Agenda Review began at 4:00 p.m. Board President Dana Saar then took the assembly through the proposed agenda for the February 25, 2014 Regular Board Meeting. Clarification was asked on a few items as they were presented; below are requests made by Board Members for additional information.

CONSENT AGENDA

- ITEM IV.B.1-IV.B.4 APPROVAL OF EMPLOYMENTS
  - A Board member asked what MCCCD’s goal was for counseling faculty ... is the expectation that they will focus on advising or on providing therapy? Does MCCCD need better trained counselors? (Employees need to meet the minimum qualifications for any position in order to be considered for employment. Currently, MCCCD does not use counselors to provide support for mental illness. A counseling license is not a job requirement. Program advisors deal with advising, while counselors teach student success courses in addition to meeting with students individually—they are faculty.)

- ITEM IV.C.1 APPROVAL OF CURRICULUM
  - A Board member asked when curriculum changes would be brought before the Board. (The Board is apprised of new courses, new programs, new degrees, and any modification or deletions to existing curricula.) A second Board member asked if modifications were huge modifications or modifications for certification/other. (Generally, MCCCD goes through an annual review cycle to meet outside accreditation standards; MCCCD also responds to changes in industry needs.) A third Board member noted that MCCCD has a very rigorous curriculum development process which may begin with a
single instructor but then has to be approved by the District Instructional Council for that discipline, then be approved by the District Curriculum Committee, and ultimately by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost before any changes can be brought forward.

- IV.D.3 APPROVAL OF CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT RISK SELECTION FOR THE NEW INTEGRATED LEARNING BUILDING AND REMODEL OF EXISTING SPACE AT THE BLACK MOUNTAIN CAMPUS PARADISE VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
  - A Board member asked for clarification on the difference between this item, for a Construction Manager, and a non-consent agenda item, for a Consultant, for the same building project. (The Consultant represents the architect/designer while the construction manager will be the contractor in charge of construction. They are hired at the same time so they can work together on the design—the contractor will take over after the design is complete.)

NON-CONSENT AGENDA

- ITEM V.A.1 APPROVAL OF ELECTRICAL AND MECHANICAL MAINTENANCE TRAINERS ESTRELLA MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
  - A Board member asked for clarification on this item. (This is equipment needed to continue a grant in progress; MCCCD agreed it would provide the necessary equipment as part of the grant. MCCCD is setting up partnerships with industry for faculty to receive intensive industry-specific training and to create internship opportunities for students with APS, SRP, Freeport McMoran Palo Verde, etc. The goal is to have trained individuals ready to hire as existing employees retire.)
  - How many employees are out at Palo Verde? (Unknown, but it will be investigated and a number returned to the Board.)

- ITEM V.C.1 APPROVAL OF FY14-15 HEALTHCARE FUNDING
  - A Board member asked what Human Resources’ goal was regarding this item. (Business Services and the Employee Benefits Advisory Committee are still working together to find the most cost effective solution before finalizing the request to increase the budget to cover health care costs for FY14-15. They are trying to come up with plan design changes to avoid increasing costs to employees.) Another Board member asked for clarification on whether this budget item was on the consent agenda or not; it’s not, so it will be finalized and can be addressed at the Regular Board Meeting.

- ITEM V.C.2 APPROVAL OF FLEX BENEFIT PROGRAM: RFP 3218-4 PHARMACEUTICAL BENEFIT MANAGEMENT
  - A Board member asked who was in charge now. (MCCCD uses Express Scripts now to manage pharmaceuticals.) Why now? (MCCCD reviews its agreements every five years. In addition to that regular schedule, there have been several complaints with Express Scripts so they decided to review other vendors.)

INFORMATION ITEMS

- ITEM VI.A. REVIEW OF PROPOSED FEE CHANGES FY2014-2015 BUDGET
MCCCD adjusts fees in order to cover the cost of the class and not for profit, correct? (Yes; fees change in response to market-driven adjustments, choice of materials, etc.)

A Board member asked if MCCCD was looking at options for fees for Open Educational Resources. (MCCCD is looking specifically at teaching and learning resources to replace text books, not for fees which cover materials, labs, etc.)

• **ITEM VI.B. REVIEW OF PROPOSED TUITION & FEES FY2014-2015 BUDGET**

  o A Board member asked when the final budget would be ready for review. (MCCCD is still in the process of working on a proposal for the state legislature. Urban community college districts did not make it in to the Governor’s budget. MCCCD is working on a proposal to provide base funds (operational) and capital which will be focused on developmental education. MCCCD is still in negotiations.)
  
  o Are any based on performance? (No, performance-based funding will go into effect the following fiscal year. FY14-15 will focus on K-12 and universities with performance-based funding; community colleges will go the following year.)
  
  o Is there any chance this topic can be addressed during the National Legislative Summit in Washington, DC scheduled for February 10-13, 2014? (Some meetings with the Employee and Training Admin and Deputy Assistant Secretary for Adult Education have been proposed.)

