

Adopted

Revised

HARTNELL COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

MINUTES

Board of Trustees – Study Session
CALL 208, Training Room
411 Central Avenue
Salinas, California

February 15, 2011

OPEN SESSION The Board’s Study Session was called to order at 5:08 p.m. by Trustee Padilla-Chavez.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE Trustee Healy led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL Erica Padilla Chavez, President
Kevin Healy, Vice President
Candi DePauw
Patricia Donohue
Bill Freeman (arrived at 5:15 p.m.)
Elia Gonzalez-Castro

Phoebe K. Helm, Board Secretary

ABSENT Ray Montemayor
Shaundra Taylor, Student Trustee

PUBLIC COMMENTS There were no public comments.

TENURE AND PROMOTION – FULL-TIME FACULTY The Board received a presentation on the faculty tenure and promotion process by Dr. Suzanne Flannigan, Vice President, Academic Affairs and Dr. Kelly Locke, faculty. Mary Dowell, legal counsel, addressed the legal aspects of this process. The presentation included the purpose of tenure review and the evaluation process for probationary faculty. It was noted that at least 170 hours is committed to each and every probationary faculty over four (4) years. Dr. Helm clarified that she receives recommendations from the Tenure Review Committee, and that California Education Code requires that the any tenure promotion recommendations to be Board of Trustees be made by the Superintendent/ President. (Appendix A)

Members of the Tenure Review Committee included Dr. Suzanne Flannigan, Vice President, Academic Affairs, Dr. Carole Bogue-Feinour, Interim Dean, Academic Affairs, Nancy Schur, President, Academic Senate, and Larry Adams, Vice President, Academic Senate.

The Board complimented Dr. Flannigan, Dr. Locke, and Mary Dowell for their informative presentation and they thanked the Tenure Review Committee for all of their hard work and commitment to this process.

**BOARD
COMMENTS**

Trustee Freeman thanked the evening's presenters. Also, he stated that, at the last meeting, he requested the meeting adjourn in Ms. Anabel Trujillo's memory and asked that this study session adjourn in Ms. Trujillo's memory.

Trustee Gonzalez-Castro stated that she appreciates being reminded of the college's processes and believes we never stop learning.

Trustee Donohue thanked everyone and stated that she missed the February 8th meeting because she was attending the American Society for Executives in San Diego.

Trustee DePauw thanked everyone for their presentation and stated that she is always impressed with the level of expertise and professionalism that everyone exhibits.

Trustee Healy thanked everyone and appreciates being reminded of college process.

Trustee Padilla-Chavez thanked her colleagues for attending this evening and thanked the staff who prepared for the presentation. She stated these are the type of sessions she would like to have each month to help the Board become more effective policy makers.

**PRESIDENT'S
REPORT**

Dr. Helm thanked the Board for their participation this evening and she thanked the presenters and staff present. She stated the evening felt relaxed and that it was nice to separate the study session from the business portion of the meeting. Dr. Helm introduced and welcomed her new assistant, Barbara Luther.

Also, Dr. Helm reported that she is an evaluator of the Accreditation Team for Merced Community College District and that her assignment is Standard IV, Leadership and Governance. Her site visit is scheduled early March. In addition, Dr. Suzanne Flannigan will serve as an evaluator to a different community college shortly after Dr. Helm returns from her visit.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board and assembly had a moment of silence in memory of Anabel Trujillo, student of Hartnell College who recently passed, and they adjourned the meeting at 6:58 p.m. in her memory.

