



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 Community College Faculty Senate November 7, 2014

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Good afternoon. I think we're going to get going.

Madame Secretary, do we have a quorum?

>> SPEAKER: Yes, we have a quorum.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Patty, let's start off with you.

(Attendance and roll not transcribed.)

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

I've got one. We had a very successful Speaker Series program on Tuesday, and they have all been really good. The past one was from Sarah Burger. It was on the aging brain. I think that was the biggest house we have ever had. It was entirely filled up. Sarah

did a great job.

She was funny, she was informative, and people asked questions and they lined up afterwards and asked questions for quite a bit longer. So it was quite a fun evening.

Any other announcements, things coming up?

Okay. Let's move to item 3.0, approval of the October 2014 minutes. Do I have a motion?

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: I don't know the order of the stuff.

Olga Carranza said she needed to be listed as absent and I was her proxy for that meeting.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Anything else? Do I have a motion to accept the minutes?

>> SPEAKER: So moved.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Second?

>> SPEAKER: Second.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: All in favor?

(Ayes.)

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

Going once? Okay.

To the business section. Behavioral assessment committee. Olga is not here. Basically this is just an informational item, too,

really. We still have an opening on the behavioral assessment committee. This is at least in part due to the efforts of Mary Mitchell and some other people that have kind of pushed along the faculty's role in being involved in student behavior issues.

Mary made a lot of progress with code of conduct last year, and this is something else I think we ought to take seriously in terms of participating. This directly affects us as faculty members. What we would need is another person to join that committee.

If you have any questions about it, Olga would be sure to answer it. Just contact Olga. Olga mentioned that she's anxious for another person to join that group.

Anyone have any questions about that?

Okay. Moving down to item 5.2, national benchmarking data. Nic?

>> DR. RICHMOND: Good afternoon, everybody. Thank you for giving me the chance to be here today to share with you some of the recent benchmarking information that the college has obtained from some of the different studies that we participate in.

I have been something of a tour sharing this information with different groups and we wanted to make sure this was information that was shared with all of you as this is hopefully data that you will find very useful to you during the course of your jobs.

Now, there are a number of different national benchmarking surveys that the college participates in, and last year, last academic year, was a very busy year for us in terms of getting updated information from these different surveys.

I'm going to share with you two key sets of results today, the first from the Arizona outcomes report, and then the second set of information from the engagement surveys. This includes a community college survey student engagement, the survey of entering students, and also the faculty survey student engagement.

This is my first big technical test. Does the clicker work? Is the clicker on? The clicker is on.

I'll be right back.

Thank you. Otherwise I could get my exercise, and that's always good, right? We shouldn't be sitting all day and all that good stuff.

All right. So to talk about this first slide, this gives you the background on the Arizona outcomes report. This is a system derived from a monetary framework of accountability. The VFA was a national initiative developed by about 50 institutions and then tested by a larger group of colleges. The important thing to note about this set of metrics is this is not something that was designed by Pima. This

is something that's used at the national level.

For the Arizona outcomes, this is a subset of the VFA that was selected by the presidents of the Arizona colleges as being "the" key performance indicators that they felt were important in understanding how the institutions were doing.

So as a result, this means that we have this data or these data, I should say, for each of the ten community college districts so we can compare from institution to institution and we can compare ourselves with the state of Arizona.

It's a Friday afternoon, I forgot what I was doing. Where do I look? What do I do?

The first set of information I want to share with you is from indicator No. 2 from this set of data. Indicator 2 focuses on underserved populations with their enrollment within the college. The first thing you can see talks about underserved minorities. In light blue we have the information for Pima. In dark blue we have the comparison data for the state of Arizona.

As you can see for these particular data, we are actually enrolling a slightly higher proportion of students from the underserved minority category.

Also included in here we have the information regarding students

age 25 and above, and you can see for the most recent year provided here, we are actually very close to the statewide average. In terms of the age of our students, we are very consistent with the other colleges within Arizona.

Then the information provided in this slide relates to Pell recipients. We can see we are very consistent in terms of our proportions relative to the rest of Arizona.

Now, indicator 8 is an important metric from this system as it relates to access. Of course we want to be an affordable option for our students so that we are accessible to the different populations in the community. What we see on this chart, Pima is over here, and what this is showing us is a cost of a percent of the annual median income for households within Pima County, and for us that cost of attending as a full-time student is about 6% of that income.

If we compare that with the average for community colleges, that's nearer 15%, and then the three state universities are substantially higher. Now, this tells us a couple of different things and raises some interesting questions. For example, we are clearly a very affordable option for our students. We are much less expensive than the universities and on the average the other community colleges in the state.

Now, one of the questions it raises, though, is do we need to be a little bit more expensive. If that brings in more money for us to strengthen our offerings, maybe diversify the times, the equipment we have, and then we have a little bit of space to play with and still remain an affordable option for our students.

That's kind of a balance as a tradeoff between the two, but there is a little bit of room to play with should the college need that.

So in addition to access measures, the outcomes report looks at a lot of different ways of measuring success. It looks at long-term success but also looks at the course levels in terms of what proportion of our students are passing different kinds of classes.

It's not included here, but there are also metrics if they pass through developmental education, how do they do with the gateway math classes, for example.

In the case of this, this is a very aggregate level, so we are looking at success rates in developmental compared to college-level classes.

Now, as we can see for developmental classes, we are a little bit less successful, on average, than the other institutions within the state of Arizona. For college-level classes, it's much more comparable.

If we move to the next slide, because we have these data for all of the community colleges in the district, we can drill down into there so we can see how other institutions are doing for these specific measures.

In this case, we are looking now specifically at developmental education course success rates. We are over here. We are one of the least successful in this area within this state. And we can see toward the end of the spectrum we have Arizona Western and Maricopa.

This gives us pointers and ideas of other institutions we can reach out to where they are seeing a higher level of success in these areas. While I include developmental education as the example here, we could do this for every measure within this system. So, for example, we could look at the college-level classes, see how everybody is doing and look to institutions we can learn from.

And remember, as I said at the beginning, this is derived from a national data set. So we are not actually restricted to just looking at Arizona. We can find nationally who is doing best in these different areas.

So if we look towards the tail end of a student's experience with higher education, or specifically here with us, in this case indicator 23, this one looks at overall success rates in terms of a

successful outcome at the end of their time at the college.

Now, there is an important thing to note about how this is done in this system. As we all know, the majority of our students, a larger proportion of them, are part-time students. Most of the national measures we have through the federal government and our mandated reports for that, they become full-time students. So this set of information is really the first way we have had to compare where we look at all students who are degree seeking in this particular case.

Success is defined in a number of different ways. It could mean they graduated from us with an award, it could mean they transferred to either a two- or four-year institution and continued their studies, it could mean they are still enrolled here at Pima but they have a certain minimum GPA and they've successfully completed certain (indiscernible), which based on national research indicates that student is still on the successful course to be successful.

And we look six years out. This isn't something where we look at the two-year or three-year mark for this. We give the student six years. It captures a lot of the success for our part-time students.

So that summarizes some of the information we have through the Arizona outcomes. And so you all know, we post these results to our

website. So you can see all of the results for all of the different indicators from this study from the national benchmarking page which is under reports under about Pima on the website.

Now, moving on briefly to talk about the engagement surveys, and I should take this opportunity to say thank you, because we couldn't participate in these surveys without your involvement enabling us to come into your classes and administer these surveys and in the case of the faculty surveys that you participated in by yourself.

These surveys come out of Texas. There is a system there where they have developed these surveys used by approximately 300 colleges each year, and the goal of these surveys is to assess how well we engage with our students, how connected students feel to the institution. So we can find out how we are doing in these areas compared with the national cohort of colleges participating. So again, we can identify where we can improve or where we're kind of doing really well in outperforming our sister institutions.

So in the case of this slide we are looking at the highest student engagement. This is based on administration of the survey from fall of last year. This highlights the top five areas. You can see in all cases for Pima, our proportions here where we had positive responses in these areas are higher than for the fall 2014 CCSSE

cohort.

Some of the areas we see highlighted, worked with students on projects during class, worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments. And we see feedback from instructors on their performance.

That's an important way to keep our students engaged. It says good things about what you and all your fellow faculty are doing in terms of working with our students, giving them fast feedback so they can learn from that and continue to be successful in their class.

Now, the other end of the spectrum, we can look at those areas where we have the lowest student engagement, and for Pima we see these specific areas. It includes things like work with instructors on activities other than coursework, talked about career plans with an instructor or an advisor.

Now, some of the things to keep in mind, particularly when looking at the areas of lowest engagement, some things that we assess with these surveys may not actually be right for what we are doing at Pima. Different institutions have different processes in terms of how they do things. So just because we are low in an area, that doesn't mean we are doing it wrong. It may be our focus or our approach to a particular thing is different from what some of these

institutions do.

But for the results from these surveys, all three sets of survey results are posted online. The ones I find most interesting to look at, there is a strong correlation between the questions they ask the students and the questions they ask the faculty. We can do a direct comparison between the responses from faculty and the responses from students, and that can give some really useful insights as to what the college's perception is of how we are doing something and then what the student's perception is in the same area.

>> SPEAKER: Can I ask a question? So if we could go back one slide, please. I see that we vary by -- they are all under 5%, 3, 4, maybe 6%. What was the variation in general for some of the other institutions from that cohort mean that you were displaying there?

>> DR. RICHMOND: There is actually quite a wide spectrum that you see. There are some areas where it can be 10, 15% different for some of the institutions. It really varies on the area. It's a huge variety that we see.

>> SPEAKER: So in general, are we far below this mean, or are there some other institutions that are even farther away?

>> DR. RICHMOND: Oh, there are others that are further away. Yeah, uh-huh.

That was a great question.

>> ROSA MORALES: I have a couple of questions.

Now, it's also important to take in consideration the fact that in Pima we do have commuting students. Usually it's stated that most of the colleges have full-time students. (Indiscernible) the ability of the students to participate in all these extra activities because of the length of time.

>> DR. RICHMOND: Absolutely. One of the subsets of information is they looked at the institutions broken out as a function of full-time or part-time students. The one thing I would say for this is there is a university equivalent of this survey, but the results we compare to are all based on community colleges.

Nationally the kind of proportion of full-time/part-time students that we see here is not inconsistent with what we see nationally.

>> ROSA MORALES: Yes. The second thing on your previous report is regarding the cost. As you indicated, I mean, it's indicated we are lower level. I wonder, the cost of living in some of the other cities, if it's congruent with the fact that, you know, they might be more expensive cities or actually, you know, also the cost of going to college might be higher.

>> DR. RICHMOND: Yes. And for this particular metric they look

at the median cost of attendance within the specific county that the community college is based in, and then they do the comparison from that as opposed to using a standard median income for the state of Arizona.

>> ROSA MORALES: Yes. And the last one is regarding the percentage of minorities attending some of those colleges. As you stated initially, Pima is a largest percentage than other colleges. So therefore, you can see the effect that it might have on the success rate for development of education as well as college courses.

So I will be very much interested in showing, you show those colleges where (indiscernible), what is the percentage of minorities? Because nationwide we know that minority students need additional support services.

>> DR. RICHMOND: Absolutely. That's a great point. It's one of the things we have been talking about with these data is embedding within it for our purposes so we understand better the demographic makeup of the specific community colleges that we are looking at and comparing our results and our proportions with Pima County, because that's a piece we need to build in to ensure we are looking at this in a fully meaningful way.

Any other questions?

Well, thank you for your attention. As I mentioned before in the same way for the Arizona outcomes, the CCSSE, (indiscernible), and faculty survey results are posted to our public website so you can take a look, see the full results for us and for the cohort, just to make some comparisons and see how you can use the information to help support what you're doing in the classroom or online or through whatever modality you're using.

(Applause.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Thanks, Nic.

I just noticed that we cut out the PCCEA report on reports. Let's make that 6.3 and we will move everything down from there.

Going back to the business area. 5.3. Board policies.

>> JEFFREY SILVYN: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm filling in for Debbie Yoklic.

