not a bad thing, because we should be doing this anyways as an organization now. We just have that over us helping us to keep thinking about that piece.
Let me talk about the governance component for a moment, because that was another topic that we discussed and she reiterated for me. This helped me, because it confirmed what I thought coming out of the northwest commission.

They are not there to tell us how to run our college. They are there to make sure we live up to the standards of an institution that is accredited under the Higher Learning Commission.

We were not living up to those standards, and we call them criterion in the Higher Learning Commission. Then that's when our peers -- remember, this is a peer review process. Our peers are the ones holding us accountable, not the Higher Learning Commission.

It's our peers that make up the Higher Learning Commission, and so our peers are telling us, You can do better.

With that as a context, in talking about the governance piece she said, We're not going to look to see what you name it. The label is not what's important. It's what you're actually doing that allows for the things that Debbie mentioned earlier.

The input, the collaboration. That is what they're looking for, and that there is a system in place that enables that to happen.

If you want to call it shared, participatory, want to call it governance, that's up to us. And ultimately it's a board's decision what we call it. Right?

At least what we need to be clear about is what we mean by the terms that we put in place. So I believe we started out with this
notion of wanting to call it shared governance, and so as we've evolved over time, we need to be able to explain how the evolution occurred.

That should be captured in our self-study. I just want you all to know this is not about them trying to dictate to us as much as us being able to say, This is where we want to go; this is how we have done it; this is what we’re going to do to evaluate our efforts so that we can continue to improve in service to our mission to our students and community.

Other questions?

>> ROB MODICA: Chancellor, thank you for your attendance today. Good to see you.

It seems like every time we open the paper there is another external review, another external investigation, whatever.

>> DR. LEE LAMBERT: Yes.

>> ROB MODICA: I see the need for those. But when the HLC kind of criticized us for contracts that weren't transparent, is there a place we can go to see where these things -- who's doing these investigations? How much they are costing? Do you have a ballpark figure for what we're spending?

>> DR. LEE LAMBERT: I don't have a ballpark figure on how much we're spending. If that's something you'd like to hear at a future meeting we certainly could have a presentation from David Bea.

>> ROB MODICA: I think it would be helpful, and in the interest
of transparency, a good thing.

>> DR. LEE LAMBERT: No, I welcome that. You know what's really unfortunate? That we have had to make those kinds of investments to correct what has happened over the years.

But my approach, as you're hopefully picking up, is I don't want to just go in and say, This is the end for somebody. I want to make sure we have our data that informs that decision.

Sometimes we have to bring in someone from the outside to help us sort through those pieces; sometimes we don't need to bring in somebody to sort through those pieces.

So that's something I hope we don't have to rely on long term. But part of, too, is we don't have the talent internally to do some of those more complex investigations.

You know, yes, that was a background that I have, but that's not the role I play any longer. We have one or two other people I think who have a solid background in that area, but with the number of complaints we are getting through EthicsPoint and some of the complicated issues like nursing, as an example, we need to really bring in folks sometimes from the outside.

But can I build off of that point, though? I want to reiterate what I said earlier. There is usually a preceding event that occurs before someone is no longer an employee of Pima Community College.

I just don't do this because I don't like somebody. I don't want employees to be afraid that, Is it my turn next? No. If you're not
being investigated, you don't have to worry. If you're not receiving all these complaints about your work, you have nothing to worry about.

So I want folks to know, it's not just happening out of the blue. Okay? Because that's not my approach.

And even when we get concerns brought to us by students or by faculty and staff, I'm expecting my administrators to have conversations with the respective individuals.

And when we don't see improvement, then changes need to occur. Because I believe that we have to hold ourselves to the higher level of accountability. We are public servants and service to students and the community, and our taxpayers have invested in us. They expect a level of professionalism that isn't always the case in the private sector.

So I really take that seriously, and I'm trying my best to model that as much as I can, too.

>> ROB MODICA: I wasn't questioning the validity of the need. I think it's just a good idea to know how much we are spending.

>> DR. LEE LAMBERT: That's a good point, because it's costing us. It's just unfortunate, and your point is well made. I think inviting Dave to come in and talk about that I think is a great suggestion.

>> ROSA MORALES: Thank you for coming. I want to ask you about something. I appreciate it that you're doing all of this, because
obviously we know the college needed to proceed in some cases on letting go of some people that might not be doing their best. So I totally applaud you on that.

On the other hand, I also want to be able to provide support to your efforts. I know you're having the PCC Futures Conference on February the 18th, and I want to know -- it's from 7:30 to 11:00 a.m., which is quite early. In my organization classes I actually gave extra credit to my students for attending community meetings.

I want to know if you think that would be a good idea to include that event among all the other community events that invite the students to participate where I give them extra credit? I want to be able to ensure that the input you're getting includes students' voices.

In many instances, the students attend when they receive extra credit. I'm asking you here, do you think it would be a good idea so I can proceed and include your event?

>> DR. LEE LAMBERT: I'm going to have Dr. Harris, who is here, who has been leading our efforts around the strategic planning Futures Conference, if you wouldn't mind commenting on that.

>> DR. ZELEMA HARRIS: I hope you can hear me. I have had laryngitis since I have been here.

But the Futures Conference is really an opportunity for us to get community input. Where the students will be involved is when each campus does its strategic planning, because we will develop the
overarching strategic directions. Each campus, through their planning process, will align with those strategic directions, and students will be involved. But this is really an opportunity to bring the community together and for us to have a purposeful conversation with them about the direction the college should go.

And, in fact, criterion 5 of the HLC criteria tells us that we are to have community input as we develop our strategic plan.

>> DR. LEE LAMBERT: And let me build on that, because it's very important. A lot of organizations, as they build their strategic plans, often only look more within its walls instead of reaching out outside of its walls to build its long-term or long-range or influence the long-range thinking.

So we're taking a different approach and really integrating that with what the expectations are of the Higher Learning Commission to understand emerging trends, especially around demographics, technology, et cetera, which is contemplated in criterion 5.

But there will be plenty of opportunities for faculty, staff, and students to be part of the overall process, because that's also important.

But it's also very vital that we understand those other elements that are happening. It's hard to do that when we don't incorporate a much fuller view in that process.

>> ROSA MORALES: Just because last week we discussed
participatory, the part approach to getting consensus, which is what you're using, and I actually explained to the students that this is a good example of how you can get participation from different constituencies and come up with a plan.

>> DR. LEE LAMBERT: Thank you for saying that.

Maybe one last question, Joe? Is that okay? I know I'm a little over by a couple of minutes.

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: Very quickly, could you please expand upon your partnership with the Korean ambassador? And you also mentioned some things with U of A and JTED. Very quickly.

>> DR. LEE LAMBERT: Yes. So I don't know if you all were aware of this, but Korea has a relationship with TUSD. It's called the Korean ambassadors partnership program or something like that with the acronym.

They had approached Pima a couple years back, and there was a meeting and everyone smiled and all of that and nothing ever came out of that.

But TUSD approached us again with the notion of us collaborating in a way where the students coming over from Korea and the ones who want to extend their time here in terms of going on and to pursue an experience of higher education level, that Pima become a partner in that.

So that's what we are looking at doing, is building a partnership with TUSD in the two schools or the two parts of Korea where there is
an opportunity to do that.

So that's what that's about.

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: You had mentioned in the thing about them living here. Are we looking at dorms like you did at Shoreline?

>> DR. LEE LAMBERT: So that's a little more complicated in terms of residence halls. You know, fortunately at Shoreline that was years in the making to develop a partnership that led to the folks wanting to make an investment.

So we're not there yet. We haven't built those kinds of relationships where folks may might want to make an investment into Pima as far as residence halls go.

Now, with that said, when you run an effective international program, you're going to look at a variety of ways to deal with the housing needs. So one approach is, which is not uncommon for community colleges, it's called Home Study.

Home study would be would be one of those options for a lot of -- especially the Asian countries. Parents really want to see their children under the care of the school they are attending, and that's where the residence hall piece really provides that kind of appearance of security if nothing else. Right?

But we don't run our residence halls the way they may be running their residence halls.

But nonetheless, that is something they look to us to provide
that safety and security for their sons and daughters.

So I think we have to think about that piece. Now, of course, apartments become another component of that solution. We may look to a partnership with the U of A potentially to see if they have underutilized residence hall space and see if there is a way to partner in that regard.

But for us to grow a program, we're going to have to be thinking about the housing component, absolutely.

But as I have learned, Pima used to have one of the largest international programs in the country, and then it changed about eight, ten years ago to where we are running one of the smaller programs in the country. And there is no reason for that.

So I'm hoping that one day we can bring things back up. It will require some investments initially to do that, but I think the rewards -- and I approach it not as a financial piece. Okay? I look at it as a learning piece.

This is about creating opportunities for our students to grow their global competence. If we provide the right type of learning spaces where they have to interact domestic and international and across countries, then that's why we do it. It just happens to have a corresponding benefit beyond that.

