

Minutes of the  
MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE  
October 31, 2011

APPROVED

- PRESENT:** Monika Brannick, Melinda Carrillo, Jenny Fererro, Katy French, Marty Furch, Barb Kelber, Greg Larson, Pam McDonough, Christina Moore, Linda Morrow, Wendy Nelson, Lillian Payn, Perry Snyder, Diane Studinka, Fari Towfiq
- ABSENT:** Bruce Bishop, Haydn Davis, Lori Graham, Teresa Laughlin, Jackie Martin-Klement, Patrick O'Brien
- GUESTS:** Mindy Katahara (SDICCCA Intern)
- 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 Morrow, Larson: Faculty Senate approval of the minutes of October 24, 2011, as presented. The motion carried.
- Public Comments:** There were no public comments.
- Announcements:** Monika Brannick shared with Senators three potential new logos for the Faculty Senate. There was brief discussion on the designs and some minor suggestions for change. Senators thanked Brannick and Lillian Payn for their work on updating the Senate's look. She indicated that this item would be brought back next week.
- Committee Appointments:**
- Motion 2** MSC Fererro, Larson: Faculty Senate approval of the following Peer Review Committee appointment:
- Sandra Andre, Peer Review Committee Chair for Ken Swift.
- The motion carried.
- Curriculum:** The next Curriculum Committee meeting will be held on November 2, 2011.
- TERB: Part-time Evaluation Report/ Revision / On-line Evaluation Accreditation:** Copies of the Palomar College Part-Time Faculty Evaluation and Part-Time Faculty Evaluation Report were provided (Exhibits A & B). Barb Kelber noted the changes made after its distribution at last week's meeting. After some discussion, Senators suggested some additional minor amendments to provide clarity.

Motion 3

MSC Kelber, Morrow: Faculty Senate support of the Palomar College Part-Time Faculty Evaluation and the Part-Time Faculty Evaluation Report, as amended. The motion carried.

Kelber noted that the documents will go back to the Tenure & Evaluations Review Board, then to the Palomar Faculty Federation (PFF) and the District before implementation.

Student Success

Task Force Draft

Recommendations:

Monika Brannick reported that she and PFF Co-President Shayla Sivert attended the California Community Colleges Student Success Task Force Southern California Town Hall Meeting on Thursday, October 27, in Los Angeles. Although several comments were heard, the responses given by those overseeing the meeting left many questions unanswered.

Serious discussion continues concerning the recommendations of the Student Success Task Force (SSTF) regarding legislation enacted last year by the California Community Colleges Board of Governors (BOG). The SSTF is composed of system representatives, including faculty, students and external partners, and has been directed to develop a plan to bring about significant improvements in success rates of students. The Faculty is encouraged to review the draft recommendations and provide input: <http://studentsuccess.ideascale.com/>.

Brannick reported that she and Sivert also hosted a Forum on Thursday, October 27, from 4:00 – 6:00 on campus to discuss these issues. She posted a summary of the items discussed on the overhead and Senators enumerated the challenges facing faculty as a result of these changes. Brannick added that, when she receives additional information, another forum will be scheduled.

Repetition and

Withdrawals from

Credit Courses:

Over the past couple of weeks, there has been discussion on new Title 5 regulations with regard to repetition of credit courses. The newly adopted regulations limit the number of times a community college district can receive apportionment for students who enroll in the same credit course multiple times. The district will receive apportionment for three attempts only, with certain limited exceptions. These changes have been in effect since October, 2011, and must be implemented by the 2012 summer session.

SLO Summary Reports:

At last week's meeting, Marty Furch provided data on the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) reports, including information from the database on how many courses have SLOs entered into the database with results, as well as those that still have no SLOs entered.

Furch reported that those numbers have not increased much over the last few weeks. She stated that she and Berta Cuaron would be sending out a joint letter to faculty members soon offering assistance as needed. She will also correspond with department chairs concerning total course or program SLOs completed, assessment methods for course or program, and results with result dates for the course or program. If any of those have a "zero" or are "empty," an action plan will need to be submitted on how progress will be made toward completion. That plan will be due to Furch by November 18, 2011.

A workshop will be offered to assist faculty on November 18, from 9:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m. in the Library Computer Lab (LL109). From 12:30 – 1:30 p.m., a drop-in workshop will be held at the same location focusing on Program SLOs.

**Accreditation Report:** Monika Brannick reminded Senators that all faculty and staff are encouraged to review the accreditation drafts posted on the Accreditation website and provide input and suggestions to Vice President Berta Cuaron or Glynda Knighten.

**Policies & Procedures:** No Policies & Procedures were brought forward for information. The Policies & Procedures Task Force will meet again in November.

**Faculty Senate Goals:** Senators were provided with copies of the Faculty Senate’s 2010-11 Goals at the October 10<sup>th</sup> meeting. Monika Brannick outlined which items have been accomplished, are in progress, or on hold. Copies of a draft of the 2011-12 Goals were distributed for information. Several amendments were made as the document was discussed. This will be brought back for further review at next week’s meeting.

**Academic Technology:** Lillian Payn reported that members of the Academic Technology Committee have provided input for the Accreditation Mid-Term Report. Members of the committee continue their work on the next three modules, which will be brought to the Senate for review soon.

**Tenure & Evaluations Review Board:** Barb Kelber reported that, as of this date, participation in the on-line evaluation process is at an all-time high of 50%. At the October 17<sup>th</sup> meeting, Kelber reported that “Evaluation Kit,” a program adopted for the delivery of on-line evaluations, would be utilized during the process. It provides a pop-up window to students asking them to participate in evaluating their instructor.