Actually, I have a question first. Did Debbie provide an overview where we are going with policies? Would that be helpful? I will do it briefly.

It's kind of a good -- so let me give you a quick bit of context. It will partly explain why you see some of the proposed board policy changes that you see. So a quick context.

The Arizona legislature carved out a certain level of authority

and gave it to district governing boards, and governing boards, one of the ways that they express that authority is through board policies.

Right now, we have this multitiered system. We have board policies, we have regulations, we have Standard Practice Guides, and then we have a whole variety of different policy, manuals and operational unit procedures, sets.

If one were to ask, well, what's the difference between a board policy, a regulation, and a Standard Practice Guide, and handed someone a set of what we have at the college and said, go explain to me what the difference is, that might be a little hard, because some of the board policies include both very high-level kind of principles or standards that the college is expected to meet but also have a tremendous amount of very detailed information, the kind of information that the employees at the college need in order to implement their tasks.

So actually, the drug-free workplace on policy, which is one of the ones you see is a great example of that. In the original policy there is language about here's the rules we have to comply with under federal and state law, and then it goes through and defines everything imaginable about drugs, right? What are the controlled

substances? What does possession mean? All that stuff.

Part of what we want to do is create a new framework. You see that in a couple of the policies in particular that are now being put out for feedback. That is to move to more of what I'm calling the three-tiered system. You have board policy, administrative procedures, and then what we are calling operational manuals, which is kind of the catchall for all those more unit-level guides for how employees are supposed to carry out their responsibilities.

So the idea is, and it's defined in the new prime policy, 1101, is board policies are supposed to -- they are really about the what. What's the goal we're supposed to reach, what's the value we're trying to advance, what's the principle we're supposed to operate by?

Then under that you have administrative procedures, which is the administration guidance to everyone to further define those standards. It's a little more about the how. And then different operational units will have their guidebooks, which is the really detailed how.

So that way, hopefully that's a more easy-to-follow system, and it really kind of establishes responsibility and authority at sort of more appropriate levels. The board sets the big picture of what we are supposed to achieve, basic standards we are supposed to meet.

Administration sets some details about how, and operational units really figure out the how we're going to do things. That's part of the context.

The other part of the context is -- so another good example, there actually is a numbering system and pattern to current board policies. I see a few surprised looks. I had the same look when I learned that, too, because when I looked at the numbering system and the board policy title, I had trouble figuring out what's the pattern? So apparently I'm not ready to be a code breaker with NSA. I could not figure out the pattern from these numbers.

So we want to move to a different system. That is also to have a system where we have a few very discrete categories. Board policy, chancellor-related policies, finance-related policies, academic and student-related policies, human resources, et cetera, so very large categories that sort of make a lot of hopefully intuitive sense, and then a numbering system that will follow from that.

So, for example, all policies that really tie to key aspects of board authority, that's No. 1. Everything under that is going to have a 1. So the first board policy is 1.01. Next is 1.02, 1.03, et cetera. Chancellor policies, 2.01, 2.02, et cetera. Follow the same format with each one.

That first policy is going to be to set the overarching framework. So take the chancellor's policy, for example. Now it's 1103. It's going to be 2.01. It's the policy that says, these are the responsibilities that the board has assigned to the chancellor, and these are the parameters on his authority set by the board. That will be 2.01, and then more detailed or other related areas will then follow in numerical sequence.

That's the plan. So the idea is to make the policies a lot more organized. Hopefully makes it easier to find the topics people might be interested. It will set up this structure.

So then we are going to move -- what we want to do is have a similar structure and pattern for what will be called administrative procedures and for unit operational guides, and what we are going to do is establish templates so there is a structured format so that we make sure we are covering all the areas we ought to be covering in those and they look consistent.

So, for example, Roman I, everything has to be authority, perhaps II is purpose, III is something else, and that same pattern would then be used everywhere.

So again, it kind of helps us with a checklist. Are we thinking this through in covering everything we need to. I don't know about

you. I find checklists to be very helpful. It makes me more certain I have covered what I should, provide some uniformity across how we do business everywhere. So easier to prepare the policies and procedures, easier to follow them, interpret them, et cetera.

So that's the goal of what we are going to move to. So now for the challenging part that everyone in the college is going to have an opportunity to participate in, and that is there is going to be a lot of work, as you might imagine, to move from our current system to the new system.

One of the things you will see in the materials, if you have a chance to look at them if you haven't already, is we are setting a timeframe for this. So by June 30 of 2016, approximately a year and a half, we are going to move everything in our current system into the new system, okay? On midnight of June 30, 2016, everything in the old system automatically sunsets if it hasn't already been replaced and we have the new system in its place.

So now we have a time frame with which we will make the transition. So we will have -- now we are working on this framework. Then what we will need to do is develop what's the process so we get input from all the people having interest in these different topic areas to come up with what's the best language for each of these

different provisions.

So part of the reason I mention that is as long as we are moving from the old system to the new system, there is this good opportunity to really look at our what are now Standard Practice Guides and unit operational manuals and take a hard look and say, are we meeting our compliance obligations? Are we setting the right goals? Have we come up with the best ways to achieve the goals we want?

It's an opportunity to have a comprehensive look at these, how we do business guides, and look at them, make sure they are the way we want them to be and move to a new system, hopefully more sort of coherent and consistent for everyone.

So that's the context. What you see in the policies that are being put out at the moment is a couple of those that are part of setting that framework and then some good examples of what I'm talking about. The drug one is a really good example. Now we are going to move to a more value-level policy that says we are going to comply with certain obligations, we are going to set certain standards, but all the details about how that's going to be done is going to be done in administrative procedure and then they will need to be unit manuals in the human resources side of the house for dealing with employee-related issues and in the provost's side of the

house for dealing with student-related issues.

So that's the context. Happy to answer questions about that if there are. If you all have feedback at any point, by all means funnel that through while we are still working on our architecture. And if you have specific questions about these, happy to deal with those, too.

Yes, sir?

>> DAVID KREIDER: This is a fascinating topic. Having gone through that some myself, I understand what you're facing. Setting a date like an arbitrary date, June 30, 2016, in itself is a major goal, as obviously you know.

Now, if, in going through between today and June 30, 2016, and looking at all of these things, there is discovered some major flaws or even minor flaws, will those be rewritten or will they be set in hold over past the July 1, 2016 date and then rewritten? It's a very, very serious issue at stake.

>> JEFFREY SILVYN: That's a good question.

So when you're looking on a collaborative process, you want enough time but not too much time so that you have time to work through these things but you actually get them there.

So the plan at the moment is we want to be done by that deadline.

I can certainly foresee there might be things that come up where we have to hold things over and modify, but for the most part, we'd like that to be a firm deadline so we get there or at least everyone should treat it as a firm deadline. Let's get through this.

So is it absolutely chiseled in stone?

>> DAVID KREIDER: So implying there, just pick anybody out of the air, any policy out of the air, and you find a series of flaws, will it go through the entire process to be modified on this side of June 30, 2016, and then carried over, or are you going to make the change and say, here it is, suck it in and take it?

>> JEFFREY SILVYN: You mean -- the best answer to that question is I don't know, because we haven't really thought that one through entirely. It's a really good question.

>> DAVID KREIDER: Basically what I'm asking is are you going to be dictatorial and change what you want or what you see is necessary now and say, once the clock is over on July 1, 2016, this is what it is, guys, have a nice day?

>> JEFFREY SILVYN: So let me modify your question a little bit, if I can.

>> DAVID KREIDER: Thank you. I had a burrito for lunch.

>> JEFFREY SILVYN: So one thing to keep in mind is we are not

carving Mount Rushmore in the sense that what comes out of this, that's it, we are done. We know that's not going to be the case for a couple of reasons.

So one is things are going to change and we know we will have to make modifications along the way. One thing we want to do as part of moving to the new system is in the current system, board policies, SPGs, et cetera, have review dates on them when we told everyone we will review and modify them if we need to.

The reality is that hasn't happened. We have board policies, et cetera. Ten years have gone by and they haven't been reviewed.

So part of what we want to do to be consistent is put some realistic review time frames and actually do it. For example, what you will see, all the new board policies it will say at least every three years, and we will have a schedule, because we are not going to do them all in the third year, right? That's not realistic.

So what we need to do is move to a rotating calendar so every three years we actually cycle through everything and have an ongoing review process. Nothing that comes out of this is going to be as it is forevermore. My hunch is that's especially true as we get into the finer-grain levels, because my experience is we make significant revisions, we think we figured it out, it's not going to work, the

only guarantee is it's not going to work exactly the way that we think it was going to work and we will have to make some changes.

I think everyone will have to be particularly sensitive to that in this first go-around, because this is going to be a big transition and we know there is going to have to be both an assurance and some kind of guarantee that we have a review process and there is going to be a way to change things as we discover they're not working the way that we wanted them to.

We also know we need to build into this some kind of assessment process so we can really understand, here's the goal we were trying to achieve, is it actually working from an institutional standpoint and from the standpoint of the people that have to carry it out? Because that's another issue.

I guess what I'm saying is I'm glad you're raising issues. We need to think about all this. We are trying to build a framework within which we are going to make a big change, do it in an inclusive way, and build in some measures so we can make adjustments so that we are tracking areas needing adjustments and making them in a reasonably, timely way. So this is a big undertaking.

>> DAVID KREIDER: I commend you for it. It is a huge undertaking. Good luck.

>> JEFFREY SILVYN: So the good news is there will be opportunity for all of you to help with this, because it is a little bit like the self-study. We need input from lots of different groups to make sure we are getting it right or as close to right as we can.

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: It sounds like a good plan, but my brain instantly went to is there going to be a map from the old numbers to the new? So that is we are referencing old data that says board policy 11.3.6-8*84, it is now referred to as 2.643?

>> JEFFREY SILVYN: Yeah, so we are working with the web services people, how we are coming up with the numbering system to make the translation and have a way for some period of time for people to make that transition until we get used to the new system. I think that's what you mean?

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: I'd do that, but I also think it doesn't need to be a temporary one. It needs to be a permanent one.

A committee meeting I was at yesterday was referring to things from 2004 and looking at data and looking at things like that. So if I'm going that far back into Pima history and you have now dropped the map, that could be problematic.

>> JEFFREY SILVYN: All right.

>> SPEAKER: Going back to the review process one more time, do

we expect to have any major changes as far as how these policies and especially the more (indiscernible) administrative procedures are reviewed, will there be again a 21-day comment period or any expected changes?

>> JEFFREY SILVYN: At the moment, I don't expect a change to that. I mean, I don't expect a change to the current framework. We certainly could. So nothing planned. If that's something that needs to be looked at, we could certainly do that. Clearly there has to be some kind of reasonable input, process, both from internal constituencies and also a chance for the community at large.

Anybody else?

>> MS. RITA FLATTLEY: I was looking at board policy 4201. I notice that you are taking the subsets of board policy 4001, putting all those little different subsets about personnel policy statements into one.

It kind of is going to drive me crazy, because it says these handbooks are all college employees, administrators, faculty. If you're saying these handbooks are, it should be the name of the handbooks, not the name of the employee groups. It's faculty personnel policy statement, et cetera. Easier to catch that.

I didn't see any changes to the core of board policy 4001. Am I

correct in that?

>> JEFFREY SILVYN: Yes.

>> MS. RITA FLATTLEY: Oh, good. I didn't want to have to come after you.

>> JEFFREY SILVYN: Just on consolidation, it's something else you will see. We had a huge number of board policies. One of the things we are trying to do is where it seems to make sense to lump them together so it's one board policy that might have subparts. Some people may or may not think we grouped them appropriately, but we are trying to do that to have fewer of them.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: I would like to know how you are deciding on which one of these are three years, two years, and one year. Because there doesn't seem to be any consistency to them.

>> JEFFREY SILVYN: So they are all going to go to at least every three years. There may be a few exceptions where there are some things that seem so critical we have to look at it every year, and then the challenge is going to be coming up with some kind of rotating calendar. Because like I said, we don't want to be in a position where it says at least every three years and everyone is reviewing it on year 3, because that's just not -- it's not realistic.

