



PimaCommunityCollege

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

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

Pima County Community College District Faculty Senate

March 3, 2020

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Welcome to our March senate meeting.

Welcome to March. Hope you're all surviving the semester.

Let's go ahead and begin. We're about 1:02, and we have a pretty -- we have a lot of kind of heavy agenda items today, so let's get started. Our goal is to be done by 3:00, as always. That's particularly important today.

We have a strategic planning meeting that several members have to go to. I'm teaching a workshop at West Campus. I have to go, too.

If we could please work together to make our comments efficient so we can move along while doing the best we can to ensure everyone's views are presented, that would be great.

So agenda modifications. There were some slight ones. One of them is that we -- because the news about the instructional structure transformation design leadership team came about this week and it generated -- I got a lot of questions and concerns from faculty regarding that, so we decided to include this item on the agenda for the president's report, and Dr. Phillips has offered to address questions and concerns related to that item.

That is one agenda modification.

I also added one item related to our administrative meeting -- meeting with the administration a couple weeks ago, so that is one other modification.

That should be everything.

Are there any -- Arlo?

>> SPEAKER: Arlo O. I wanted to see if we could bring up what Pima has for emergency preparedness for the Coronavirus and what that might do to teaching and that aspect.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So, Kate? I was just told by a source that you were in a meeting about that recently as today? Would you mind --

>> KATE SCHMIDT: There is, one of the reasons Dolores is not here is the Executive Leadership Team has been meeting daily since Tuesday or Wednesday to identify a plan that I believe will be communicated as soon as it's done.

There are kind of two directions being considered. One is if

there is something severe enough for a complete shutdown. Not only the physical plant but also anything online would need to be shut down, what are the steps that would need to be taken. They're working out templates for communication on that.

The second is an academic continuity plan on what pieces of our academics could we continue. As you all know, this is changing minute by minute, and so it's pretty hard to plan anything definitive. It looks like a statement came from Department of Ed yesterday that looks like they are going to be fairly liberal in terms of trying to ensure that students can complete their studies as best as possible.

For example, if we move something into the online environment, it wouldn't need preapproval as an online program in order to do that.

My recommendation at this point, probably put it out early next week is everybody make sure they are up to date on their grading, grades are in the gradebook in D2L, that everybody, whether you're facing face-to-face or whether you are teaching an online class or hybrid class, that you know how to use the communication tools in D2L, because although there will be global communication coming out of pima.edu and on our website, I guess as things progress, our communication from the faculty member to the individual students is going to be important.

That is not a definitive, final, final word, but that's where we are. That's where we are right now. They are finalizing some plans

I expect to be rolled out over the weekend or early next week.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Sounds like stay tuned for something e-mail early next week?

>> KATE SCHMIDT: That would be my guess. As you know, things may change over the weekend.

We hope none of those plans have to go into place, although I do think it's been a good activity to say the what ifs, what if we have to shut down, how do we communicate? What is the tree for communication?

I think that no matter what -- ideally nothing happens, Tucson isn't impacted, we go on with our day-to-day life except curbing maybe a little bit of travel, but we have this in our back pocket for improving our own response to any kind of crisis.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you. Good question. Thank you.

Any short announcements? Any open-forum items?

All right. Let's move along. Approval of the February minutes.

As is customary, I will pull them up and scroll through them.

Assuming everyone has had a chance to review them.

Thank you to Anthony S for providing the minutes for us.

Yes, Ken?

We have a motion to approve. Second?

All in favor?

(Ayes.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All opposed? All abstain? Two abstentions.

The minutes are approved.

Two of these items we're going to have to hold off because Julian Easter and Jenny Conway won't be able to be here till 2:30. We will move along to Ken and the academic freedom board policy preliminary review.

Ken, would you like to come up here?

>> KEN SCOTT: Sure.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We have seen several iterations of this throughout the past several months. I believe this is the last iteration we will see. We were given an opportunity to comment on it, and now it's at the point where it's going to be shuttled through the formal policy review process, and then we will see it again as that process unfolds.

>> KEN SCOTT: Ken Scott, accounting, business information, Northwest.

We have had this out there. I don't think we have gotten much in the form of comments. Yeah, we haven't actually gotten any comments from anybody on this. Although I did exchange a couple of e-mails with Joe.

Essentially what we are trying to do is trying to preserve the academic freedom for the instructors to try to present information in the classroom the way they see fit provided that, one, they stick with the guided pathways of their program and, two, that they stick with the appropriate material for their course.

Just to clarify, it does not mean that instructors get to teach or do whatever they want but rather they have the academic freedom to choose how they deliver that information that they should be delivering in their classroom. Questions?

>> JOE BREWER: So I guess academic freedom is usually seen as a right of individual faculty members to teach in the classroom and also to conduct research.

So my question is how does this freedom relate to the freedom or the power or autonomy of the faculty in preparing the curriculum rather than preparing and delivering individual lesson plans and grading rubrics and things like that? Does this particular document talk about the collective rights or freedom of the faculty in curriculum development rather than the smaller part of curriculum being lesson planning based, as you said, on a larger curriculum?

>> KEN SCOTT: Well, to address that question in parts, first of all, with the research, we don't do a lot of research here, but we did include a little bit of that just to cover that in case we have an area that does some research.

We were trying to be as broad as possible to apply to the college-wide, so I think that that is going to cover that curriculum area.

Ideally, each department should be meeting to go over what curriculum that they are going to include.

Again, what we are focusing on I guess more appropriately

addresses how that information gets delivered as opposed to what they get to choose to teach. As a group, you guys should pick what you guys are going to teach, but if I'm supposed to be in there to talking about individual income tax, I can't show up and start ranting about what I heard on the news. That's not what that class is for. I have to stay on topic.

>> JOE BREWER: My question is are there limits or freedoms analogous to this in what the faculty collectively can choose to teach?

>> KEN SCOTT: Yeah, I think that that would be partially covered on that. I think that Kimlisa is going to chime in on this. She's also on the committee.

>> KIMLISA DUCHICELA: Joe, are you getting to the concept of being forced to teach canned courses? Is that where you're going with this?

>> JOE BREWER: No, let's just say the faculty either wanted to teach a subject that caused problems for the institution as a whole, maybe at the administrative level, or they wanted to include a portion of, content portion of something we already do that the faculty was behind but there were other reasons why maybe the institution didn't want that to happen.

>> KIMLISA DUCHICELA: Okay. So if you scroll up to that first -- No. 1. I think what we tried to do there was that where it says academic freedom due to the learning objectives of the institutions,

will be clearly stated, so what we went after for that was to make sure that we were able to teach what we needed to teach in the way that we needed to teach it, but to also understand that sometimes, for example, say, we were a religious institution and that religious institution has certain concepts, you know, maybe, but if there was that type of limitation to be placed upon us, that it's incumbent upon the institution to inform us ahead of time and that it should be part of our appointment.

Once we're appointed, which would probably be that contract that rolls year to year, if the institution should bring on some kind of ideology like they just decide that they are just so for Trump that we have to all talk to our students about how great he is, then they need to tell us up front then we can make a decision collectively as faculty.

I think for the other part of the curriculum as far as curriculum development and what we present and what we don't present, that would go to -- that would go to an HLC place where HLC mandates that the faculty control curriculum and what is needed according to the faculty, not those, not other entities, what is required to acquire a degree, turn a degree at Pima Community College.

So I think both, we looked at the HLC things that protect us, but also we have to keep in mind that the institution, if it decides that it has an agenda, we should be informed of the agenda before we go into a classroom. And hopefully they don't pick that particular

example. Just sayin'.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We have one more minute for this agenda item.

>> JOE BREWER: I just advise the committee to take a look at whether they want to make a reference to things like curriculum development, which are really a collective right of the faculty, and here it doesn't say so directly, but if you read it it's about individual faculty members doing that.

>> KEN SCOTT: That's really what this is for. It's not really for the curriculum. That would be covered under the curriculum documents.

This is more for you in the classroom and also outside of the classroom, No. 3 there deals with what you're doing outside of the classroom that you might be held responsible for.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Maybe we can take one more comment or question, and then -- and please, remember this is the final stage before it goes through the process. We will see it again, but if you have burning suggestions or comments that you feel need to be included, please e-mail them so that the committee has a chance to integrate any crucial final comments.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: In previous policy in the FPPS, we had the following textbooks and other materials shall be selected by departmental faculty.

Do we have anything equivalent in this new policy, or will that be part of the AP? Or will that go somewhere else? Is there a plan

to change that?

>> KEN SCOTT: We don't specifically cover that in here, but we do elude to materials, but again, we're trying to keep it broad, because in, say, in writing, you know, you may need to cover a particular topic but the instructor has the right to choose which books that the students are going to read.

But like in my area, like, we pick the book that we're going to use for accounting 211, everybody is going to use it. Again, that's more a curriculum issue than a how do I want to deliver that in my classroom? Do I want to use a PowerPoint? Do I want to talk? Do I want to do exercises? It's my freedom to get to teach how I want in my classroom.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Right. I just didn't see that said somewhere. The intent is that it would be the accounting faculty together who are choosing the textbooks and materials? Not, you know, some director, vice chancellor of -- not this one, but in general, right?

>> KEN SCOTT: Right. So that's covered in the other document that you referenced.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Which other document?

>> KEN SCOTT: The document you referenced that had that passage in there about the faculty --

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: That is the FPPS, and that's what I am concerned that we preserve. Currently it's not in any other

document.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Are you suggesting that a line be added to the effect of faculty within their division and department areas should have purview over textbook selection?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Yes.

>> KEN SCOTT: If you can send that to us in an e-mail?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Sure.

>> KEN SCOTT: Appreciate it. Cool. We are open to suggestions.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: For these comments we are collecting, Ken, are you the best person to e-mail them to? Should it be Kate or...

>> KATE SCHMIDT: (off microphone.) Should I send that link again?

>> KEN SCOTT: Yes, please.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We can attach it to the agenda. We will just pull it from February. If you have trouble accessing the link and it's easier to e-mail, I'm sure the group would be fine with that, as well.

>> KATE SCHMIDT: (off microphone.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Just so we are aware of the timeline, when should we say these comments need to be submitted by? Today would be great.

>> KATE SCHMIDT: (off microphone.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So send them today or while they are still on your mind is best.

>> KATE SCHMIDT: Today would be great. Or we will say before
spring break. (off microphone.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Got it. Perfect.

>> KEN SCOTT: Thank you very much.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Who's on that committee? Kimlisa, Ken --

>> KATE SCHMIDT: It's at the top of that. It's on the document.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you to the work of the committee. I
know it's been a long process.

Okay. Next item is Faculty Senate elections with Tal. Brooke?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: I just want to make one quick comment
because I just went to the form, and it's closed. If you could
please just reopen it, that would be great.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All right. You're up.

>> TAL SUTTON: I shouldn't need the full ten minutes because
it's more just an announcement in March.