**OTHER CONCERNS**

• Is MCCCD budgeting for potential liability in next year’s budget? (No new funds from revenue are slated for this; funds have been set aside from the fund balance.) When was that set-aside? (At the end of August, based on facts known at that time; not all funds being set aside were slated for IT, other issues, such as Project Ayuda, were also included.)

• What is the total cost spent on consultants and attorneys to address the IT issue? (Unknown, an expense report will be prepared and presented to the Board.)

• Will FY14-15 budget be asking for additional funds for this? (Business Services will look at the numbers in June and make projections, up or down, then.)

• How do you project for litigation? (The Vice Chancellor of Business Services and the Chancellor review the budget and major projects and initiatives, the purchase of additional land, etc., and put those on hold as necessary so resources are not drained.) Does this include employee salaries? (No. Employee Salaries are based on permanent dollars, not one-time funding like this.)

• Should MCCCD get cyber insurance? (Administration is reviewing options right now on cyber insurance. The Board will be presented with a discussion regarding insurance at a later date once information has been put together.)

**ADJOURNMENT**

Agenda Review was adjourned at 4:44 p.m.

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Work Session was called to order a 6:03 p.m.

**BOARD CONVERSATION WITH FACULTY**

Dr. Patty Finkenstadt, president of the Faculty Executive Council, gave a short introduction of her topic and asked the members of the faculty who were present in the room to introduce themselves at the Chancellor’s request. She then continued to explain her presentation would address Faculty Involvement in Governance: Peer Review and Faculty Evaluation.

About four years ago, Mr. Eddie Genna, Philosophy and Political Science Faculty from Phoenix College, presented to the Board on the *Three Pillars of*
the Professoriat—shared governance, peer review, and academic freedom. Shared governance is defined as constituencies that are given primary responsibility over appropriate decision making areas. Peer review is defined as the regulation of professional standards by members of that profession. Academic freedom is defined as “the freedom to pursue the scholarly profession according to the standards of that profession.” It includes: Freedom of Research and Publication and Freedom in the Classroom—the ability to learn and disseminate knowledge; Freedom of Intramural Speech—comment, support, and criticism within the organization; and Freedom of Extramural Speech—comment, support, and criticism outside the organization.

A Board member questioned if there were boundaries for academic freedom. Dr. Finkenstadt replied there were. Faculty hold themselves accountable, perhaps to a higher degree than others. A review of the facts of any given case, and any subsequent disciplinary action, must include a process for members of the profession to determine if the questionable actions were within bounds and also to determine what, if any, disciplinary action should occur. The Board member asked if a person is a great academician but not necessarily a dynamic instructor, who does not adapt to his/her students’ learning styles, would that person be in conflict with academic freedom by having different standards. Dr. Finkenstadt replied that academic freedom encompasses what is taught, how it is taught, and how it is assessed—what methodology in teaching, etc. MCCCD’s new probationary evaluation will include student evaluation as part of the process to address situations where the instructor may not be teaching to the students’ expectations even if meeting instructional competencies.

There is a Ladder of Faculty Involvement in Shared Governance ranging with levels 1 through 8 (see PPT slides included in Appendices for detail). Level 1, Manipulation, indicates that a decision is made by another party who then calls a committee together to pretend that a discussion will induce change. Level 4, Consultation, indicates diverse experts who are brought together for conversation, but some other party will make the final decision. Level 6, Partnership, indicates that all participants are buying-in to the decisions because they have been an equal part of the entire process. Level 7, Delegated Power, indicates the person in charge of a decision delegates the decision-making process to a group with diverse expertise and perspectives (i.e., MCCCD’s selection committees) and that group is responsible for making the final decision. Level 8, Faculty Judgment, is effective when faculty expertise and pedagogy are key, i.e., curriculum decisions and grading.

There are several instances of shared governance built in to MCCCD’s Residential Faculty Policies (RFP). There is trust in the administration, colleagues, Governing Board, and Chancellor. This contributes to a climate that allows students, faculty, and other employees to succeed. Faculty participate in education policy making, budget development, screening and selection committees, and other activities including the support and development of faculty and increased communications between and among constituency groups.