So I hope that we'll all be willing to engage in thinking of that in the longer term view. I would not be surprised, as we do the Futures Conference, that this is going to be one of those overarching
trends that we have to be paying attention.

Another question you asked, or did I cover it?

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: You got it.

>> DR. LEE LAMBERT: Thank you, all. Enjoy your weekend.

(Applause.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: We will go back to the business section.

4.5, disruptive students code of conduct changes.

I'm sorry, Mary Mitchell isn't here today. She couldn't make it.

This is something that Mary and the Adjunct Faculty Senate Committee really worked hard on and pushed through, and I think it just kind of shows that the Senate isn't just a full-time senator operation.

Our adjunct faculty are very important in terms of pushing through initiatives.

Mary and I met -- well, a little background information. The Senate passed the resolution at the October 4th meeting that really made this official. We have had discussions about disruptive students and code of conduct problems for quite a long time.

That set us on a path to authorize Mary and me to go forward and try to make some improvements in the code of conduct. Specifically, what was advocated coming out of the meetings in the Senate was an appeal process for the faculty.

I sent out the changes to you. If you got them and saw them in color, they are in red.

Since most of the code of conduct really, you know, doesn't
really affect that situation, you'll notice most of the code of
conduct stays in one piece. But the key pieces are on pages, I
think, 13, 18, and 19, and they are substantial.

We worked with VPs Aubrey Conover and Ted Rausch, and we had some
candid discussions. Both of them were very good to work with. We
covered a lot of territory very quickly.

Now, this is a major improvement in terms of that process. There
is something else that kind of came out of those discussions, too, I
will talk about next. That's the behavioral assessment committee.

So if we go forward with this, this is a process that we haven't
had access to before. I think you have had enough time to look at it
and see really what a difference this makes.

With that in mind, I'm just going to open it up to the group if
you have any comments or any kind of discussion.

Denise?

>> DENIS MEEKS: I totally applaud everything that the committee
has done. Also, in light of the report that came out this week, or
actually the threat assessment process review and recommendations
that came out just a few days ago and was posted on the college
website contains additional recommendations from the consultant that
probably should be incorporated in this document.

Also, in the document that we currently have, if it's there, I
wasn't able to find it. There is nothing in here really that
provides that the BAC even needs to consult with a faculty member in
the case of problems with students.

> MR. JOE LABUDA: Well, Aubrey, you want to help me out on that?

> SPEAKER: So a couple of different things. One is just before I even answer the question I want to say -- one of the things we talked about is this is just a first step.

(Off microphone.)

I believe you mentioned having that back and forth, but were you also asking how that plays out, like how the communication plays out?

> SPEAKER: Right. There are 38 problems that are identified.

(Off microphone.)

> SPEAKER: So the major piece we added was the appeals component. We had wording specific to communication that requires that faculty -- it speaks to faculty, but also more generally. (Off microphone.)

Both up front, during, and after there is a required communication piece. That's in here saying that's expected in every single case regardless of the issue.

> MR. JOE LABUDA: MaryKris?

> SPEAKER: Well, while I definitely applaud the addition of a provision for faculty appeal process -- and I live -- you never see me in a hat because my hat is always off to Mary Mitchell and the tremendous work that she has done to try to push forward some sort of apparatus to ensure faculty safety and life and limb in the face of
But as we move forward with this process of revising our current student code of conduct, one of the things that I want to reiterate as many times publicly as people will allow me to keep saying this, is I strongly, strongly feel that we need to decrease the number of steps specified in the student code of conduct that a faculty member must go through to get a threatening and/or threateningly disruptive student removed from their classroom.

One of the things that I kind of feel a little discouraged about when I think about the faculty appeal process -- which we now have and I'm very glad about -- but would I ever be able to get there? Because the number of steps to even be able to get to the point where I can have a student removed to even be able to appeal when administrators insert that student back in my classroom.

I don't think, you know, fall of 2011 when I was dealing with some thugs in my classroom, as I followed the rules -- I mean, it was like 16 steps. First, you know, write up an incident report, and then wait for so-and-so to call you back, and then begin a preliminary hearing about possibly thinking about setting up a behavioral improvement plan.

Then once that is in place, give a three-week probationary period to the student and see if they can do this, and then another four weeks for the -- I'm exaggerating.

Aubrey, I just want to say has been nothing but like an amazing
supportive helpful clear-headed, reasonable, you know -- muah.

My critique is of the document, the document known as student code of rights and responsibilities, whatever the actual formal document is. As we move forward, I just hope that we can try to decrease -- that we can streamline and try to subtract some steps and streamline. That's basically my issue.

>> SPEAKER: One of our goals with the appeal process is kind of specific to that timing factor. One of the pieces is also going to be just that everyone is on the same page and communicating effectively.

Because the way I kind of envision seeing this happen, is that if you were to remove a student of a classroom because behavior you're recognizing as inappropriate -- whatever level that may be, all the way up to threatening or disruptive and you file that report that says, I have removed this person; this is the incident I'm dealing with -- at that point in this appeals process, what it's saying now is before the student is even allowed to come back to the classroom, before that is allowed to happen, you, as the instructor, are going to be notified about what the process has happened, what discussions have happened, what the outcome is that is being suggested.

If you don't agree with that and that student is planning on coming back to the classroom, you have the opportunity before that student returns to have your voice heard in this appeals process. The student will not be returning until this process is completed.
It is a tight timeline because of the nature of having a student removed from the classroom, so we only -- what we ask is that the instructor use this appeals process within 48 hours of the notification of whatever has been decided. That's only to allow us that if you come to a decision that the student can return that they are not out of the classroom very long.

But if you disagree with that decision, you'd have that chance to appeal again. The student would not be put back into the classroom during the appeal process. The whole appeal process would be completed fully, and then after that, the outcome, you know, we would move forward with whatever outcome that would be.

So hopefully in terms of not feeling like the issue is being addressed immediately, this will help hopefully address that.

>> SPEAKER: And, again, this changes very much my view of the document and the policies that now stand, and I'm going to try to say back to you what I think I heard you say to make sure it's not what I wanted to hear.

I think what I understood you say is, were I to find myself in a situation where I'm being threatened by these thugs and I boot them out of the classroom, let's call that time 1, and I write up an incident report and I submit it to you, then that -- pushing them out of the classroom will hold until some formal...

>> SPEAKER: Right. Whatever the decision is -- so part of the communication piece, regardless of what level it is, is making sure
that the faculty member or the reportee is notified prior to whatever is going to occur next, especially if the student is being allowed back in the classroom.

The instructor will be notified before the student is even notified. The student will not get the outcome until the instructor is notified and the communication has occurred. Because what we don’t want to have happen is the student is notified and then we’re like, Oh, wait your instructor doesn't agree with this and you have to wait.

We are not going to set up that type of environment. We want to let you have the opportunity to have a conversation, talk through it, think about whether or not you feel it's appropriate. And if you don't and want to go through the appeal process, complete the appeal process and then the student will be notified whatever the outcome will be after that appeals process is completed.

Yes, if a student is removed from a classroom, that communication has to occur before they are allowed back in, again, to give the instructor that opportunity.

>> SPEAKER: Thank you. That's amazing.

>> ROSA MORALES: First of all, I also want to thank the committee, because you guys are doing extraordinary work and everything. I'm very glad that you were able to cover most of the issues that I have seen happening.

But I still have several questions, and I actually wrote them in
the code of -- on the track that you're presenting this.

Especially in some of the pages where it says, Information will be given to the administrators, I don't see the name instructors repeatedly. So I wrote questions. Okay, what about notification to teacher? Notification to teacher? Which I feel is missing.

I would like to talk to you and give you the instances where I don't see it there.

The reason why to me it's so important is because I have worked with Aubrey on several instances where I have students, you know in social services who have -- you know, a few have some emotional and mental issues to deal with. The office, the staff, and Aubrey have been extremely helpful.

But last semester, a colleague and I encountered a student that presented different symptoms. Both of us are social workers. Both of us are very much aware of that this student, we have never had a student like this one at all.

So we check information, and in that process we said we need to talk to Aubrey, because we need to get assistance. In my case, I even contacted the psychologist and left a message, because I really -- we wanted to get some clarification and some guidance because we had never had somebody like that.

So in this process, one of the things that happened is that one of the administrators got involved. Exactly when that happened, one of the things that I experienced was that Aubrey never communicated
with me anymore.

It was just the information to the administrator, and the administrator wasn’t giving me that information.

So the situation was creating problems, and my colleague and I kept discussing that some days were better; some other days were wrong. For the first time I was quite surprised, because I had never had those problems before.

So because of that, I’m very much interested in ensuring that once this processes starts and if an administrator is involved, that still the responsibility is to ensure that the faculty, who is the one that is closely working with a student, is informed in any occasion that is transferred to somebody else to provide that information. That he has to come from there.