As you may remember, we revamped our election process and so now
we hold our elections in the spring to begin in the fall.

Because we switched over to assigning seats through divisions
rather than everywhere, we sort of hit the hard reset on those seats,
which is why last year's election about half of the seats were for
one year and half were two years. So half of you are, have another
year before an election and your division is going to run and the
other half you'll be expecting to see another round of Google forms
from me probably sent via through your dean to make sure they get

sent to everyone.

This is more of an announcement. Again, I'm up for ways of improving this method. I'm not entirely happy with doing -- I like the idea of preserving institutional memory by sort of staggering elections half one year, half the other, but I'm not entirely happy with the fact that logistically it's been easy to do it by division, so like all of communication is up rather than being able to do half of the division in 2020 and then the other half of communications in 2021, I don't have that set up yet. Maybe we can sort of do another transition to that, but for this year, it's going to be just by division.

So the divisions that were -- it said last year which ones were just going to be for one year. So I think I can call it up. I don't have it in front of me right now, but I know communications is one of them. Adult education is another.

But anyway, if you want to know, you can shoot me an e-mail. I will be sending out a general call. The process I'm using is a general interest for people who are interested in running, so it will be a feedback form that you just enter and it will come back and you just put your name in if you want to be a senator.

I will collect those names and I will put together a second Google form that will go out to your division as the election ballot. That survey will be essentially the ballot. Then the division would vote on those people who put their names forward, and then it would

come back.

Again, I included a question, because we do have some lopsided participation, if there are 17 people from communications that want to serve, but that's too many seats, and then 0 interest from another division, I do include a question, would you be willing to serve as a representative to this other division? And if you do, you'll get access to their LISTSERVs so you can communicate to them, gather feedback from them, and then disseminate what's happening in senate.

That's coming out, and like I said, I did not need the full 10 minutes.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Unless there are questions.

Seeing as there are none, we'll move on.

So everybody should have a yellow form, and this is -- we're moving into emeritus nomination time. We do this twice a year, November is the deadline for the fall, and then I believe April 1 is the deadline for spring. So this is the meeting we need to vote.

So three nominations were submitted, and hopefully you all had a chance to look at the various statements provided by those who nominated these faculty members.

We do have a couple of them here. Also, if you're a proxy, please, on your yellow form, please write if you are a proxy for one, just write 2 and circle it so that we know how many votes to account for with your ballot. That would be very helpful.

The first one is Simone Gears, and the person who nominated

Simone is not able to be here today, but we do have several writing faculty who can attest to Simone's achievements and successes and just all that Simone has devoted to the college.

Are there any questions about Simone's credentials?

I should also clarify that we did -- I worked with Kate to make sure that all of these candidates as far as we can tell do fulfill the criteria listed in the emeritus AP.

Go ahead and fill out your vote for Simone, and then we have Becky Moore, and I believe Chuck Becker from East Campus library is here. Chuck, is there anything that you would like to say about your statement that you provided?

>> SPEAKER: It's a great statement. (off microphone.) I'm up for questions.

I'm just here for questions. I think the statement speaks for itself.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All right. Any questions for Chuck? Seeing that there are none, we will move to the next one, which is Brad Fiero. Is the person -- anyone here? Thank you, Lisa.

>> SPEAKER: Lisa. So I think the statement speaks for itself.

I hope everybody has read it. Just in case, I have a few things to say, because this is so important to me.

Some years ago, we did put a request through for a nomination for Brad, but unfortunately, the person -- we didn't read the rules and how you did it. Anyway, so our first statement wasn't so good.

So I want to make sure that that doesn't in any way taint Brad and what we're putting through now. I want to make sure... he was such an amazing, he was like the life force in biology. He was the most important teaching mentor I ever had. Probably -- Hernan? Steve, if he was here. Really, the whole of biology. He was there for every single person there. His first absolute love was teaching.

His door was always open. It was filled with his faculty colleagues and students constantly. It was such a different situation than what we have now, but then, he was there regardless of when his office hours were. He was there unless he was in class.

He never taught more than three classes so that he could give things his full attention.

He was also department chair for I think six years or seven? Seven or nine years all together. My bad. He was a fantastic department chair. Everything he did, he had a system for.

He made sure, and he got feedback to make sure the system was worked, it was presented on the website, everybody knew what to do so everybody could do their job. He was a fantastic leader. I was trying to think, what kind of leader was he? He was the kind of leader I just read about this recently called the developmental leader.

So he helped me learn how to do what they could do to do the best they could.

I know I'm going on too long. I could go on for another half

hour. But he was also on gen ed for about ten years. He was the PI, the Pima -- the program develop -- what was it? Director, excuse me, for the Perk Grant (phonetic) for well over 10 years.

He was the -- the grant would have never succeeded for that long had he not been director. He was such a critical segue to the U of A and their way of thinking on this.

Anyway, he really embodies what we want to do best here at Pima.

So thank you.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you, Lisa.

So would anyone want to volunteer to count -- Ken? Ken will, please cast your ballots to Ken and Ken will count them.

We are moving on to the president's report. This item, we have had it on the agenda for the last couple of months, but we have just haven't had the time to actually get to it.

Officers have worked on developing some charter language that outlines some of what we feel are reasonable expectations for those who serve on committees appointed through senate.

Why we developed this or felt a need for it is because there are so many important things going on, and we have senate representatives on key committees, and we would like a way to ensure that we know what's happening, if there is anything that Faculty Senate should be aware of related to the work of these committees, we would like to have a way to just ensure that that happens.

So this, hopefully you've had a chance to read through it. I

will just read through a couple of things.

The purpose of this addendum is to designate roles and responsibilities of Faculty Senate representatives on college committees. Faculty members elected by the Faculty Senate to serve on a college committee, which includes work group, task force, or any other similar group, serve as representatives for Faculty Senate. In this role, the representative in fulfilling the expectations determined by that committee is expected to represent Faculty Senate by adhering to the following rules and responsibilities as appropriate.

So note that as appropriate. So we are not expecting that everyone sends minutes of every meeting they attend. However, be the idea of this is if there is any alerts that senate should be aware of, if there are any areas that Faculty Senate should be involved, this is -- that's the purpose here, is that just we are informed.

What we'd like to do is vote on this, and if we vote on it, then we will add it to our official senate charter.

First, are there any questions? Nancy?

>> SPEAKER: Nancy H. Just in the definition of faculty, real quickly, in the last line there, and to educational support, faculty, including counselors and librarians, because of the reclassification, should we change that to faculty and staff, including counselors and librarians?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Is that necessary?

>> TAL SUTTON: I think in terms of just being consistent with the, at least the most recent changes made to the charter, we are trying to just use the word faculty the way HLC uses the word faculty, and so that would include...

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Any other questions, comments? Any motions? Motion? Tal?

>> TAL SUTTON: I motion to approve.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We have a second.

Discussion? All in favor?

(Ayes.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All opposed?

All abstain? So two abstentions.

So the motion passes and we will add this language to our charter.

So here is the item that we would, we will invite Dr. Phillips up here for. This is the instructional structure transformation design leadership team, and I will -- if we could have another mic, actually? Joe -- because I will -- so thank you for your willingness to address our questions.

I have collected several from faculty that have sent them to me, so if you don't mind I'd like to go through these ones first, and then we will open it up to other questions.

So one question that we have is what is the exact breakdown of this team in terms of faculty, staff, administration? What members

are already on the team? And how many faculty will be added? How many staff will be added? And how many administrators?

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: Is it okay if I just generally talk about the team for a minute?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Absolutely.

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: One of the first things is the particular team we are recruiting people for right now is a design leadership team. So these are individuals that are going to help steer us through the first stage of our process that we're working on.

We're actually not doing anything different than is already in board policy. If you want to look at Board Policy 2.02, that's the policy that allows us to hire individuals, to create positions. The institution has been doing this for 10 to 15 years.

Our challenge is we have been doing this separately in each different division, each area of the college. So everyone has kind of created their own positions which has resulted in staff, instructors, and workforce trainers and academic directors and department heads and discipline coordinators, et cetera.

What we are doing is we're trying to have a discussion about how can we bring these things together so we have a common structure at the institution, and instead of everyone making independent positions, we can do it together and get something that we can work on together.

So this group, which will be a very small group, is someone, a

group of individuals that are going to work to help guide us through the discussion for this.

The group's going to be, right now there is seven spots on the group, counting, like, official group people. Of those, four of those are instructional-related people, faculty members, staff instructors, adjunct faculty, people like that, and three of the individuals are staff/administrator kind of individuals, vice president, dean, some kind of academic-related staff.

Those seven people will coordinate the work. We will be bringing in individuals from across the college from each one of the divisions to discuss different areas.

So they are not the ones that are actually going to be having all the discussion. They're going to be the ones scheduling the discussions and having people come in and then compiling the information and putting it together.

There will be presentations that will be for Faculty Senate and staff council and the other different groups over the time we are working on this. The goal for this particular group is simply to identify, based upon what we are doing here at Pima and where we want to go, these are the kinds of positions that we think we need to have here at Pima.

So it's really the same way that academic directors or staff instructors or whatever other positions we have had in the past came about. We are just doing that in a thoughtful way and saying, is

there some way that we can stop doing this individually and do it together?

Nothing actually happens from this particular group other than there will be some recommendation that says these are the kinds of positions that we think we need to have.

In the future, there will have to be some work done if the institution is going to move and start using these positions instead of current ones and we figure out how that happens. It might happen -- might, this is just me hypothesizing right now -- it might happen when we hire people in the future we hire under the new definitions that we have created instead of high people under our current positions and eventually things would turn over and we'd be using the new positions.

There might be some kind of transition process between here's where we have the old system and here is the new system. All kinds of pieces that have to be figured out. That's downstream. All we are looking at right now is figuring out what are the kinds of positions we think we need to have at the institution. The leadership team has significant team, four instructional people, three administrative staff people to be able to move us in that direction.

Josie, you have more questions?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Yes. So how does the timeline of change of possible structure changes align with the classification and

compensation study? And you kind of answered this in your last question by noting this is the first step, and it will continue in some other form.

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: This is actually one of the things having us do this, because we are paying for class and compensation and we want to be able to consider these positions as part of that work, and so I would expect that as class and comp comes around and things are being done that they would identify, here's appropriate salaries and appropriate classifications that goes along with these positions.

So we want to help inform that process. This is not a separate something. This is just providing information for it.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: When does the classification and compensation study officially begin? Do we know that yet?

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: I don't know the specific dates for that.

They are working on right now identifying the group to come in and work with us on class and comp, but I don't know personally where that's at in process right now.

It's happening now, identifying the group.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: The vendor group or --

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: Trying to figure out who the vendor group is, how we do the vendors, bringing them in.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Got it. Many are concerned this is ultimately about reducing the amount of full-time faculty positions.

