Minutes of the
MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE
October 25, 2010

APPROVED

PRESENT: Bruce Bishop, Monika Brannick, Marty Furch, Lori Graham, Erin Hartensveld, Barb
                 Kelber, Teresa Laughlin, Jackie Martin-Klement, Pam McDonough, Linda Morrow, Dan
                 Sourbeer, Perry Snyder, Diane Studinka, Fari Towfiq, Wendy Nelson

ABSENT: Haydn Davis, Patrick O'Brien

GUESTS: Channing Shattuck

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by the president, Monika Brannick, at 2:00 p.m., in
                 Room SU-30.

Approval of Minutes:

Motion 1   MSC Bishop, Sourbeer: Faculty Senate approval of the minutes of October 18, 2010, as
                 amended. The motion carried.

Public Comments: There were none.

Announcements: Marty Furch announced that an Assessment Workshop with Bob Pacheco, Research and
                 Planning Director of Barstow College, has been rescheduled for Friday, November 5,
                 from 12:00 – 2:30 p.m. in room MB2. Lunch will be served at 11:30 a.m. The workshop
                 will focus on types of Assessment, SLO's (Student Learning Outcomes), and SAO's
                 (Service Area Outcomes). Additional information can be found on the Learning
                 Outcomes Council website.

Summer Bridge 2010
Pilot Program: Teresa Hogan-Egkan updated Senators on the Summer Bridge 2010 Pilot program for
                 students who tested into Math 15 (Pre Algebra).

                 21 students participated, and 21 completed the program, which initially focused on
                 Escondido High School but eventually included students from several area high schools.
                 Information meetings were held at Escondido High School and at the Palomar College
                 San Marcos campus for students and parents. Students were asked to provide information
                 regarding their most recent math instruction, why they were attending college, etc. After
                 completion of the Summer Bridge program, 35% of the students placed in Math 50, while
                 the remainder enrolled in Math 15 for the fall semester. Students have been contacted for
                 the purpose of follow up, and many are enrolled in Learning Communities (one for the
                 Math 15 cohort, one for the Math 50 cohort) taught by two faculty teams in the Math and
                 Counseling areas.

                 Goals for the future:
                 • Increase Summer Bridge cohort, possibly to include other disciplines (Reading, ESL)
                 • Create additional resources for parents
                 • Have Peer Educators talk to students at the local high schools
                 • Encourage students to access Palomar email in January while they are still in high
                   school (to look at study guides and other important information)
                 • Work together with other areas

- Use a reading component -- students need comprehension/critical thinking for Math.

A question and answer period followed. Teresa Hogan-Egkan offered several interesting observations, noting that in organizing the program for the upcoming summer, more students will be contacted initially with the hope of a greater number of participants. Also, she pointed out that although many faculty and staff members assume that students have all manner of electronics and technology, only 50% of students in the program reported that they had access to a computer with internet in their homes.

Committee Appointments: There were no committee appointments:

Curriculum Committee: Monika Brannick updated Senators on the following Legislation:

SB 1143: This bill will change the current resource allocation model (funding) for higher education. The current allocation model is based on how many full time students are enrolled at the census date. The proposed change would tie funds directly to students' success and completion rates, allocating funds according to how many full time students pass a class at the end of the semester. Instead of receiving the funds for the year at the census date, the funds would be allocated at the end of the year.

Brannick noted that a task force has been established to examine best practices and models for improving student success and completion rates.

Senators discussed a study recently conducted by the Institute of Higher Education and reported by the *Los Angeles Times* which tracked 250,000 degree-seeking California Community College students over six years. The study found that fewer than 30% have transferred to a four-year school or earned a Vocational Certificate or an Associate's degree. This item will remain on the agenda to allow for ongoing discussion.

SB 1440: This bill gives students who earn an associate degree for transfer a direct route to upper division coursework at the CSU. In the process, it will increase the number of degrees granted and will directly affect college curriculum.

Tenure & Evaluations Review Board: Barb Kelber provided copies of the Palomar College Peer Evaluation Report currently in use, as well as a copy of the document with changes recommended by the Tenure and Evaluations Review Board (TERB). She briefly outlined the changes and asked for the Senate's support of the revised document. With the Senate's support, the revised form will be recommended to the Palomar Faculty Federation and the District for approval or negotiation, per Article 17.2.2 of the faculty contract.

One Senator expressed concern with item #9, "The professor establishes the appropriate learning outcomes for each course and consistently assesses for student learning of those outcomes," stating that faculty may feel like they have to individually evaluate and define what those learning outcomes are. Other Senate members felt differently, stating that faculty are evaluating colleagues in their own disciplines and do have expertise in those areas. It was also noted that this particular wording in the document has been in place for some time. The revised form appears as follows:

PALOMAR COLLEGE
PEER EVALUATION REPORT

Evaluee _____

Department _____

When the committee members are finished reviewing and discussing each component of the evaluation the committee chair will complete the **Peer Evaluation Report**. The various components will include:

a. Professional Improvement Form   b. Professional Development Contract c. course materials d. student evaluations (method is chosen by evaluee)   e. peer evaluation (method is chosen by evaluee)   f. supervisor evaluation (if appropriate). Please attach supporting documents. In your comments, please do not refer to the student evaluation questions by number. This report will eventually be a stand-alone document. The student evaluations will not accompany this report, so referring to the student evaluation questions by number (rather than in words) will not be descriptive.