The other thing is that I noticed that in one of the instances actually on page 15 on the top, it says that there is a process to appeal, but it doesn’t include a process for the teacher to appeal. It just said that the student can appeal, but not actually the teacher.

So I’m interested in that.

And regarding sending the student back to the classroom, precisely there is a paragraph where it doesn’t say whether the faculty will be involved in the decision for the student to go back. Because obviously if the decision is made by that committee that the student is going back, the No. 1 person that’s going to be affected
by that action is going to be the faculty.

So I really would like to have a revision on those instances, and I have the pages here where it's not listed that the instructor is going to be notified.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Okay. Well, couple different things.

>> ROSA MORALES: There are several pages.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Page 13, there is a section, a newer section of the code of conduct, This review may include examination of relevant documents and/or interviews with students, faculty, staff when appropriate.

And then E, throughout the review process, the VPSD will maintain communication with the reporting individual -- which would be the faculty member -- where faculty and classroom and so forth.

Let's see. Communication with the reporting faculty is encouraged to ensure the faculty voice appropriate points in the process. At a minimum, communication will include knowledge of the receipt of the incident report, follow-up questions, clarifications when needed, and final communication.

>> ROSA MORALES: And then on page 15, actually on the bottom there is another one that says there is no information about notifying the teacher, which is about notifying the teacher that the student has made the appeal. It's not included there.

So I think the instructor needs to know if the student has appealed whatever decision was made, because it's important for the
instructor to be aware that this happened.

So everybody else is listed but not the instructor.

There is another section on page 16 on the top also where there is a listing of individuals that are going to be informed, but then instructor is not included.

So there is several sections where I want to just make sure that the instructor is included.

>> SPEAKER: We can include those. I don't think there is ever an intent to not include them. Sometimes, you know, when we are talking about like suspensions or expulsion, sometimes we list out groups of people because financial aid needs to know that maybe for processing. So maybe that's why they were individually identified, and had that's why we want to make sure we included the specific paragraph that we did about making sure regardless of the issues that faculty are communicated with.

But if you identify other areas where it would be helpful to be specific, there's no problem with that at all.

>> ROSA MORALES: No, I understand it's because even when it's written sometimes you don't get the information. Imagine when it's not written.

So in my case, like I said, I never expected the type of behavior, but it happened. I know that it's becoming extremely more difficult because there's more students that were presenting disruptive behavior, so the work that Aubrey is doing is tremendous,
because having to report to multiple individuals can be difficult.

So I understood the process, but it really affected me tremendously on my ability to deal with the situation.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Yeah, I think it's good to have a lot of different eyes on this, because we tended to sit there and we knew that was going to be an issue. After you're looking at a document for so long, it's like what did we miss and that kind of thing.

Someone sent me a note about -- a question regarding the "only when" portion, whether that would apply, only when return to the classroom and what was the classroom. And if you had a virtual class, okay, did that apply? We kind of talked that over.

>> SPEAKER: Basically just one individual is worried about, okay, they will not be allowed back in my physical classroom, but do I still have to deal with this person? The way I interpreted it -- and we can maybe work on cleaning it up a bit -- was if you're being asked to interact with the student again whether in a physical classroom or electronically, that's returning to the classroom.

Again, you know, we want to talk about the appeals specifically to that environment. But, yeah, you would have absolutely the right to appeal if you didn’t feel comfortable with whatever solution was being proposed.

And I know that when I have talked to my fellow VPs about this, our whole goal at the end of this is to have a conversation with you and the student and try and figure out what is the best way to move
forward.

And if you're not feeling comfortable accepting things over e-mail, we'll talk through that and try to find a different solution.

Someone had brought that up as a concern that if they didn't feel comfortable even communicating over e-mail with a student would they be forced to? No, they would have the right to appeal, just as someone coming back to the physical classroom.

>> SPEAKER: Aubrey, I'm glad you touched on that, but let's say it's an online class and the incident has to do with some bad behavior that the student exhibits or bad or threatening behavior the student exhibits via e-mail.

Well, no matter what, based on the language that's in here now, the student would actually be returning to the physical classroom.

Is there a way of including language in here so that it can't be misinterpreted?

>> SPEAKER: Absolutely. I don't have that wording off the top of my head, but I'm sure we can do something that basically clarifies what we are talking about in terms of return and type of classroom. So we can word it.

>> SPEAKER: Thank you.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Let me ask the group: Are we, you know, pretty comfortable with what we have so far? We have some language to clean up, but I think you can see what a difference this makes to the code of conduct.
I just want to kind of get an informal sense. Are we pretty satisfied with the direction we have gone into?

Okay. Aubrey, can we possibly get together another couple times and hash out the rest of that?

>> SPEAKER: Absolutely. If there is wording or like the specific ones, Rosa, if you want to send it to Joe or myself, we can make sure we take a look at those.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: As Aubrey mentioned, this is what we are working on. It doesn't mean that something else isn't going to be worked on in the future.

I have to say, Aubrey and Ted were extremely cooperative and, you know, very diligent in this whole process.

So, I mean, you know, I don't see anything we can't work out at this point.

Any other comments?

I'm not going to ask for an endorsement or anything. I will say we are substantially happy with it and we will go forward and we'll come back again. Thanks.

>> MS. RITA FLATTLEY: Thanks to Aubrey.

(Applause.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Related to this, behavioral assessment committee. I sent out an e-mail to you all, and this is another situation that faculty haven't participated before and now have the opportunity to do so.
Do you want to describe the committee?

>> SPEAKER: One of the conversations actually before the safety report came out that had been going on was how can we improve the communication that's happening with faculty, and specifically with the behavioral assessment committee, how can we make sure that the voice of faculty is being heard and that there is a conduit that can relay information and be a sounding board for faculty who may have questions.

Currently the behavioral assessment team basically has a member from several different areas: legal; the college psychologist; our police force, either our commander or his representative is there; VPI; VPSD.

The thought was, well, what's missing is a faculty member. So what I was talking to Joe about is we'd like to, as soon as possible, look for getting someone on that committee so, again, that voice and perspective is being heard.

What I recommend, and whatever you'd like to do, is having someone -- and as Kimlisa mentioned with her role -- having an alternative, too, because we do meet pretty much every Wednesday afternoon for about two hours, every other Wednesday.

But there are times when significant issues come up and we need to meet more frequently. Just so that you have a backup if you happen to be in class or something and can't attend.

But if people have questions about the committee or the
commitment, I’d be happy to try and answer those.

>> SPEAKER: You said two hours a week?

>> SPEAKER: Basically every Wednesday for about two hours.

>> SPEAKER: We have had some surveys come through and whatever, and on my mind is that seems like a really appropriate position to offer a course release to a faculty member who is actually going to a weekly meeting that’s several hours long and schlepping to it.

I’m just wondering how we could maybe as a Senate resolve that that should be so, or what do we do?

>> SPEAKER: I have no idea.

>> MS. RITA FLATTLEY: It’s a compensation issue, so my PCCEA brain woke up. As soon as somebody talks money, I just perk right up.

There is certainly precedent for there to be release time or stipend at the hourly supplemental rate for additional assignments. So, you know, if it is looked at and it looks like that level of time commitment, not just, you know, something that happens once in a while but is a fairly significant time commitment, then I think that would be appropriate.

If it is a compensated position, it’s typically put out to all faculty so all people can apply for it. Like the student learning outcomes coordinators, other positions like that. It’s certainly possible and within policy.

>> SPEAKER: Just to follow up, just to put on the record that
that's not simply a we want more money issue, but in fact a pedagogical issue. That with a five/five load, to also commit to that just in terms of hours in the day is a lot.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Now, I'd like to ask the group how we want to decide who we want representing us.

We have had some interest within the Senate. Olga Carranza, who is a former senator, has expressed some interest. I think it's smart for the Senate to take the lead in terms of who we want on it, but we still might want to consider somebody that's particularly qualified. Olga is a licensed psychologist.

Any opinions about that? Should we keep it strictly in-house? Do we find somebody that we feel is really appropriate for that position who isn't a Senate member?

>> ROSA MORALES: Are we going to go with having only one person instead of two? I remember at the last meeting I discussed that sometimes when you just have -- when you just nominate one person, it might be if that person is not able to attend those every-other-week meetings it would be important to have someone else.

And then the discussion also was whether we should have one that is a full-time member and another one part-time member.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Well, I think we have already discussed the fact we will have somebody as a representative and also have an alternate in case that person can't make it.

You know, this is another one of those situations where whatever
we do we are not bound to it forever. So I think we ought to, you know, kind of play it along and kind of see, Well, does that person and the alternate work, and if not, revisit it.

Any comments?

Okay. Well, we certainly can figure out the money part if that does come into play. Any comments about the fact we are going this route, how valuable you see it or not?

Okay. Well, I have to say, again, from my point of view, this is another really good situation for the faculty. It really plays into the whole rest of the code of conduct situation and the appeal process for the faculty members.

So we have made substantial progress in both those areas over the past several months. I'm sorry Mary Mitchell isn't here, because Mary really was the person that carried this along.