People are also worried about career downskilling and downward

mobility. What is the more specific idea and purpose behind the charge and this team's work? I believe you did cover this earlier when you were talking about the purpose and you defined that. I think the main concern with this one is just, one, the potential of this to reduce the amount of full-time faculty positions and then downskilling or downward career mobility.

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: There is no goal at this particular point associated with this with reducing the numbers of full-time faculty. It may be that in the new structure we actually have more faculty in that -- than we currently have. Because when you combine all the different academic people, it may be that, oh, in the new structure, those are all faculty.

That would be some of the things, even your charter things you're talking about, is do we include these or do we include those. It may just be that, no, all those are faculty and we put those together.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: This next one kind of aligns with that, but just to clarify, is there any thought to reducing the 50 to 1 faculty ratio that is our goal to stick with?

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: 50 to 1 faculty ratio was something that Dave Bea came up with to help us with budgetary challenges. With the budget cliff coming this fall, whenever that is, we're roughly at that 50 to 1 level. So going forward, the 50 to 1 piece isn't as important as we need to make sure we have appropriate staffing for our academic programs to run in the right way, and so we'll become

more focused on what does this particular program area need for these particular kind of classes to meet the needs of our students.

And so the overall -- okay, so it's just going to be 50 to 1 no matter what, eventually, you'll see that's not something that's necessarily going to stay the same. It's going to match up better for what we need for our programs.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: And I think people do understand that in some areas it makes sense that having a smaller ratio is necessary and then some areas it's larger. I think the bigger concern is will this result in full-time faculty reduction.

Because we know that those numbers are often used to show to the community, the public, the value of an institution, you know, because it's commonly considered important that there is a good balance of full time. There is a substantial amount of full-time faculty members, as well, to balance out the ratio and ensure quality of structure in all of that.

So I think that's what is behind that specific question and concerns related to that ratio.

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: A piece with that that's key with this, a lot of the things that full-time faculty provide, some of them are working with students outside of the classroom. They are doing advising, doing programmatic development, all of these kinds of things that are essential for the success of the institution.

The other piece is we have a lot of part-time adjunct faculty

members, workforce trainers that spend a lot of time with us that we really need to figure out how can we better utilize their expertise and how can we build them better into the system as opposed to just looking at them as, oh, you come on Thursday for three hours, and then you go away and we don't really care about you other than those three hours on Thursday.

We'd really like to have a more comprehensive way in integrating them in our processes and what's going on. More support for our students, not less.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: And then I believe you have already covered what is the intended outcome of this team. Are there any deliverables that are part of this charge, like any specific items that --

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: Just overall, the general thing is the team is working on defining, if you were going to start an institution today and say, here's the way that we should have our faculty, instructional positions set up, this is what we think things should look like, so that's what the team is going to be working on.

There is going to be pieces of that that match what we have already. There is going to be pieces for that that are going to be a little bit different than what we have already.

But the key piece is, in some way the structure is being designed so it works for the institution. It's not a system where, while here's something that the Allied Health people are doing in nursing.

Here is something that Jim Craig does in business. Here is something we do in aviation. And here is a different way that we do things with math faculty members. It's some kind of thoughtful thing that connects all those pieces together.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I have three more, and then we will turn it over to the rest of our senators.

So faculty are already feeling discouraged, anxious, fearful, and demoralized. How can you assure us that Pima remains a decent long-term career choice where educators are appreciated and valued for their knowledge, experience, and commitment to student success?

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: I actually was just at a community event this morning talking to high school students, and at this community event, the high school students were sharing what their particular career objectives were, and I talked to students that said, I would like to go into education.

One of the most important things I talked to them about is education is the place where you really make a difference in people's lives, because you can take someone from wherever they're at, you can help them become more educated and get them to where they are going to be able to provide for themselves, for their family, and they are also going to contribute more for the rest of us and our community.

That's where we really need to go. Faculty members, instructors are the backbone of Pima Community College. They are the individuals that provide our primary service for our students. They are the

place that our primary support needs to be to get things done that we need to get done.

We need to rejoice in the professionalism of faculty members that we have and support that in every way that we can. The challenge is we have sometimes is it's just so inconsistent across the institution. We need to make sure that that's happening everywhere, not just in particular places in the college.

It's going to be a positive change in the long term.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Okay. So we should feel encouraged by this plan in terms of the long-term career viability? Like specifically in relation --

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: I think this is an opportunity, because individuals that are currently working at Pima Community College, by going through this process, by doing some of the things we are doing to support training, the teaching and learning center, the things Kate is working on, the support we are trying to get for faculty members so we can deal with things like this health crisis that we are in right now, all of these things make us stronger as an institution, but truthfully, as an individual faculty member, they make you stronger, as well.

It makes you more attractive if you decide you want to go somewhere else, but the other piece for that is it makes Pima more attractive, because people looking at Pima Community College are able to say, wow, they are really doing amazing things here.

That's one of the things I was so proud of our math faculty when we went and shared information at the Bellwether conference, and we see the Bellwether award, the math faculty had a student there that was talking about how their lives were changed by the things that were done in the math class that they were doing.

I want to thank our writing faculty, because they actually started doing it even before with their 101-S class where they have been doing that for several years now. And these changes, faculty-led changes, working with Jeff Thies, working with the other developmental faculty member, that's the reason that we were recognized, nationally recognized because of the work of our developmental faculty.

That's really where we want Pima to be.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Well, thank you for recognizing faculty.

That's very much appreciated.

I think, you know, what's behind this question is just -- and you see this reflected in a lot of questions, is just faculty came to Pima with some expectations of what the career would look like. And it's a difficult time, and we have talked about that in senate. We have talked about that in other forums.

Uncertainty is a very difficult thing to deal with, and with that, it breeds nervousness and worry and more fear, which is why you see that reflected in a lot of these comments, because the description of the group is -- you know, there is a lot of unspoken

questions behind it. That's where people are sort of speculating, and that explains the concern.

Two more questions. These ones are quick. This one, is there anything else you'd like to say about how this plan aligns with student success goals?

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: The piece for this is improving our students' ability to succeed in their classes and improving the way that we are serving our community. So that's really one of the things that we are looking at.

Part of the structure is we want to have some way to have progression steps in this structure that we are talking about, so we will be able to connect each of these positions to student success. We will be able to connect the positions some way to faculty development.

And so individuals would be able to go through some process and do something, so, oh, I'm going to be at level 1, level 2, level 3, something like that. That would be built into this, as well.

That's really a goal for this going forward is to find ways to promote student success and how to help our students.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: You know how when you're teaching and you sense that maybe students are antsy and I'm sort of sensing that in this room and I'm feeling like a debate moderator.

I have one more question and then I will turn it over to the rest of you. I wanted to give these questions that I received the

opportunity to get answers. That's why I'm reading through this list.

Why wasn't this introduced earlier? And why the rush? It's middle of the semester. The goal is to finish at least this phase by the end of spring. Why wasn't it introduced earlier so people could maybe plan if they wanted to be part of the group?

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: We actually have talked about this in concept for, I don't know, six months or so. We have had some conversations with different faculty leaders, with administrators about this is something that we need to do, look at this. This is just the beginning of the process, so this is not really rushed because of the fact -- this is going to go the whole time we are looking at class in comp kinds of things.

We are just working on this first piece in trying to identify, so, what kind of positions do we think we should have? Part of what we need to change to in our institutional change processes is places where we're doing things in steps.

So we, instead of saying three years from now we're going to be at this point with no milestones along the way with no way to identify where we're going, we want to be able to say, okay, so we want to be there, so the first thing we should do is have a conversation about what is there? What is it we're trying to do? Let's spend a couple of months and work on that conversation and figure out where it is that we're trying to go.

Now, once we're done with that, then we move on to the next step, and that will be informed by whatever happens in step 1, to some extent, for that. So we will have different wait points we're looking at. We will invigorate the group. Won't necessarily be the same people working through the same thing as the leadership team, because some people will say I did this part, I'm happy with that, someone else can work on this next section we are going to work on and take the leadership role of that.

That may be part of the change, as well. It's not going to be done-done for a good while. This is the process for us to start talking about this.

So that's one of the things that's challenging sometime is you say, well, why are we starting it? Well, you have to start sometime. So whenever you start, someone could say, well, why are you starting it today? It just turned out this is the time that we could actually get the information out and start working on things.

There is not an emergency something where we get to the end of the semester and we say, oh, we're kind of close but we've got this kind of thing. I mean, we can adjust. We can do something with that. We are trying to get the stuff done though in a time so that the class and comp we can get the things aligned with it.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: That's enough from me. I'd like to see -- we have, we could probably devote five, seven more minutes to this item.

Let's turn it over for any additional questions. Brooke has a

question.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Hi, Morgan. One of the questions I had was about the time commitment. So you said ten hours a week, and I think this is a nice piggyback on that question.

If that's happening this semester, ten hours a week is a lot of time. I think this speaks to what Josie is saying, too, for a faculty member to have ten hours a week to devote, we could plan for that for the fall, but it's hard to really all of a sudden have ten hours a week to devote. I'm concerned about factually having the time now to work on this committee.

So can you tell us what exactly will those ten hours consist of?

So, for example, how many of those are going to be hours devoted to meeting in person with people as opposed to the kind of work you might be doing on your own outside of individual meetings, or is it ten hours of scheduled meetings that faculty are somehow going to have to figure out how to get to every week?

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: It would not be ten hours of scheduled meetings every week. The ten hours is kind of how much time would be expectation that you would be doing things. Again, remember, this is the leadership team that we're talking about. There will be other groups, other opportunities for people to come in and give feedback on things that are going on. Those won't take anywhere close to ten hours a week. Those would be every couple of weeks maybe an hour opportunity for those individuals to come in and hear about what's

going on and to provide feedback.

The beginning time, whenever the leadership group starts, it's kind of like doing Honors 101 class. You kind of have to figure out here's how it works and then the students kind of go on and work on their own projects. It's kind of the same thing.

So once the group figures out, Hernan, you're going to lead this particular piece, and Jenny, you will work on this particular part, a lot of the things start becoming independent for that. The key pieces, though, we need people to understand that, oh, okay, I'm really busy, but I really want to do this, so I'm willing to spend a couple of hours in the evening time working on this, or whatever it is, I need to do that.

Truthfully, if it's me and I'm teaching a 10.5-hour overload, I'm not signing up for this. I'm saying, okay, maybe when we do the transition group or maybe when we do the support loading group or whatever the other future groups are, maybe I sign up for one of those.

But take advantage of the feedback opportunities for people to come in and do that, and it's okay not to be one of the people that's scheduling the meetings and figuring out, okay, so how do we write this document or things like that.

>> TAL SUTTON: Given the amount of work that a member would be doing, they are probably going to be very invested in the actual times that you are meeting. So I just wanted to make sure that this

being such an important meeting that we are getting information out to faculty, to everybody, as clearly and quickly as possible.