Definitions of evaluation categories: *(based on Standards of Performance for Faculty, Faculty Manual)*

High Professional Performance *- Frequently exceeds accepted standards of professional performance. (Check this box when the professor's professional performance is beyond what is reasonably expected.)*

Standard Professional Performance *- Regularly meets accepted standards of professional performance. (This is the standard of performance that is expected of all professors when they are hired and they are expected to maintain this level of performance throughout their tenure at Palomar College.)*

Substandard Performance *- Does not consistently meet accepted standards of professional performance.*

Unsatisfactory Performance *- Does not meet minimal standards of professional performance.*

Comments for each of the following are highly encouraged. It is appropriate to write positive comments for meaningful feedback and encouragement for each question where it applies. If a "Substandard Performance" , "Unsatisfactory Performance" , or "No" is checked, ***comments are required.***

1.   The professor establishes a classroom or online environment that promotes the active role of students as learners, encouraging questions and other forms of participation.

☐ High Professional Performance   ☐ Standard Professional Performance
☐ Substandard Performance   ☐ Unsatisfactory Performance
Comments:

2.   The professor treats students with respect, demonstrating a willingness to work with a diverse student body.

☐ High Professional Performance   ☐ Standard Professional Performance
☐ Substandard Performance   ☐ Unsatisfactory Performance
Comments:

3.   The professor teaches a course that is appropriately organized, with clearly-stated objectives in keeping with the Course Outline of Record.

☐ High Professional Performance   ☐ Standard Professional Performance
☐ Substandard Performance   ☐ Unsatisfactory Performance
Comments:

4.   The professor demonstrates subject matter expertise.
☐ High Professional Performance   ☐ Standard Professional Performance
☐ Substandard Performance   ☐ Unsatisfactory Performance
Comments:

5.   The professor is proficient at integrating appropriate material and methods into the classroom or the online environment.
☐ High Professional Performance   ☐ Standard Professional Performance
☐ Substandard Performance   ☐ Unsatisfactory Performance
Comments:

6. The professor communicates in a clear, informative, and professional manner.
   - ☐ High Professional Performance
   - ☐ Standard Professional Performance
   - ☐ Substandard Performance
   - ☐ Unsatisfactory Performance

   Comments:

7. The professor designs fair and clearly-stated grading policies that promote high standards for student work.
   - ☐ High Professional Performance
   - ☐ Standard Professional Performance
   - ☐ Substandard Performance
   - ☐ Unsatisfactory Performance

   Comments:

8. The professor provides fair and reasonably prompt evaluation of student work.
   - ☐ High Professional Performance
   - ☐ Standard Professional Performance
   - ☐ Substandard Performance
   - ☐ Unsatisfactory Performance

   Comments:

9. The professor establishes the appropriate learning outcomes for each course and consistently assesses for student learning of those outcomes.
   - ☐ High Professional Performance
   - ☐ Standard Professional Performance
   - ☐ Substandard Performance
   - ☐ Unsatisfactory Performance

   Comments:

10. The professor fulfills the contractual requirements of the position.
    - ☐ High Professional Performance
    - ☐ Standard Professional Performance
    - ☐ Substandard Performance
    - ☐ Unsatisfactory Performance

    Comments:

11. The professor demonstrates continued professional growth by participation in professional development activities.
    - ☐ High Professional Performance
    - ☐ Standard Professional Performance
    - ☐ Substandard Performance
    - ☐ Unsatisfactory Performance

    Comments:

12. The professor demonstrates commitment to the college and to education by service to the college.
    - ☐ High Professional Performance
    - ☐ Standard Professional Performance
    - ☐ Substandard Performance
    - ☐ Unsatisfactory Performance

    Comments:

13. **Summary Comments and Recommendations (required)**

Overall Recommendation:

☐ High Professional Performance

☐ Standard Professional Performance

☐ Substandard Performance
   The Tenure & Evaluations Review Board will assist the peer review committee in developing a plan for improvement.

☐ Unsatisfactory Performance
   The Tenure & Evaluations Review Board will assist the peer review committee in developing a plan for improvement.

☐ Referral to Tenure & Evaluations Review Board
   The Tenure & Evaluations Review Board will reach a consensus with the peer committee for the overall recommendation.

Evaluation Meeting Confirmation:

Date and Length of Meeting with Evaluee _____

Committee Signatures

Administrative Signatures

My signature acknowledges that I have reviewed the materials.

Division Dean: _____   Date: _____
(print name): _____

My signature acknowledges that I have reviewed the materials.

Vice President: _____   Date: _____
(print name): _____

Tenure and Evaluations Review Coordinator: _____   Date: _____

My signature acknowledges that I have reviewed the administrative signatures as well as received a copy of my evaluation.