So part of this process, we have to come up with some kind of assignment so that we are figuring out what's going to be year 1, 2, 3, at least in the first go-around. After that it won't matter as much but in the first pass it will.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: I think it would be prudent for the college to adopt some type of system where they get reviewed the first year, there for a certain period of time, and then you review it to make sure that it's still working, and then every three years thereafter.

I say that because there is a lot of times where something will languish there ridiculously for three years before we get to review it. The other thing I want to ask about, and this is something that I would like to see as far as senate is concerned. I'm looking at these review dates.

Some of them are back in May -- and these are all past dates. Some are September. Some of them are last week. I think it should become the policy, if you're going to bring board policies and SPGs, that they need to be into the senate's hands no less than seven days before the senate meeting, preferably before.

These came very late, and there are so many of them that it makes it very hard for us to make some kind of reasonable thought process

to them unless it's an absolute, absolute emergency, if that makes sense.

Thank you.

>> JEFFREY SILVYN: Just a quick logistics question. I'm taking notes on these comments so we can think about them.

Do these kind of comments get captured in the minutes you all take of this so I can double-check?

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: Yes. Are these posted?

>> JEFFREY SILVYN: That's a good question. I don't remember whether these have been posted yet. I'll have to go look. I just don't remember.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Other questions?

>> JEFFREY SILVYN: All right. Thanks.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Thanks, Jeff.

(Applause.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Prereq committee. Jeannie Arbogast.

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: I need a little setup time, so you know.

All right. So have mercy. This is probably my second PowerPoint ever in my life. It was scary.

So some of you have always thanked me for my reports being short

and sweet. This one ain't. But it is the final report from our committee. Our task is now done with this presentation. There will be a little bit of follow-up, but our formal committee will end as of today.

Just a little bit for some of you that are new or some of you that have been with me from the beginning, we started this a year and a half ago, April 2013. Kreider's going, yeah (smiling).

The committee itself has gone through some changes, but I do want to thank everyone that did spend some time on it. If I left your name out, I'm sorry, my brain is not working. But Dave Kreider, Teddi Schnurr, Greta Buck, Cheryl Blake, Margarita Yungo (phonetic), Melinda France, Susan Pritchett. I think we were the starting group.

Then we also had a tremendous amount of input and effort from Jenny Conway who really helped us understand more of the situation, and recently, when Nic Richmond came back, you have no idea how much she has helped us out and gotten us through this final piece of data gathering and how she will help us.

So I want to thank everyone for doing their input, giving everything they could, asking great questions, and helping us all understand what's going on here.

What I thought was going to be a two-month project has now turned

into a year and a half. I think it will be another year and a half before I really feel like, you know, we're on a really good path and things are really solid in there.

A piece that came out of this that I did not expect when we first started talking about prerequisites was about Banner. And me being a math person, I'm used to having Banner check our prerequisites and assessments and everything was fine.

Math and writing were the only ones privileged to have that done. There is a long history about how that process stopped, but the committee and extra input from ESL -- I don't think Cynthia is here -- brought this to light with the provost's office, and Jerry Migler approved finally getting everyone's courses checked through Banner, all of the prereqs.

That's been an interesting haul. Everyone got stopped with the HLC self-study. That just sucked all of our resources and all of our time. In more than one way it's still doing that, but we are starting to come out of that situation.

So starting when students register this semester, so starting for spring 2015, classes reading and ESL will have their prerequisites checked, the assessment scores checked, the prerequisites checked. That has been programmed into Banner, and that will go into place.

In the following semester, it's going to be a little messier.

Everyone else follows. Jenny needed a jump-start on this, which is why she picked two particular areas to expand it to, the basics, and then everything else goes on.

I got even more hints yesterday at the monstrous task this is. I have been through our catalog a few times now looking at prereqs. I'm astonished at how many courses have some kind of prerequisite in it. Not just reading, writing, and math. There are over 1,300 courses that Pima offers and a large chunk of them have prereqs. So it's a huge undertaking.

Jenny recently put out an e-mail to all of the CDAC co-chairs to have everyone review all of the prerequisites that are currently on the books. You need to review and make any adjustments that are in there and get back to her as quickly as possible.

As of yesterday, only four CDACs have responded, and that's pretty disappointing. There needs to be more. Either we are not changing anything or this is what's happening.

The reason is all of these prerequisites of specifically this or this condition or that conversion, it has to be input by hand, course by course, and that's a monstrous project. Everything has to be done and up front so that they can do this in an organized manner and then

start working with IT to make sure that all of these checks are put into Banner and everything we want to have done be accomplished.

So I am passing that message on. There is an implementation committee. That's what we met with yesterday to make sure that things are well thought out, things are organized, things are marketed well, so cooperation from everyone will help this task go a whole lot easier for everyone.

So, please, I beg you, go back to your CDAC chairs and go, have you done this? If you haven't, please respond to Jenny Conway so that this can get done and make their task easier. It's huge. You have no idea what we are doing.

All right. So the other part that came in and what I thought the focus would primarily be, though it did come in these two directions, was the conversations I had heard for the last four years or my first four years in senate about faculty wondering about student success and even administrators who are formal faculty would start this conversation with me, our students' reading level isn't sufficient, their writing level isn't sufficient, I wish our students had a particular math level before they took a CAD course or one of the culinary courses, various things that come along.

So I started this because a year and a half ago is when we were

making a nasty statement or just a statement about the Board of Governors, there was all sorts of horrible, horrible things we were trying to do, wanted to do something positive for the school. Holy smokes.

I think it is, just as I think I told you, a long, long path along the way. Our committee went through, we spent a lot of time trying to figure out the history. I have only filled in one piece of history last week that has been nagging me for a long time.

We got to spend a lot of time worrying about what was our charge? What were we trying to do and what was our ultimate goal and when were we done? We came down to we need facts. We need to not do this based on anecdotal evidence that I have been hearing at senate but what are the facts. And also, under the leadership of our chancellor, Lee Lambert, he wants to set this institution as making decisions based on facts, not just intuition, minor stories, or, well, it's the whim of the moment. That was our goal. That's been a long, long haul in there.

So we ended up looking at this from two directions. Because of the self-study, that gave us a goal of what are our peer institutions doing and then what are statistics from Pima students?

So the first piece that I sent out to everyone was a spreadsheet

that I'm only showing a piece of right here just for the history component. You have all of it all spread out to you as best I could, all of the CDACs, the courses laid out, and all I can do is say, it's an estimate and it is my personal estimate of what I think is going on. It was brutal.

This is not 100% accurate. I did the best I could. But it has a pretty good guideline. It's not officially sanctioned Pima evaluation. If you want that, go to a course evaluator and it will be official. This is all I can do is provide you the best baseline I can.

I went to the college's course catalogs, 17 different colleges, and then, let's go through all the courses. Let's go see what their prereqs are. I concentrated on introductory courses. There are some 200 levels in here. I didn't do a lot with honors courses which I know is deficient. I did the best I could in there.

Let me get this. When I initially started this, I was led to believe that Pima was the only school that didn't have prereqs. Boy, did I have a rude awakening as I went through this process. I'm just pulling up history, because I also have stats from the history in there. And you can see that it is an incredible diversity that in -- these are pretty much history 101 and the 100-level courses in

general of what the various institutions have. If there is nothing there, it means they don't have a prereq or they don't teach that course.

So that's the reason why some things are blank. The writing and the math -- writing was well defined. I had very little trouble with that. Math was well defined. The reading was hard. I talked to Greta about one of the schools. I don't know if (indiscernible) is here, but I talked to him about another one of the schools.

I had two reading teachers who had as much trouble as I did trying to figure out the course catalog and what was equivalent to us.

The one that I talked to Greta about was Central Arizona, and in their course description, it said college level reading. Everything about it said it was equivalent to our reading 112 class. But it didn't make sense, and Greta did a little more research, looked at their COMPASS cutoff scores, and said, oh, that's our score for reading 91. So I changed it.

And Will helped me with El Paso, but even then he wasn't confident about what's going on.

So you can see quite a diversity. You can see things like Mohave just says, okay, you have to have a GED level in reading to go in.

The Texas schools, as my committee found out really early, they have their own assessment program. Some of their data is at the last two pieces of the spreadsheet about what they do when it says TSI compliant. It means that they have reading, writing, and math requirements to graduate to get a diploma from that school. It has to be met before you leave. It doesn't say that it has to be done in advance.

So it's an interesting adventure, and if you're interested in those schools, I gave you the best I could at the end in there. But you can see the variance in writing, and when you look at other places, this is, you know, kind of crazy of what's going on.

A year ago the reading CDACs got together and started talking about this. It was helpful that Greta was on my committee so she could be a big part of getting them to come in. You'll see in the introductory notes that the reading CDAC said, this is our recommendation for Pima.

For anyone taking a gen ed course, something like history 101 or something that needs that, their recommendation is reading 91 or higher, or, you know, could be concurrent if that's fine with you, but they are thinking that's a pretty good recommendation and a guideline. But again, look at some of these. And for the

higher-level classes, you have to make your own decisions. We can't do that for you. This is the best we can offer along there.

When you look through the spreadsheet, I'm hoping that you understand what's going on in there. If you have recommendations of changes to make in there, please let me know before I release it to everyone. Right now it's just (indiscernible). That's the most I released this for.

So far, so good?

>> SPEAKER: Really quickly, you have Mesa Community College on there. Did you look at any of the other Maricopa colleges?

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: They all came under the same general heading. Mesa is one that the HLC listed as one of our peer institutions, so that's the one that I focused on. But Susan Pritchett looked at them initially, and she found that pretty much that whole district was pretty similar in all their requirements. She didn't see any differences in things that she looked at.

The next part is super cool.

Then we talked about, well, there is a whole lot of grad students doing some data on this. Why do we have the research? Let's go look at that, and I personally protested and said, no, a student in Minnesota is not a student in Tucson. And I want to know what Tucson

students do. I know what we want -- we want to do it based on ours.

We have -- you know, our advising model I think is, that's my personal opinion, an example of we used other institutions, and we didn't really focus on the needs of our students in here, and it didn't entirely work well. So I wanted statistics from there.

That was an adventure. But the good news is we got Nic Richmond back, and one of her goals in coming back to PIR was, in the long run, to get statistics accessible to faculty to make these decisions.

The self-study has stolen a lot of her time and resources away. It's been a long process. We have worked on this together. We have established a basic template that we can use. It will be expanded. It will be changed with time. But right now, this is a sweet little start. This is why I picked history.

There are five classes. I sent you the entire report as part of this. There are five classes that I picked just as a first survey to make a run and see what it looks like and see what happens, so I picked history to share with you today.

These are statistics from summer 2011 to spring 2014, so pretty much three years of data that she went back and looked at all of the data on here.

What I had her do was I wanted not only percentages, but I wanted

raw numbers, because, you know, percentages can be misleading at times. So what you've got is raw data, and she was able to do this for -- she went through for reading, writing, math, she did this for ESL, but the numbers were so small that it skewed the statistics way too much. So there is a little piece at the end on all of this.

The game was that if it says adult education it was -- if a student took the place of an exam and it said, go see an advisor, we don't have anything, those are the types of students that are there, in history, there are no prereqs. So a student who is assessing lower than even reading 70 can sign up for history, and they did, there were 52 people in this three-year time, not a lot, but some, and you can see their success rate. You can see that if the student's highest recorded reading level was 71 or 81 or whatever, there was their success rate, meaning a C or better in the class. The Fs were recorded. The withdrawals were recorded.

Now, we know there are lots of reasons for Ds and Fs and Ws. You know, the numbers can't tell you all those little things that come into play of life happens, but at least we got some numbers to look at and make some great decisions on there.

So you can see some raw data about percents. The unknown, you get people who don't take a placement exam here. In math, I'm

protected because we've got placement exams and you've got to take it. Deal with it. But in history or some of these other courses, you have UA students coming in, they don't take a placement exam. We don't know what their assessment is coming in to take these courses. That's what the unknown is about.