So I would just recommend that and encourage that there be a support staff dedicated to taking good notes that can get turned around and put out quickly to the faculty so that we can stay abreast of the situation as things go on to sort of say, to expect that the faculty members not only have to do all this additional research and getting ready for the meetings and participating, and then they go and share out would probably be overwhelming and they might miss something because they are focusing on their part of the conversation of the meeting and so have sort of an independent support staff that can calmly collect all of what's being said and synthesize that and put that out for the college to know what's going on in these meetings would be greatly appreciated.

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: There will be support people with the meeting besides the people that are actually the ones that are going to through and having the discussions and doing things. Exactly the reason Tal is talking about this.

The way we are setting this up is a little bit different than we have done previous things, like our academic leadership group that we had, because what we realized was you ended up with a core group of individuals that actually did the leadership and pushing things through. Then you had other people that wanted to be there to give feedback and to give suggestions and things like that. But they

truthfully weren't really interested in being there in all the blow-by-blow kind of meetings, so we structured this based upon what faculty members were showing that this seems to work better for us. So that's why we are having the core team figuring out how to get stuff done and then the feedback meetings for everyone to have representatives to come to. And then general sharing with Faculty Senate and other things like that.

>> TAL SUTTON: I guess I'm speaking specifically to what they know what their role is, it's to take notes and share them.

>> SPEAKER: Is this an open meeting where individuals could come and be the audience and listen?

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: I don't have any issues with that. That's something I would have to check someone. I don't think there is any things that we do here at Pima that's nonpersonnel kind of whatever that secret kind of stuff.

>> SPEAKER: Thank you.

>> KEN SCOTT: Could you state your name for the...

>> SPEAKER: Jenny H.

>> KEN SCOTT: I actually don't have a comment on the particular program but more so just the feedback that I got from other faculty that I spoke to about this. There are a number of people who said, yeah, might be interested, but it's ten hours, doesn't say when, so I'm not even going to look at it.

So as faculty members, I think that you could get better

participation from faculty if, in those e-mails, if there was more information about those ten hours. I know it's already kind of been touched on, but if there was more information about that, because our first thought is, well, it's probably while we are teaching, so I can't do it. So the e-mail gets immediately dismissed.

So if there was some information about exactly what day that we would be holding those administrative meetings or it's going to be independent work on your own, if there was some of that information from the start, I think it would really help to get us involved.

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: That's a great suggestion for future. One of the things in the form, if you actually went past the place where you're talking about and clicked the thing, in the form it asks you, so what times would you be able to meet and do things?

Part of the reason it's asking that is to figure out, okay, the people that are being selected to be on the leadership team, what time can we actually schedule stuff around their classes and stuff like that. But explaining that that was going to be in there ahead would have been a good idea.

Thank you for the feedback for that.

>> KEN SCOTT: Thank you.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Just quickly, Tal and I were having a side question. Tal noted that quite a few people are concerned about the ten-hour thing, which I think is a really valid concern because people had planned their semesters. People would really like to

contribute, but ten hours is so difficult to fit in right now.

So Tal had a suggestion to consider the possibility of having partner faculty or group faculty kind of alternate. That way if one wasn't able to attend a meeting, the other one could. That way the ten hours wouldn't be so daunting, and you could even get more...

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: Any individuals want to turn theirs in that way, they are more than welcome to turn that in. One of the things, too, remember, the leadership team, we are only looking for four people for that.

Already I have about 35 people that have turned in desire to be on the team. So although certainly encourage anyone else because we still take other people to put things in, our challenge is going to be at the beginning of the next week when I sit down with the provost staff and say, okay, how do we fill out our teams so we have, we have transfer faculty, CTE faculty, adjunct faculty, et cetera, and divide everything out, how do I get this down to four people.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Got it. So if people are interested in partnering thing because of fear of commitment of 10 hours, just fill out your form with that clearly stated within it.

Nancy? Then Sarah and then Matej and then we need to move on.

>> SPEAKER: My question is kind of going back to some of the earlier concerns and tying in with the academic freedom.

A number of people that I was hearing from were very concerned that this is a step towards I guess the canned curriculum where there

are going to be curriculum designers and curriculum providers. And that this is a step in that direction kind of going away from our whole academic freedom.

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: I can't tell you whether this is a step in that direction at this particular point because that's part of the discussion for how do we operate as an institution.

We already do that to some extent with some of our adjunct faculty members. Maybe not in Nancy's area in the college, but one of the things that I mentioned were we are inconsistent around the college in how we do things.

Allied Health very frequently has very specific things they have to do in the class, and so their accreditation information says you have to have three hours of this and five hours of that. Aviation is the same way for those things.

So part of this is just realizing that, okay, so how do we build things so this is going to work effectively for all of us. But that's not -- that's not the intent to say, oh, let's make this happen. We want what to happen to be what works best for our students and what works best for our institution. So it's not a particular thing that we are necessarily trying to push for. That's why we have this group.

If we wanted to do the Board Policy 2.02, we can create positions. The chancellor can just say I want these. Board policy 2.02 allows him to do that. But that's not where we are going at

this particular point, because we want to have this discussion and people involved.

Thanks for the question.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: That was a good question. I wondered that, as well. So it could relate to that instructional educational models topic that the chancellor -- it could relate to that? It could be part of that? Okay.

Sarah and then Matej.

>> SPEAKER: Couple of questions. Thank you. I was wondering -- so you mentioned one of the things that this team is going to be looking at is how to better utilize full-time faculty maybe or where they might be needed? One thing I was wondering about was disciplines, there are disciplines that have no full-time faculty. Is that something that the team is going to be looking at?

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: That would certainly be a consideration. So right now we have processes through our academic leadership where we bring in part-time people and have them do things in our academic leadership structure that normally full-time people would do.

And is that the best thing for us to be doing? Should we be doing something else? That's a question. A key piece for this, the team is not trying to say how do I take my current faculty members and make them do something different?

So that's not the goal. The goal is for them to say here's the kind of structure that we think in the long term Pima should have.

So they are looking at how things should look for 2030 or whatever, and then we have to figure out the path of how do we get to whatever that is?

So for me individually, as a faculty member and the things that I'm doing, that's not going to be as impactful on me right now.

That's going to be something that's down the road a good ways.

>> SPEAKER: So a rule could be developed like every discipline should have at least one full-time faculty member? That would be the kind of thing?

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: Maybe.

>> SPEAKER: That big-picture, structural type thing? Okay.

And for the leadership team, are you going to have any adjunct faculty on that leadership team? Are you thinking of them more as an advisory role?

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: One of the positions is supposed to be an adjunct faculty member.

>> SPEAKER: All right. Because we had some concerns at the adjunct faculty meeting, about that 10 hours a week, what everyone is concerned about, like how is that going to work for adjunct faculty.

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: Again, we're going to have to figure out how to get that to work for whoever it is we have on the group. We do have adjunct applicants at this particular point that said they are willing to come in, volunteer and work with us on that.

When I say "volunteer," please understand that I'm not at this

particular point committing to saying anything as far as honorarium, compensation, blah, blah, blah, whatever it goes for this. We have to figure that out. That's a conversation the provost's office still has to have, and we will have that information for people.

We did not want, we absolutely did not want people to sign up to be on the leadership team because they said, oh, here is a chance for me to get money. So we wanted individuals that wanted to do the work. We are going to try to --

>> SPEAKER: Oh, of course. Our concern was just that service is sort of part of the full-time contract, whereas it isn't for part-time faculty. So we just had some concerns about that. Thank you.

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: Good concern.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Matej? Then we will move on.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Thank you. So what you were explaining in the beginning, Morgan, I think that all sounds very great and reasonable to just review all of the positions, make sure we don't have redundancies, more consistency, right. I think that sounds like something we could all get behind.

But I'm hoping everybody heard the response to Nancy's question where the concern is, and I think you have acknowledged that what this really is about is not just leadership positions or adjunct faculty and staff instructors but about fundamentally reworking the position and the role of full-time faculty members here at the

college.

That's something that the chancellor has talked to the board about and been kind of been dropping things or you said there have been conversations, not that anybody has been involved in any systematic level.

So now you're sort of hand-picking some people for this committee who decided to apply, who happened to have the time, who are willing to do it for free. Don't you think there should be some kind of other process of the faculty being able to send their representatives to this committee, or we have the AERC established and it already has meeting times set aside and representatives and reassigned time available or at least a process for that? Why was that not somehow combined with that since that is our process for making changes to these kinds of policies of working conditions and compensation?

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: AERC is not involved at all in implementation of Board Policy 2.02, none. So any positions at the college created are created by the chancellor. They are approved by the board from recommendations from the chancellor.

All we are doing in this particular case is we are trying to get more input on this as opposed to this being something that's just happening administratively, and we have had areas in the college that have changed recently, primarily administratively, that's not what we want to have happen here. We want input for this.

The leadership team is not making decisions for this. The

leadership team is compiling information. They are getting feedback from people across the college to do these particular things.

So that's one of the things we did not want, and we did not want to present the idea that in some way this is like the super committee that's deciding what happens to faculty in the future or et cetera. That's not what this group is doing.

This group is coordinating feedback for us to do a better job of implementing 2.02.

>> KEN SCOTT: Could you please state that board policy again for the record?

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: 2.02. That's our hiring policy.

There is associated APs with that if you go through the numbers are the same for the APs with that.

If you remember, we have academic directors, different places in the college, and we have staff instructors, all of those positions came about because some administrators, someone in the college, made the recommendation of we should have this kind of position, and then it was created. Then we have hired people to fill those positions.

And in many cases, we have hired people instead of people in the traditional faculty role to fill those positions, and we're concerned about the proliferation of so how many of those different kinds of things are we going to create?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: So sounds like you found some kind of nice -- I would call it a loophole. Do you think 2.02 allows you to just

create 200 new positions and close the 200 faculty positions we have now?

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: 2.02 isn't related to the number of people in positions

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: It's the types of positions we hire for.

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: 2.02 is related to the types of positions.

So full-time faculty at Pima Community College is one position, so the board says we're going to hire full-time faculty, that's this position. So you would, under 2.02, you could create an academic director position and say we want to hire some of these and the board will say, yes, you can hire some of those, or no, you can't hire some of those.

How many academic directors we have is part of our budgeting process and part of the process that we go through to figure out how to staff our areas. That's not even a 2.02 part. That's just regular hiring processes.

Part of the 50 to 1, for instance, that David Bea said this seems to be a reasonable number for us to make our budget, that 50 to 1 is something that the finance office figured out this seems to be a reasonable number.

A key piece with all of this is please understand this is happening because the individuals that are in this room, the people working with our students, we want to make sure that you are having input and feedback in the things that are going on. We want to

involve you in these decisions. We don't want to be going and saying, oh, well, Allied Health is doing this and creating these kind of positions. Aviation is going to create some of these. Math is going to have some of these kind of positions.