Again, I really appreciate the work that Aubrey and Ted did on this, too. I think this is one of the fastest-moving committees I have ever been on.

Nothing lagged. People were very up front with each other in terms of what we wanted. If you remember, really the charge that we were given was that appeal process. So that's what we went after at the time.

What about picking somebody? I think probably it makes sense to pick somebody pretty soon so we get them engaged.

Like I say, do we want to keep it within the Senate or are we
okay with picking somebody, the Senate choosing somebody on the faculty at large to represent us?

>> ROSA MORALES: I think if anybody from the Senate is interested, this is the time to speak. If not, we should proceed with Olga if she's interested in doing it.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Well, I did get a few people that expressed some interest. You know, a couple of people had questions about it. Do you want me to pursue it? You want us to form a little committee on this?

>> SPEAKER: I think it would be fair to send it out to all faculty, because this is, you know, everybody has a stake in this. So I think everybody should have a chance to express interest, and maybe we could have several candidates and then maybe vote.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: So if you're comfortable with that, I will send something out to the whole faculty and have them understand -- yeah. Aubrey?

>> SPEAKER: Just to throw it out there, if there is someone that might want to be present for the next couple of weeks, because I don't know how long this process is going to be, you know, we are meeting already and we already have situations out there and I'd love to have that voice already on the committee.

You know, it wouldn't be a long-term commitment. Maybe for the next month and a half and two months while you're going through your process. If someone is interested.
It's a very interesting -- I mean, it's a very interesting discussion. We are dealing with a lot of complex issues.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: This is really something we asked for to be involved in, so I think we want to step up and do it.

Is there anybody here today that would want to step in at least on a temporary basis?

>> ROSA MORALES: Can you tell us what campus you meet at and what times?

>> SPEAKER: It's at the District Office Wednesdays and it's from 3:00 to about 5:15; every other Wednesday right now.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Okay. Are we happy with the premise? Okay.

Now item 4.7, on-time working group.

This was another long-term Senate project. The discussion about this general idea went on for several years, and probably decades, right, Rob?

And there was a Senate resolution about a year ago to support this. The group has gotten together. We originally met with Dr. Migler when he was here, and then there was meetings with Aubrey and Bridget Murphy to iron this out.

If the group wants to give their presentation, I think they are going to have a couple of recommendations coming out of this. I think they will probably ask for a motion to accept those recommendations.

Perry is here as a guest, but Perry was absolutely instrumental
in moving this along, which I think is another good thing we have been doing, which is when we needed people to go out and help us on faculty as a whole, they have been very cooperative in terms of really doing a lot of committee work with us.

>> SPEAKER: Thanks, Joe.

Carol and MaryKris and I will do the presentation together. I also would like to acknowledge some people that worked with us on the committee from the administrative side providing input for implications there, were Bridget Murphy and Aubrey Conover. Tara Benson collected a lot of our data at the registrar. Suzanne Desjardin was at every meeting. Joe Labuda was at every meeting. So thank you to those folks for participating.

We have a slideshow with about 25 slides, so shouldn't take more than two minutes or so.

>> SPEAKER: Good afternoon, everybody. I heard laughter, but I didn't hear what Perry said. I'm sure it's incredibly witty. He's the head of the work group and he's been instrumental in gathering a bunch of data. I have about 15 articles' worth of scholarly research on the impact of late registration, on student persistence and performance and so on, and also some Pima data that I will share with you in our slide show.

I will also have some data -- I have this crusty old letter from Rob Modica from September of 2004. We are at the ten-year anniversary of the Senate thinking about this. I think it's actually
the 20th anniversary. This is not a sudden thing. For about 20-plus years in this body we have discussed the notion that allowing students to come stumbling in at lesson 4 or 8, depending on the format of the course, is probably not a great idea, and especially for the at-risk students.

To that end, I just want to right up front share with you what this committee is recommending in the way of action to be taken, and then I will go through the slideshow and share with you why we are recommending this.

My very first slide is our two sentences worth of a recommendation, and in dramatic intonation I will now read it. We recommend that beginning with the fall 2014 semester, all students must be registered one business day prior to the term start date of their respective courses of whatever format.

Faculty shall continue to be authorized to permit late registration on a case-by-case basis for individual students given faculty members' expertise and professional judgment.

So that's what we are recommending, and I want to now formally go through our slides and talk with you about why we are recommending this so that you can see that this has been thought about. We have been meeting, conferring with Tara Benson, the registrar, Bridget Murphy. A number of people from different departments and functions across the college have been working with us.

So you should see here a couple of definitions. Like good
scholars, we want to make sure we define our terms from the outset.

One of the most key term is this notion of the practice known as an add period.

This is a number of days starting with the first day of the semester while a student can still register for a class without instructor's permission.

A related definition is this practice called late registration. This is the policy of having an add period of one or more days.

So when it comes to courses of different formats, Pima does specify right now add periods. We are observing this practice of late registration. For 16-week courses and 14-week course, 8-week courses, the add period is 8 days. Yeah.

The 5-week term the add period is 2 days. Remember that a 5-week course, when it meets, that's like an entire week of instruction essentially almost.

And I thought these were tremendously telling examples. As you can see from this current semester right now where we stand, spring 2014, here is this example, Spanish 101, it's a Tuesday/Thursday class, so it began back Tuesday the 21st. A student could register for the course without instructor permission after it had already met three times.

If the student waited until after the class had already met at lesson 4 and still registered then, they could be coming in even as late as perhaps lesson 4, lesson 5, without having had any contact,
no orientation, no nothing.

And here is a different format, of course.

Math 151, it's a Monday through Thursday class. The student could register for the course without instructor permission after it has already met five times. Quite substantial.

Now, Pima, as you can see, notice, bottom of the barrel. Quite different from our peer institutions by allowing such a long add period.

Notice that Tarrant Fort Worth, they require their students to be registered a full seven days before the beginning of the term start date.

When I talk about our peer institutions, to my limited understanding -- and Perry knows more about this than I do -- but my understanding is that these peer institutions are community college or otherwise two-year institutions whose students have a similar sociodemographic profile to that of our students.

So notice that the deviant cases here, Portland and us, that we're are allowing students to continue tweaking their schedules and shopping around and ironing out details eight days into the semester once instruction has already gotten well underway.

So I want to look at some of our own data about late registration as it impacts grades.

As you can see here, when we have collected data on our own students -- and Rob Modica wants to on his own for six semesters in a
row -- but other people have, at Pima, been collecting data. Fall '04, percentage of students with a C or better, if they registered by the first day of the term we're talking about 70.3% getting through the course with a C or better.

But if they registered after the first day of the term it's more down to like 64%. So a fairly substantial difference between timely registering students and late registering students in terms of the grade they managed to earn in the course, which is probably not surprising given the impediment to learning and success represented by coming in in kind of the middle of things.

Then there is some numeric data. I personally find percentages more telling than absolute numbers, but 834 fewer C or better grades.

And then we have some more current data, fall of 2012. Again, we are looking at the C or better achievement level. As you can see, the timely registering students are coming out with a C or better at about the 80% level; whereas the late registering students, only about 51% of them are getting to this threshold of C or better.

Notice that nearly half of all the 11,088 grades were unsuccessful for students who were late registering versus only a quarter of the 54,180 grades defined for students registered before that date.

We have been collecting our own data on this, sort of intraPima data, but I think it's also instructive to compare ourselves to the, what is it, the community -- yeah, the CCSSE. You know, the CCSSE
Survey that you administer to your students involves community college student engagement data. If you look at the right-hand pie graph, you'll see that in terms of our peers, students at other places, only about 11% of them are still messing with their schedules during, you know, the earliest weeks of the classes; whereas at Pima we have about 16.3% of students who fit that profile.

So as we looked at these data, we became concerned that, you know, as we continued to do this eight days' worth of chaos, basically, that we were harming our students, especially those most at risk.

In fall of 2013 it was a team effort. We got together a survey instrument, and a survey was sent out to a very broad spectrum of PCC folks. Full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, student services staff, administrators. We had a very high response rate. 447 people took time out of their day to respond to this.

There were two substantive questions asked on this survey. First was, Should we reduce the length of the add period? And second, If we did, by how much?

So here's the percentage split for those who said, Yes, we support shortening the add period. It’s over 80% of people surveyed here at Pima said, Yes, shorten this add period; a little bit less than 20% said, No, keep it as it is.

Now, this next slide shows in tabular format the numeric data on the responses concerning the number of days that registration should
be allowed for after a course has already begun. These data are preliminary. I will talk about that in a moment. I am going to give a qualification.

But notice the single largest category is people saying, Zero, zero. We don't want students to be able to register after the course has already begun. Notice 101, that's the single largest of a bunch of minority -- everybody is a minority here. Right?

But notice that the largest number, if you had to pick one of these, if you didn't do any clumping, if you just looked at what the single largest one is, 101 people said, No, we don't want students to be able to register after our course has already begun.