Peer review, the regulation of professional standards by members of that profession, is closely linked to academic freedom. It promotes excellence in teaching, supports faculty engagement, encourages professional growth, and increases accountability (to self, peers, administration, and students). A Board member asked if peer review took place between colleges or only within a single college. Dr. Finkenstadt replied it happened both ways. District-wide Instructional Councils (ICs) consist of members from all 10 colleges. The new probationary faculty evaluation is college-specific, but individuals are not prohibited from using another college as a source. Another Board member asked the frequency of peer review. Dr. Finkenstad replied it goes on all the time. Formally, however, new faculty are reviewed in their first year then every
three years after; but most faculty are continuously reviewing themselves and their peers. Board members asked if the process was the same for adjunct faculty. Dr. Finkenstadt replied it was a bit different—adjunct faculty are reviewed every semester for their first three semesters and department chairs come to class to see how they are doing. A third Board member asked if occupational faculty were included and Dr. Finkenstadt replied the process was for all faculty regardless of field.

There are several examples of peer review in MCCCD’s RFP, including: Faculty Evaluation Plan (FEP); Administrative Evaluation; Dismissal Hearing; Faculty Selection Committee; Faculty Professional Growth; Curriculum Committee; and a Professional Code of Ethics. The Revised Probationary Faculty Evaluation now includes a Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) process, which will be rolled out on July 1, 2014. The PAR focuses on teaching, professional development, and service. Faculty are evaluated and observed by administration, peers, and students. The PAR focuses on teaching with peer observations of teaching, administrative and chair evaluation of teaching, and student feedback.

Board members asked if the reviews were any different than what occurs now. Dr. Finkenstadt replied that they were looking at the same kinds of things—student rapport, how well the faculty member can answer questions, etc. Board members asked if there was a single evaluation for all the colleges. Dr. Finkenstadt replied that currently every college, and even some departments, had their own form/process. But a standardized tool has been created, based on tools currently being used by SCC, PC, CGCC, and FEC will strongly encourage the colleges to use that form so comparisons can be done between colleges. A Board member asked if the new probationary evaluations would become part of a faculty member’s official record. Dr. Finkenstadt replied that hasn’t changed, but the new model includes the Peer Team. The old model only had two decision-makers—the chair and Vice President of Academic Affairs. The new model adds the Peer Assistance and Review Committee (PARC), made up of four faculty and one administrator, who will review and recommend renewal/non-renewal for probationers.

The new evaluation plan also provides for professional development such as workshops and seminars, continuing education, and research and writing. It also includes service to students, community, department, college, and district.

Board members asked for clarification on the PARC team recommendations and how faculty are allowed to respond. Dr. Finkenstadt said faculty create a personal development plan detailing what they want to accomplish.

A Board member asked how reviewers defined “wonderful” or “good” faculty and asked what measurement can be applied that is not subjective—are any data being collected? Dr. Finkenstadt replied that every college has identified student learning outcomes. Faculty support disseminating information and promoting students’ abilities to think critically and be useful members of society. Critical thinking skills—students’ ability to read, synthesize, and draw their own conclusions—are highly encouraged. Faculty are asked to challenge the norms. A Board member asked if data are now being collected and was informed that data are being collected, in some manner. The Board member argued if the evaluation was not the same, comparisons would not be possible. Dr. Finkenstadt replied the assessment tool may not be the same, but what is needed to be mastered is. Another Board member asked if student mastery of competencies played into evaluations and asked if MCCCD compares the growth of probationary faculty in terms of student mastery of outcomes. Dr. Finkenstadt replied she believed pass rate should not be used to show how well a faculty teaches. She does not want to lower class standards because a subject may be difficult to master. She said the tool they have developed
assumes the course addresses the competencies and peer observation, chair assessment, and student evaluation provide feedback to the faculty.

A Board member argued that faculty who may be “wonderful” outside of the classroom may be less dynamic in the classroom. For example, he/she may only lecture. What about students who have different learning styles who do not do well just sitting and listening? Another Board member asked if the expectation was that a single faculty member should be able to teach to all learning styles at the same time. When told yes, he asked how that could be done. Dr. Finkenstadt replied that Maricopa provides many different formats of the same course and students can choose the method that best suits their learning style. Another Board member remarked that most faculty have a handle on multiple intelligence methodologies. Another Board member replied that faculty don’t just teach to intelligence alone—students need to be aware of their strengths and weaknesses and do some work, too. A Board member stated that half the job is getting students involved in the process. If they are involved in the process, they need to be part of the faculty member’s advancement. Dr. Finkenstadt replied that experience comes with time and academic freedom allows faculty the opportunity to try new methodologies, and the peer review can help with that. Board members asked if Maricopa provides classes to new faculty in instruction. Dr. Finkenstadt replied they are provided many forms of professional development.

Dr. Finkenstadt continued her presentation on Peer Assistance and Review by reiterating that faculty self-reflect on feedback from mentors, administrators, and students. Faculty also craft Individual Development Plans (IDP) which report on accomplishments from the past year and devise professional development plans for the next year. Faculty work with peer mentors and administration to fulfill IDP in a collaborative peer process.