We want to do it in a comprehensive and thoughtful way across the institution.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: That sounds good, but, I mean, there are other issues clearly on the table, and you're selecting a small team that based on, you know, where we have no input into how people are selected. Then the ship is sailing, right? Then you have a team you say you got input from and it's all legitimate and at that point it's of course much more difficult to start walking things back once it has to go to the AERC because it's compensation and working conditions. That's 1.25.

So I don't know. I think it's unfortunate that we're kicking this fundamental change, what seems like to our sort of instructional structure at the college in this matter.

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: There are no changes taking place from this group. This group has no power to vote for, authorize, or make any changes.

This group is simply facilitating discussion about what should instruction look like for Pima Community College going forward. That's an important piece for this, because once we decide here's the kinds of things we need to be doing, the kinds of discussions Matej

is talking about, that has to happen.

Those are things we will have to look at, but that's not what we are doing now. That's not this part.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We are so over time on this one, and like I said, we need to be careful about time today. So I think -- we could talk about this as with so many topics for a lot more time.

I think the main thing that has come to the surface in this discussion is some anxiety, some fear, some concern about the future and some frustration with the way that this process has rolled out and the possible implications of what this process could be.

I don't think we have any way to resolve those things in this forum at this time. I do know that transparency is going to be crucial. I anticipate that this will be a standing agenda item throughout the rest of this semester. There is only two more meetings after this one.

So with that in mind, officers have toyed with this. We discussed this idea it would be valuable to have a special session. We're not sure what shape that would be or what we would do, but we do know we want to be involved in this, and we have talked about, well, what would be the best scheduling. The best we could come up with, instead of creating a whole separate meeting is that at our April meeting we will stay after for an hour, so from 3:00 to 4:00 will be a special session on this. Look for more information on this, but please, please do plan ahead, please make the time in your

schedule to attend a special session in our April meeting. Just stay after.

Our goal would be it would be more active so you wouldn't be sitting and listening but actually doing things, like doing work, working with groups, et cetera. So whatever you can do, write it down, plan ahead, please make an extra effort.

More information about that will be coming soon, but that's our goal at this point, because we think this does devote more time and attention. We can work perhaps and coordinate on something we could do to make that time meaningful in conjunction with the work of the team.

So thank you for taking our questions. Much appreciated. All right.

From our election headquarters, we have some news, so I'd like to turn it over to Ken who has the latest count.

>> KEN SCOTT: Thank you, Josie. The weather out here is outstanding. (Laughter.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: What's the word on the street, Ken?

>> KEN SCOTT: Thank you for asking.

Simone has a vote of yes of 32, no of 1, abstain of 3.

Brad has 32 yes, 0 no, 4 abstain.

Becky has 25 yes, 2 no, and 9 abstain.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So that indicates to me that all of them have been endorsed?

>> KEN SCOTT: What's the minimum number?

>> TAL SUTTON: 75%.

>> KEN SCOTT: 75% of 36?

>> SPEAKER: Math.

>> KEN SCOTT: Here's your chance to shine. So they needed 27.

So Becky squeaked by. Everybody passed.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So everybody that was submitted for nomination has been endorsed for emeritus status. That includes Simone, Becky, and Brad. Those names will get passed on to the chancellor's cabinet for approval, and we will hear more about that soon.

Ken?

>> KEN SCOTT: I'm sorry. That was my mistake. Becky only had 25 yes. Actually, Becky did not make the cut. She needed 27. Only got 25.

>> SPEAKER: Can I ask why so many people abstained?

>> KEN SCOTT: It's a closed ballot.

>> SPEAKER: What's that mean? Why would you abstain?

(off microphone.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So, Chuck, I can understand the nature -- I can understand. Chuck, can I give you -- Chuck. Please come back.

There is another --

>> KEN SCOTT: Back to you, Josie.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Just for the purposes of your knowledge,

there is another opportunity. You can submit your nominations to the Executive Leadership Team, so that's another way to -- so if anyone can see Chuck or communicate with Chuck, please let Chuck be aware of that.

Also, this opens again in the fall. So we can see a nomination again in the fall.

Okay. Where are we? Here we go.

I'm just going to quickly tick through these things. Meeting with administration, some highlights. This is a quick one.

Basically we reported the statement that we endorsed last meeting about compensation.

Digital literacy, we brought up that topic again. Dean Jim Craig was there. Dean Jim Craig is here today. We got the sense there is a much more scaled-down commitment to actual, the actual technology that will be implemented. It will be done with care, one step at a time, which I think alleviates a lot of the concerns that were expressed during the last meeting.

And let's see. Educational models. Again, officers discuss this. This relates to the special session.

What else can I say? Officers had this discussion, what would be a great way -- how would be a great way for colleges to go about this? We thought DFC involvement would be really valuable. I know that with the communications specifically the writing DFC we have been seeking input from our faculty regarding what do you understand

about this, what innovative strategies have you seen? We have faculty going to conferences and reporting back, so we are collecting information.

So I would encourage between now and when we meet again in April everyone to reach out to your DFCs, the people you represent, and say, perhaps make this a discussion and try to collect as much information as you can about instructional changes, structural changes, and educational models, if there is anything innovative we should be aware of that other colleges are doing.

So that is that item. Then we have -- because Dean Jim Craig, because you're here, is there anything you'd like to add to the digital literacy piece?

>> JIM CRAIG: Thank you. Just a quick update, so there is some new program management over the digital literacy initiative. Raj M in IT will actually be heading up this initiative going forward.

Like you mentioned, we want to give digital literacy to all the students, but we need to be prudent in our planning and our phasing of all of this, so we are taking a more cautious approach.

I want to thank all of you for your input to help temper where we were going for this and what we should be looking at and in what order and some of the questions and some of the definitions that we still need to define and to explore.

So thank you for that. Also, special thanks to some of the All College Council with Sean and Joe and Brooke for their feedback and

really helping temper where we need to go and how we need to get there. Thank you.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you. Feels like this is a topic in which faculty views were really taken into consideration. So thank you for that. That's just appreciated. We felt like there was -- we were listened to and responded and our concerns were taken seriously. It's very much appreciated.

All right. Now, the last item we covered in our administrative meeting, our meeting with administration, was dean evaluations, and so I'll turn it over to Brooke, because Brooke took this item to the administration a few weeks ago.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Thank you. Before I talk too much about that one, I wanted to piggyback on the educational models, part of the president's report, I think hearing from Morgan is very helpful. It helps us think about the direction of the college.

One thing in particular in our discipline when we gathered feedback, there are several positions that really writing faculty are best suited to fill to serve the college as a whole, and so one of the questions coming up for us, like writing across the curriculum position, position working with writing tutors, dual enrollment positions that don't just serve our department but serve the college and seems like from what I'm hearing from Morgan, if we're talking about the creation of positions that serve the whole college, those kinds of things may be part of that conversation that again from the

DFCs, those are where those conversations are going to emerge.

So I hope that we are able to give that committee feedback in relation to that sort of work.

As far as the dean evaluations go, one thing we brought forward to the administration is the fact that currently there is no process for faculty to provide feedback on how their deans are doing.

So we really feel that there is a great need to be able to provide that feedback on a regular basis. Dolores seemed pretty responsive to that, and so we hope to continue to push that forward. I think this would be a really good forum for us to talk about that need.

Again, we're talking about not just having someone to go to to complain to, like our dean's boss, right? But rather a regular way of providing feedback that's not just negative but can also really highlight our strong deans and the powerful things that they are doing to strengthen our divisions as well as providing a space for us to be able to give feedback on our deans that could help them grow and develop as leaders for us.

So that's one of the things that we talked about.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So we'll expect to hear more about that as we move along.

So I see that Jenny Conway is here. I see Julian Easter are here. We can move backwards and go to AP 3.25.02 revision. I don't know if anyone had questions about that but if you have questions

about that, Jenny is here to answer them.

Are there any questions related to this policy?

>> JEANNIE ARBOGAST: Yeah, I did have one. Why are you limiting the number of degrees? I can't remember the exact phrasing in there.

>> SPEAKER: So there is a concern by a lot of folks -- couple of things. One, financial aid will only cover one degree in a particular area. So if we have our Associate of Arts and multiple concentrations within that. Financial aid only covers one of those because it's based on the major, in this case liberal arts, and not concentrations. So a lot of students wouldn't be able to pay for one.

The second thing is a lot of time students assume that they need another degree, so let's say they were studying anthropology and then they decided, no, I want to go into sociology for my Bachelor's degree. They say, oh, I need to now go get the concentration in sociology, but that's not true.

We often keep students at Pima way longer than they need to be. So we're hoping in part that by limiting the number of degrees, the number of areas that they can pursue, that we move them along to where they need to go.

So if they need to transfer to the U of A in science and they have an Associate of Arts, then it probably makes sense that they need to go back potentially and get an Associate of Science, because the foundational aspects for science need to be done in the first

couple of years before they can move forward.

For almost all Associate of Arts degrees that's not true. They could leave here with almost anything and still be able to get their Bachelor's degree in the last two years at the University.

So part of it is really to help facilitate students moving on to where they need to go. We are not limiting the number of AS degrees a student wants to pursue. So if they wanted to do welding and they want to do paralegal, that's not a problem. But the issue is mostly the transfer.

Other questions? Well, that was easy.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All right.

>> SPEAKER: Thank you much.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Just as a reminder, if you wake up in the middle of the night and wished you had asked a question or clarified something, you can always submit your comments through the public feedback forum.

Guided pathways. We heard about this -- Julian Easter, if you'd like to come up, we first heard about the changes to guided pathways on All Faculty Day, and there was a study session in which Julian and the provost were there and presented on it, and so because there are many questions about it, Julian has agreed to come to senate today and offer and address any questions that might be related.

Would you like to give us an overview and maybe take some questions?

>> JULIAN EASTER: Sure. The main part is as of January, the guided pathways oversight was brought to the provost's office and I was deemed to be the lead on this.

One thing we wanted to do, first of all, was get an idea where we are in pathways, because there was a lot of discussion about have we implemented, are we fully implemented and all this stuff.

A number of us went up to Gateway Community College, and there was a presentation on pathways. Representatives from all over the state were there, because we were all, we found, at different stages of pathways.

So it was good to get up there and hear representatives from the community college resource center as to the direction that we should take with pathways.

So when we left there, we realized that, you know, we're doing okay. We're not perfect. And the gentleman, Dr. Rob Johnstone, said we're not supposed to be perfect.

The way we are going to approach this is like -- we officially really unveiled pathways the fall of '19. I liked the analogy that this person presented. He goes, it's like the Apple or the Android phone when it first came out, version 1.0. Now we're at version 10 or 11 in some respects.

Can anyone remember what version 1.0 of the iPhone looked like? But he said, approach it that way. Yes, the first version of it, and I'm calling it the operationalize that we got things in place. Then

we're going to continue to improve.

So without going back in the past, I know there was a big push to get a lot of things done like sequencing our courses and all this stuff.

So we got that laid out, and so now, as we approach version to get to 2.0, we are looking at what things do we really need to do now to kind of optimize pathways?