So we have it for reading and writing. She did it for math. You know, she also, in the writing one, I forgot to mention when that was up, she did it for writing 102, and then she said, if you have taken a class beyond writing 102, what was the success rate? It's hard to see in the numbers. Wait until you see the pictures.

So we've got it for math, we've got things that are all coming in so you see those kind of pictures.

This is so sweet. This is so cool. I was jumping when she showed me the draft. I'm like, here is a picture. This is the reading. So if you don't like looking at numbers, here is a picture that shows you -- the numbers don't show up well on here, but, you know, as their reading level went up, their success rate went up.

Now, you know, there are other questions about why is it still only 65%? Again, those are those variables that come into play, but it gives you, as a department, a chance to go in and talk about why is this, why is it 65%, and what are other things we can do to

improve student success?

There's the student learning outcomes output. That's what I think this stuff is about, and these numbers are sweet and pretty to go in and do that. So there is the reading. The writing is the one that Nic saw that was fascinating, and I can't remember if you saw it in all five courses?

>> SPEAKER: Yeah, pretty much.

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: This is the writing one. And notice that as the writing level went up it got higher, and then if they took a course beyond 102, the success rate dropped. That was, you know, an unexpected result, but a sweet little thing to go, what's going on with our students and why could this happen?

>> SPEAKER: It could be that after 102, students take creative writing rather than academic writing.

>> SPEAKER: Creative with their history?

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: Yeah, I think we were thinking about that along the way. But it provides that extra conversation that all of the groups can have about what's going on, why are we doing that? You know, what's writing doing? How do we interact together as a group?

So that was kind of pretty. And of course for me I'm super proud

of this one. This is math. You know, it proved to me as a math teacher the contention that says the more math you have, it helps you out. As much as you don't like numbers, look at the success rates based on the level of math that students have had. That's my little excitement.

>> SPEAKER: You skipped one really fast.

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: ESL one. So coming back to this, this was what you get for ESL. This is what we came up with. If you took any ESL course in the last three years, you can see it was about 45 out of all the people that came in, but the at least you get some data and some information, and I think this is really pretty. This is incredible, helpful, and this is the kind of stuff that we need.

So here's the deal. I have asked Nic -- I had asked all of the CDACs a while ago to submit to me courses that they would like initially to have statistics like this on. I had 27 courses. I sent you that list, just so that you're aware. That is in the works.

This major presentation that Nic did and something else that she was doing, it sucked all their time out and personnel stuff. So, you know, they have to prioritize, as well, to try and get all the big stuff in and little things at the same time. I think Nic manages really well how to make a balance between the two.

So in the works, we will get the data on all 27 courses. So I picked them so that there is -- I mean, there is incredible diversity of what's going on so you can use it as a baseline to make your decisions in there. With that said, there is a couple of things that we need to do.

I showed this to Cheryl Blake, who was part of my committee, and we only did bio 101. She said, but Jeannie, I want to know about bio 156 and it's not on the list.

So talking with Nic about how best to handle this situation, when I send this out to everyone, you can e-mail her and she will go through -- the template is set up. There is some kind of report site, I never clicked on, that you can generate or request yourself. Have patience. You know, this is a huge balance of what's going on. This is the template we have right now. Individual CRNs, breaking it into grades of A, B, C, that can be in the future, but let's get something baseline along the way. So we can request that.

The problem and the questions that I have are how do I get this out to you? Do you want to know what happens in all of the courses? Do you just care about the ones that are in your department? That's a piece that I don't know how to get this information back out to you.

So that's one of the pieces that we need to work on. So let's start with that.

Any comments about getting statistics from PIR or what you're going to see in here? There is another one at the end of that report that talks about STU classes, that for those five courses she has a statistic that say if she had a STU course, how are they successful in all of these five courses. So that is available. I can get shared with the advisors along the way.

Any questions you have on that so far? Yeah, is this cool or what? So we are there. It's in the process. It's going to take us a while. And that leads me to the next part of going back to the reading, writing, and math prerequisites.

So it is taking a long time, but you don't have to listen to me again. It's a long process. When we started out and I had you do the conversations, faculty members came up to me and said, we don't want to do anything because our enrollments are getting lower. We are frightened to death that if we set prerequisites students aren't going to take our classes, period.

You know, all of this started with prerequisites, and the more research I did, I'm a little slow on the uptake a lot, but the idea is you don't have to make it a prerequisite. My personal

recommendation is don't. Unless the numbers you get are so blatant -- history, I don't think, is blatant. Why not make it a recommendation right now? Go slow. Thoroughly talk about this. Don't rush into anything. We do not want to make any quick decisions and run into trouble like we had with the admissions policy. Everything has to roll out, go slow, be well organized, be well thought out, be well documented, based on fact.

So you've got this data. There is no rush to get it in for Banner to check things out. My personal advice is make a recommendation, see how that changes the success rates in your classes. The new advising models start in the spring where all new students have to meet with an advisor, period. They have to be meet someone face-to-face.

I'm getting a picture of what's coming on with the new advising model and that advisors are being assigned students -- Bob, help me out.

>> SPEAKER: I don't know if that's for sure.

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: But it's part of -- it's a possibility that they are trying to create a model that gives students more one-on-one time with a human being instead of self-advising, so they are going to see things -- you know, when you're working with

someone, they are going to see reading 91 is a recommended course.

Writing 101 is a recommended. If they don't have it, they are not kicking you out, but you are being aware as a student that you may be taking on something more challenging than you're ready to meet right now. So a personal contract with yourself.

Developmental redesign, there are all these things coming into play. My advice is just go slow. Thoroughly talk this out with your departments. See what you want to do. Make some changes. Don't rush.

When I was talking with Jenny Conway yesterday, she and I both agreed on it's not something that has to be done for the Banner rollout of prereqs of making all those changes. Make wise decisions. Go slow.

When you make your decision, though, it does have to go through the regular process of going through curriculum council, so you have to file those regular course changes, whatever their proper name is, and if you want to add a prerequisite or you add a recommendation, it still has to go through the current process.

There is no -- I was hoping we could streamline it, but the timing on everything is just really hard. So right now that's the best we've got.

With that... so if you have any comments, suggestions for improvements, please tell me now or send me an e-mail. Help me, help me. Thanks, everyone.

(Applause.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: 5.5, PCC IDs for adjunct faculty.

Carlo, you want to speak to that?

>> SPEAKER: Briefly, we'd like to thank the chancellor who was involved in getting us ID cards. It took about two months going around. He agreed everything is all set. So thank you to the chancellor.

(Applause.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: 5.6, on-time registration. That's a fact of life. So I think there are still some FAQs going on. Otherwise this is now a policy for (indiscernible).

5.7, elections. Pat, you want to help me out with that?

>> SPEAKER: Yes. According to the charter, elections this year, Community Campus, Northwest Campus, and West Campus, so we have started that. We have all we need from Community and Northwest. We still need some things from West, of course, the largest campus.

If your department has not finished that or if you haven't heard about it from your department, please talk to your department chair

about it or ask me if you're uncertain. I have a record of who's notified us of the new representatives. They will begin their terms in January.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Any questions? All right.

5.8. Faculty senate charter change.

We have been going back and forth a little bit about the proxy change, and there is agreement on quite a bit, but there are some items that we wanted to put out for discussion.

Jeannie, did you want to talk about the quorum issue?

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: All right. So I looked at this a couple of times of, you know, we kind of do unofficial Robert's Rules of Order, and I keep looking at there, and they say, well, whatever your institution decides to do, go do it.

So there is nothing set about whether you can have a proxy or how it counts towards a quorum. It's whatever happens to go on in there.

I took some time this week and looked at probably 10 to 15 charters from other community colleges, what are they doing, what's going on?

It's half and half of do they allow proxies? Some do; some absolutely don't.

We have a quorum of more than half. Some of them have it at

three quarters. It's up to us to figure out what we want to do.

Does a proxy count towards quorum? Does it not? That's one of the things to do. You know, then I can tell you my personal opinion right now or not or I can wait.

The other piece I saw that we hadn't talked about yet but I saw on one person's charter I think was important. It said you can only be proxy for one person. You know how sometimes we're proxy for two, three, four people. I thought that was a viable piece to talk about so that one person isn't representing everyone, which could make an interesting election.

So those were the things about proxy. The other piece that also needs to be discussed is who you name as proxy. Is it only another senator or can it be like what we have been doing and you name someone appropriate, and that is probably the one, you know -- the number of proxies I don't think is too debatable. I think that will be simple enough. But does a proxy count towards quorum and who do you name as proxy, those will be two issues we really need to talk about thoroughly before we prepare a statement to the charter for us to scrutinize and vote on.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: What's your opinion about counting towards a quorum?

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: Mine is I think we should count proxies towards quorum. If we don't, what's the point of having a proxy? Your vote doesn't count. And your proxy is there to represent you. You cannot physically be at that meeting, but we still need to -- you know, we still need to meet quorum. And, you know, I was out with the flu for two weeks. We are getting into flu season. If suddenly we have a meeting and more than half of faculty senate is out because they are sick and they're naming proxies, we are not going to be able to vote on anything.

So my personal opinion is I think a proxy should count towards meeting quorum.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Opinions?

>> DAVID KREIDER: I agree entirely with Jeannie.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Any alternative points of view, whether or not the proxies would count towards a quorum.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: It's not that I have an alternate opinion, but I think we need to have something in place in case it becomes rampant, if somebody is always proxying. I think there needs to be some balance there. I think proxies are important because things happen, life happens, right?

But I think there needs to also be some type of thought process

about somebody who is on senate but we never, ever see them and they are always proxied. You know what I mean? Just my thought process.

>> DAVID KREIDER: I agree with you. That's not a proxy issue.

That's an attendance issue.

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: In the charter right now, which I never did, I confess, as vice president, the vice president is in charge of attendance. If people aren't attending regularly, the only authority that the vice president has is just notify them and go, hey, where are you?

So that's the best we have, and that may be that if that's the situation, then the vice president needs to step up and really be more aggressive about if you can't come to these meetings, then find somebody else.

So it does exist in the charter. It's just that we haven't been enforcing it as much as maybe we should have.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Would we be all right separating those issues as David suggests? Attendance is one issue, proxies are a separate issue?

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: Yes.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: What about more than one person, a person holding more than one proxy.

>> DAVID KREIDER: Did you mean, Joe, at the same meeting or...

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: At the same meeting.

>> DAVID KREIDER: Could someone speak to the downside of that?

I don't see a downside. I personally would say that if three people here chose to give Jeannie their proxy, it was A, for a good reason, and B, an expression of trust that she would handle this as the other people wanted.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: I think there is another part of this we ought to consider. Now, we have talked about whether you could give your proxy to anyone, including a nonsenator.

My argument against that is nonsenators can't participate in debate. They haven't sat in on other meetings, wouldn't know our format, wouldn't necessarily know the issue, regardless. We don't generally have departmental specific debates, per se.

So from my opinion, I think it's better to have a senator, even a senator outside of your department, be a proxy. Now, if we let one person have multiple proxies, and then it was a nonsenator, well, you have a potential of that person having several votes and still not be able to participate in the debate, not necessarily know what's going on.

So we can separate the issues, but my suggestion is that we go

with one person can hold multiple proxies, it should be a senator that does that.

>> ODILE WOLF: Personally, I don't think it's a good idea to have multiple proxy for one person. And here's the thing: So currently we get the agenda and all the papers and all that rather late. So we have to, as proxy, we have to go and discuss those issues with whoever we are proxying, we are representing.

If we have more than one person that we are representing, it may get hard to distinguish who's who and what do they want to do and if they have a strong opinion one way or the other.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Comments?

>> ROSA MORALES: I agree with the fact that I prefer to have one person representing one proxy. I think it would allow for a little bit more democratic opportunity for other people to represent others. I'm just concerned that there are individuals that are very well known could be working with a college for many, many years, and therefore, a lot of people might be interested in them representing them, but what about the new people, the people that are barely coming? I think it will give the opportunity for the individuals to be looking into all those that might not -- might need to get some experience and participate more.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: So you think one person should only hold one proxy?