Erica Padilla-Chavez
Board of Trustees President

Phoebe K. Helm
Board Secretary

Tenure Review Process

Presented to Governing Board

Hartnell College

February 15, 2011

Purpose of Tenure Review

- Improve educational programs
- Assure compliance with district policies and procedures
- Recognize excellence
- Enhance performance and assist with improvement

Evaluation Process

- Team Composition
- Frequency
- Criteria
- Components
- Review of materials
- Conferences
- Results

Team Composition

- Evaluatee
- Administrator
 - Area Dean
 - Director Library/Instructional Services
 - VP Student Services
- Peer
 - appointed by the Academic Senate
 - From discipline or reasonably related discipline

Frequency

- Probationary faculty
- Undergo evaluation process at least once during each year of probation

Criteria—“shall be evaluated”

- Professional Competence
- Professional Conduct

Professional Competence

- Teaching practice and techniques
- Knowledge of the field
- Effective preparation and planning

Professional Conduct

- Adherence to course outline of record
- Observance of district policies
- Collegiality
- Willingness to grow

Criteria—“may be included”

- Additional areas of Professional Competence
- Professional Growth
- Professional Activities

Typically seen at increasing levels in years 2-4

Additional areas of Professional Competence

EXAMPLES

- Curriculum development/revision
- Development/revision of classroom materials
- Timely return of exams and papers

Professional Growth

EXAMPLES

- Research in field or in pedagogy
- Publication, editing professional journals, reviewing textbooks
- Participating in professional organizations

Professional Activities

EXAMPLES

- Department and college committees
- Academic Senate committees
- Recruitment activities
- Student club advisement
- Community service

Components

- Reports and class materials by evaluatee
 - By October 15
- Worksite Observations
 - By November 15
 - Three classes each by administrator and peer
- Student appraisals
 - By November 15
 - Every class

Review of materials

- Administrator and peer review materials
 - Reports by evaluatee
 - Worksite observation reports
 - Instructional materials
 - Student appraisals

Conferences

- Pre-evaluation conference
- Conference with peer
 - At least twice a semester
- Conference with administrator
 - At least once a semester
- Peer and administrator meet
 - By Dec. 1
- Post evaluation conference
 - By Dec. 10

Results

- Summary Evaluation Report
 - Overall performance rating
 - Years 1-3: Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory
 - Year 4: Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory
 - Recommendation to Tenure Review Committee
 - Renewal or nonrenewal
 - No recommendation given year 3

Results

- If “Needs Improvement” rating given
 - Team must prepare a remediation plan
 - Submitted to Tenure Review Committee
 - Reviewed by Tenure Review Committee

Assistance

- Constructive Criticism
 - Expected
- Counsel and advice for improvement
- Remediation Plan
 - Formal process
- Can be at Evaluation Team level or Tenure Review Committee level or both

Tenure Review Committee

- Composition
- Review Process
- Recommendation Process

Composition

- Vice President for Instruction
- Vice President for Student Services
- Academic Senate President
- Academic Senate Vice President

Or designee

Review Process

- All members read entire packet for each evaluatee
 - All years reviewed
 - Each candidate reviewed
- Complete review for each evaluatee
 - High level of scrutiny
 - Evidence of criteria

Review Process

- Meet and discuss findings
 - Thorough discussions
- Develop recommendations and write recommendation summaries
 - Documentation of findings

Recommendation Process

–Recommendation to Board of Trustees

- Enter into next contract or not
- No recommendation given year 3

Why not in year 3?

Recall...

- At end of first year
 - Renewal of appointment for year 2
- At end of second year
 - Renewal of appointment for years 3 and 4
- At end of third year
 - No Board of Trustee action
 - Appointment in effect for years 3 and 4
- At end of fourth year
 - Decision to grant tenure or not

Recommendation Process

- For evaluatees in years 1 or 2
 - Enter into next contract
 - Do not enter into next contract
 - May recommend tenure at end of year 2

Recommendation Process

- For evaluatees in year 3
 - No recommendation

Recommendation Process

- For evaluatees in year 4
 - Employ as tenured faculty for all subsequent years
 - Do not enter into next contract

Recommendation Process

- TRC Recommendations forwarded to President
- President recommends to the Board of Trustees

Prior to March 15th

- Board action
- District contacts to report status

Board's Study Session
developed by and presented by

Dr. Kelly Locke, Faculty
Dr. Suzanne Flannigan, Vice President
Academic Affairs/Accreditation