We realize that one key issue technology is related, because this goes across the entire spectrum, how we deal with our students in pathways, is that we have to get DegreeWorks up and running. We realize that that is the software that is used as the basis of assisting advisors in the planning of degrees, to track their degrees, progression in their programs, and the like.

And there are other things that need to be done that on the student services side, instruction, advising. So in the long run, to be respectful of time, and you probably saw the short PowerPoint -- does everybody have that one? I can get it out to them. I will send you the presentation that I did at the board study session. It will show the four pillars, how we're going to gauge our progress on pathways and use that as our basis to see where we are.

I really would want you to look at those pillars that we are going to be guiding ourselves on.

So what's happening now is that we have asked the respective deans, program advisors, to get with faculty to look at those

pathways, though sequences that you presented that you had to do in a year, and now look at them and say, do they make sense? How can we review those and improve those?

On the flip side, the advisors, student service side, they will be getting the templates ready so students will be able to see their progress, advisors will be able to monitor progress, and even you as faculty can be monitoring your students' progress within your respective programs.

So we'll keep you abreast on this. And the other thing is important to keep faculty involved in this all the way. I'm not a big fan of creating brand new committees, so what's going to assure faculty input as we move in the pathway, especially with academics and curriculum is utilize the three academic committees that are established. College curriculum council, academic standards, and general, which has representation of all divisions, has representation of senators from this group.

So that is going to be how we're going to ensure that there is continued faculty input and oversight in especially the curriculum process.

We have it ready made, so guided pathways will be a standard item on all the agenda items to be kept up and your representatives will be able to keep this organization apprised of how we're going.

That's kind of quick, but any questions?

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Today we had a meeting with the arts

division, and someone mentioned that you had said that there is -- you're interested in eliminating cross-listed classes, which could be very detrimental to the smaller but still vital programs that require a lot of hands-on instruction.

That's one question. Is that so? Is that a step in that direction?

And the second one is what is the software you mentioned? You said we must get some-such software up and running.

>> JULIAN EASTER: Jenny? MyDegreeWorks? We use different names.

>> SPEAKER: So DegreeWorks is the name of the software. At Pima we call it MyDegreePlan. It's our degree audit system. It's actually been up and running since 2009, but we're in the process of upgrading -- my phone is ringing. Hold on one second.

So we're actually at the newest version, but we are in the process of -- it's called scribing. That's basically programming all of the degree and certificate requirements using the new available programming language that they have in there.

So we have the new version, but we need to upgrade the way we have programmed it so that we can utilize that to its full extent.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Thank you.

>> JULIAN EASTER: And your question about cross-listing, yes, that is a direction that we are going towards, and you used it correctly, interested in, because there will be a lot of discussion.

What will happen is that I know since I have been here there has been issues with cross-listing, which I didn't want to tie up on that discussion, but I'll make sure I will keep the senate involved on that as to why we are looking at that.

But your question, are we interested in moving in that direction?

The answer is yes.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: So will we be able to creatively continue serving the public the way the public would like to be served in another way other than using that term "cross-listing" and still keep those classes going? Particularly in visual arts and fashion design.

>> JULIAN EASTER: Sure. I mean, we're not going to -- I'm trying to see the direction of the class.

If we have courses that are meeting the public's needs, we are not going to do anything to them, but I would challenge how does cross-listing do that. That will be a discussion that we will continue to have.

>> SPEAKER: Nancy H. Same issue, because all of the ESL classes are cross-listed due to Banner restrictions on noncredit and credit. Where does that leave us?

>> JULIAN EASTER: Sure, and those are discussions we'll have as far as are there Banner restrictions because that's Banner or is it because we don't utilize Banner the way it should be?

I came from a Banner school where cross-listing wasn't done, and

there wasn't any impact on classes that were considered vital to the community.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: I'm a little confused. Are we offering cross-listed courses this fall?

>> JULIAN EASTER: Sure. As probably said this would be aim for fall of '21, not this term. So it's plenty of time to discuss and have that conversation. That tends to get lost and what I said was fall of '21, not this fall.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Just to clarify, because this could impact a great many people, there will be no more cross-listed courses at Pima starting fall of 2021?

>> JULIAN EASTER: That is the direction, unless in conversation there is a very valid reason to remain cross-listed.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: And those conversations, would those conversations occur within the CCC?

>> JULIAN EASTER: Well, within the CCC and within affected divisions, too. So, for example, if we have an area that is heavily cross-listed, we will be talking with those divisions or programs very intensely.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So if a course, if it can be justified to offer a cross-listed course, because there may very well be it could hurt our college perhaps to remove some of them, then is there still the possibility those cross-listed courses will be offered?

>> JULIAN EASTER: Yes.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: It's not a one-and-done kind of thing.

>> JULIAN EASTER: That's why when she said interested in, I said interested.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Just wanted to clarify.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Nancy H. Will these discussions take place early on? Because fall schedules are going to have to be in very quickly. I know for 2021, but next year, will those discussions take place early enough that there are going to be alternatives before the fall schedule will be --

>> JULIAN EASTER: Yes, it will. That's why not fall of '20.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Any other questions?

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: Julian, do you know how many courses at Pima are cross-listed once, with one other discipline, how many are cross-listed with three, four, and five? Do you know those numbers?

>> JULIAN EASTER: I don't know that number. I did request a curriculum team to draw that up, and when that list is presented to me, I can answer that question.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: And would there be discussion on whether certain classes could be grandfathered and left alone if there is no detriment -- if it is helpful for students and enrollment and programs, those existing cross-lists would be left alone, or -- say there is a course three ways cross-listed, and if you remove them, each of those disciplines will have to apply to the CCC to become a class noncross-listed? And then the CCC would decide? Or your

office would decide this one, yes, and these two no? The process would be how?

>> JULIAN EASTER: That will be developed.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: That is being developed now?

>> JULIAN EASTER: Right.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: So the divisions -- in our division of liberal arts, social sciences, if an anthro class with an archeology class, for example, is needed cross-listed so those students with low enrollments in archeology but significant graduation successes percentages in those low numbers are needed as a cross-list, then the deans and those faculty members would have a form to apply to keep the cross-list, or is there going to be another pathway to attempt to keep a cross-list?

>> JULIAN EASTER: When it's developed, there will be a process like the example you brought up, that it can -- I hate to use the term "appealed," but justification.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: Like our archeology classes are now world-known, they appeared in the National Geographic as they just went to Egypt and did a great dig, international dig. There was some Egyptian mummies, and a student from Pima was involved in that, but I don't think it would have been possible if that archeology class is lost for lack of enrollment for not being cross-listed.

>> JULIAN EASTER: Uh-huh. Sure. Just like the process which you are aware of when divisions have requested to uncross-list.

Again, it's the same consideration. Uncross-listing being requested, is that detrimental to the students? So far nobody said it is.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: I will end with this. The University uses cross-lists in certain departments and not in others. It's up to each department at the University of Arizona. But they are using it for interdisciplinary degrees over there, and so they justify their cross-lists like that.

For us, do we have anything that we might consider interdisciplinary, freshman/sophomore pathways, where cross-listing would be ideal, in other words, double dipping in those ways where the University of Arizona does that comfortably, or are we losing a chance of being able to do that at Pima if we remove all the cross-lists?

>> JULIAN EASTER: Well, in fact, I just came from University of Arizona, but in another meeting I had, although nobody said public, they have some things cross-listed six to seven ways. But I'm just saying. It's done differently than we do here at Pima, so there is different ways to cross-list. Not necessarily the way Pima is doing it. Because at U of A they make cross-lists but they are still individual courses being taught. Here at Pima, we say cross-list and it's one course with four prefixes or whatever.

So when we say cross-list, there is different models of cross-listing that are done in the country.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: Thank you.

>> JULIAN EASTER: You're welcome.

>> ANTHONY: I have a question. What problem is this getting rid of cross-listing trying to solve? Like, what's the problem that we're solving? That's where I'm getting lost here.

>> JULIAN EASTER: Okay, it's more of the purpose of cross-listing. For example, and I'm just throwing this out there because I never get -- let's just say when I have asked the question of why we are cross-listing, the answers can be very varied.

For example, I might ask if we have three courses that are cross-listed, and they transfer to U of A as one class, why do we need three, okay? And I don't get an answer.

When we get into faculty qualifications that teach the course, that has caused problems in some areas as to who has ownership, who is responsible for the faculty, who does the evaluations and things like that.

And the other thing is, the rationale of trying to keep a class active because of low enrollment is not a reason to keep a class cross-listed.

>> ANTHONY: Okay. Well, I heard a lot of good reasons as to why we cross-list, so if I may, instead of starting with a negative of let's uncross-list everything, why not simply ask the DFCs to present their cross-lists and what they've got and deal with the problems as you see them?

>> JULIAN EASTER: Some people may not interpret as a negative,

because not everybody in this room says cross-listing is a great thing. I just said that's the direction.

I did say we're open for discussion. So there is a possibility, but --

>> ANTHONY: I guess it's a matter of approach. Sometimes I see a lot of things that are, like, this is what we're doing and the reaction is defensive, whereas instead if you say, hey, can you explain to me what courses you have in your discipline that are cross-listed and why they are, it just becomes off as an encouraging, as a discussion, as a promoting of me explaining why --

>> JULIAN EASTER: Sure. And I would say it's a perspective. I mention it to other faculty and they go, thank you. In their perspective, they feel it's a positive.

It just depends where you are when this is stated. Yes, I have had faculty support the uncross-listing. They see it as a positive and not necessarily a negative approach.

>> ANTHONY: No, no. I mean saying broad hammer, slice, we're going to cut all the grass down to this level, as an administrative technique, I think it causes more problems than it solves instead of just saying, hey, why don't you just ask the deans to ask their faculty to send you a piece of paper that says here's what we've got?

Not to call you out on this, but you couldn't answer the question of how many we've got. So we don't know the scope of the problem.

Right?

>> JULIAN EASTER: Okay. Well, the answer is not based on the number we have. It's should we be doing it, anyway.

>> ANTHONY: Well, I think it is, because -- I mean, what's the problem we're trying to solve? How big a problem is it? How much time are we investing in it? I think strategically as an institution these are concerns we should be asking about everything we do.

>> JULIAN EASTER: It will be. And if this was a topic on the agenda today, I would have come ready to talk about it, but pathways was the only thing I was going to talk about.

So... no, no, I mean, because this is a whole separate discussion.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Jenny? I assume you have knowledge of cross-listing. Because the cross-listing has dominated our discussion of the pathways, do you have anything to add that could perhaps address some of the concerns and questions addressed?

>> SPEAKER: I don't know that I can address the concerns.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Or to speak to? I think the questions that Anthony brought up, which is what's the problem? What are we trying to solve? How widespread do we cross-list?