Now, an interesting thing -- and I have to definitely attribute this insight to Perry, who I'm either going to hand this over to him or Carol within a few seconds -- but I just want to mention that at the time we devised this survey instrument, we were not even aware that some of our peer institutions were so assertive as to demand that their students be registered, accounted for, within multiple days before the start date of a term.

Had we known that, we would have designed this survey instrument differently. We would have included like negative numbers here, and we would have asked the survey respondents, Hey, how do you feel about the idea of us demanding that you be registered even as much as seven days? Could we model ourselves after Tarrant Fort Worth?

We didn't even know the paradisiacal land of bliss that some of
these other places represent. I wish now we had clumped these for obvious reasons, but we didn't.

But anyway, take these data with a grain of salt, but do please notice that if you had to specify which was the favorite option, I'm sorry, but the favorite is zero days. Let's not do this late registration. Before I get my blood pressure quintupled any more than I already have, I'm going to hand it off to either/or of my better people.

>> SPEAKER: So with the survey it's going to be one variable that we used to make our recommendation. There were a lot of other things that we did.

We also looked at some of the sort of the main bases by which some of us are doing work on the HLC and on program review this year for all student services. Student services is going through their program review this year, as well.

So a lot that came out was articles by Terry O'Banion and the 21st Century report. The group that also does the survey that we just showed you from 2011 is a published sort of a report from national leaders working on this called a matter of degrees, so we have some quotes from that, as well.

Basically the 21st Century report is advocating but also noticing a shift in the last 15 years or so whereas even the proceeding, when Roy Flores was chancellor, but even before that, our emphasis on redesigning campuses and things like that was the quote, the one stop
shopping thing, where a student could show up on the first day of class never having done a thing to start the process, and they would walk out a few hours later registered for their classes.

So it was all about access, access, access. Now the shift, because of the fact that, you know, like the statistics said, almost 50% of all students who show up on the first day or later end up with unsuccessful grades, that access just isn't enough. You have to also have student success.

So the Department of Education is cracking down on that. Financial aid of course is a big part of that. During the recession people were using financial aid as a form of unemployment basically.

So we have had a lot of swing back the other way where now accountability, institutional effectiveness is measured, things like that, more accountability. So it can't be just about access anymore. So that's sort of the background for that.

Here is some other sources that we cited, and Carol printed out some of those. I don't know if you want to read a couple quotes.

>> SPEAKER: When we were looking for different survey results from amongst our peers, the most startling thing to me was we didn't find any that said that late registration is better. Everyone said it makes things worse.

This Ford study, for instance, the first one in the article, better late than never. An interesting comment near the end of their survey was a multiple regression analysis indicated that registration
latency was the only statistically significant predictor of course
grade, and potential explanation includes individual differences in
consciousness and the many undesirable consequences of registering
later.

The second article by Freer-Weiss says institutions that allow
late registration may be doing a disservice to students who have not
adequately prepared for their transition to college. This research
examined 785 admissions files of first-time matriculated college
freshman at an open-access college.

Data were collected regarding the demographics, characteristics,
and academic performances of these students. Using Tinto's model of
attrition as the framework, these data were analyzed to test the
following hypothesis: One, students who apply late have different
characteristics from students who apply earlier.

Two, students who apply late do not preform as well academically
as students who apply earlier.

And three, students who apply late are less likely to re-enroll
the subsequent term.

According to this research, late applicants exhibit different
characteristics from students who apply earlier and have higher rates
of attrition. And these findings corroborate the high-risk profile
for attrition in the professional and research literature.

So it's just two of the many, many examples of data that we have
looked at along our search for shall we do this or not.
So we felt like part of our recommendation, we had to look at some of these concerns to make sure we covered all sort of the unintentional consequences that might occur.

Will stopping enrollment before the first day of class cause enrollment to go down? Will it cause students to be turned away? One of the ways that we could think about preventing students from being turned away is if there were enough late-start offerings for them to go into instead.

So that led to the question, What are the logistics of that? Is that going to be hard for department chairs to do in their schedules? So we looked at all three of these questions.

To figure that out, we had to figure out, Well, how many students actually do enroll after the first day of the semester, or actually starting on the first day of the semester and then afterwards? It turns out to be about 10%.

So 10% of all our enrollment generally has been occurring after or starting with the first day of the semester and beyond. At least on those two semesters that we gather data for.

Can I ask a question?

>> DR. ZELEMA HARRIS: Can I ask a question?

>> SPEAKER: Yes.

>> DR. ZELEMA HARRIS: Are you saying the remainder of our student body enrolled after the first day?

>> SPEAKER: Well, starting on the first day or after, yes. So we basically reach about 90% of the total enrollment we are going to
have for a semester before the semester begins, and then we add 10 more percent.

So the last slide basically said that what we estimate is that of that 10%, we will do good marketing to make sure that many of them will register earlier. So say we divide this 10% up into thirds. One third will register earlier because of our marketing strategies. One third will be allowed to enter classes because instructors will sign permission forms or send e-mails saying so.

That leaves one third left that we think we will need to find late-start offerings. That would mean if it's about a third, maybe 4% of all our enrollment will need to find late-start classes to go into. We don't know if that means exactly 4% of all classes should be late-start classes, so we took a look at writing 101, because there is a lot of sections to count and get a good sample of.

So right currently in writing 101, 5.6% of the offerings are late start. Just 14-week and 16-week are the only thing we looked at. We didn't look at second 8-weeks, or anything. So if we included that it's probably more actually.

But we thought that perhaps just to be on the safe side for the fact that we don't really know what the impact might be, that it might be a good idea to have 7 to 10% -- of the classes between 16- and 14-week classes that 10% of them should be 14-week classes or up to 10%.

So we estimated how many sections that would be for the example
of writing 101 and what they would have to do in order to change a class to be a 14-week class. As you can see, they would have to add five minutes to the beginning of the class and five minutes to the end in order to change it to a 14-week class.

We thought this might be interesting to take a look at. Again, we looked at writing 101. What did the other peer institutions do? I'm not sure we got too much good data out of this. Seems like they are all over the place.

Obviously we're not the marketing department here, and so we can only make suggestions as to ways in which we could communicate this change. One of the colleges we looked at -- I wish I could remember which one -- was just making this change this semester. The equivalent of their home page where we have that big picture of the student, right next to that student it said, Registration closes January 21st or whatever it was.

So it was like the biggest sentence on the home page. That's probably -- I think that would probably be a good idea for us to do, as well.

We thought we'd also take a look at financial aid impact. One thing that's not on this slide is all the students have to do a financial appeal. Every semester at least a thousand of them, I think. They have to wait to find out whether their appeal is approved or denied before they can register for classes often.

Some of them are -- it's suggested to some of them they could do
a payment plan, but their response back is that, Well, if my appeal is denied, I'm not able to come to school, so I don't want to put money down that I have to ask for then back.

This year I met with a student who found out on Christmas Eve, she got an e-mail then saying you will be on appeal. Your financial aid is suspended unless your appeal is approved. So she was down at West Campus Student Services Center the first day it opened after she got that e-mail, January 2nd, at 8:00 in the morning, demanding to see someone so she could get her education plan and get that appeal done.

She was told that there was no appointment available for about a week. So when she got that done, she turned it in. She still insisted on meeting with someone that day. She raised a fuss. She got her educational plan done on the 2nd.

Then she waited and waited and waited. By the way, she had straight As in the fall and she still was told she had to do this appeal. She did not hear back until six days after the semester began that her appeal was approved.

So this is impacting a lot of students, and we'd like to see that appeal process go faster. Maybe even recommend that we make an exception for such students. That we would go ahead and allow them to enroll late if that were the case, as long as they had turned in their appeal, say, within two weeks before the semester began.

We also thought it might be a good idea to see how this might
impact veterans who arrive late. It turns out that their pay is
dependent on how many weeks they are in school, but also that if they
are in shorter semesters their status can actually shift up, as you
can see here.

For someone in 10 credits, for example, if they decided to only
enroll in 14-week classes, then they would be considered full time;
whereas if they only enrolled in 16-week classes they would only be
considered three quarters time.

So they would get less money for being in school less weeks, but
more money for being considered full time. And then the different
chapters and different benefits, allotments, so it would be really
difficult to say in general which way they would end up in a
situation like this. But we don't think that the impact will be very
much more than minimal.

We notice with interest that some of the peer institutions
actually listed in their academic calendar, This is the last day that
classes will be canceled. I think that might have been Tarrant
County, the one that closes registration for seven days. During that
seven days they have a special registration period solely for people
whose classes were canceled. That's how they work it.

Other institutions had registration periods where they charged an
additional fee. Say for the last week before classes began students
had to pay an extra fee. I don't know if that was used as an
incentive to try to get people to register earlier, but it's not
something we put in our recommendation. It may be something to think about maybe in future semesters.

