Faculty Senate March 2019 MINUTES

Meeting called by	Josie Milliken, President @ 1:08 pm		Note taker	Rita Lennon, Secretary (absent) Minutes taken from video and Lisa Werner's notes
			Timekeeper	Tanya Preusser
Type of meeting	Monthly Meeting			Sergeant at Arms /Logistics Officer

SENATOR ATTENDANCE

SENATOR NAME	REPRESENTING	Present?
Josie Milliken	President & DT Writing & Reading	Yes
Taliesin Sutton	Vice President and EC Mathematics and Engineering	Yes
Brooke Anderson	Faculty BOG Representative , and DT Social Sciences	Yes
Sean Mendoza	Adjunct Faculty Representative and CC Adjunct at Large	No (Proxy)
Rita Lennon	Secretary and NW Allied Health	No (Proxy)
Tanya Preusser	Sergeant at Arms, Logistics Officer, and District Counseling/STU	Yes
Community		
Kimlisa Duchicela	Senator at Large for Arts, Communications, Business, Mathematics, Sciences, Technology, World Languages and Social Sciences	Yes
Desert Vista		
Susan Kuklin	Senator at Large for Aviation, Communications, Humanities, Languages, Reading, Culture, Culinary, Business, Computer Information, Social and Cultural Sciences	Yes
Jeannie Arbogast	Mathematics	Yes
Jeanne Yarab	Adjunct at Large	No
Teddi Schnurr	Education	Yes
Cori Leonetti	Science and Fitness	Yes
District Wide		
Joe Brewer	District Librarians	Yes
Lisa Grenier	Staff Instructors and Adult Basic Education	Yes
Downtown		
Barbara Fox	Adjunct at Large	No
Alexis Osorio	Arts and Humanities	No
Skylar Webb	Automotive Technology	Yes
John Gerard	Building and Construction Technology	No (Proxy)
Ken R. Scott	Business	Yes

Matej Boguszak	Mathematics	No
Gwen Gorbette	Paralegal	No
Dennis Just	Sciences	No
Mayra Cortes-Torres	Senator at Large for English, World Languages and Translation, CAD, Interior Design, Office Technology Systems, Welding & Machine Tool Technology	Yes
East		
Michelle Mathews	Adjunct at Large	No
Brandy (Wright) Randolph	Emergency Services and Related Technologies	No
Mays Imad	Humanities, Arts, and Fitness	Yes
Vacant	Life and Physical Sciences	N/A
Kyley Segers	Senator at Large for Business, Travel, Communications, Computer Sciences, Languages and Social & Cultural Studies	No
Northwest		
Paulo Sudhaus	Adjunct at Large	No (Proxy)
Elena Grajeda	Languages and the Arts	Yes
Inoka Otero	Mathematics	No
Noah Fay	Sciences	Yes
Randy Munsen	Social and Behavioral Sciences	Yes
Diann Porter	Senator at Large for Biology, Wellness, Professions and Occupations, Written and Oral Communication	Yes
West		
Nancy Hamadou	Academic Skills	Yes
Hernant Aubert	Adjunct at Large	Yes
MaryKris Mcilwaine	Behavioral Sciences	Yes
Steve Mackie	Biology	No
Donald Kavanagh	Chemistry	No
Jackie Kern	Nursing	Yes
Carol Christofferson	Performing Arts	Yes
Karie Meyers	Physical Sciences	Yes
Margarita Youngo	Social Sciences	Yes
Rosa Morales	Social Services	Yes
Lazaro Hong	Technology	Yes
Michael Nolan	Visual Arts	Yes
Lisa Werner	Senator at Large for Allied Health Professions, Computer Sciences, Dental Studies, Digital Arts, Fitness and Sports Sciences, Writing, Mathematics & Engineering	Yes

INTRODUCTIONS, AGENDA MODIFICATIONS AND SHORT ANNOUNCEMENTS

Time allotted | 10 minutes | Agenda topic *Topic* | Presenter *open*

Introductions: Senator Introductions

Request for open forum or executive session: No requests

Short Announcements: Reminder of the Powwow tomorrow; details can be found here. Also reminder of the Speaking Out Workshop; details can be found here.

BUSINESS

Time allotted | 55 minutes | Agenda topic *Details below* | Presenter *Details below*

a. **Approval of February Minutes (5 minutes) - Josie Milliken**
   Motion to approve February minutes was initiated and seconded by Senators on the floor.