>> SPEAKER: Off the top of my head, I don't know how many courses we cross-list. I would say there is definitely more than 10 and less than 50. Right now I can't narrow it down more than that. In the past couple of years we have gotten rid of a few courses. Some have been uncross-listed in this past year.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So somewhere between 10 and 50. And in terms of the problems related to cross-listing?

>> SPEAKER: So from my perspective in my office, there is issues. It's just -- somehow having two courses is less work than having two courses that are cross-listed, because you have to have two courses and you always have to make sure that they are tied together.

When we do the programming for MyDegreePlan, the cross-listing comes up and it's an issue. It's not that things can't be done. It is more time-consuming when there are cross-listed courses and when there are not. So it's not an insurmountable problem. It's just additional work added.

The cost benefit ratio, honestly, for me when I try to make decisions I try to figure out what is in the best interest of students. From my perspective, and I could be wrong, but for at least 90% of the cross-listed courses, I don't know if there is an additional benefit to students by having courses cross-listed.

There may be a perceived benefit but not a real benefit. So I think students may say, oh, I'm an anthropology major, so I want to make sure I take a course that's ANT prefix as opposed to an archaeology major.

But again, like Julian mentioned, if courses transfer to the University as the same course, the prefix they take at Pima has no bearing on how it's going to apply towards their degree. It doesn't

have a bearing on how it applies to their degree at Pima, so what is the benefit to students by having courses that are cross-listed?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: One that comes to my mind would be opportunity, because in some cases cross-listing can ensure that the class runs whereas if it was not cross-listed there is a large possibility it would not run. So that helps to facilitate diversity amongst our course offerings, open up some opportunities for students.

I mean, I'm just recognizing that that is one that students may not think to acknowledge, but that is definitely a benefit to our curriculum as a whole.

>> SPEAKER: And it is possible that what you just said is the case. I have never seen any evidence that by having courses with two different prefixes it's going to guarantee there is more students who are going to enroll in the course.

If a student wants to take a course and it's offered only as anthropology and not anthropology and archaeology and GIS and GEO, I'm not sure why a student would be less open to taking that course. Especially if it's required for their program. I mean, they need to take this course. If it's for personal interest, I would think they would take it based on the title of the course and the description of the course, not the prefix of the course.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We are almost out of time, we are out of time on this item, but seeing as how there has been so many questions, I

see at least one more question, so Anthony? Sarah?

>> SPEAKER: I just wanted to give a concrete example real quick.

>> ANTHONY: Well, that's better than mine.

>> SPEAKER: I teach philosophy of religion. It has 15 students

enrolled. Half of them came from religion, half from philosophy.

That course would not be able to run anymore. We would not be able to offer it.

So that would be a concern. You would just lose the course.

There wouldn't be sufficient enrollment, right?

So half the students are searching for the course because they want to take a religion course, right? Half of the students are searching for the course because they want to take a philosophy course. That would be the concern. Right?

Some students may have never heard of philosophy of religion, but they want to take a religion course.

So that kind of situation I think is a concern.

>> JULIAN EASTER: Sure.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Is that in relation to Sarah's comment?

>> SPEAKER: Yes. Mike Nolan. To piggyback on that, the entire visual arts program in a way serves both the community and transfer to U of A and other colleges. In other words, we are running at painting 1, 2, and 3 and that class wouldn't run unless we had numbers from the community taking a painting 2 class -- pardon me, taking a painting 3 class, and also half the students being a

transfer class.

If we got rid of the cross-listing classes, we wouldn't have that class run altogether. We'd be out of those numbers and we wouldn't be serving the community, and also those students wouldn't be able to transfer based on that section not being offered.

>> JULIAN EASTER: But I think painting 1, 2, 3 are three

distinct courses. You just teach them at the same time?

>> SPEAKER: Right.

>> JULIAN EASTER: Where I came from, that was called an overlay

where you could have --

>> SPEAKER: We call it cross-listing.

>> JULIAN EASTER: So there is different definitions of

cross-listing here, then. See?

>> SPEAKER: Can we get a manual with the listings?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I have heard that as called stacked courses.

So stacking is still permissible.

>> JULIAN EASTER: Oh, yeah.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We can still stack but not cross-list, which

would be different disciplines.

>> SPEAKER: That's good to know. Is there a dictionary with all

these terms?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Jenny is sitting right over there in the

corner.

Anyway, the time is up on this. I was just referencing you,

Jenny, because you are our reference for curriculum.

The intent of this item was to be guided pathways, and it ended up being cross-listing. So before you leave, Julian, what can we expect in terms of being of the transparency of the guided pathways process moving forward and how we can stay involved and what is happening?

>> JULIAN EASTER: Like I said, the key way to stay involved is going to be like -- I like getting out general information to all faculty, but also your reps that are here on these committees and I talk to all reps, expected to bring the immediate feedback to their respective divisions or organizations, so -- also, it's a standing item on the monthly leadership meetings, too. So we'll keep -- we will probably overcommunicate, but it's better to do that than --

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I think it's such a broad, big thing. It's difficult to have a presentation at a meeting and get into the specifics, like we saw what happened today with just one specific tangentially related, so I think it's going to have concerns associated with it. It's going to have concerns related to losing courses, losing diversity in our courses. As much as we can know about it, you know, more knowledge is what we'll need.

Anyway, thank you. I think we'll move on to the next item.

>> JULIAN EASTER: All right. Thank you.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So we are to our reports, I believe. We are starting with the PCCEA report so that Matej is not the one who keeps

us away from grading.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Hey, everyone. If you'll bear with me, kick me out if I'm too much over my time.

So I think the main concern these days is really this new instructional structure team exploration. Lots of -- all faculty and administrators I have talked to about it were confused. I was on the phone with the provost this morning, and she reassured that she would like to see faculty input, AERC, Faculty Senate, but I'm not sure how that's all working through.

I again have to call attention to the fact that the chancellor has some ideas apparently about the future of instruction here at Pima Community College to potentially divide up faculty into, you know, graders and teaching assistants who teach sort of canned curriculum and sort of curriculum coordinators. So our students wouldn't have, like, real professors to work with that that they have a relationship with, something like that.

I cannot underscore how I think that is not the vision for our future and that it's really going to have a detrimental effect on our daily jobs, on our pay ultimately, because of course it hooks up with the class and compensation study, right? And it most importantly really on the quality of experience for our students, right?

So I think much broader conversation have to happen. I'm really disappointed at this -- it's really a threat. Well, we would like input from you, but really we can do whatever we want because we have

management rights and board policy where we can create all these new positions that are totally different and close all of your positions, right?

There is still board policy that requires any kind of -- we would still have to develop a new handbook for these kinds of positions, and that's where board policy still requires some significant input.

At least for PCCEA's sake, we'll go to all lengths to make sure that that actually happens. But be aware that this is the kind of ship that is setting sail, and it will be sailing and it will be said that they had input from some hand-picked group of people that was announced three days ago.

So again, like I said, I don't think this general idea is bad the way that it's presented, but I do not have the confidence that that is the full picture. We really need to be vigilant and kind of figure out where this is going and what the goals are and what sort of our red lines are, and then stand up early enough to potentially be opposed to this in some major way.

Why are we doing this? The chancellor told the board because it will allow us to look differently at our cost structure. So right there tells you what that's all about.

I'm really -- I'm still hoping that the AERC or we will be making sure that the AERC is somehow involved with this.

Regarding the budget compensation and sort of tuition increase issue, we will be having a resolution team meeting next Friday to

talk with David Bea a little bit about more details -- you can see my e-mail from February that I sent out with some of these issues. I don't think we will make any huge headway, don't expect steps or anything this year, but we can talk a little bit about what the projected availability is for COLAs and things like that.

The board chair, Demion Clinco, at the last study session said that the board wants to hear from the faculty, from employees, students, everybody, about this tuition and budget issue. I would encourage you all to provide some feedback. You can e-mail them, you can make a public comment. Next regular meeting is next Wednesday at 5:30.

At that study session, the chancellor said that he has identified some programs for probable closures and he would like to have board support on that. These would not be just positions but very painful reality with people and students involved in this.

He specifically mentioned programs where graduates do not make much more above minimum wage or some phrasing like that, which I have no -- or PCCEA has no information on this, so I would love to see the analysis again which we still haven't seen from the positions that were closed last fall for does this make financial sense if we have students enrolling in some programs where there is a community need for them but maybe aren't making a whole lot of money afterwards, and we're getting FTSE and the classes are full, why would we not continue doing that?

But again, I don't know what this involves. It sounds like they want to have a decision by the April 1st board meeting, so programs should be hearing from people, I suppose, pretty soon. I haven't heard any announcements, but this was what was discussed at the study session, and I think you should be aware.

There is also an expanded use of this Ad Astra scheduling software you have been hearing about or been working with a little bit. The college is looking into expanding something that has this very well-marketed name, Platinum Analytics, where it's some kind of software that recommends on what sections ran low, that we shouldn't schedule those anymore.

There appears to be some kind of plan I haven't heard about or just heard sort of secondhand of reducing 200 CRNs perhaps this way, and we got some reports that's already happening, and without consulting department heads, a bunch of sections were taken off of the fall schedule based apparently on some, you know, flawed obviously AI that we just started using.

And so, please, department heads, make sure you're working with your deans and Lamata Mitchell, who is now overseeing all the deans, to make sure we are making rational decisions based on some human decisions too. I love we are trying to leverage all these new tools, but in a typical Pima way, the way we are going about it, great idea but sounds like the implementation so far is lacking, for lack of a better term.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So related to that last item, because I have heard concerns about the Ad Astra software, and I think people are just discovering that courses that have been planned for fall have been deleted from the fall schedule. I just heard about this last night, and I'm finding -- people are discovering it.

So can you clarify what you just said? Is that a technology error or intentional and these courses are not going to be offered?

From what you know. Do you know anything more than we do?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: I do not know anything.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: You do not does anyone? Anthony, can you speak to that?

>> ANTHONY: Yeah, I can speak to it, because I got an e-mail from my dean about it, that these were -- there were a bunch of classes that were identified, because I guess Platinum Analytics, but Lamata, the decision was made to cancel some.

And so I received an e-mail that said we're going to cancel some classes, and then they canceled some, and it didn't make sense to me, the ones that they canceled, so I pushed back on it. Lamata said, oh, that was a mistake so that got fix interested my particular issue.

I would encourage you to take a close look at what was actually canceled and then what I did is I went -- I still had the proof of schedule from past fall and I went on the day it started to see if it was right, if there wasn't a whole lot of folks.

The one they ended up canceling made sense for my department.
And I didn't have the full face-to-face picture. So there was that.
But these are intentional, but it doesn't mean that a mistake didn't
happen along the way.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So when you're communicating notes from
senate, make sure that department heads know to check the schedule
for fall to ensure that it aligns with expectations, because no one
wants surprises in the fall related to courses people were expecting
to teach and courses that were expected to be offered.

I didn't mean to digress too much. I just wanted to clarify
that. Again, this is something that's breaking news.

Jenny? Rita? We'll return to Matej.