Student services is going through a program review right now, and I know that you have seen some e-mails, some concerns from some faculty about whether or not we're putting up barriers to access for some students if they show up late.

The trend is going to be in that direction, like I said, because student success is going to be as important as student access. For faculty, we are concerned about that. We are going to be concerned about a lot of the things you see up on this slide that are coming from the student services program review.

In particular, I just got an e-mail this morning from the developmental education group that's recommending a two-hour, maybe a one- to two-hour session on test preparation or assessment preparation before they are allowed to take the assessment test.

So if you think about the sequence of things that are now happening for new students, this assessment preparation, they have to go through that first before they can take their assessments. Then they have to do an orientation.

So there is a lot of sequential things. Are these things all going to be scheduled in a way that students can do them quickly? When I talk to new students I tell them I wouldn't even try to do all three assessments in one day. Can you imagine how well you could possibly do on the third assessment if you do one each hour for three
So the idea that students should try to finish all this in one day, although that's an admirable thing to think about, perhaps for access issues I don't think it's necessarily good for them to place well in the classes they need to be placed in, especially if we want to try to limit the amount of developmental education they have to take.

Then the recommendation included the idea that a lot of students are now going to request to be added after the first day of class. Student services already does this, but you may not be aware of it. If a student e-mails you and says, Can I add into your class, now you only get those e-mails when your class is full.

In the future, you could get them if the class is full or if it's past the first day of the semester.

In either case, a lot of times you will e-mail them back and say, Yes, that's fine. We allow them to print out that e-mail and bring it down to us at the student services center, and that is enough. They don't need to go find you and get you to find the add form. The e-mail is enough.

They are letting people in with an e-mail.

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: Now, I was told that we were no longer allowed to do that.

>> SPEAKER: As far as I'm aware, advisors are doing that. Certainly if the number of add forms is going to go up
considerably, logistically it would be more difficult to have a whole army of students out there looking for the instructor to sign their add form.

I should say also that in some of the peer institutions, these add forms are not being brought down to student services but are being brought to the individual departments. Department staff are enrolling the students to take the burden off of student services.

We were not recommending that in this, but it's also something that maybe for a future date to consider if it turns out that the number of add forms and people standing in line down there goes up too dramatically.

>> SPEAKER: I actually use the one in Banner where you can authorize a student into the class. Then I send them an e-mail and I tell them, Print it out; take it with you. If they can't find it online, ask them if they will accept the e-mail. Nobody's ever had to use it. The online one works.

>> SPEAKER: Are you actually enrolling the student?

>> SPEAKER: No, not enrolling them. I'm authorizing them into the class. I do an override for class full.

>> SPEAKER: So you're using the prerequisite, yeah.

>> SPEAKER: The different things. I thought there was one in there for late.

>> SPEAKER: Yeah.

>> SPEAKER: There's not one for late, but they could.
>> SPEAKER: Yeah, I'm not sure what you're doing.

>> SPEAKER: But when you go in and you do the faculty overrides for registration, I know there are some for course full and for prerequisites supposedly not met, because maybe they met them differently.

>> SPEAKER: Are other faculty doing this?

>> SPEAKER: Yes.

>> SPEAKER: Yes? Okay.

>> SPEAKER: Anyway, it seems like that would be a logical place to put something to reduce the number of forms to be carried around. If it isn't in there, it sounds like a good place for it. And they have accepted my e-mails before, but it has been a long time since I have needed it.

Denise?

>> SPEAKER: I've got two questions. (off microphone).

>> SPEAKER: We didn't include that in our recommendation but we would like to see that. Mesa Community College, which is one of the peer institutions that just implemented this, their purge date for spring semester, instead of January 10, is like December 10.

>> SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

>> SPEAKER: I think student services would definitely endorse something like that.

>> SPEAKER: My other question was of our 10%, do we happen to know how many of that 10% happen to be high school students? (Off
>> SPEAKER: Yes, we weren't able to break down the 10% by how many are students new to Pima and returning to Pima. But I can tell you a statistic from student services program review, and that is in the last five years, all Pima enrollment has dropped 20%, but enrollment of 18 and 19 years olds has dropped 31%.

We're not reaching out to high schools.

>> SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

>> SPEAKER: That sounds like a good idea.

So here is our recommendation, once again. One more slide.

So what's next besides asking for you guys to endorse this resolution is we're going to present these same findings and recommendations to student groups and community groups, and I assume probably to cabinet.

The list of other groups that are working on similar issues at the college right now I think will have to add what Denise was mentioning, whatever group, if there is one, that's working on high school outreach.

Any other questions

>> SPEAKER: One more question. I can't remember for sure if it was slide 19 or 20, but there was something in there about financial aid dates. You didn't really talk about it very much, but it sounded like to me it was saying that if we implemented more percentage of our classes as 14-week that we might actually lose some of the
funding for our students because the date at which they count it is before the 14-week classes start?

>> SPEAKER: It's actually the same date. So if you guys -- if the college adopted our resolution to close registration for the 14-week classes the day before 14-week classes begin, then that would also be the same day that financial aid takes their snapshot to decide final financial aid for a student.

I'll turn it over to Joe.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: What we are going to do is have a motion on the floor to accept the recommendations, get a second, and then we will go into discussion and debate and then we will call the question.

My suggestion on the other additional ones that Denise brought up is create another subset of those and so we keep those clean.

Does that make sense? Those are good things, and we will go on with that.

Do I have a motion to accept the recommendations?

>> SPEAKER: After wanting this for 10 years, actually longer, I heartily endorse this and think we should accept the resolution as it stands.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Second?

(Second.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Open to the floor, discussions, questions?

>> MS. RITA FLATTLEY: Did you guys discuss like kind of stepping
this in instead of making such a major change so quickly. I had to step out during part of it, but going from like eight days after to one day before is like a real big step at once.

>> SPEAKER: Yes. You may recall that the resolution of February of 2013.

>> MS. RITA FLATTLEY: Yeah, I might not. I'm old.

>> SPEAKER: Happy one-year anniversary to formal work on this. I believe it was the February 13 Faculty Senate meeting where we had a resolution about wanting to move forward with successively shortening the add period until it was no more. You know, shorten, shorten, shorten until we got it down to zero.

But once the omnibus group started meeting, and that is the group of all the many faculty members who were on this work group, as well as the registrar and people from financial aid and counselors and advisors and the provost and other departments at Pima, when we finally got down to like, okay, let’s see what it would take at the nuts-and-bolts level to do this and we began talking with Tara Benson about using multiple different parallel universes of semester and part of term and all these complex Banner things and the impact that this would have on the student services office and the staff therein, it became clear that trying to do a successive shortening of the add period would be a logistical kind of nightmare, and that it might be more confusing for students as well as staff trying to, you know, continually have to be revising, oh, and now this semester is X
number of days.

So we finally came to the conclusion under the wise guidance of people with good logistical brains to pull off the Band-Aid fast.

But the quick answer to your question is, yes, we did. That was the original plan. But as we became chastened by actual practical considerations, we felt it would not be wise.

>> MS. RITA FLATTLEY: I see. Interesting

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: You had said some things -- I guess Perry maybe this would be you. Do we know any of the demographics of that 10% that's late? Do we know who they are besides the fact that they are probably not high school students?

>> SPEAKER: We didn't break it down any more than that, no.

>> SPEAKER: However, in the copious amount of scholarly data that Carol Christopherson pulled up, I notice there are patterns in the literature that the late registering students tend to be older, maller, (laughing) and I can't remember what else. I thought I underlined it here. I remember they were older and maller than other...

So, now, I don't know if that applies to Pima, but often what prevails from one place -- you know. Okay. So somebody knows.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Okay. We have a motion on the floor. What this will do if it's passed, it means this goes on to another level. This isn't a done deal. Basically the process just becomes an earnest means of communicating with other people and so forth.
We had a motion, a second. All in favor of the motion to accept
the recommendations from the OTR committee, raise your hand.
(Hands raised.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Those opposed?

Abstentions?

Great.

That was another committee that put in a monstrous amount of
time.

(Appause.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Believe it or not, we are to reports.

Brenda?

>> DR. BRENDA EVEN: Mine will be very short.

I'm thinking that most of you were not at the board meeting the
other night, which was our first meeting since everyone had been
back. I did tell a quick story, but I will summarize it very
shortly.

The woman with three hairs. Now, Kimlisa, you have had to hear
it before, so have you, Zelema. But all right. You too.

Lady had three hairs on her head and she looked in the mirror and
said, By golly, I'll braid it. And she did. She had a great day.

Next time she looked and she only had two. She said, Well, I'll
part it down the middle. And she did and had a fine day.

The third time she had one, and she said, I'll wear a ponytail.

The fourth time she had no hair. She said, Ah, well, I don't
have to do my hair today.

I know it's kind of goofy and silly, but it does say how important attitude is. That's why I'm here today, to recognize your attitude and the fact of how you have pulled together, worked hard, and done a variety of things in this last year.