Dr. Maria Harper-Marinick, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, said one of the important members of the PAR team is the college faculty/staff developer (FSD). Their job is to look at faculty responsibilities and come up with a consistent list. The first year experience is where expectations need to be set and tools need to be provided, including introducing mentors, to the new faculty. FSDs will shepherd new faculty their first year. Most FSDs are well versed in instructional technologies and peer mentoring, are involved in their college community, and are well dialed in to what’s going on. If the FSD is not on board, it is unlikely probationary faculty will be as successful as MCCCD wants them to be. Faculty/staff developers must adhere to a rubric and they must commit to three years so they can continue to shepherd their faculty members.

A Board member asked if a similar process exists for adjunct faculty, since most classes are taught by adjuncts. Dr. Finkenstadt replied that one of the outgrowths from the implementation team was the knowledge that they need to on-board adjunct faculty, one semester only (OSO), and one year only (OYO) faculty. Each college does it a little differently. They have developed a standardized orientation for all faculty (no matter their status) and invite all new faculty to participate. Again, the role of the faculty/staff developer is to help orient new faculty to district compliance issues and their college community. A Board member asked what the long-term goals were to enable adjunct faculty to be as dialed in as much as residential faculty (i.e., switching from one learning management system to another—Blackboard to Canvas). Dr. Finkenstadt remarked that many adjunct faculty have other jobs so their time is limited and many teach at multiple colleges. But they do want to be engaged. So the college Centers for Teaching and Learning (CTL) offer brown bag lunches, access to specialists in instructional technology, and an Adjunct Faculty Convocation, which offer opportunities to share and provide information. But time will always be an issue. Dr. Harper-Marinick said that
training was built into the transition from Blackboard to Canvas. That training was provided in multiple formats. Ms. Lysia Hand, Adjunct Faculty Association President, remarked that her employee group took a push from the CTLs and created a web page to create a schedule for adjuncts to learn how to use Canvas. She remarked that the Affordable Care Act is affecting adjuncts who teach at multiple campuses and it is affecting their availability. Dr. Finkenstadt ended her presentation and asked for any additional questions. Hearing none, President Saar concluded the evening’s discussion.

ADJOURNMENT

The Work Session was adjourned at 7:22 p.m.

___________________________________
Randolph Lumm
Governing Board Secretary
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Academic Freedom

Peer Review

Shared Governance
Working Definitions

- **Shared Governance**
  constituencies are given primary responsibility over appropriate decision making areas

- **Peer Review**
  the regulation of professional standards by members of that profession

- **Academic Freedom**
  “the freedom to pursue the scholarly profession according to the standards of that profession”
  - Freedom of Research and Publication
  - Freedom in the Classroom
  - Freedom of Intramural Speech
  - Freedom of Extramural Speech
# The Ladder of Faculty Involvement in Shared Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Involvement Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Faculty Judgment</td>
<td>Full Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Delegated Power</td>
<td>Full Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Placation</td>
<td>Minimal Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Minimal Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Informing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Therapy</td>
<td>No Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td>No Involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shared Governance in the RFP

- Shared Governance constituencies are given primary responsibility over appropriate decision making areas.

- Contributes to a climate that allows students, faculty and other employees to succeed.

- Examples of shared governance in the RFP:
  - Educational policy making
  - Budget development
  - Screening and selection committees
  - Other activities, including support and development of faculty and increased communications between and among constituency groups.
PEER REVIEW
The regulation of professional standards by members of that profession

Closely linked to academic freedom: the freedom to pursue the scholarly profession according to the standards of that profession

Peer review
- Promotes excellence in teaching
- Supports faculty engagement
- Encourages professional growth
- Increases accountability
Peer Review

Examples of peer review in the RFP
- Faculty Evaluation Plan (FEP)
- Administrative Evaluation
- Dismissal Hearing
- Faculty Selection Committee
- Faculty Professional Growth
- Curriculum Committee
- Professional Code of Ethics

Revised Probationary Faculty Evaluation
- Peer Assistance and Review (PAR)
- Focuses on teaching, professional development, and service
- Faculty evaluated and observed by administration, peers, and students
Peer Assistance and Review

- Focus on teaching
  - Peer observations of teaching
  - Administrative and chair evaluation of teaching
  - Student feedback
- Professional development
  - Workshops and seminars
  - Continuing education
  - Research and writing
- Service
  - To students, community, department, college, and district
Faculty self-reflect on feedback from mentors, administrators, and students

Faculty craft Individual Development Plan (IDP)
- Report on accomplishments from the past year
- Plan professional development for the next year

Faculty work with peer mentors and administration to fulfill IDP
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