**Continuing Contract Review Committee**

10-11 AM, Friday, April 5, 2019 in AA-177

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Russell Swanson | ***Present*** |
| Heather O’Connell | ***Present*** |
| Harold Van Boven | ***excused*** |
| Mark Cevallos | ***Absent*** |
| Marti Jenner | ***Present*** |

# Meeting convened at 10 AM

* + - * 1. Portfolium update: it awaits mid-April Budget meetings for approval

1. CCRC business: **2018-2019 CCRC Documents and Process Review Recommendations**

The following represents a collection of observations, questions, and suggested corrections put forth by the CCRC at the end of AY 2018-2019. These concern all language contained in documents relevant to the Initial Granting of Continuing Contract (IGCC) Process: Articles 9 and 10 of the CNA, the CCRC Guidelines, the Faculty Evaluation Plan Handbook (FEP), the IGCC Subcommittee Recommendation Form. Some recommendations go beyond the scope of the CCRC in the attempt to improve any language regarding faculty evaluation processes that were noted during the course of the CCRC review.

* 1. All references to the Dean and/or Supervising Administrator should be reduced to **“Supervising Administrator,”** and that should be defined as the supervisor that would be most directly responsible for a faculty member’s evaluation. This applies to all documents referenced above. The rest of this list of recommendations will proceed according to this practice.
  2. **EVALUATION STATUS NOTIFICATION**: Given that the idea of the public HR Evaluation Status list has been abandoned, it seems that the Supervising Administrator (SA) is best placed to communicate Evaluation Status to individual faculty members after receiving that information from HR by the second Friday of August (see FEP timeline). Notification is especially important for IGCC eligible faculty who will have the opportunity to apply for IGCC via letter in April of the relevant year.
     1. Currently in line 2 of the timeline (appendix I of FEPH) we say IG eligible faculty will be emailed by the 2nd Friday of August. It lists “Provost’s office, Deans, Chairs” as the responsible parties. This is obviously too late given the requirement for a letter of intent in the previous Spring. It also diffuses responsibility and forgets to include “Supervising Administrators.” We need to nail down who communicates evaluation status.
     2. **PORTFOLIUM**, under consideration as a replacement for Canvas as a platform for electronic portfolio submission, would offer a solution to this potentially onerous burden on the SA given that it can be made to send out automatic notifications of evaluation status and timeline notifications/due dates, etc. If PORTFOLIUM were adopted, all references to a Canvas eportfolio would have to be replaced in all documents relevant to evaluation.
  3. Article 9 of the CNA, 9.1 – “calendar year” should be changed to “academic year.” In practice, all evaluation seems to be proceeding according to academic year.
  4. 9.1.E specific dates should be removed
  5. 9.2 consider a specific reference to 9.2.1, 9.2.2, and 9.2.3
  6. 9.2.1.A and B change “faculty handbook” to FEP
  7. 9.2.3 switch order of B and C just be parallel to title line (not crucial)
  8. 9.2.4.C This seems incorrect. The SOS is only required once a year in at least five sections. This should not say “all course sections.”
  9. 9.3.1 “to the timeline in the contract”; replace contract with FEP
  10. 9.3.2 and 9.3.3 contain examples related to the first recommendation above.
  11. 9.3.5 faculty don’t administer SOS; and administration of SOS guidelines are not in Appendix C.
  12. 9.3.5.A faculty don’t administer SOS
  13. 9.3.7 replace reference to “faculty evaluation guidelines” with FEP. Also, is the SA required to meet with all Annual contract faculty? It is required according to page 6 of the FEP, but it is by “the end of the Spring Semester.” This is not on the FEP timeline and should be. And what evaluation is being referenced here? Make the language consistent with that on page 4 of the FEP.
  14. 9.4 Biii and Ciii should be consistent language in reference to forms
  15. Article 10 of the CNA, 10.1.A This March 15th reference is not on the FEP timeline. It says month of March on line 18 of the FEP timeline. It says by the end of the semester on page 6 of the FEP for a post-evaluation conference with annual faculty. These all need to be consistent. Also see 9.3.7 above and in CNA.
  16. **10.2.1** Remove “After completion of the portfolio evaluation”
      1. The process is not outlined in **9.4** as it implies here. Send them to the FEHP.
  17. **10.2.2 B** “five years” is right here since IG portfolios are due in the fall of the fifth year and that process ends in the spring of the fifth year (note that this assumes four consecutive years of meets or exceeds evaluations).
  18. **10.2.2 B and 10.2.4 B iii** “proficient or better” should be “meets or exceeds expectations” to correspond to Forms #1 and #2 evaluation criteria language
  19. **10.2.2 E and 10.2.4 A** Fix name of CCRC (also in 10.2.5 and **10.2.5Ciii**) and clarify that it has no role in recommending (10.2.2) or in evaluation (10.2.4)
  20. **10.2.5.Civ** remove CCRC reference. The CCRC has no role in assuring evaluation status, only in the fair running of the IGCC process.
  21. **10.2.6** Call them “Initial Granting of Continuing Contract Subcommittees”
  22. **10.2.6.A**  what follows is not the process by which subcommittees are formed. Perhaps it is the process by which they will proceed, but that is also spelled out more thoroughly in the FEP.
      1. **How can we ensure that all detail in the FEP is respected as legally binding and cannot be changed? Should the FEP be an appendix to the CNA?**
  23. 10.2.6.A iv “a record” should be specifically spelled out as filling out the “IGCC Subcommittee Recommendation Form.”
  24. 10.2.7 Subcommittee reports go to the Provost by the second Friday in December according to the FEP timeline. Furthermore, the CCRC have no role in the decisions or their validity, only in the process. Align timing here and remove CCRC role implications. Lastly, these reports are NOT required to have an “explanation of how the candidate met or failed to meet the criteria.” See the IGCC Subcommittee Rec Form and remove this language accordingly.
  25. 10.2.10 “Once the final [Appeal Process decision?] has been made…”
  26. 10.3.D and 10.4.A should perhaps be clarified as to how they are different. Is the latter saying that after return to annual contract, faculty have one year?

Meeting concluded at 11AM

Next meeting will be in Fall of 2020.