>> ROSA MORALES: Yes.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Before we go too much further, proxies are in the charter. They are just sort of ambiguous.

Kind of a straw poll. Are we still in favor of having proxies?

All right, good. We resolved that. So now we are trying to figure out can you hold multiple proxies and who can hold a proxy?

Any other discussion about someone holding multiple proxies?

>> DAVID KREIDER: Jeannie made a good point in the previous presentation of not functioning off of anecdotal evidence but in fact functioning off of fact.

How often are proxies used here, one, and has there been a problem with it, two?

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Well, in terms of being a problem, I don't know how we define "problem." Pat can give us some kind of idea in terms of how proxies are used.

>> SPEAKER: Well, first of all, let me say that all things considered, we are not real well attended. We have 62 senators, and we have difficulty getting a quorum from time to time. But the attendance, I would say, typically starts out with about 40, and

there might be five, six proxies.

Now, as far as problems, I don't know, because have we been counting their votes? A lot of these questions we can't really assess whether there is a problem until we decide what our policy is. It's been pretty vague.

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: I have been looking this up from the beginning. I'm paying attention to the charter, and I don't see anywhere that it says that only a senator can vote. In the meetings we have, when we meet, that they are open, we have to have a quorum, decisions are made by the majority of the members of attendance, the three portions, part F, participation and report in business sessions is limited to elected members and invited guests. Motions, debate, and resolutions are restricted to the business session. But nowhere does it say it has to be a senator.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: It says debate is -- the business section is devoted to the senators.

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: Elected members and invited guests. Is a proxy an invited guest? Is someone acting -- you know, like if Lisa can't make it -- my case is always ESL. If Lisa can't make it, Cynthia or Caroline is going to be here to represent ESL, and we need that point of view in there.

So by saying we can only do this if it's a senator, that restricts input from that particular group and their votes and how it influences the outcome of something.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Well, I go back to the fact that we rarely have departmental specific votes. But what initiated that original clause that was changed was a criticism of the senate going back to the proposal by Chancellor Flores having to do with the reading requirement coming in.

We handled that whole situation very clumsily as a senate. We lent doubt to its legitimacy that day.

So we, a couple years later, put in a clause to make it clear that business can only come through the business section and the implication of it was this was a senator-driven situation. There could be visitors in the open forum, but that was not where we do business nor take votes.

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: It doesn't say --

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Well, it may need be. I think that was the implication of why we put that in there if we need to clean that, too.

I think we should be very reluctant about encouraging a system where we have nonsenators to come in to vote. You know, our

attendance problems aside -- I think that's one situation, but I don't think we should encourage people that rarely come to meetings have a vote.

>> ROSA MORALES: I think I want to go back to the fact that we not only have an attendance problem, we also have an education problem.

From the minutes last time it would very important for us to consider providing an orientation to those that are elected. It has been my understanding in the previous years that some of my colleagues never attended the faculty senate, but at the same time they didn't even know that they could have signed a proxy.

So I think we need to revisit the fact that it might be a good idea to establish something to that effect so individuals know that if they are not, you know, able to come, at least it is a responsibility to select a proxy.

>> SPEAKER: I'm just wondering if, since the voting is the issue here, I'm on two different CDACs and voting electronically. The issue that comes up, could we not meet electronically and vote electronically? Would that solve the problem?

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: No. It wouldn't solve the problem.

Okay. I think we still have some disagreements on what to put

forward, so at the next meeting why don't we draft two different proposals and bring them forward, and we can take a vote on them unless there is any other further discussion? Carol?

>> SPEAKER: Could we please add the attendance problem to that discussion over the next month? This is horrible. Look around the room. This room is half empty. I'm so discouraged by that.

It would be great if we could do that. At the January meeting, when the senators come, that perhaps would be an ideal time to do some sort of short orientation, history thing. Even if it takes up, you know, a half an hour, it would be well worth it just to go over the charter, whatever form it takes at that point. That's my opinion, anyway.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Anything else before we move on?

Okay. Great. We'll come back to it.

If we have another charter (indiscernible) any controversy about it, that will come in December. That has to do with the composition of senate representatives to the Board of Governors and to the council, and that's a matter of conforming to board policy. That one will come. We have mentioned, talked about that one before.

Moving ahead to reports, chancellor's report, David Bea is here with us today.

>> DR. DAVID BEA: Good afternoon. Last Monday we had a work study session in which we talked to the board about budget, financial projection issues, that sort of thing. The board and Lee both said during that session, hey, why don't we take some of this information to faculty senate, getting the word out about the status of the financial condition of the college, where things are going, because we are entering sort of a new era and we need to start getting that word out.

With that said, there are a few slides. I toned it down.

(Indiscernible) talked to the board about. I think I have like five slides. I thought they were the most poignant slides to talk about various issues. Two principle factors to be thinking about are state aid and enrollment.

So with that, we can turn to the first slide. This slide is one that looks similar to a slide that anyone who has seen budget projections in the last number of years, same going out of business card. This is actually a little bit different and is a little bit more telling for the future. What this actually is the average amount of state aid per full-time equivalent student for all of the community colleges.

So anyone have any idea what our average state aid is per student

right now, Pima's? A bit over \$300 per student we get for state aid.

If you look up here and you look toward the right-hand side, what the average state aid is, it's about \$250. The way that the state funding formula works is it goes back in time to, two years back in time for enrollment, and then it incrementally changes where you're currently at based on changes of your enrollment year over year.

It changes it not based on what your college's average enrollment FTSE figure is, it changes it based on the state aid. Right now that's kind of good news because that means because we are in a enrollment declining situation that we are being cut on a \$300 per student we are getting cut at \$250 per student.

Downside of that is once we turn enrollment problem around we are not going to be gaining much. We will be gaining about \$250 per full-time equivalent student. If you see the red figure there, what that is is even a more grave situation, which is a number of years ago in the middle of the cuts, the state cut the funding for dual enrollment to be 50% of what the full-time equivalent rate was.

For every FTSE we had in dual enrollment, it's \$127. Anyone teach dual enrollment or organize dual enrollment? Is the cost of putting that together, organizing that, doing what we need to do as a college somewhere in the neighborhood of 127 bucks? Probably more.

So what we have is we have a problem where the state is asking, hey, we want to start increasing the number of students we graduate, increasing the number of educated people in the state, but the state aid, unless they change, is not going to do anything toward that end.

Now, moving forward, this is what used to be called capital aid, and it shows the difference that the line on the top, red line is what we should have gotten from the state. The yellow line is what we actually got from the state. So going back in time, one of the first things that happened when big cuts occurred in fiscal year 2009, capital aid was eliminated entirely.

There is a statute that says per student you should be getting X amount of money. That basically has not been funded, not been appropriated for the number of years that we are seeing.

You can click it again. Over that period of time we would have gotten \$23 million in capital aid more than we got.

What do we use that money for? We use it for computing equipment, for equipment in the classrooms, to renovate the classrooms, renovate buildings, all of those kinds of things, \$23 million over the course of the last seven years we would have had.

What we have done is adapted that by pinching as much as we could, cutting down the capital budget as much as we could and then doing

some amount of funding out of fund balance and out of surplus budget from the prior years.

We got to the point where we are sort of capped out and maxed our ability to do that. We need to replace that kind of equipment. We can't just let things fall apart. We need to find a way to operationalize that shortage expenditure in the budget.

Now, shifting over to the enrollment. Let me see before we shift to enrollment, the state budget situation, hopefully you got a chance to see -- we started putting out a newsletter. It should be quarterly, give you some factoid things to be aware of. Try to keep it short and simple. Information where you can click and get initial information, but the idea is let's read one page of information -- we are overloaded with information. I get it. I'm trying not to overload people but to provide information that's useful.

If you want to click on links, we will get links on there, but it is to get you an update on where things are at. If you read that last newsletter, the state budget situation is not good. The revenue projections from last year, the actuals came in lower than they projected last year. In the current year, their revenue projections were based on their last year estimates. So last year came in lower than they were expecting, then they built off of it, which means in

the current year they are expecting a revenue shortfall of around \$200 million.

In addition to that, there was a court decision related to K12 entitlement, index inflation-based funding at the K12 level. There is a lawsuit between the K12 system and the state. The K12 system won that and now the state is disputing that.

What's at stake here is that in the current year, basically the lawsuit that went in the favor of K12 education is saying that the state owes the K12 system over \$300 million in the current year. Revenues are down about \$200 million and they owe K12 \$300 million-plus. In the current year, the state is looking at a real deficit versus their expectation of about \$500 million.

Next year, the budget they are building going forward, there will be a deficit to about \$800 million and could easily grow. The reality is we are currently getting a little bit over \$6 million in state aid. Going back in time for fiscal year, before the cut started, we got about \$20 million in state operating aid and \$3 million in capital funding. We are down to a little over 6 total for both things. Now capital is STEM funding. If you hear STEM, that's what that is.

We are in a situation where we are getting a little bit over \$6

million. The best case scenario looking at sort of, looking in the tea leaves and the election results weren't too favorable in getting any of these (indiscernible) is the best case scenario is that we will hold steady at what our current funding situation is, which means we will lose about \$400,000 of operating aid because of enrollment.

So we know that. That's the best case scenario from what I see. We will be hoping to not lose any of the additional STEM funding, \$600,000 there was that little uptick. We will be lucky if we don't lose that.

Shifting to enrollment. The other component we have to factor in is our enrollment is obviously suffering badly. It's in bad shape. Talking about enrollment, one of the things that I have been surprised about is that when you talk about enrollment, there is a tendency to say our enrollment is back before the peak happened for the economic downturn.

Anyone still think that's true? You guys are all educated and knowledgeable.

If you look at this chart, our enrollment is actually back at about the level of the year 2000. We are not at the 2008 level. We are back in 2000.

(Indiscernible) a few different things. One is our infrastructure has grown quite a bit since 2000. We have a new campus since then. We have a lot of additional staff. What this chart shows, it compares addition in staff positions, regular staff, administrator, and faculty positions over the number of years. And then you go back and you look at the year 2000, you see our staff size, number of employees, we have grown since that time, also an added campus. The reality is that the infrastructure is quite a bit bigger than what our enrollment is right now.

The other component to enrollment that's really critical is part of the state, state constitution, there is a thing called expenditure limitation. It hasn't been that much of a factor for a number of years because (indiscernible) in enrollment or the state aid was decreasing. What the enrollment or expenditure limitation is about, it says looking back at 1980, it's really funky -- I'm going to totally simplify this. This is a convoluted regulation.

Essentially it compares the institution to the 1980 level and increases that expenditure level that you had in 1980 based on what your enrollment is, how much your enrollment has grown since 1980, and there is an inflation measure. It's extremely conservative inflation measure. It's (indiscernible) familiar with. So it

doesn't grow that much.

So over time, what happens is that it basically says, based on the public revenues that you get, that's the combination of property tax and state aid, there is a cap on how much you would spend for operating purposes. And because again this is the issue that's at play here is because our enrollment has declined so much, we now have a reality base (indiscernible) expenditure limitation.

So there are a number --

>> SPEAKER: David, put your microphone closer, would you?

>> DR. DAVID BEA: Sure. How is that?

So going into this budget season, anyone who has been around for a long time, we are talking about budget way earlier than we have ever talked about it before. Giving presentations, doing long-term financial projections, involving adding more forums, discussions about budget.

There are a few things that we will be doing quite a bit different. One is that we are going to be establishing a budget and planning committee. As it indicates up there, that committee, that group, we are just going to be working on establishing the criteria by which budget decisions need to be made, sort of things like how mission critical is it, is there a potential for return on investment

for whatever the budget issue might be, that kind of thing, looking at how you would decide and evaluate cuts.

This group won't necessarily be making the prioritizations. The will be establishing the criteria for it. Going through the budget process, making sure that it's an inclusive process, people feel they're knowledgeable, there is good communication out there, and that it's linked really well with the strategic plan which is historically with the HLC it's something the HLC was looking at, it's something we knew we needed to strengthen. So the idea is our strategic goals as an institution should have budgetary mechanisms to make sure that the resources are going towards the strategic plan and we can actually meet those.

