**Continuing Contract Review Committee**

10-11 AM, Friday, August 16, 2019 in U-202B

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

# Meeting convened at 10 AM

* + - * 1. 14 out of 15 eligible Annual contract faculty have applied for IGCC this year.
        2. CCRC members have each been assigned 2-3 IG Faculty for whom they will act as the CCRC point of contact and front line for IG questions/concerns.

These CCRC members will also be points of contact for IG subcommittee members once those are formed by third Friday in Sept.

* + - * 1. Portfolium update: budget approved; potential for training to start this Fall for implementation in the Spring for Evaluation Forms and e-Portfolio submissions. However, IG Faculty will use the current Canvas system for their September deadline for e-Portfolio submissions.
        2. Rebecca Yost will be publishing the IGCC Canvas page by the end of next week. IG Faculty will receive invitations. We will request that CCRC members be added to the page as well. She will add IG Subcomm. Members as well, all at once once the CCRC Chair has all reported.

1. CCRC business:
   1. 2019-2020 CCRC Documents and Process Review has begun with a review of the draft elements of the 2019-2022 CNA relevant to our charge, i.e. Articles 9 and 10. Today we reviewed Article 9 line by line and have suggested changes that will be forward to Union Representatives. Our suggestions are listed below.
   2. We will review Article 10 alongside the current FEP in our September meeting.

The following represents a collection of observations, questions, and suggested corrections for the draft of Article 9 of the CNA put forth by the CCRC during our August retreat.

1. 9.2.1 reads “Classroom performance” and Form #1 reads “Instructional Performance.” These should be made consistent.
2. There is an inadvertent D without content in 9.2.3
3. The is a missing second parenthesis on 9.3
4. Strike Academic Dean/ in 9.3.1
5. Change ‘less than a “satisfactory” evaluation’ to “Needs Improvement” in any area of the evaluation in 9.3.9. This would make 9.3.9 consistent with the standards in use and would allow for faculty disagreement with any aspect of the evaluation, not just the overall number.
6. We did not understand the meaning of “at Step 2” in 9.3.9A.
7. Change ‘less than a “satisfactory” to “Needs Improvement” in 9.3.9B
8. We don’t know what the “Overall Summary” is in 9.3.10.
9. 9.3.11 contains an incomplete sentence. Maybe simply repeat “After review and signature” to start the sentence?
10. 9.3.12 seems to repeat what is in 9.3.6B. Perhaps it should simply be removed. If is stays, change ‘less than satisfactory’ to “Needs Improvement” in both the first and second line. Also strike Academic Dean in line 2.
11. 9.3.6 contains a reference to “Appendix C.” We thought this might be an outdated reference to something that used to be in the FEP. However, currently Form #2 is Appendix VI.
12. Strike Academic Dean in 9.4Bv
13. The reference to Form 1 in 9.4Ciii should be a reference to both Forms 1 & 3.
14. Under the performance standards scale in 9.5 there is another reference to Appendix C. If we are correct you should replace that with “the Appendices of the FEP and posted independently in the Faculty Evaluation Folder within the VP Academic Affairs folder on the Document Manager” (or however you think best to word the Doc Manager reference).

Meeting concluded at 11:15 AM

Next meeting will be September 6, 10-11, in AA 177