I, as past chair, just wanted to come and say thank you. Thank you for all you did. And if you think our meetings are long, look at what happened today in terms of your meetings. Does it mean that things are happening? Yes. You have done many things as far as trying to keep the college moving forward, and I think we just want to make sure that you know that it is appreciated.

Disruptive student. I mean, I could go down your whole list. All of those are important and contributory.

We are delighted that you will be a moving force on our governance council, and the board is very excited about that and very excited about having such an opportunity.

So today is mainly just to say thank you very much for all you do. I'm delighted to hear this last report. That makes so much sense. So much sense. And it will make it a lot easier for everyone.

But, again, I appreciate your attitude. I appreciate the fact that you work very hard in conjunction and interaction with other college groups.

I just want to say many, many thanks and keep up the good
attitude and the good work. We appreciate it.

(Applause.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Okay. We're really flying now. (Laughter.)

Dr. Harris?

>> DR. ZELEMA HARRIS: Reminds me of a board meeting.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: That's a terrible thing to say. (Laughter.)

>> DR. ZELEMA HARRIS: No. I mean time-wise. Okay? (Laughter.)

Well, good afternoon, everyone. I just have a few items I think I need to talk about.

First I want to really thank all of you for your work on all of these areas, whether it's the behavioral assessment committee, disruptive student, code of conduct, and all of the others.

But I am very, very impressed with the work of the on-time registration working group. The kind of work you're doing I think is so important for this college. I think as it rolls out, the provost's office and those in C.J. Karamargin's office will develop a communications plan, because it's so important to get the word out.

And the majority of our students are adults. They are not in the high schools. So we have to remember, now, nationally the high schools represent about 30% of your student population, so we have to really work hard to get the word out since the majority of our students are adults, average age 27, and they are within all pockets of our city of Tucson.

So it's going to be very tough to get that word out. But I do
believe we're moving in the right direction. I'm also impressed with the fact that you do have room to evaluate those students who are arriving late, and that faculty members are doing that.

In my previous work experience, it's generally the department chair that makes that recommendation, and in cases where I have worked where the community college is in the same city as the university, the exceptions generally go the university students who overall are a little bit more prepared than the students we see in our college.

So that's a good thing. I hope that we will develop more discreet data and we will know exactly which students are affected more by this restrictive deadline.

I worked in one system where students -- we didn't have a system where you had registration cutoff two or three days before classes started, but what we did in the counseling office is we could tell everyone who wanted to enroll late the probability of their success based on data.

So eventually from that the college decided no late registration. That was about 25 years ago. There was always room for faculty or department chairs to have exceptions.

I think that's very important, because you know your curriculum. You can talk with those students and determine if they enroll a day late they're not going to flunk out. But we need to keep track of that data so that we'll know if, in fact, that is true.
So, again, thank you all very much. I was so intrigued by your work. As I am with everything that's occurring here at the college because of our probationary status.

I won't talk a lot about these areas, but I will answer questions. I don't know how many of you were at the Are We There Yet forum that occurred on the 31st of January, and I want you to know that the video of our update is on the website.

So if you, you know, get tired of reading, grading papers, and you want to see what's up there about HLC, you can do that.

There are some key initiatives as a result of our probationary status that are really much more comprehensive, and I think we are delving deep into the system to identify issues that need to be corrected.

One is strategic planning, and we hadn't, as I said before, embarked on that, though it's clear in criterion 5 that we should have.

Someone mentioned students. There are so many layers to this process where students will be involved, but we were talking about the Futures Conference, and the question I answered pertained to that.

But on our overall strategic planning committee, and the chancellor has appointed that, there are 63 members made up of every employee group, and the two student reps are on that committee.

Now, they will take the data coming from the Futures Conference
and help us to decide those areas that the college is going to move in, and then each campus will develop its own strategic plan based on the college's plan.

I said this before, but it's very important to reiterate, that every campus will solicit the involvement of every employee to work on the plan and make sure it is aligned with the college's plan, though it may be different based on the students you serve, the communities you serve, and your programmatic thrust.

So I wanted to mention that. That Futures Conference, as you know, is the 18th of February.

We anticipate having the plan in place around the 1st of April, and then the implementation will begin in earnest. There are a lot of pieces that we are doing now that will fold into that strategic plan. For example, enrollment management. The group now is at the point where they will need somebody to come in and help us to build the plan.

A lot of the data that I heard this morning, these are some of the same kinds of issues that that group is struggling with. So all of it hopefully will come together.

I'm going to so many meetings and hearing some of the same information bubbling up I think which is a very good thing, because we're all focused on student success, what is best for the students, what are the practices we can put in place to make sure they are going to be successful.
So the enrollment management group has done a lot of the work that we normally would rely on a consultant to provide. So when we issued the RFP recently, Deborah Yoklic took the one that we had in June before I left, and she had to cross off a number of things that the consultant will not have to do because that task force has done a lot of the work already.

I think Lee mentioned the developmental education redesign. That particular group, really their work is addressing open admissions. So how will we treat those students who have been disenfranchised, who were not here because we decided to lop off all those developmental ed classes.

So we really need to look at other indicators. Because I think if I took ACCUPLACER or any other test, God forbid the ACT, I would probably be placed in 70 or 71, some of those remedial classes.

Doesn't mean I need the whole class. Maybe all I need is a module out of that to refresh my memory.

But anyway, I think we need to look at other indicators, and I think there is research that demonstrates that your high school grade is a major indicator of success. I don't think we're using that at all, although we have an SPG that says we can use it.

So we need to begin to look at other indicators of success other than a placement test. So we're working on that. And certainly we ought to be able to do that even before the work of the developmental redesign committee task force has finished its work.
I mentioned the SLOs. I won't go into that. David Perkiss, who is in planning and institutional research, has begun to work at the campus level with administrators. I learn something new about Pima every day. The way I've used student learning outcomes, we know what faculty need to be more effective, and then I learn that the administrators can't even go in and see what we are doing with student learning outcomes, that some say that they are forbidden to look at the data.

So I'm wondering, Well, why are we doing it? Because if you're doing the work, you have findings where their resource is needed, there may be additional training needed, so how will you get the help unless we are in partnership?

So we are not going out to the campuses and making an effort to teach, to work with the administrative teams so they will understand what the student learning outcomes are all about.

So that's very important. I know we have been through a period where, my God, there was no trust. I don't even know how you made it through in a sane manner and continued to work, to do great work with your faculty when I consider all that you all have endured.

But at some point, give us a chance and know that if you prick us, we bleed. We're human, and I listen.

So think about partnering with us on some of these initiatives, especially student learning outcomes. I think we're pretty far behind. I don't even know, quite honestly, how we can measure the
things we say are supposed to be our outcomes.

But needless to say, that plan was approved. We turned it in in January of 2013, so we're going to stick with it. We're going to try to make it work so that we will have 100% faculty participation beyond when you turn in your grades and this little thing drops down and you can say yes or no, you inspired or communicated or whatever it is. I have never quite seen a plan like that, but I'm committed to making it work for the sake of HLC.

We're all in this continuous improvement mode, so even now we can begin to look at it and see what would work better and benchmark what other schools are doing.

I was involved with HLC during the early stages when student learning outcomes came in to being. When I saw ours, I thought, Oh, little different, but we'll work on it. We're going to make it work.

The chancellor mentioned the provost position being advertised. What they are waiting on now, and I haven't talked to Joe, but I need two additional faculty members from the Senate. We currently have -- we're using the same committee that we used for the interim position, and those members are Char Fugett, Joe Labuda, Rick Rosen, (phonetic). We have an HR rep. We had Mark Ziska, but we probably need another one. He's very busy.

Mary Beth Ginter. I'm on the committee. We need one more faculty and one staff.

So we're ready to go with that group, and a week ago we had 23
applicants. So I am encouraged that we are going to have a pretty good group to choose from, because the interim search failed because I and others did not believe that we had the quality.

And when you think about it, who would come here at that time to stay until June 30th? They either were out of work, retired, or may have wanted to be in a warm climate. You may have had a handful. Not a handful. We only had seven, so maybe one or two might have been serious about coming in and helping us. So we sort of rendered that an ineffective process.

So that's it.

I'm happy to answer questions. I didn't mean to take as long, but we're doing a lot of work and I think it's important that we share. I see you sighing now. Like, whoa. But anyway, I am available, Joe, if anybody wants to ask a question. Thank you. Thank you, very much.

(Applause.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Thanks, Dr. Harris.

5.3. Prerequisite committee.

>> SPEAKER: Hi, everyone. I will keep this brief because I know you're probably all getting very sleepy.

Jeannie could not be here today, so she asked me to give a brief update with the prereq committee. At this point the committee has been finalizing the benchmarking that we have been doing with other community colleges, and we are actually starting to collect some
statistical data on the prereqs here at Pima and student success and trying to look at that relationship.

We are planning on doing that with some few select core courses.

