

## Humanities and Social Sciences Division ♦ Minutes

**April 2, 2015**

Present: Stacy Bacigalupi, Glenda Bro, Teresa DeLaby, Mike Dowdle, Marlene Gallarde, Solene Halabi, Hal Hoffman, Luisa Howell, Elizabeth Lobb, Bob Stuard, Margie Whalen, Jeanne Marie Velickovic, John Vitullo

Guest: Rebecca Hatch

Item	Comments/Discussion/Outcome
Minutes	Minutes for December 2014 and March 2015 were approved as submitted
Announcements	<p>Research Showcase: Rebecca Hatch shared that as of last night's midnight deadline, 12 abstract submissions for the Mt. SAC research competition had been received, all in disciplines under Humanities and Social Sciences. Finalists will present their research at the Research Showcase on April 21, with the awards likely being presented on April 22 to allow time for the judges (deans and associate deans) to deliberate. There will be four cash awards.</p> <p>EEO Training: Due to new statewide Title 5 EEO regulations, we are changing the way we screen and rate job candidates. While not yet being strictly enforced, all members of screening committees need to go through EEO training before they can serve. This training must be repeated each year one serves on a hiring committee.</p> <p>Enrollment Trends and Planning: Jeanne Marie expressed appreciation for the great job the Chairs do with scheduling. Our division goal is to increase fill rates and strategically grow where there is a need. Overall, the spring semester is a bit larger than the fall semester, so we may want to concentrate this strategic growth more toward the fall.</p> <p>Dual Enrollment: Dr. Scroggins is encouraging dual enrollment. We are waiting to hear what the demand is on the side of the high schools, and potentially some of our classes will be offered on their campuses.</p> <p>Promotion of Instructional Programs: Jeanne Marie thanked Stacy, Mike, and John for their presentation of promotional materials on the Psychology and Communication programs prior to the last Board of Trustees Meeting.</p>
Curriculum	Jeanne Marie provided the Chairs with a printout of their courses up for 4-year review and a screen print showing the stage of their current proposals. She also reminded them of the need to submit department meeting minutes showing approval of new or reviewed courses. Per the Curriculum Office, these minutes need to be more specific regarding course amendments (e.g. prerequisites revised, aligned with C-ID, etc.). Also, there is a proposal that EDC membership should include two representatives from each division.

Outcomes	<p>Jeanne Marie reminded the Chairs to be sure that outcomes are being assessed for all reviewed courses, and that they are being developed for any new courses. Departments with courses reaching Stage 5 for which outcomes have not been assessed, will be given maybe a year to comply, after which the course(s) will be deactivated if outcomes have not been assessed.</p> <p>Course level outcomes or the URL to the Mt. SAC outcomes page (<a href="http://outcomes.mtsac.edu">outcomes.mtsac.edu</a>) need to be included on syllabi. Glenda asked if the division could send a notice to all adjuncts regarding this. Stacy said compliance with this requirement is a criterion included on her department's Adjunct Summary (H.8) forms (adjuncts are regularly notified/reminded of this requirement). Mike mentioned that he is participating in the Online Education Initiative pilot, and one of the things he has had to do is clearly show on his syllabus the connection between each class assignment and the outcome or measurable objective it relates to.</p> <p>Program level outcomes should be included in the catalog, and we will be receiving a list of our programs that don't have outcomes. We will address this at our upcoming division retreat. Stacy mentioned that the way many other schools deal with outcomes makes a lot of sense. The institutional level outcomes, program level outcomes, and course level outcomes just link, and by virtue of assessing the course level outcome, you are by association also assessing the program level and institutional level outcomes. The institutional level outcomes were rewritten (based on the old G.E. zones) last semester, pending Academic Senate approval. The proposed institutional level outcomes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication</li> <li>• Critical Thinking</li> <li>• Information and Technology Literacy</li> <li>• Personal, Social, Civic, and Environmental Responsibility</li> </ul> <p>Jeanne Marie also reminded the Chairs to develop an SLO rotation plan, if they haven't already done so.</p>
Division Retreat	<p>Jeanne Marie asked the Chairs to let her or Jim know if scheduling our division retreat on Friday, May 8, will work for them. The agenda will include the Sandbox enrollment tool and program level outcomes. Department Chair training credit will be earned.</p>
Chair Duties/Reminders	<p>PIE Planning: Jeanne Marie advised the Chairs to consider the ripple effect of any needs included in the resource section (e.g. a request for additional space needs to include the furniture and equipment that will go into that space). Department resource requests need to be brought to the May division meeting, so we can prioritize them as a division before they go to the Instruction Team. Jeanne Marie also mentioned the future document imaging system that will replace Hershey, and that departments may want to request scanners. One of the</p>