>> SPEAKER: Jenny H. So yesterday when I pulled my report to
compare it with the weeks before report, there were obvious classes
missing. Some of those were classes that were staffed with full-time
instructors.

So when I worked with my dean and sent a query to my scheduler,
it became obvious that I found there were five ECE and EDU courses
deleted. Had I been contacted or any consultation been done, I would
have assured those would have not been full-time sections. Our
sections all have already been staffed for the fall, so it was quite
a bit problematic for me. I'm scrambling, but we'll get ahead of it.
It was done Thursday night, from what I heard, a minimum of 200 CRNs
to save a half a million dollars.

>> SPEAKER: Rita. One of the problems I was wanting to raise was Anthony had mentioned he heard this from his dean. I haven't heard it from my dean, so this is another issue that we have with our leadership where some of the information gets sent out to some of the department leaders. Some doesn't.

I'm scrambling to my next-door neighbor who is in accounting and asking, did you get this information? And sometimes she's asking me, did you get this information?

This is a problem that we need to raise and mention that, you know, sometimes Anthony is getting this stuff from Jan but I'm not getting it from Brian. Sorry, Jim, you're here, but accounting is not getting it from Jim all at the same time.

What do we do about that? When we don't know it's happening, we can't do anything about it. We can't stop it from happening. That's an issue.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Perhaps the instructional structure team can resolve that problem, because I think we have been pointing it out and dealing with it for a long time, the inconsistency and the spread, the communication. It would be simpler if it all came from one source. That way we can ensure everyone receives the information who needs it.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: A few more items but hopefully much shorter.

I have some unwelcomed news regarding the professional enrichment reserve fund. If you recall, those used to be the campus funds for

faculty professional development. If people don't use up their personal funds when they accumulate, they kind of spill over into this reserve fund.

Until now, well, until last summer, actually, it was, you know, faculty money to be applied for by full-time faculty for initiated professional development activities, or if you had, you weren't meeting performance expectations and your supervisor would require some professional development, that was the kind of, kinds of uses that it was intended for.

There is a faculty committee that takes applications, and there is some rules around that and limits, and you kind of apply for funds once you've run out of your own funds.

After public comments last summer the college inserted a sentence where it basically allows the college to allocate these funds to any kind of other professional development activities that benefit the college or something like that. So essentially now it's not faculty money. Now it's the college's money to do with as they please, and what they think is important professional development.

So I think -- you know, I don't have any concerns about our provost, current provost using it for anything inappropriate. I'm definitely open at looking at other uses of that money, but there need to be some guidelines and that committee needs to be involved in that.

For months we have been trying to go back and forth in the AERC

to kind of establish some guidelines for this use, but we were not successful. Yeah, so as it stands, you know, you can still apply for the money, and I would encourage everybody to do it, but it's not our money anymore.

The counselors who were recently reclassified as staff, it was announced that they would be held harmless, but it turns out all the nine-month counselors are being asked to work 12 months now but only being paid for 11 months. It's a clear cut, it's a big cut in the rate of pay.

The kicker is 12-month counselors aren't being asked to take that same kind of pay cut. Just like an arbitrary criterion like that. Thanks to counselors who spoke up about it, they weren't afraid, their HR is looking at it now, it's going to take some weeks to figure this out, but fortunately we have heard about it and we're trying to address it.

So just to kind of show you how a reclassification can go at Pima Community College.

The Arizona House passed a bill HB 2790 to potentially allow community colleges to offer four-year degrees. This is moving into a crucial stage in the senate this week and next week.

It's pretty brief language, and it really only opens the door if community colleges would like to offer four-year degrees. Lots and lots of considerations, potential upsides, downsides for students and for colleges. I think it would be especially great if we had more

affordable option, especially for our rural students here so they wouldn't have to move to the cities, perhaps offer some more courses in like some degrees in Santa Cruz that are especially needed there down by Nogales.

Our chancellor doesn't -- if it does pass and it's far from certain, our chancellor doesn't plan to offer four-year degrees. I think we have a lot going on already and I don't have a whole lot of confidence we could pull this off right now. There is potential, competition for resources. There is no extra funding for this from the state, so, you know, people are kind of on the fences about it.

Universities are opposed, obviously. The Maricopa Community College 's administration and faculty are in support and are working to get some support. PCCEA aren't taking any position. This is just an information item. If you have any views, I would encourage you all to contact your lawmakers in the senate now especially.

I think some of that Southern Arizona folks are also kind of on the fences, so it still could make a difference.

Just a reminder, there is no student feedback in courses this year. The college is going to a new system and retiring class climate. If you want, you can still do your own surveys, Google forums or free tools out there. I have done that in the past to get informal feedback from my students. So something you might want to think about.

There is a TLC workshop monday the 16th, if you're around for

spring break, thanks to Mays and TLC for organizing that. And All Faculty meeting the Friday after spring break on March 27. These are tumultuous times. I really think we can get through this together if we speak up for what we think is right and, you know, how we think that the future at Pima should look like.

So this will be 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. here, Downtown, Monday, March 27. Hope to see some of you.

Any questions?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: One question and then we will move on to our next report.

>> KEN SCOTT: What was the document that you referenced in regards to the enrichment?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: It's in the employee handbook. There is a section, a policy called faculty professional development. Under there, on, like, the last page or two, it talks about these enrichment reserve funds.

>> KEN SCOTT: Thank you.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All right. That conference that Matej was talking about is called the Unconference. The Unconference. I will be leading a session, Unconference Unwind with some yoga and meditation and breathing, which I know some of you might enjoy, appreciate. Feel free to join.

We next have our Governing Board report, and Brooke is here to present the Governing Board report.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Good afternoon, everyone. Man, 3:15. We're running over.

But you have all received my report. So I won't read it to you verbatim. I have just two information items I will be including, and then we have our statement about compensation and tuition that I'll be reading. Sean and I were just talking about how the adjuncts will also be speaking to that at the board meeting, which is really important.

I want to sort of follow up on what Matej was saying. We are representatives and we are there, and I can say this is what we voted for, but we're just the representatives of the body. So if we really want to make an impression about any of these points, we need people showing up to the meeting and making open forum comments. That's what's going to get the board's attention, and that's where you can add the context behind the statement, right? Because the statement itself, I can say a little bit about the context behind our decision and why we are saying this statement in particular, but it's going to resonate more, and the board is going to be able to do more to support us if they're hearing from individual faculty, as well, so that they really can't ignore our concerns about compensation as well as tuition.

I just encourage everyone to come. Anyone who feels passionately about this particular issue. This is a really important issue and this is a really important meeting. Please, please come prepared to

make an open forum comment to have our voices heard about this issue.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Brooke, just to clarify, the public comment section is early on?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: That's right.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So not saying you don't have to stay the whole time, but you wouldn't have to stay the whole -- I mean, just know that the public comment period is early on.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: True. Very true.

And then I'm really going to stress this time around the faculty role in things like winning the Bellwether. So you see in my report I've got extensive information about DeLisa and Darla and their role in the Bellwether award that we just won, and so really what I want to stress at the board meeting is that, you know, this work is faculty work that we're winning awards for, and it's because of the faculty that we are the powerful institution that we are.

It's really, really, really critical that we are recognized in meaningful ways and given the credit that we deserve. I'm going to make sure to spend a significant amount of time emphasizing that this month.

So, yeah, so please do -- I have some TLC highlights in here to back up what Jessie was just saying. We do have the Unconference coming up. That should be a really wonderful event. And D2L essential trainings they have going for us, as well, that are useful, teaching and learning center events.

Then I have the invitation, open invitation for the board members to come to senate and see what it is that we're doing here and the concerns that we have and the issues that we discuss.

Thank you. Any questions, comments, discussion on any of this?

>> SPEAKER: Rita. I wanted to know if the board members have mentioned coming or do they grumble? Do they look at you when you say it?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: No. And I will admit sometimes I think I forget to actually orally say it, so there hasn't been much response and I'm going to be vigilant to make sure to orally say it, as well, as well as not just have it in the report.

But I have heard no signs of board members coming or planning to come.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Maybe we should go to the board.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Yeah. Thank you.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you, Brooke. Thank you for communicating all of these, all of the issues that arise in senate. It's a big job, and we appreciate just how much work you put into it. Very much appreciated.

We have one more report, and then we can get back to grading.

>> KATE SCHMIDT: I think everybody got the report digitally; is that correct? I have a couple more paper copies here.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Should be attached here.

>> KATE SCHMIDT: I don't think there was anything earth

shattering in this month's report from the provost. I did want to point out two things. Matej and his team worked pretty diligently I think about a year ago to talk about this issue of leapfrogging. Matej can explain it better than I can. I think it came up in the last senate admin meeting. There was still some confusion about that, so Dolores wanted to put that information in.

That is the idea annually HR will be looking at faculty salaries and adjusting them for years of service so that if someone comes in we hire brand new with 16 years of service, and you had only four when you started and now -- I'm going to get the math wrong. You have been here 12 more years. You're not going to have somebody who is newly hired coming in at a higher salary. There will be regular adjustments on that. There is a formula for that. They wrote up a standard operating procedure so that gets examined every year.

The second, I want to give a shoutout to Hernan. This was your input, you noted that the way the names were listed in Attendance Tracker, is this correct, was ordered differently than they are in D2L? First name, last name, last name, first name.

Michael Tulino was able to make that shift about a week ago. Even though it seems not usually recommended to make a change in the middle of a semester, we couldn't see any downside to that on.

At least now when you're doing grades in Attendance Tracker, you should be able to visually see that they're all in the same order.

Minor change, but hopefully it will save you a few seconds as you're

doing those administrative duties.

>> SPEAKER: Hernan. It helps a lot taking attendance.

>> KATE SCHMIDT: Great. I'm glad to hear that.

I know it's a challenging time and we are going through lots of change and doing a lot of planning together, and then we get COVID-19 in the middle of it, but I took a lot of notes since I was here in Dolores' absence. I'll be sure to share your concerns with her when I get a chance to connect with her.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Again, please -- are you making a motion? Before that, just please, as I noted earlier, do plan to stay here an extra hour in April, and I'll be in touch... Tal, someone has asked me to ask for refreshments or if we do have a special session in April, someone has asked me to ask for refreshments. (Laughter.)

>> KATE SCHMIDT: Looks like you're asking me.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Since you're representing the provost, I guess... you know, Red Vines maybe? (Laughter.)

>> KATE SCHMIDT: A sweet and savory option?

>> SPEAKER: Yes. Thank you.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Pop Rocks? (Laughter.)

So please do plan to stay. There is going to be lots of really good candy, it sounds like. And that's all I wanted to add was just leave that in your heads.

I believe Anthony had a motion.

>> ANTHONY: Motion to adjourn.

>> SPEAKER: Second.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All in favor?

(Ayes.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All opposed?

See you in April. Have a wonderful weekend and enjoy spring
break.

(Adjournment.)

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

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