Professor: _____   Date: _____

Motion 2   MSC Kelber, Morrow: Faculty Senate support of the revised Palomar College Peer Evaluation Report as recommended by the Tenure and Evaluations Review Board. The motion carried.

Learning Outcomes
Council:

Marty Furch indicated that members of the Learning Outcomes Council will meet on the next two Thursdays to discuss their proposals for the funding of the ½ of 1% of the unrestricted budget.

Furch also reported on Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's) and how they are entered into TracDat in response to issues of public access. She quoted the following wording in the document (the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Part 3), "Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Student Learning Outcomes," defining the rating of "Proficiency:"

- Student learning outcomes and authentic assessment are in place for courses, programs and degrees.
- Results of assessment are being used for improvement and further alignment of institution-wide practices.
- There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results.
- Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward improving student learning.
- Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.
- Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed on a regular basis.
- Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.
- Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.

She also indicated that the college needs to be at the proficiency level by 2012 and then move to the higher level of "Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement:"

- Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic and used for continuous quality improvement.
- Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust.
- Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing.
- Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college.
- Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews.

She noted that when SLOs are entered into TracDat they are available to faculty in the discipline or service area, and that the Department Chair or for that discipline or service area directs the "Super Administrators" of TracDat (Cheryl Deloatch and Glenda Knighten) with regard to authorization and access to the assessment data; however, the work related to Student Learning Outcomes does need to be public.

Furch noted that she, Katy French, and Richard Albistegui-DuBois are being removed from the list of those with access to discipline information but will still be available to assist faculty with SLO's upon request.

Discussion followed on access, and Monika Brannick noted that last semester the Curriculum Committee recommended that SLO's be made available on departmental web pages and/or individual faculty web pages, as well as on syllabi. Furch added that the LOC has also made that recommendation. It was noted that the issue of whether it is a soft recommendation or a clear requirement will be important if there is to be consistency in faculty evaluations. Senate members asked that the issue of SLO's and where to house them be placed on the agenda for further discussion at next week's meeting.

Policies & Procedures: Monika Brannick reported that the following Policies & Procedures will be presented to members of the Strategic Planning Council at their meeting on October 26, and were approved by the Policies & Procedures Task Force at their last meeting:

AP 4023 Course Outline
AP 4228 Course Repetition, Significant Lapse of Time
AP 4400 Community Services
AP 5055 Enrollment Priorities

BP 2720 Communications Among Governing Board Members
BP 4005 Formal Communication of Matters of Instruction
BP 4023 Course Outline

Senators were provided copies of the following Policies & Procedures:

BP 4235 Credit by Examination
BP 4240 Academic Renewal

Senators discussed the documents, and there were some questions regarding changes to the wording, and what will ultimately be included in the Academic Procedure of BP 4235, Credit by Examination. There was also concern expressed with the proposed changes to BP 4240, Academic Renewal. One Senator noted that as an Academic and Professional Matter, procedures for Academic Renewal should be established by the Faculty Senate and then recommended to the Superintendent/President and the Governing Board.

These items will be brought back to next week's meeting for further discussion.

Other: Monika Brannick provided copies of correspondence from the Strategic Planning Council regarding the designated ½ of 1% of the district's unrestricted budget, which will go toward funding the college's goals and objectives as articulated in the Strategic Plan 2013. The amount to be disbursed is approximately $460,000.

Those interested in recommending an activity that supports one of the objectives in the work plan can complete a Resource Request Form and submit it to the individual

identified in the Action Plan as responsible (i.e., the objective leader) for that objective. All requests are due to Objective Leaders by the target date of November 5 at 4:00 p.m. Senators and other faculty members can review the Strategic Plan 2013 Action Plan – Year 1 at:
http://www.palomar.edu/strategicplanning/SP2013ActionPlan/ActionPlanYear1.pdf

GRAD Program: Monika Brannick reported that faculty, students, and staff members involved in the design of the GRAD Program are meeting each week. The program envisions a focused campaign to encourage students' awareness of Goals, Responsibility, Attitude and Determination (GRAD) as essential elements for success in the college environment.

Exemplary Program
Award: The Academic Senate has announced the call for nominations for the Exemplary Program Award. The Academic Senate selects annual themes in keeping with the award's traditions. The theme for 2010-2011 is "Innovative Programs Supporting Student Success." The Academic Senate describes the theme as follows: "In spite of the many social and economic pressures that tend to silo college functions, effective programs that genuinely aim at maximizing student success must innovate and collaborate as broadly and widely as possible. This year's theme seeks to support those innovative programs that embrace the possible by finding efficient and effective ways to provide a variety of services to students." Completed applications must be received in the Academic Senate Office by 5:00 p.m. on November 9, 2010. Please visit the Academic Senate website at http://www.asccc.org/ for more information.

Board of Governors
Nominees: Annually the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges calls for nominations for one of the two faculty seats on the Board of Governors. While there is a particular interest in candidates who represent and who have shown commitment to issues of diversity, the Academic Senate has broadened the criteria to encourage leaders with a variety of experience to consider applying. Faculty who are interested in being considered or who need additional information can visit http://www.asccc.org/ .

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barb Neault Kelber, Secretary