

**Glendale Community College Faculty Senate
2009-2010
Meeting of August 27, 2009, 2:30 p.m., SU104-ABC
Approved Minutes**

(Please note: General interest issues or meeting and notifications are listed below in **bold** to allow them to be located more easily.)

The minutes will now be provided in Spranq eco sans font, a font that decreases ink usage. You can download this environmentally-friendly font from: http://www.ecofont.eu/ecofont_en.html. Thanks to Robert Reavis and the Green Efforts Committee for this tip!

I. General

A. Call to Order

1. A quorum being present, President Jim Reed called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. in SU-ABC. Senators present included Vice President Gay Garesché, Executive Councilor at Large Steve Kadel, José A. Aguiñaga, Doug Brenner, Ruth Callahan, Susan Campbell, Phillip Fernandez, Erik Gergus, Mary Harris, Susan High, Elizabeth Jacobs, Johnnie C. May, Angela Mick, Julie B. Morrison, and Jim Sanders.

B. Guests in Attendance

1. Guests included but were not limited to: Joseph Bednorz, Don Davis, Doug DeSanti, Ernesto Escobedo, Fernando Garcia, Rachelle Hall, Michael Holtfrerich, David Jenkins, Pam Joraanstad, Christine Moore, Shohreh Moshrefzadeh, Carlos Nuñez, Melinda Ornelas, Phillip Roderick, David M. Rodriguez, Trini Sandoval, Lyle Walcott, and Steven Williams.

C. Approval of Agenda

1. It was moved and seconded that the agenda be approved following addition of items. The motion passed unanimously.

D. Approval of Minutes

1. It was moved and seconded that the minutes from the April 23, 2009, meeting be approved with minor changes. The motion passed unanimously.

E. Officer Elections

1. It was moved and seconded that Connie LaBuhn be elected to another term as Senate treasurer. The motion passed unanimously.
2. It was moved and seconded that Julie Morrison be elected to another term as Senate secretary. The motion passed unanimously.
3. Discussion ensued regarding elections for the fourth FEC Representative (in addition to Reed, Garesché, and Kadel). No election was held.

Note: Due to the guests present, we followed a revised agenda order that switched between Old Business, New Business, and Information Items.

II. Information Items

A. Faculty Professional Growth – Pam Joraanstad

1. Given the current budget status, there will be no sabbaticals for a 2-year period and no summer projects. Approximately \$1 million will be available for travel/fees. Details of the administration/awarding of the funds still need to be worked out. In keeping with the RFP, when conference attendance could result in advancement on the salary

schedule, a faculty member needs to choose between having the fees paid or advancement, but is not eligible for both.

B. IT Project Guidelines – Rachelle Hall (handout provided)

1. PSTaRT, the presidential committee for recommending technical projects, wants to implement a standardized process for all IT projects across campus. It would include a cost-estimate form for all new items, and a way to consider upgrade operational costs for new versions of programs. The goal of this process is to prioritize tasks and budget items.
2. Senators raised concerns that IT would need to provide their projective costs on the IT side to facilitate the estimates, but that it may be a conflict of interest for IT to do so.
3. **Given the questions raised in response to this proposal, additional information would be provided on this topic by David Cost at a later date (see attached e-mail at end of minutes).**

III. New Business

A. Hispanic-Serving Institution Initiative and Diversity - Carlos Nuñez

1. A school may be designated as a Hispanic-Serving Institution (<http://www.ed.gov/programs/dueshsi/index.html>) if it has at least 25% Hispanic FTSE, which makes it eligible for Title V dollars. These dollars can be used in a wide variety of ways. EMCC currently receives approximately \$2 million through the HSI initiative.
2. GCC has 24.3% Hispanic headcount. Approximately 15% of students do not indicate their ethnicity.
3. Dr. Nuñez thanked the many individuals who have been helping with this initiative, including the support from Dr. Green.
4. Several strategies can be implemented to help us achieve 25%:
 - a. More regular identification of FTSE by category.
 - b. Consideration of how the purging for nonpayment eliminates minorities more than other students.
 - c. Focusing recruitment on the areas closest to GCC.
 - d. Helping faculty retain students. Senator May suggested we look at the retention strategies used by other institutions.

B. Staffing – Jim Reed

1. Faculty need to figure out a way to get the best hire, which includes in part hiring diverse faculty and faculty who are interested in serving a variety of student populations.
 - a. We watched a video from the Advancing Hispanics/Chicanos and Native Americans in Science (SACNAS) organization, see <http://www.sacnas.org/> and click the “SACNAS Video” link.
2. Brainstorming is needed. Send suggestions for how faculty can address our hiring issues to Jim Reed (jim.reed@gcmail.maricopa.edu).
3. Senate asked Dr. Green to add additional members on the Staffing Committee. Currently all members are Chairs. Reed will appoint approximately 5 faculty non-Chairs to the Staffing Committee pending Senate approval.