Jenny Scott has also been involved with our committee. She has formed a group that is working on the implementation of enforcing the prereqs in Banner, and that was approved by the Senate and the provost's office last fall. So that group has been working on that project.

The other thing that's come up with our committee as we have had some discussions about the prereqs is that we have had some discussions about the advising model here at the college, and that there is some revisions that probably need to happen there that would be beneficial in working in concert with the prereq changes we might be proposing.

So we realize that's out of the scope of our committee and that there is some other groups at the college currently working on that. We just want to keep our finger on the pulse and just make sure that we're tentative in making sure we know what's happening there, because we see that's probably going to have a relationship to what we do with prereqs.

That's it.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Any questions? Thanks.

>> SPEAKER: I had a conversation with my chair in writing, and there seems to be a fairly significant misconception about which way
prereqs go, i.e., thought that the writing CDAC could determine
prereqs of writing courses in other departments.

Like could tell psych that they needed to -- right? I know. But
she's my chair. She's been here forever. I felt like, Wow, that's a
significant, you know, knowledge gap.

Is there any way that maybe -- I mean, it's something to think
about. Like does everybody understand even what the purview of, you
know, how it -- I don't know. It's just something that I probably
should have told you and Jeannie on campus, but I never see you.

But it's just worth thinking about, that particularly I think in
a field like writing we might want to -- and I don't know whether we
could, whether the writing CDAC would want to maybe make
recommendations rather than requirements or have some kind of conduit
between CDACs. I don't know.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Aren't the prerequisites a function of the
discipline?

>> SPEAKER: Yes.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: So like if you want to have intensive writing
in history that's your business, and if you don't, you don't. Right?
So if you wanted to require writing 101, you could; if you don't want
to, you don't have to. Right?

>> SPEAKER: Thank you.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Thanks.

Rita?
>> MS. RITA FLATTELEY: I will just stand up and talk fast because I'm falling asleep, too.

Several of us here, myself, Kimlisa, Matei (phonetic) have been involved in the Meet and Confer process, and we are taking sort of a different approach this time.

Before school started, we were involved in a three-day training with the Eller Executive Education Group for a process called interest-based collaboration. I now have a first certificate from a business school and probably my last. Woo Hoo.

It's all about professional development.

We have been doing what you could call a Mega Meet and Confer with all of the employee groups involved, including administrators, and tackling some of the red zone issues for HLC, including things like hiring SPGs and policies and procedures and having input into the grievance and complaint policies and procedures, which are not usually traditionally part of Meet and Confer.

Usually Meet and Confer is just about the faculty personnel policy statement. But we are taking kind of a bigger picture approach. For me, sometimes it's been frustrating because it's a lot of talking and kind of a little confusing on exactly how much progress we're making.

I think we are starting to make progress and starting to kind of like check things off our list of what we're trying to accomplish.

As we get this section wrapped up, two things will happen. Each
of us employee groups -- so for you all, that's PCCEA -- as things
get written up, we will be sending things out to you for your review.
Do you support or not support this? How do you feel about it?

Also, as we wrap up this kind of broader approach, we will go
into kind of the more traditional Meet and Confer where we deal with
wording changes and the faculty personnel policy statement as well as
my favorite topic, salary. Believe me, I will not forget that topic.

Questions? Thank you.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Kimlisa, Board of Governors

>> MS. KIMLISA SALAZAR DUCHICELA: Actually, I believe that Lee
and Zelema pretty much covered everything at that board meeting, so
there was one thing that I don't think anybody mentioned in all that
that I thought was a really good idea was to go back to mandatory
orientations for new students, which I thought was pretty amazing.

Other than that, I think that's about it. Considering the time,
I'd like to defer the online task force to the next meeting.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Okay. Senate president's report.

You know, we covered a lot of territory today, and we had some
projects that had been going on for over a year in some cases. You
know, we really haven't closed the deal on some of them, but we have
gone substantially along on them.

One of the reasons why is we do have a core of administrators who
are willing to work with us, and this is real positive. I think you
can, you know, get a feeling for what my approach is when we go into
these negotiated situations.

I try to go in and work with people and really get as much out of it in terms of what the Senate requires as possible and get that -- get it through, go back for more. And, you know, so I think we did accomplish that substantially.

Now, the OTR committee, they still have some work to do, but a lot has been accomplished.

Same with the student code of conduct. I think that really looks really good. Little bit of wordsmithing, and then we're done with that.

The governance thing I mentioned before, that's really fluid. I still don't know what quite to make of that. I don't think it's going to hurt us. I don't know how useful it's going to be. We'll see.

But I think the main thing, if we have our membership in it, and so far it can be Kimlisa and one of the adjunct people, we will know enough to look out for our interests. I think going forward that's the way you have to look at it: have people there that can speak up and press the issue.

Going out for the rest of the year, be thinking about what other initiatives we want to push forward. This is the time to do it. We've got a good group in terms of people understanding issues, and so if you have something, you know, bring it forward. Anything today that we discussed that needs to come forward, you know, send me an
I have to craft some language for the OTR or whatever -- let's see, the student code of conduct, let me know what that is and I'll send out some language having to do with that adjunct faculty position.

So with that in mind, unless you have any questions? Carol?

>> SPEAKER: Joe, has there been any kind of rumblings at all about what the governance committee is going to be up to, what they are doing? Nothing at all? Are we still deciding?

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: I don't know. We have had a number of these meetings. You know, I get very pointed. I say, What are we going to do? What's our intention?

It's hard to really kind of figure out what our intention is. I have made a few suggestions, and the way I thought it might be a useful committee is if we -- mentioned this to the adjunct faculty committee today -- use it as an early warning system. We had things bubbling up in a Senate a week ago, and start working those out with that group.

Same thing like if the administration had something coming our way. We can give them some heads up. Oh, for instance we have SPGs that haven't been coherent. Well, you probably ought to clean this one up before you bring it to us.

It's that kind of thing we can get some work done before we walk in here. The thing I don't want it to be is somehow that's a committee to bypass as the Senate. I think it could be a useful
situation in terms of working through some issues quicker, but we will just have to see.

I'm one person in that group, and I keep on coming around to the fact that I'm not very comfortable with the idea, and the Senate isn't going to be very comfortable with the idea, that that's the place to stop for essentially conversation with the faculty rather than the Senate.

So I think that's a nonstarter as far as we're concerned. Like I say, after three or four meetings I'm still kind of puzzled where we're going.

You know, I think the thing, we'll worry about that, but the real plus is the access that the board member rep has in terms of addressing agenda issues and so forth. That's major.

So consider this: Because of that proposal we got that input there, and then we've got these proposals that we went through. All things considered, we had a pretty good three, four months in terms of things going faculty's way.

I don't want to stop, so if we have issues, bring them forward now. Now is the time to do it while the iron is hot. Keep on pushing.

Any other questions?

>> ROSA MORALES: One of the things that I want to remind everybody is that for some reason a lot of the committees keep still meeting at the District Office.
I was listening about the DAC, you know the committee that they are going to be having it every other week on Wednesdays at the District Office.

Obviously if nobody is interested in assisting I would be willing to assist, but I teach from 1:00 to 3:00. It's going to take me half hour, 45 minutes to get to the District Office, and I have to go back to campus because I teach another class from 6:00 to 9:00. Right?

So now on Tuesdays, like somebody was mentioning, why don't you go to the board meetings? Well, I teach a class in the evening on Tuesdays.

So how can we make somehow some attendance to some of those committees a little bit more flexible instead of limiting it to District? Why can't we have them someplace else? You know, my sense is that faculty is more, how can I say it, it's a lot more difficult for them to get out than administrators. Right? They can travel; they can move. Because we're constrained by the classes we're teaching.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Well, you know, I think sometimes you go in and negotiate that out. So I wouldn't be shy about asking for that.

>> SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Sure. There might be a variety of ways people can handle that. Rosa, good idea.

One last thing. At the speaker forum on Tuesday, Chancellor Lambert and Gene Trester, who is an anthropology instructor, had a
presentation on a technique called inculturation. Very interesting.

I mean, it's kind of new, but in a way it's kind of ancient.

It's like the Socratic method in effect where students are engaged from the get-go. They teach a lesson, have to give presentations. You could see the students were coming out of this extremely confident.

It was a very interesting, you know, presentation. I suggested to the chancellor that he might want to sort of take that on the road in terms of showing people.

Now, I don't know if it would work in every discipline, but I think a lot of disciplines -- humanities and social sciences I think it would be real effective. It might be something you might want to keep your eye open to see.

I also suggested they videotape one. If people couldn't get to one you could see it in action, too.

You know, our presentations tend to be for the most part nonacademic, cooking demonstrations, whatever. This one was pure education and was a little different. I think the crowd was a little different consequently. It was worthwhile. It was something to think about when you left the room.

We'll have another speaker forum in March and go from there.

Do I have a motion to adjourn?

>> MS. RITA FLATTLEY: Motion to adjourn.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Second?
(Second.)

(Adjournment.)
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