That's the first part of it. The second part is being tasked by the board to do scenario planning. That includes cuts of 5%, 10%, 15%. A 15% cut is a very large budget cut. I'm not telling you that because I think that's what the outcome is going to be. I'm telling you that because that's what we will be working on. We will be thinking through new ideas how this college can strategically go through this period where we are looking at difficult financial times and how we are going to address them and come out and create solutions. It's intended to be an inclusive process.

The slide that I was just showing you, and this is actually predicated for a couple of different reasons, the adjunct faculty model, the model that results in the campus funding that goes out to support the adjunct faculty -- there has been a group off and on the last couple of years that have been reviewing how that model works.

One of the things that's come up is this new approach to distance education is actually going to force the issue a little bit, because depending upon how the structure of this distance education comes together, we have to change how that model works. Right now a faculty member is at campus. The funding and enrollment goes to that campus. If that goes to some more of a centralized model, like if the adjunct, all the adjunct funding goes to Community Campus, we have to adjust the model for the campuses.

The idea with adjusting model, by the way, before anyone gets too concerned, the idea right now is just to make it wash. So there's a lot of data being analyzed right now that says, okay, if distance ed shifts, how do we keep it so the campuses, on-site instruction campuses will be essentially the same?

So those who know the overall model is based on a 21.1 ratio, but if you know distance education classes actually run a little bit higher on average enrollment versus the nondistance classes, so if

all the distance ed classes go one place, that will, by the very fact, by the math of it all, will change the funding, how the funding goes to the campus. The idea isn't to hamstring the onsite campuses. The idea is, okay, we are doing this differently. We're just going to try and reflect that within the model.

A couple of other things we are working on within the model structure is more along the lines of what you see with the green, which is looking at enrollment from a holistic standpoint. Up until, when you see those two big dropoffs -- this is two different years, the most recent spring and the prior spring to that. If you look at it, the enrollment grows and drops off dramatically like a cliff. That is the shift for nonpayment that occurs a few weeks before the semester starts and then enrollment picks back up.

One of the things we are looking at is getting out of that practice. The way we have people paying is really funky. It's a legacy here and is actually a very generous way to have payments where students aren't required until the very last day and they can push some of the payments into the semester.

What we are working on and we will need to work with financial aid because of the interaction between financial aid and this is really critical, getting this so students are actually paying more

when early enrollment occurs. Then you don't have this big dropoff which will allow us to do a lot better predictive scheduling and so forth.

You've probably heard of the idea of getting guaranteed scheduling. Without having some predictability in your enrollment, it would be very difficult to do that and we get into the situation we are in.

That's one component of what we are looking at. That also actually will cut down some costs if we shift to that model, because as we have payment plans in the semester, some students actually don't pay. It's actually a pretty low percentage, but it adds up. And if we get people to pay before the semester starts and we know the students who are in classes have either paid or have the financial aid coming, then we don't lose that bad debt.

Moving forward then is also the notion of what we are looking at is incentive-based funding that will be based on a student success measure. You were listening to student success information earlier. If you look at this and see there is a decrease, that line decreases from Day 1 (indiscernible) all the way through day 99, most of that in this kind of a chart is related to withdrawals.

What the idea is that if we can start focusing on success, and

success is not just withdrawals, it's obviously success in class, and will come up with some mechanism by which the campuses get some funding that they can carry over year to year, it's totally different from what is in existence right now, and that campuses will have some discretion in terms of how they use that money. So we are working on that. I can't tell you exactly what that's going to be, but conceptually that's one of the things we are talking about from a student success model, trying to create some financial structure and also reinforce college goals for student success.

The other thing, I'm looking down toward the bottom, along the same lines of incentive-based funding is the idea of one of the only revenue sources we can have significant impact on, has a significant impact on the institution, is how out-of-state/international enrollment. A couple of initiatives, distance education initiative is related to that. Out-of-state students pay more than instate students. Instate students pay about \$2,000 per year. Out-of-state students pay about \$10,000 per year.

The idea is that between \$2,000 and \$10,000 is a great difference, and it would make a big difference to the institution if we can bump up either/or out-of-state or international enrollment even a little bit will have a big impact on the institution, money

that can go to support other things for our educational purposes. So that's another component to the model we are working on.

And then, lastly, if you look at the bottom, it's creating some funding sources for program renewal, really linking things with program review. And program review comes out and says, we really think we need to do X, Y, or Z, in which we need to establish funds available so we can actually do that.

I know the last number of years, sort of, we have a recommendation to do that. Then you have to put it in the regular budget process, and it's 18 months later before that even is the possibility of funding. The idea is to have those things linked much more closely.

Anyway, that's the early version of it. I wanted to give you all a heads-up, wanted to give you a chance if you had any questions and hopefully I didn't go up too far past my time.

>> DAVID KREIDER: Just one real quick question. With regard to the high revenue of out-of-state/international, I know the chancellor had spoken about trying to push on this and I know President Albert of West Campus is working on it.

Are you able to speak a little bit to that, or would you prefer not to?

>> DR. DAVID BEA: I can speak a little bit to it. We are going to be talking to the board about it next -- we are doing some financial projections. Basically, because of that \$10,000 per student, even if you ramp up the support, which we will need to to have a robust or appropriate international student program, even if you ramp up the support, the financial return to the institution is significant.

To give you an idea, if we were to add about a little less than 900 FTSE -- and it's bigger than what we had been but not a whole lot bigger. Adding 900, and then adding a significant amount of staff to support those units, still net return to the institution of about \$5 million. Significant. I mean, it's big, big dollars because of that \$10,000 per student.

In addition to that, obviously there are other components to the international education that I'm not an expert on it, but obviously globalizing the instruction and the curriculum and all that is part of the college's direction, as well.

>> DAVID KREIDER: I just saw the notice in the news that they were having the former ambassador speak to that and some other meetings. Thank you very much.

>> SPEAKER: There was some talk about six months ago or so that

they were going to do some investigation of why the enrollment is dropping. Can you tell us what was found, if anything, on that?

>> DR. DAVID BEA: I believe it's still underway. There is a group that's doing a review of enrollment management, consultant group, and I know they are doing some analysis on it. I haven't seen any data on it. I will give my personal perspective of it.

It's across the board. It's everything. Clearly we lost adult education as a result of the changes that were made. I don't think we have recaptured those anywhere near the degree to which we could. We have also lost students, the economic turnaround. The economy is a little bit better. People aren't coming back to school.

And we are also losing students otherwise. And it's not unique to Pima, but the degree to which the downturn is I think -- I think the HLC status has had an effect, as well.

There are four factors I think immediately. And I think the reality is there is something else going on that I think is truly in higher education, and that's where I have to do more analysis to figure out. And I can't tell you which part is what percent of the decline.

>> SPEAKER: So if that's the case, then has anybody looked at why the enrollment at the universities has gone up by about 5%?

>> DR. DAVID BEA: Community college enrollment and university enrollment are two different things. When you're in a more select situation, you have more control over what your enrollment trends are because you can decide to open up capacity or decline capacity.

It's when you're open, like community colleges, you sort of -- the factors are you market better, have better outreach, but there are other things like the economy that have a bigger effect.

If you look at selective college, a Harvard or something like that, they can choose how big their enrollment is going to be. They have a surplus. That's the situation in the university. They've chose it -- and the board has told them of increase of enrollment, so they are looking at increased capacity.

They are also big on the international and out-of-state for the exact same reason we are, by the way. So this isn't a novel approach. Anyone who knows anything about the university, international and out-of-state students are a big priority there.

>> ODILE WOLF: Speaking of the international and out-of-state enrollment, I know that in Washington state the priority to do international and out-of-state tuition became, is such that now it's very hard for students that are within Washington to actually register in the state universities.

Is that going to be -- is that taken into account, as well, or
are we just allowing anybody in so it's not an issue?

>> DR. DAVID BEA: I think at the extreme you could have that,
but when you're looking at our capacity being down as low as it is,
we have so much capacity at this institution right now, there won't
be a crowding-out situation. That won't be a problem for some time.
I wouldn't say that -- that might be an issue at the university,
though.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Questions? Great.

>> DR. DAVID BEA: Thank you much.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Thanks, David.

(Applause.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Item 6.2, provost's report. Dr. Holmes.

>> PROVOST HOLMES: Hello, everybody. Happy Friday.

Many of the things that are going on currently in academic and
student affairs have already been mentioned in other things. I won't
repeat those things.

I just wanted to mention that last week we sent out the Title IV
program review report, and the findings were shared with the college,
and so the response report was submitted on October 24. So we had a
lot of participation from different members of financial aid and

faculty and task force, and so that was very helpful and we were able to get the report out on time.

Related to Title IV, as an information item for you, there was some Clery training this week, two-and-a-half days. We had our officers and staff and presidents and other members of cabinet, and student services went through some training on the Clery Report.

That is a federal requirement that we report college statistics, and so this training was very helpful for all of us in knowing what to report, how to make reports, and to make sure we get timely reports. You will probably hear more about that on the campus level as that information starts to come through from the training that we had.

I wanted to make sure that everybody takes a look on the website if you haven't already done so at some of the accomplishments of the athletic program and help us to congratulate some of the students, coaches and staff on the accomplishments that have been achieved in the athletic programs this semester.

Finally, I hope that everybody will participate in naming the distance education program. The voting is open. We did receive just about a hundred entries, and those entries were sent to the task force. The task force narrowed it down to four, and those four names

are out to the college for voting. The most popular name will be the new name of the distance education program.

If I don't get a chance to see you all next week, I want to wish you all a happy Veterans Day and enjoy your weekend.

Any questions?

>> ROSA MORALES: We are still having some questions regarding the attendance records report. I sent an e-mail, but I think I didn't get a response.

Who do you recommend for us to be the contact person for that?

>> PROVOST HOLMES: The contact person is Tara Benson.

>> ROSA MORALES: Okay. Thank you.

>> PROVOST HOLMES: Thank you, everybody.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Thank you.

(Applause.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: PCC report.

>> MS. RITA FLATTLEY: Due to the hour, I will be brief. Yay.

Last time I spoke to you, we talked a little bit about All Faculty Day in January. I had a tentative agenda. I have not had a chance to review that agenda with many of the constituents.

I did talk to the student learning outcomes leaders, and they actually agreed with many of you, they'd rather have student learning

outcomes on a separate day.

So everyone I have checked with thinks having everything all in one place instead of driving all over town sounds like a good idea.

So I will finalize that with Mary Ann Martinez Sanchez so you will be getting that agenda.

In the great news, the Meet and Confer teams are being formed and will be announced this month. I'm not the chief spokesperson. Nope. Not. Nan Schmidt will be the chief spokesperson, and she will be sending out all the team members. I know she's been being very busy about gathering input and has a folder going on Meet and Confer ideas for next spring.

The agenda already has some reports on some of the other issues that PCCEA members are very actively involved in. There was one task force proposed last spring that actually has not come together yet due to other issues that have arisen, which is a task force on the horizontal movement on the faculty salary schedule.

Vertical movement, you get a step awarded, that's working your way down. Horizontal movement at this time has been mainly just graduate credits. It's like a Master's degree, you get another 15 moves. Graduate credits, you move over. So it's another way to build your salary.

There have been concerns that it kind of is skewed towards the academic areas over the occupational areas. For some occupational areas, I think in aviation, there is not graduate classes. I don't know. Maybe in engineering. But there are a lot of certifications in occupational areas that are really, really relevant to that field and are not anywhere in our current horizontal movement model.

So one question I have is -- I know everybody's committed out, but I would like to be contacted if you do have an interest in looking at horizontal movement on the faculty salary schedule. We do have other models from other colleges, like Maricopa, for example. Portland Community College has some interesting models for possibilities, things you can count towards horizontal movement for adding professional certifications, continuing education units, however you want to look at that.

So if you do have an interest in that, let me know. I think it's something that we really need to review. Our current model, the Flores administration, it was totally focused on graduate credits and I don't think that's all there is out there.

Any questions?