IV. Old Business

A. Adjunct Faculty Planning Team – Jim Reed

1. It was moved and seconded that the Senate form the Adjunct Recognition Committee to coordinate an Evening Award Ceremony and

to include adjuncts in nominating students for the yearly student recognition event. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Committee members include Johnnie C. May, Jim Sanders, Connie LaBuhn, and Jim Reed. It was suggested that Karen Russo, GCC adjunct faculty association president, be invited to join the committee.
3. Steve Kadel requested residential faculty receive pertinent information sent to the adjunct faculty so we can share it within our departments.

V. Information Items

A. GCC North – Steve Williams (handout provided)

1. 300 new parking spots and a traffic light are being added at the North campus using roughly \$100,000 from savings Chuck Jeffrey had from other campus projects.
2. North had a 54% FTSE increase from Fall 2008 to Fall 2009 at one week out; Main had a 13% increase. North is growing like crazy!
3. Currently 175.3 residential or OYO faculty load hours are being taught at North. According to GCC administration, no faculty are supposed to have permanent offices at North, and the facilities were not designed as such. Expansion is difficult for this reason.
4. North will continue on a 4-day class schedule. Deedee Denslow, Dean of GCC North, requested a 5-day schedule (MWF,TTh), but it was not approved. Administration is considering adding a Fri-Sat schedule.
5. Williams wants the guidance of the Chairs for how to proceed with North to deal with its growth. Reed encouraged Williams to present this information to the Chairs, maybe in a Communications Meeting.

VI. New Business

A. Assessment of Under Age 18 Students– Gay Garesché

1. Mesa faculty want to be asked permission to have under 18-year-old students who attend classes on the campus (“concurrent” students) in their classes. Concern is liability and maturity.
2. FEC will put a proposal to the Common Pages that would require faculty to give approval for these students to attend.
3. This issue opened the door to consider issues related to all under age 18 students, including ACE and dual enrollment. The Faculty Executive Council created a committee to review the issues surrounding under age 18 students and make recommendations. In addition, Garesché wants to investigate whether our faculty assessment activities are occurring in ACE and dual-enrollment programs.
4. It was moved and seconded to form a committee to consider assessment with respect to non-concurrent (ACE and dual-enrollment) under age 18 students at GCC. One of six criteria for enrollment needs to be met in order for a non-concurrent under age 18 student to attend GCC. These standards may not be appropriately high. The motion passed unanimously.

B. Student Scholarship Money – Gay Garesché

1. \$200 was given to the Senate by Maricopa Faculty Foundation for student scholarships because of GCC presence at the hockey fundraiser in the spring.
2. Senate must decide how to distribute the money.
3. The Faculty Foundation urges faculty to take photographs at relevant functions (like the awarding of this money) for PR purposes.

C. LICs, MICs, and HICs (Involvement) Committees – Jim Reed

1. Reed wants all committee assignments to be designated as “low-involvement”, “medium-involvement”, or “high-involvement”, and cap committee involvement for faculty based on involvement, not on number of committees.
2. Reed will rank committees initially to start this process.

D. Jury Duty – Gay Garesché

1. The All-Employee manual has been changed with respect to Jury Duty. Faculty will need a signed court document to verify attendance at jury duty. Without it, you will be docked for personal time.
2. If you are serving on a jury, you must return your non-travel compensation to the District.

VII. Information Items

A. Membership & Faculty Foundation – Jim Reed

1. Join the Faculty Association! Consider a donation to the Faculty Foundation to provide scholarships to students. Reed wants an automatic donation option available on our paychecks, and needs 100 people to agree in order to go forward.

B. eCourses Strategic Plan – Gay Garesché

1. Faculty to review the proposed Strategic Plan for eCourses. Due by September 10th. Intent is to proactively establish goals to assure quality in GCC online course offerings.

C. GCC Town Hall Meeting, Mr. Randolph Lumm

1. Friday, August 28th, at 2:30pm in SU-104

VIII. Old Business

A. All Faculty Meeting – Jim Reed

1. Thanks for the Senators help!

IX. New Business

A. Refund Policy – Gay Garesché

1. Garesché wants to work on a pro-rated refund for students who withdraw from courses. She is also collecting **information regarding financial aid problems/issues** (gay.garesche@gcmail.maricopa.edu).

