**Continuing Contract Review Committee**

10-11 AM, Friday, September 6, 2019 in AA-177

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

# Meeting convened at 10:03 AM

* + - * 1. 15 out of 15 eligible Annual contract.

Margaret Kruger asked to apply within the last two weeks. The Provost allowed her to apply. Marti Jenner will be her PoC.

* + - * 1. All CCRC members have each been assigned 3 IG Faculty for whom they will act as the CCRC point of contact (PoC).

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 by Rebecca Yost: training will start this Fall; implementation in the Spring for Evaluation Forms and e-Portfolio submissions is still being considered.
				2. Rebecca Yost published the IGCC Canvas page. She will add IG Subcomm. Members as well, all at once, once the CCRC Chair has all reported.

All technical questions regarding ePortfolios have largely fallen to Rebecca Yost, although IGCC faculty are helping each other out on the Canvas page forum.

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 10 line by line and have suggested changes that will be forward to Union Representatives. Our suggestions are listed below.
	2. We will hold an October meeting on the 4th if deemed necessary.

The following represents a collection of observations, questions, and suggested corrections for the draft of Article 10 of the CNA put forth by the CCRC during our September meeting.

1. 10.1.A – line 1 reads “in their probationary period” and we think it should read “on Annual contract.” Do we want this added to the timeline?
2. 10.1.A – line 3 reads “prior to or on April 1.” It would be simpler to just say “by April 1.”
	1. Would it better to change this to the current common practice of something like “by the first Friday in April”?
3. 10.1.A – line 4 reads “supervisor’s” and we may want to be consistent and change it to “supervising administrator.” The same applied to lines 7 and 8 of the same section.
4. 10.2.1 – change “fourth year” to “fourth consecutive year of evaluations that meet or exceed expectations” in order to not be seen as contradicting what we have elsewhere, e.g. what we have in section 6 of the FEP.
5. 10.2.2.E reads as a conjunctive statement, meaning that all four parties listed must recommend. Are we really committed to the subcommittee having to recommend no matter what the others say?
6. 10.2.3.A – It is not clear that Article 9 houses the “role of the faculty member.” That would seem to be in the Job Description. Are we trying to reference the three Areas of evaluation here that are discussed in 9.2.1-9.2.3? In 10.2.3.B we suggest changing “in each area” to “in each of the three evaluation areas referenced in 9.2.1-9.2.3.”
7. 10.2.4 – this section is on the sources of evaluative data. It seems that 10.2.4.A is incorrectly specific in referencing the IGCC Sub-Committee. If so, we recommend removing that reference and replacing it with something like “All reviewing parties shall use…”
8. 10.2.4.iii – It may be helpful to make a more specific reference to “Evaluation Forms 1-3 from the last four years.”
9. 10.2.4.iv – It was suggested that in light of future changes to the SOS or adoptions of other instuments, that we find a more neutral way to refer to whatever instrument is being used to collect student opinion data, something like “the relevant instrument(s) used to collect student opinion data.”
10. 10.2.5.C.iii – Add the word Continuing in front of “Contract Review Committee.”
11. 10.2.5.C.iv – We certainly don’t mean the “Sub-Committee” here. Furthermore, verifying eligibility does not seem to be the job of CCRC either. We recommend removal of reference to the CCRC in this section.
12. 10.2.5.C.iv – strike “Academic Deans/”
13. 10.2.6.A – It seems that the subcommittee formation should be said to occur at the Department level, and perhaps at the “School/Division level in the case of Academic Success and Learning Resources.” However, we don’t know enough about those last two areas to verify that School/Division wording.
14. 10.2.6.F – Again, the reference to the SOS instrument should perhaps be changed to something more neutral in case the SOS is replaced.
15. 10.2.6.G – Add an “it” between “upload” and “to.”
16. 10.2.8 – There is no issue here. We only want to be sure that notification will take place prior to the BOT approval. We assume that is to allow for appeal, but this has not been the past practice.
17. 10.3.C – We are unsure of the “appendix C” reference here. This is Form 4 on the Doc Manager. It is not in the FEP. We don’t know where it is besides on the Doc Manager.
18. 10.3.F – This section says “shall be returned to continuing contract status” as if someone had been removed from it. However, one is only removed from it and returned to Annual in the subsequent case of failure to meet expectations of the Form 4 Performance Improvement Plan as it says in the title of 10.4.

Meeting concluded at 11:15 AM

Next meeting tentatively scheduled for October 4, 10-11, in AA 177