Chair Duties/Reminders (Cont.)	<p>Chairs mentioned that the copy machines are capable of scanning and emailing documents, but that the copy quality is not good. It was then suggested that all departments include the need for new copy machines in their PIE.</p> <p>Chair Evaluations and Elections: Department Chair peer evaluations have been collected from the faculty in each department. Chair self-evaluation narratives are due by April 17. Evaluation meetings will then be scheduled between April 20 and May 1, after which department faculty will be notified of their Chair's eligibility to run. Chair nominations then need to occur by May 15, with May 29 being the last day to hold elections (must be at least two weeks between nominations and elections).</p>
Enrollment Planning	<p>As a division, we will continue to grow slowly and strategically, while focusing on fill rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review past enrollment rates by term to find trends</li> <li>• Evening and distance learning enrollment rates are down in general</li> <li>• Jim would like to develop some G.E. transfer pathways linking 2-3 critical courses (AHIS 1, ENGL, HIST 1, POLI 1, PSYC, SOC 1, SPCH 1A)</li> <li>• We are slowly moving toward better coordination in the scheduling of classes requested by learning communities and special programs (A.C.E.S., Arise, Aspire, Bridge, Upward Bound, etc.)</li> </ul>
Adjunct Evaluations	<p>Chairs were provided copies of the Teaching Faculty Performance Expectancies (18.B) from the Faculty Contract, with those that apply to adjunct faculty marked, and a copy of the Adjunct Summary (H.8) form. A discussion was held regarding the ratings of "1" vs. "2" and "3" vs. "4":</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A rating of "1" should be reserved for stellar performance, with the main criteria being classroom and/or student evaluation (as required for that year)</li> <li>• Concern was expressed over possibly skewed student evaluation results alone determining a rating (e.g. too much weight given for attendance/participation, etc.)</li> <li>• Even if they have perfect student evaluations, adjuncts who are habitually late in administrative matters should not receive a rating of "1"</li> <li>• Adjuncts need to be advised that although a rating of "2" is described as "satisfactory," this is not a negative and is the level of performance expected of them</li> <li>• Adjuncts who fail to do something contractually required of them (e.g. adjunct with rehire rights not submitting a student evaluation summary and tallies) should receive a rating of "3" (or "4" for a second occurrence)</li> <li>• Jeanne Marie said that based on a discussion she and Jim had with Eric Kaljumagi a while back, a rating of "3" should be used when the problems are correctable and the adjunct can be mentored, while a rating of "4" should apply for unacceptable performance</li> <li>• While not prohibited by the Faculty Contract, a drop in rating from a "2" one year to a</li> </ul>

Adjunct Evaluations (Cont.)	<p>rating of “4” the next year does not provide the faculty member due process from a Human Resources perspective</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It was suggested that the Classroom Visitation and Student Evaluation forms should be revised during future negotiations to better align with the Teaching Faculty Performance Expectancies</li><li>• Bob mentioned that there are too many classroom visitations required by the new Faculty Contract, to which Luisa replied that they were trying to parallel the probationary evaluation process and that additional LHE of reassigned time is needed</li><li>• Elizabeth asked how feasible it would be to get released time for an interdisciplinary adjunct mentor, to which Luisa replied that a proposal should be submitted when the Faculty Association asks in November or December for items to be negotiated</li></ul>
-----------------------------	--

Respectfully Submitted,

Teresa DeLaby  
Administrative Secretary