B. Adjunct Hiring Policy – Jim Reed

1. In RFP, residential faculty have priority over adjuncts in course scheduling. What do you do with residential faculty who adjunct at a different college for an overload? Who gets hired and/or gets scheduling precedence? Clarification is needed on this issue.

X. Information Items

A. Pay for Print – Jim Reed

1. Detailed information about this program is coming soon.

B. Faculty Association – Gay Garesché

1. Membership automatically rolls over if done by payroll deduction. Need to fill out a new form if you pay yearly by check.

C. Buildings and Grounds Recognition

1. Senator Callahan wants the Senate to formally acknowledge the time and effort put into the business building, the new kiosks/signage, and the overall beauty of the GCC campus. It was moved and seconded that we

commend all those involved in making our campus beautiful. The motion passed unanimously.

XI. The Senate adjourned at 5:10 p.m. The next meeting will be on September 25, 2009, location SU-ABC.

Subject: RE: August Faculty Senate Meeting--2:30, SU 104 ABC - IT Project Process Questions

From: "David Cost" <d.cost@gcmail.maricopa.edu>

Date: Fri, 28 Aug 2009 15:45:29 -0700

To: "Jim Reed" <jim.reed@gcmail.maricopa.edu>, "Rachelle Hall" <rachelle.hall@gcmail.maricopa.edu>

Thank you Rachelle for volunteering to present the proposed guideline and process to the Faculty Senate! I appreciate it, especially in light of the importance and need for timely feedback. As for your questions:

PSTaRT is currently considering various thresholds for project evaluation. The suggested threshold amounts have ranged from \$1,000 to \$5,000 (total project cost over five years). I believe it should be fairly small while still being large enough to eliminate expending more resources on evaluating a project than the project requires to complete. At the same time it should be enough to ensure adequate resources are available to both implement and maintain the technology that is being proposed. Those projects that are not evaluated (because they are below the threshold) should be automatically implemented by OIT since their costs are deemed insignificant. I think it would be appropriate to add language to the process that clarifies what happens to projects that fall below the threshold (that they are automatically implemented).

As we all know, every organization has a limited amount of funds to work with, therefore all projects must be evaluated against one another. The criteria in evaluating projects would be determined by the members of the committee performing the evaluation whose current membership is made up of mostly faculty. I would expect that the committee would publish the criteria and obtain feedback from the GCC community at large before implementation. I would also expect that the evaluation would not be simply a cost per student ranking, but should encompass the total cost since spending more dollars on one project suggests some other project(s) that also serve students will not be funded, or worse, the technology may fail to perform correctly due to the lack of resources available to support it.

We will have to depend on the expertise and experience of the IT personnel to estimate the support costs. In order to assure the community that the estimates are reasonable (and for OIT to gain the knowledge from their experience), they will have to track the actual costs during the implementation and support of any project and publish the information. The GCC community will be able to see what OIT's estimate was and compare it to the actual costs once implemented.

As for higher support costs for new technology due to OIT's inability to support it; we could manage that issue by supporting and funding the ongoing training of the OIT folks. Certainly we should weigh the cost of such training against hiring outside consultants. With proper planning, surprises, such as the one you identified, should not occur. This is the first step in that process. We certainly can't continue to ignore the total cost of implementing new technology. Doing so will result in the waste of capital dollars when existing technology can no longer be supported due to the lack of operational funds. Imagine if GCC did not have the funds to fly in the consultant and the result would have been expensive capital equipment sitting around and not being used, not to mention students not having access to technology necessary for their education.

The "appropriate technology team" would consist of personnel well-versed in making such determinations (estimating the cost of implementation and support). I believe that would be the IT managers who are responsible for managing the resources available to support GCC technology. The rest of us will be able to evaluate the performance of this team since their estimates would eventually be confirmed by the actual costs following implementation. Incentives should also be put in place (per the strategic plan) for GCC personnel to identify ways to reduce costs for supporting existing technology. That would reduce the likelihood of OIT incurring higher support costs than necessary to perform their duties.

PSTaRT is in the process of implementing the strategic plan which includes strategies such as OIT producing and publishing measures of performance. We are also starting the implementation of SLAs (Service Level Agreements) which will require measures of performance. If the Senate and the Department Chairs support the strategic plan priorities presented last spring, as well as other initiatives such as this one for initiating IT projects, we can get the President's Executive Leadership Team behind them and OIT will start performing at the level of service we would all like to see.

Dave

David Cost
Business and Information Technology Faculty
Glendale Community College, 01-113
623.845.3232