Voice Vote: Majority Yay, 0 Nay, 2 Abstentions

   February 2019 Minutes approved

b. Mandatory Training Letter
   This detailed letter, signed by the Communications department, outlines an argument to reduce mandatory training requirements for PT faculty, eliminating aspects of training which are not pertinent to their current position. The senate officers met and discussed and agreed that the letter should be presented to senators with an option to endorse or not.
   Comments:
   Diann Porter – prepared a statement "Faculty Senate supports the proposal in the letter from the Department Heads in the Communication Division regarding reduction in mandatory training for PT Faculty."
   Motion from Senator on floor to endorse the letter and the prepared statement, seconded – open for discussion
   Hernant Aubert: Constituents from his campus have inquired if there will be compensation for the mandatory training?
   Vote to endorse the letter and the statement:

Hand Vote: 32 Yay, 0 Nay, 1 Abstentions

c. **Policy System and Process Overview** (10 minutes) - Jeff Silvyn and Seth Shippee
   Jeff Silvyn Presentation: Numbering system was revamped once several new staff came on board a few years ago and looking at the then current numbering system, couldn't understand it. They decided to adopt a new numbering system hoping it would be more coherent.
   Board Policy numbering: the 1st number represents the main topic. For example, the 1st BP relates to the board itself or an overarching college-wide issue or topic. BP topics falling under two (2) relate to the Chancellor, topics under three (3) refer to topics concerning academics and student affairs. The

idea was to link the APs to the BP's numbering system. Therefore, all APs referring to curriculum, academic or student affairs begin with the same three numbers found in the BP (for example 3.25) with additional numbers to follow. The Board Policies are the big goals of the college, or the standards set by the college while the Administrative Procedures set the framework and direct how the goals or standards will be implemented.

What has been discovered, however, as BP or AP have been modified or deactivated is that topics weren't grouped coherently originally, which has caused the need to renumber APs. A future effort will be to renumber and better group APs to the appropriate BP.

Comments:

What explains the large gaps in numbers? Is it that over the years certain policies have been retired, merged or modified? Answer: Yes, over the years, those scenarios have occurred and caused what was a perfect numbering system to now appear disjointed, which is why a project to renumber and regroup is necessary.

Will you be discussing policies "below" the APs? Answer: that wasn't the main point of our discussion, but we can provide some insight after our presentation, if time permits.

Seth Shippee presentation: Seth shared a schematic explaining how a proposed new or revised BP or AP from any office, unit or department is reviewed, assigned and completed. If the AP or BP is brand new, it is assigned a number corresponding to the topic above. The department/division/unit or office initiating the proposal becomes the sponsoring unit and works with stakeholders on a new draft. The draft is reviewed by the Chancellor's office and by legal. Once the draft has been reviewed, it is then posted for public comment for 21 days. Following 21-day review period, changes are made, if necessary, and reviewed once again by the chancellor's office and legal. The 21-day public review occurs just once during the process. The final draft is prepared by the sponsoring unit, submitted once more to legal and the chancellor's office and presented/submitted to the board for final approval. The board is **<u>informed</u>** of new/revised AP at the next regular board meeting, they do not vote on them. New or substantially revised BPs are presented to the board as an action item, and the board must vote to approve them.

Minor BP changes are, like APs, in that they are added to the Board's agenda to inform, but the board doesn't vote.

Comments:

Agree that some APs do not seem to fit under the topic and encourage revamping to occur. Also, as some APs are moved to an SOP, there is great concern that they will no longer be reviewed by the college's governance groups. Also, because various sponsoring units are drafting BP and APs, they read very differently and do not have any standard structure. Recommendation to have a template to provide guidance concerning structure and a checklist to demonstrate what the AP/BP should include. Answer: The idea is that APs explain all the departments involved in implementation, oversight and review while a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) provides a step-by-step process in completing such tasks. It is true that SOPs will not follow the current governance process (review), but ideally the AP should mention corresponding SOP.

The "P" within the AP stands for Procedure, however many of the APs are defining systems, not procedures.

Several APs are scheduled for removal from the sponsoring unit, of which quite a few have to do with curriculum.   It is the senate's concern that if they are moved to an SOP, meaning no governance review, how will senate be able to oversee curricular manners mandated by the HLC? Can sponsoring unit be anyone, such as faculty senate? Answer: Anyone can suggest, but only departments (not committees, workgroups, etc.) can draft a BP/AP.

How long, on average, does it take the college to draft workable APs from a new or revised BP?

Answer: There's no rule of thumb for this procedure, however, most of the time the sponsoring unit has drafted a BP and the corresponding AP together and they go through the process at the same time.

Can you explain the connection of an SOP to say a handbook? Answer: there is no true college definition, but if there is a handbook, it should be discussed within the AP. The handbook then explains how to become a member, a list of members and operating procedures.

d. **Policy Review with Summary (20 minutes)**

   a. BP 3-40 - Julian Easter
   b. AP 3.25.02 - Julian Easter
   c. AP 3.25.03 - Julian Easter
      The current members on the CCC do not reflect the reorganization changes within the college. The AP has been revised to reflect current divisions/departments in order to ensure proper representation.
   d. AP 3.25.07 - Julian Easter
      This is an AP that describes a manual, not a procedure. In fact, the most important manual, the catalog, does not have an AP dedicated to it.
      Comments:
      Although it is true that the current AP defines a manual, not a procedure, deleting the AP creates a gap. What should be publicly available is an AP outlining curriculum procedures. What Jeff explained is that an AP should exist if it involves multiple areas of the college. We are not disputing that the curriculum manual should exist as an SOP because those are the steps the curriculum office takes, but there are steps that other areas of the college interact with the curriculum office. This is a clear example of multiple operational units within the college interacting with each other based on the legal department's definition of an AP to provide transparency for that process.
   e. AP 3.25.09 - Julian Easter
      Curriculum office AP. The current AP is not a procedure yet defines the purpose of the curriculum office and explains that additional responsibilities of the office can be found in the Procedures Manual. The sponsoring unit recommends deletion of this AP.
   f. AP 3.40.01 - Julian Easter
      New AP to clarify the terminology of a grade (A, B, C, D, F) and a registration status ("I" or "W"). Also, this AP recommends the use of "W". This discussion will continue in April meeting.
   g. AP 9.01.07 - Kurt Meyers
      Update of the AP for technical guidelines. General Council and members of the Information Security group will approve the process, currently the Chancellor approves.