>> SPEAKER: I would just like to maybe re-emphasize for everybody that faculty surface that comes out every fall, like Rita

said that would be coming up, please do encourage your colleagues to participate. This is really the main survey instrument for us to gather raw faculty views and feedback on concerns in general but especially as it pertains to Meet and Confer as it comes up next spring.

It really helps us to have the broadest possible faculty viewpoint, not just from membership but from faculty in general so that we can make those arguments during Meet and Confer and we can make those arguments in front of the board. All right?

So please participate and encourage your colleagues to do as well. Thanks.

>> MS. RITA FLATTLEY: Thank you for that addition. That's really an important one. Besides sharing that faculty survey data with the board, we sometimes use that survey data to compare what's going on now with some other previous point in time. So we will sometimes do time trends on how faculty views, trends, issues have changed, and that has been very important when we have looked at the level of -- for example, we compared the level of faculty confidence in the chancellor like about five years apart, and like we have had an excellent improvement in that regard.

So your views that you put on that survey really are important

and are carefully analyzed by the Meet and Confer team.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Thank you, Rita.

(Applause.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Item 6.3. Kimlisa.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: I think I'm up for the board report, too. So I will tell you right now I don't want to talk about the board. They haven't done anything that we haven't already heard about, so I don't see any need to take your time with that.

That being said, I do feel the need to take your time with this. This is about the board policies that went through the board just last meeting. They had to hold a special meeting to do this. This is policies that are supposed to address the situation that we are in with the Department of Education.

I cannot impress upon you -- if you're asleep right now, wake up. Seriously. If we lose Title IV funding, we're done, okay? We are literally done. That is financial aid for us, and it is more important than HLC.

So pay attention to this attendance-taking, this attendance task force. On this task force there are two senate members. There is myself and Odile. I may call on Odile to come up here and back me up.

And there is also PCCEA representation. There is Scott Collins.

We also have on board Julia Fiello. We have Robert Both (phonetic) is on there. I'm not sure which one of us he's representing but he's there and he's good. And we also have Bridget Murphy as our VPI.

This is a task force. It is not a standing committee. These two particular board policies that I'm about to show you are the ones that we need to pay special attention to.

First of all, this one I'm sorry it's so small. I should probably go blow it up, but basically -- hang on. Let me blow it up. Can somebody run the computer and hit the + sign.

Certain things that you need to know. First of all, there are certain things that Department of Education expects from us if they are giving us financial aid.

First of all, there needs to be academic activity in your class, and for sure the first week of any class, any class, any modality, must have some kind of academic activity going on in it. Otherwise we fall into something called a correspondence course. We are not accredited for correspondence courses. We should not have correspondence courses.

The way they define correspondence courses is when you just give the students the material, and then you have very little interaction

with them, okay? So we should try and avoid those. The other classes, and this is extremely, extremely complicated, and these are board policies. They are supposed to be very overview, but what this one basically says is that course attendance/participation are essential and that you need to have the participation and attendance requirements in your course syllabus. The days of you don't have to attend are gone, all right? Just gone.

The other thing is that if a student decides -- there is a couple of things that we had to think about. First of all, the students that register for a class and never ever show up, okay?

That's why we need to have that activity in there. If a student comes into a classroom or registers for a class, never shows up, then we are moving to a scenario where you can just drop them, okay, as in they're done. That way you can open up a slot for another student, okay, that actually wants to show up.

When you drop them, it will become something called -- what was it? Registered, never attended. No, that's the RN status. It's RA.

I will show it on the next one. Then basically, when you give them that grade, they drop them as if they were never enrolled. The money goes back if they paid their money. From what David Bea just said, they will have paid their money. Financial aid is

recalculated. We only have 14 days to do this whole scenario.

The one you see up here on this particular board policy is for those students that are registered, they show up a few times, and then they kind of just disappear. All right?

We call that registered but not attending. This is not a grade. It is a Banner flag, okay? And what this is going to do, assuming that we can get everything in Banner to work, which is, you know, whatever you do, please do it, what this does is as you're doing that attendance thing in Banner, if it starts showing up that this student has been missing for a significant period of time, hasn't shown up for two weeks, then what happens is they get flagged RN. They still sit on your roster. And there is a way for them to come back. Say something catastrophic happened, and for whatever reason, they're not there, and then you hear from them, and then you start marking excused absence when they get back, then we can change this, all right? And then financial aid can be recalculated.

But if they never come back, then you have the option to give them the W, give them the F, whatever. So that puts how this works out into our hands, and we are going to work on an SPG and have lots of feedback on that.

Yes, ma'am?

>> SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: I can't hear you. It's not working.

>> SPEAKER: Right now in Attendance Tracker, as far as I know I don't have a way to mark an excused absence in there. Is there a way to mark excused absences?

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: The best we can do right now is mark them absent and put the note. There is a note on the side. We are going to start working to see if there is a way to integrate that excused absence.

That's why it's so important for them to remain on your roster so that you have the ability -- so what will happen is when this gets triggered, then a note will go out to the student. An e-mail will go out to the student. You should be cc'd in a perfect world, and then the student has a chance to respond.

So if a student has been, you know, going to be gone for some horrible thing that's happened or whatever, been deployed, whatever, then you have the ability to maybe not -- maybe you're in contact with them every week in doing it, so in your mind they're not absent, right? Then you have the ability to do that.

The point is that we want to be able to clearly explain to Department of Education we have academic activity going on, this

student is around. We don't have activity going on, this student is not around.

>> SPEAKER: Yeah, got it. I don't know how it is for the rest of you, but every semester I have students they -- it happens that way. They mean to be there and they come back.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: And we want to be able to bring them back if it's reasonable to bring them back. If it's not reasonable to bring them back, then we just keep them flagged, recalculate the financial aid, because Banner tells financial aid this has happened, and then we, as faculty, at the end of the semester, when we submit our grades, we make the decision, if it's a W, if it's an F, whatever, but they get a grade at the end.

That way we don't have to constantly be grading them in the semester.

>> SPEAKER: As far as modalities, how is it going to be different for online versus self-paced, hybrid? How will students know this information? Will they have an orientation or do we have to put this information in our syllabi, or how is that going to work?

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: Odile? Does anybody -- if anybody in here has a five-week class starting, please let me know at the end so I can talk to you.

>> ODILE WOLF: So one of the biggest issues we have is that our definitions and the definitions of the Department of Ed are radically different. So when you have a self-paced class, and I'm working on a paper right now that will be eventually sent to the entire faculty body, when we have a self-paced class, currently we say, okay, the students can do whatever they want to do as long as they are done with all of their assignments by the end of the term, and that's true for both in-person and for web self-paced.

The Department of Ed doesn't think that way at all. So what they want is they want an academic activity or face-to-face contact for all self-paced, self-paced class, whether it's in person or it is online. And it's actually even more complex than that. It has to be within a seven-day period. So if they come on Monday one week and then they don't come back until the following Friday, we have more than seven days, but in our definition they came every week so we should be okay. So that's one thing.

Hybrid classes we are pretty much on track. The only thing we need to do is we need to have this academic activity. We are going to give you a definition of what that is. That definition -- you are going to have choices, but you need to tell your students right away. So you need to put that in your syllabus.

Another thing is open entry upon exit, well, open entry upon exit means the student can finish whenever they want and they can finish whenever they want. What that means when it comes to financial aid is they only get financial aid at the end of the term, and we can't give them financial aid like at any point in time.

Usually what happens at Pima is when they start the class, we say, hey, great, here is your financial aid. It doesn't work that way. The reason behind that is that financial aid has two parts. One of them has to do with tuition and books. The other one has to do with living expenses.

So if they do their entire class in three weeks, their financial aid is not going to be calculated the same way as if they had 16 weeks to do it.

So we are going to have to give definitions. We are working on that at the task force. And we are going to give you recommendations of things that you need to put in your syllabus. And we are going to do that as soon as we can.

But it is very complex, and every time we meet we find new complexities. So we will recommend you to put a link in your syllabus to the financial aid office at Pima.

They will keep it current. So that if we find out something

else, and it's two weeks after the school starts, you don't have a problem in your syllabus.

Did that answer your question?

Coming to class for in-person is an academic activity, and, yes, if you have students that come and they fall asleep, they still consider to be present and have academic activity, whereas if they are on a website and they go and they play on video games at the same time, it doesn't count.

>> MS. RITA FLATTLEY: I am concerned about one aspect of what you just said. The idea of having some dynamic link in case things change that after you have written the syllabus, that's a violation of a board policy on class orientation.

>> ODILE WOLF: We are not asking you to change your syllabus. We are asking -- the students are supposed to keep track of what financial aid means, and what we are going to ask you to put a dynamic link to is the financial aid calculation. It's not something having to do with academia; it has to do with just financial aid calculations.

That's why, you know, in the same way that we have an attendance section in our syllabus. That is going to not change. The thing that will have more information will be the financial aid part.

>> MS. RITA FLATTLEY: Couldn't you just put a link to financial aid information in your...

>> ODILE WOLF: That's what we are asking you to do.

>> MS. RITA FLATTLEY: But it's only about financial aid?

>> ODILE WOLF: It's only about financial aide. It has nothing to do with your class. It has to do with what's happening at the financial aid office.

>> ROSA MORALES: One of the things that I like is the fact there is going to be an orientation, mandatory orientation, so hopefully the section that discusses these types of issues for the students will be expected, and especially the fact that we are going to be, you know, putting some of that information on the syllabus.

One of the things that is happening currently is for those classes, like in my case that I teach five classes, each of the classes are coming on the attendance records as separate courses, which is the same issue that one of my partners are having. She's having that because she teaches seven classes on Thursdays. So every time that we go and place the attendance records it's not in the same line. It's in a different line. Same CRN.

The other thing that I notice is that (indiscernible) and the student comes two hours late or has to leave early. So obviously there is a partial attendance. So while I mark them they attended, I also go on the sites and I put the amount of hours they attended. Unfortunately on this site it says 100%, where in my records it's not 100%.

>> ODILE WOLF: Yes, at this point attendance is binary, either they were there and they did something or showed up or they were not there.

>> SPEAKER: Two things. One, I have all hybrid classes and each one of my classes has two listings, so I called Carrie Mitchell. She said just take attendance in the top one, and that's all I have done all semester. I have just recorded on one of them and the other one is blank all semester, so that's how we did that.

Can you tell us a ballpark time period for when we could expect some type of a sample syllabus statement like in early December, late December? Because I do mine pretty early.

>> ODILE WOLF: Yes, I understand that, and that's one of the issues I had with what happened at the beginning of last year.

I'm working on it right now with Kimlisa. We also, you know, are totally overbooked, but we have already started things. The task

force is currently focusing on cleaning up the class definitions, but I will be -- my goal is going to have to some statements, some examples, you know, examples of academic activity, which you will have to define. Right now the most I have is here are the things you're going to need in your syllabus so that you can put some place holders.

>> SPEAKER: Would it be safe to say if I made my syllabi out early that I could mention academic activity will occur during class sessions and that might be safe enough for me to get me by for a starter?

>> ODILE WOLF: It will be safe for you, but it won't be safe for your students --

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: Depends if she's face-to-face --

>> SPEAKER: I'm all hybrid so we have both.

>> ODILE WOLF: Well, hybrid, you're going to have to -- it depends how many times you meet per week.

>> SPEAKER: Twice a week.

>> ODILE WOLF: If you're 50/50, you're okay. If you have a time where you don't meet during one week, then you start having the issue about the academic activity that has to happen online.

>> SPEAKER: So if they turn in assignments online, that would be

a demonstration of academic activity, right? So as long as we have a weekly assignment due electronically, that would be a demonstration, yes?

>> ODILE WOLF: Yes and no. The yes part is that you do have an academic activity. The bad part is the submission date is what's important. It's not the date, the due date.

So if you have a student that has -- and you have like five assignments, and all those assignments are available from the beginning of the class, and they do three assignments in one week, they will be present for that week, but they may not be present for other weeks...

>> SPEAKER: I totally got that. Yeah. That's tricky.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: If you're face-to-face it's not that big of a deal, because going to class is an academic activity. If you're 50/50, then that's not that big of a deal either because you will see your student every week. It's when you get to that point where you haven't seen your student for, say, 14 days. Then it gets weird.