**Palomar Faculty Federation:** Perry Snyder indicated that members of the Palomar Faculty Federation have begun negotiations. The group is currently discussing benefits.

**Student Services Planning Council:** Diane Studinka reported that members of the Student Services Planning Council viewed a presentation by Human Resources on the Staffing Plan. The group also discussed the Strategic Plan Priority Funds (SPPF).

**Instructional Planning Council:** Linda Morrow stated that members of the Instructional Planning Council also saw the presentation by Human Resources on the Staffing Plan at their recent meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 3:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Melinda Carrillo, Secretary

EXHIBIT A

Department Chair

**DRAFT, 10/24/11**

**Palomar College  
Part-Time Faculty Evaluation**

**Department Chairs:** Please complete this form as a component of the evaluation of the part-time faculty member named below. If you have designated another full-time faculty member as the Evaluator, please give the completed form to your designee for inclusion in the evaluative materials.

Name of Evaluatee: \_\_\_\_\_

- 1.** The instructor adheres to department guidelines and is responsive to communications from the department.

High Professional Performance

Standard Professional

Substandard Performance

Unsatisfactory Performance

**Comments** (if performance is substandard or unsatisfactory, comments are required):

- 2.** The instructor participates appropriately in the development and assessment of Student Learning Outcomes, as determined by the department.

Yes: \_\_\_\_\_ No: \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments** (if the response is negative, comments are required):

Signature:

Department Chair \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ (print name): \_\_\_\_\_

EXHIBIT B

**DRAFT 10/24/11**  
5/2011

Revised

**PALOMAR COLLEGE**  
**Part-Time Faculty Evaluation Report**

Part-Time Instructor/Evaluated:

\_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

—

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Semester/Year of Evaluation:

\_\_\_\_\_

After reviewing student evaluations, ~~and the classroom observation form~~ ~~visitation report~~, ~~and the Department Chair's form~~, the Evaluator (Department Chair/Director/Designee) will complete the following report. A copy of this signed Evaluation Report, ~~signed form~~, ~~along with the other materials noted on the Evaluations Checklist~~, must be given to the evaluatee, and another copy must be sent to the TERB Office. Evaluatees have 10 business days; beginning on the date the report was signed by the evaluatee, to add a response to their evaluation by sending it to the TERB Office (AA-112). After the 10-day comment period, this report and any evaluatee comments become part of evaluatee's personnel file maintained in the Human Resources Office.

**Summary Comments and Recommendations**

**Comments for each item 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" or "Unsatisfactory Performance" is checked, **comments are required.**

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

***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.*

1. The instructor meets classes as required, teaches according to the Course Outline of Record, and is well prepared.

High Professional Performance                       Standard Professional Performance  
 Substandard Performance                               Unsatisfactory Performance

**Comments:**

(For the previous #s 2 and 8, please refer to the accompanying DRAFT of the Department Chair's form)

~~2. The professor establishes instructor communicates the appropriate identified learning outcomes for each course and consistently participates appropriately in the assessment of student learning of those outcomes.~~

~~High Professional Performance                       Standard Professional Performance  
 Substandard Performance                               Unsatisfactory Performance~~

~~Yes: \_\_\_\_\_ No: \_\_\_\_\_~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ **Comments:**~~

2. The instructor treats students with respect and tolerance, demonstrates patience and a willingness to help when needed, and encourages student participation and questions.

High Professional Performance                       Standard Professional Performance  
 Substandard Performance                               Unsatisfactory Performance

**Comments:**

3. The instructor demonstrates effective communication skills in the classroom or online environment, presenting course material in an interesting and engaging manner.

High Professional Performance                       Standard Professional Performance  
 Substandard Performance                               Unsatisfactory Performance

**Comments:**

4. The instructor maintains fair and clearly stated grading policies and provides fair and reasonably prompt evaluation of student work.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> High Professional Performance | <input type="checkbox"/> Standard Professional Performance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Substandard Performance       | <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory Performance        |

**Comments:**

5. The instructor demonstrates depth of academic preparation and subject area competency.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> High Professional Performance | <input type="checkbox"/> Standard Professional Performance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Substandard Performance       | <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory Performance        |

**Comments:**

6. The class syllabus clearly states course requirements and Student Learning Outcomes, as determined and identified by the department. Course objectives and requirements are clearly stated in the class syllabus, and communicated to the class.

Yes: \_\_\_\_\_ No: \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments:**

~~8. The instructor adheres to department guidelines and is responsive to communications from the department.~~

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <del><input type="checkbox"/> High Professional Performance</del> | <del><input type="checkbox"/> Standard Professional Performance</del> |
| <del><input type="checkbox"/> Substandard Performance</del>       | <del><input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory Performance</del>        |

**Comments:**

7. **Summary Comments (required)**

**Overall Recommendation: (Required)**

- High Professional Performance
- Standard Professional Performance
- Substandard Performance
- Unsatisfactory Performance

**Signatures**

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator : \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
(print name): \_\_\_\_\_

Department Chair (see form, attached): \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
(print name): \_\_\_\_\_

My signature acknowledges that I have met with my evaluator and reviewed my evaluation. It does not mean that I agree or disagree with the evaluation summary. I am aware that within ten business days after signing this report, I have the right to submit a response to this evaluation to the TERB Office (AA-112). I am also aware that this evaluation and my response, if any, will become part of my personnel file maintained in the Human Resources Office.

Part-Time Faculty Evaluatee: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
(print name): \_\_\_\_\_

**Administrative Signature**

My signature acknowledges that I have reviewed the materials.

Division Dean: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
(print name): \_\_\_\_\_