   h. AP 9.01.08 - Kurt Meyers
      Information management standard ensures data is confidential, data integrity and available to the "right people at the right time."   Access depends on employee responsibilities. A handbook/manual will be developed.
      Comments:
      Will there be training? Yes
      When will the manuals be developed?

e. **Curriculum Update (5 minutes) - Julian Easter**
   In order to update processes and launch a management system, the curriculum office will only accept critical curriculum changes.

f. **Election Update (5 minutes) - Tal Sutton**

Officers will now be allocated by division rather than campus. Concerns of smaller disciplines losing their voice within a larger division are noted, but the hope is that divisions will work together to ensure all constituents are heard and provide a diverse constituency. At large positions will also be opened if there is minimal representation for one of the smaller campuses. Also, this ensures that there is no undue burden to smaller disciplines who may only have 1 or 2 full time faculty members (in addition to the large amount of work small divisions must do, you must also sit on multiple committees). If that is not the case, then revisions may need to occur. Tal asked for several volunteers to look at a survey he created to ensure that it captures appropriate data about division representation and to determine who will be running for senate seats from each division. Senator Volunteers include: Joe Brewer, Lisa Grenier, Rosa Morales

g. **Senate Committees:** **Senate Committees: Membership & 2019 Goals**

Thank you to those serving on a committee, and for providing up-to-date information about members and goals. If you are on a senate committee and have not yet updated the committee info, please try to do so by the April 5, 2019 meeting.

Senate Comments:

Are Standing Committees still under the FS purview?

We are uncertain at this time but will likely need to add this as an agenda item for FS officer's meeting with leadership.

Membership desperately needs to be updated for all standing committees!

h. **President's Report (15 minutes) – Josie Milliken**

   a. Faculty Senator Officers Meeting with Administration, 01/28

   b. Faculty Senator Officers Meeting with Administration, 02/20

   Technology and Faculty Allocation were discussed. Josie will supply meeting minutes once they become available.

   c. CDAC Evolution Update

   The handbook draft was sent, and Josie is collecting comments/feedback. Common comments include diverse perspectives about dean, PT & FT voting powers. Please be sure to share with constituents and collect feedback. The more faculty who see/comment, the more information the committee will have to make final changes. A supplement FAQ document has been requested, a subcommittee may be formed (a request has been made) in order to facilitate the creation of this document. Send comments/feedback to Jennie Conway @ jscott@pima.edu and carbon copy Josie @ jlmilliken@pima.edu. Jennie is extremely responsive and dedicated!! Thank you for going above and beyond

   d. Speakers' Series, March 5

   This will be the last Speakers' Series so please attend if you can!

REPORTS

Time allotted | 30 minutes | Agenda topic *Details below* | Presenter *Details below*

a. **Provost's Report (10 minutes) - Dolores Duran Cerda**

Please review the Provost's report. Notable topics include:

- The provost attended the State of the City luncheon earlier today, the mayor mentioned PCC and how vital the college is to the community.
- Deepest condolences to faculty and employees who recently passed away.
- All Arizona Academic Team: 12 students were recently recognized and received scholarships (waiver) in order to attend any of the AZ state university. Students were recognized for academic achievement, leadership and community service.

- Joint UA and Pima Deans meeting. For the first time ever, deans from both institutions met to discuss seamless transfer opportunities.
- HLC Conference is coming up in April, several from Pima will be presenting.

b. PCCEA Report (5 minutes) - Matej Boguszak

- 63 new policies have been generated to PCCEA for review, many of which concern faculty workload, RIF, and educational support faculty changes – specifically counselors.
- Mandatory training: PCCEA unanimously voted to endorse the Mandatory training statement
- Overload Contracts: PCCEA has heard from some faculty that overload contracts have not been reviewed in a timely manner, leading to delay in overload pay!
- More information will be available concerning faculty and administrator salary and positions are under review.
- Recently an administrator refused to allow faculty representation during a meeting, stating that only if a grievance was filed should representation be provided. This is not what policy states, and PCCEA reps are working towards resolution in this matter.

c. Governing Board Report (5 minutes) – Brooke Anderson

Please send Brooke Anderson items you feel she should share at the next Governing Board.

OPEN FORUM

Time allotted | 0 minutes | Agenda topic *Not Requested* | Presenter *N/A*

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Time allotted | 0 minutes | Agenda topic *Not Requested* | Presenter *N/A*

CLOSING

Motion to adjourn, seconded by senator on floor/ Meeting adjourned at 3:14 pm