Online is another weird thing, because, say a student logs on and they have been in there reading and doing things online that we would think of as academic activity, but that is not academic activity. If

they take a quiz, it becomes academic activity. If they e-mail you and you e-mail them back, you have an academic activity. If you do a discussion, that's an academic activity.

But Department of Ed sees reading as something that you do -- that's like homework. Do we count them as present for reading their texts at home? So they see that as like homework.

So, like I said, it is extremely complex and we are trying hard to get you the best information as quickly as possible. The reason I brought up the last five weeks is we really need some pilot people because we are supposed to be piloting this thing we haven't quite figured out yet.

It's kind of like flying a plane while you're still building it.

>> SPEAKER: So you can imagine that we have our entire (indiscernible) lab is self-paced. I think we have a system that's fitting pretty closely, but we need to plan for the spring semester, and we really need to be, you know, we need to have communication as to whether we are in compliance or not.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: Right. We don't want to tell you the wrong thing.

>> SPEAKER: I just think it's important to touch base -- you know, there are other actually self-paced programs that are going to

have to make major changes. But there are things today that we need to know who to talk to and they need to communicate with us, please

>> ODILE WOLF: And you can communicate with either Kimlisa or I, and we will bring it back. Yes, I know -- that's why we are working on a communication for you.

You know, it may evolve and you have to be kind of patient with us, because we are not the only people who are confused. Every time we actually go and benchmark some universities, none are doing the same thing. It's a work in progress.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: But other universities are not under the gun like us. You have to understand that. We have been messing this up for years, and we have paid back to the tune of almost, what was it, 2.-- almost \$3 million back over the past three years. We are on probation. They know we're here, okay?

So we are like in the spotlight. And so while other universities and colleges that have done it right or sort of done it right and haven't gotten in trouble and haven't ignored them and aren't on probation -- I mean, we have the perfect storm here.

It is what it is, and we have to do what we have to do, but we are trying, you know -- for some of, and I know what Tim's talking about. You know, for some of you guys, even though you would call it

self-paced, it really isn't self-paced in a lot of ways, because there are clear requirements to come in and be seen and do things and work your way through, so there is contact. It's the contact that's really important.

The other thing that we went through was the grades, and we really pared back the grades, because we only put forward the grades -- this is 3108 up there -- that were absolutely positively had to do, so that WP, WF thing, that went away for now. We talked about withdraw passing, withdraw failed, and I didn't get that many responses back on this, but the ones I did were like I don't like that. I just want a W. Thank you very much.

The other thing is that NA, never attended, which makes them not applicable. So that's how I'm trying to remember it. Never attended is the one I was talking about for students that are registered but you never see them. So at a certain point you're going to be asked to just get rid of them, dump them.

Now, if that student has contacted you and said, you know, I'm stuck in Thailand and I can't get there, and there's been this and that and I'm in the military, I'm coming, you know, then you may go, okay, you need to do X, Y, Z, here's all your stuff and I will see you then. Then they would get this. They have contacted you. You

know what's going on. But if they don't show up when they're supposed to be there, then you need to do this.

We're trying to get grading open much more so that you can do -- you know, say some student comes to you and says, I want a W and this is why, and you're like, well, that's completely justifiable, instead of keeping them in the back of their mind and keeping it flagged and having all these e-mails and stuff, just give them a W, and you're done grading them for the semester. Then when the other grades come up then you do those.

Kind of in a way it's kind of good and in a way it's kind of hideous.

>> ODILE WOLF: One last thing. When it comes to the academic activity, Kimlisa was listing a whole bunch of academic activity. You don't have to keep track of all the things that they are doing as long as you define in your syllabus, this is what academic activity is going to mean for me from this term, and this is what I'm going to check.

It can be a quiz where you ask them the question to just say, hey, what did you learn this week for online? For in-person, as we said, if they show up and they are bodily there, that's all we need.

But, you know, it could be an e-mail that they have to send you

or it could be -- but it has to be within a certain period.

>> SPEAKER: I have a question about the student W grading, and it's in the board policy. So we have no -- and this came up with the department board. We had to enter the veterans information. Their W grade, it goes off our records and we can't really enter the last academic activity.

So if they put a W, we can't record it. There is nowhere to record it. But that's not it. That doesn't count for it. So is it going to be left open in Banner at the end?

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: Yeah, it should be left open in Banner at the end, but if a student comes to you and says I need to withdraw because somebody has died or whatever, then you can just withdraw them right then. They have the option to withdraw whenever.

>> SPEAKER: But if there is a student W, it goes off --

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: If the student withdraws himself, then what it does is it puts that date --

>> SPEAKER: But that didn't count as the last --

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: No, it doesn't unfortunately.

>> SPEAKER: So we have no way of recording really when they stopped coming to class.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: What they will take is the last time

you entered them as present in the course in Banner when you were doing the attendance. That's what it will take, and that's what they will be recalculated to.

>> SPEAKER: I do want to mention, and it's about also the attendance tracking, the X grade. Now, many of us were not aware, I know that at the languages CDAC, we were aware because I was an LATF, language articulation task force, back in 2010 we discovered that the X grade does not transfer. The three universities do not accept the X grade.

What the X grade is is test by examination. In other words, in languages, we have what we call the challenge exams. The students take a proficiency exam, get a grade with an X, and it doesn't transfer.

Many times we were just giving them the grade, because it was also done at the universities, but once we found out that it was nontransferable, we stopped giving them the grades.

Now it comes to the point where we have to track attendance. Students can no longer challenge the courses. They can no longer take a proficiency exam, get the credit by examination, because we have to account for the seating time, and financial aid will not pay for it nor the universities. The universities want to know that.

So we still have that X grade as an option for students that want to do so here at Pima College. The only requirement is that they are aware that it does not transfer.

So I wanted to mention that, because I have been bringing this with the CDAC for a long time, and many people were not aware of this X grade. I think Desert Vista was the only campus that was using the X grade for the students that challenged, and there was a whole system in place.

But now we know, so I just wanted to bring that up because it does affect the attendance tracking. If a student tests out, we have to say they have never been to class. So with that...

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: Any more questions on this?

I swear we will get better information to you. We don't want to give you the wrong information, and so we are going to try and send out as much as we possibly can as soon as we can.

>> SPEAKER: I feel like attendance is something that makes sense to everyone else, and I feel a little lost. I want a little clarification.

It seems like we are being asked to keep track of things that are not verifiable, and so I just don't quite understand -- maybe from the perspective of the student, there seems to be like certain

triggers that sort of lock the student in or out of financial aid or something like that and other times something under other circumstances is sort of the instructor's call.

What's the line again?

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: It depends. It's really complicated.

So if you want, you and I can sit down and we can talk about it.

Because it's -- I'm going to have to ask you like 3,000 questions, like what's your modality and what kind of activities are you talking about? But the thing -- I think what Department of Ed is really cracking down as far as -- we are giving the student money, and so we expect them to have their butts in a seat and that they are doing some kind of academic activity.

They are worried that we are giving them their money and then we never see them again. Then you have this horrible, you know, all these Fs and Ws, and then they don't repay the loan anyway.

So then we have that -- if the student -- but they want to give us some leeway in that, you know, life happens and the student may be doing the academic activity in an unexpected way, and then the faculty has to be able to record that and say, this student hasn't been attending my class because he is in Iraq, and we have been corresponding by mail, you know, or by e-mail or by Skype.

Then you need to make -- but you need to note it and let it be known. So if we get audited and they say, what's going on with this student? We can say, here's the stuff. It's all about the trail.

>> SPEAKER: And right now there is not a really good system for keeping track of that because Attendance Tracker is so wonderful.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: Yes, exactly.

>> SPEAKER: Department of Education is a federal -- that's the federal one you're talking about. Are the state compliance requirements in alignment with the federal? Are we keeping -- are we listening to two different requests?

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: We are focusing on the federal.

>> SPEAKER: Just focusing on the federal.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: The state, they just don't give us any money, so what's the point? (Laughter.)

>> SPEAKER: Thank you. So there are students that are -- they are paying their way through on their own. Their parents have money.

So financially are the numbers, percentages of students on financial aid, is it that high? Are we talking about 80, 90% of our students are on financial aid or more? Because they're not going to check -- they're really interested in a certain name that applied for financial aid. They got money. They're going to go look at our

records and say -- the other student who paid, they could care less about how we took attendance.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: They care about the financial aid.

But does anyone in here know which of your students are on financial aid or not?

>> SPEAKER: I don't know.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: That's the point. We don't know. So we have to take care of everybody.

>> SPEAKER: And then the first question?

>> ODILE WOLF: One more thing. We are talking about the Department of Ed just because we are under the gun right now with Title IV. There are 26, I think 26 different organizations who have different requirements, and it looks like so far from what we have seen, and again, that may change tomorrow, the Department of Ed seems to be the most stringent.

But we are under that gun and that gun is coming in March to do random auditing and they are not going to care. They just want to make sure everything is done according to their rules.

>> SPEAKER: I just want to thank you and the task force for clarifying everything, because it is making a difference. It's starting to look really clearer than when we first started.

So thank you.

(Applause.)

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: So the next thing that I'm up here for really quickly is I want you to know, as the provost pointed out, there is a naming contest out there for the online theme. The online theme is moving forward. It's going to happen.

There is going to be two -- Pat, help me. There's going to be two forums that we will be doing. They are coming up. One is -- the 19th, right before the Board of Governors meeting, and then the other one is the week after. One is at Downtown Campus. One is at East.

So if you teach at a distance, if you did any of the online, if you have hybrid, if you're interested, please come to the forums. That's a place where you're going to be able to let us know what you're thinking, and we can give you a better overview.

The other thing is that please, if you know people who are interested in technology, want to serve on any of the technology stuff, are interested in training, please -- first of all, if they're interested in the technology standing committee, please let me know so I can get them on there.

The other thing is there will be some supplemental assignments coming out. They are to work on training and things for this ePima

thing. So please let your constituents know to be watching for it.

The other thing is that there is going to be a quality matters training here at Pima on December 5. It's an all-day thing. That's on a Friday. So if you know people that are interested in that, please let them know. It would normally cost you \$200. There is also going to be some opportunity to get involved in our quality initiative for our distance education where Pima will pay for your peer reviewer certificate. Again, you will see those assignments coming out from HR. So please let people know to be watching for them.

Any questions? All right. I wish you a very great weekend.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Thanks.

(Applause.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: Carlo, anything else?

Senate president's report. Next meeting, December meeting, will be my last one as senate president. Kimlisa will be taking over in January. She's going to need some support. Four positions up for election: President-elect, VP, secretary, and Board of Governors rep.

Be thinking about that and don't leave her hanging. This is really kind of a very involved job, and it really needs some support

out there.

Carlo, Kimlisa, and I are on the governance council. The governance council is still kind of feeling its way in terms of what we are supposed to do as members from the staff council, student body, from the administrators. We get together a couple times a month, and as I say, we are still kind of feeling our way what our mission is, really.

The way I see it, it's kind of an early warning system we can get information that any problems that come out, we can pass them along sort of between senate meetings. It's also a way for the senate members to meet with the other employee groups, and rarely do we get eyeball to eyeball with them.

It's a work in progress, and we have been having a number of meetings and still trying to figure out what our role is going to be.

Now, we have been very accommodating on bringing forth board policies. I know there has been (indiscernible) because of various HLC issues, but Kimlisa and I have kind of made it known that we held up our end, and we expect some action on the other end.

We have an SPG for faculty emeritus that's been kind of hanging there. We'd like to see some action on that before we see more board policies. Also, we did make progress on the idea of e-mail for

retirees, so I think we might finally have that worked out.

Last, but not least, thanks again to Mike Rom for taking care of
us.

(Applause.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: And any questions? If not, a motion to
adjourn?

>> SPEAKER: Motion to adjourn.

>> SPEAKER: Second.

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: All in favor?

(Ayes.)

>> MR. JOE LABUDA: See you next month.

(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.