Department Chairs’ Meeting Minutes

February 13, 2009

Battle Mountain - #1; Elko – EIT #203; Ely - #111; Pahrump – PVC #124; Winnemucca - #108

Present: Dick Borino, David Ellefsen, Patty Fox, Richard McNally, Bret Murphy, Cyd McMullen, Mary Swetich, Bonnie Hofland, Xunming Du, Lisa Campbell, Doug Hogan, Angie de Braga, Carrie Bruno, Jay Larson, Charlene Mitchel

Guests: Diane Elmore

Minutes were approved from the January 15, 2009 meeting.

Chair of Chair Reports

1. The budget task force committee has not received any additional news on the budget crisis. The faculty senate chair recently sent out a very lengthy communication describing all NSHE institutions budget reductions. A very big concern is if GBC has to cut an additional 24% then the college will lose approximately 40 to 50 more positions.
2. In order to receive higher education stimulus money from the federal government funding will have to be reinstated to its normal level. There also must be a plan that indicates how Nevada will use the money in higher education. The plan must indicate how the money will be used to stimulate the economy and create jobs.

Dual Credit Statement

1. GBC already has much of the dual credit information that Mountain States Association is suggesting. The issue is that the information is located in several areas. Jan King and Angie de Braga are working on finalizing the information.
2. A handbook is being created that will be disseminated to students and parents. The plan is to have the handbook ready for students enrolling in dual credit classes during the fall 2009 semester.
3. Students interested in dual credit courses must receive permission from their high school principal and counselor prior to enrolling in a college course. GBC policy states that high school students can enroll in upper division courses as long as they have met the prerequisite requirements.
4. The Admissions and Records department is working on streamlining the grade reporting process. It’s difficult at times because high schools are on different schedules than the college. It was suggested that a form be created to document grades rather than contacting instructors by phone.

Catalog Submissions

1. A list has been generated by SIS Operations that indicates classes that are in SIS but not in the catalog or vice versa. Departments are being asked to clean the reports up and to make necessary changes in either the catalog or in SIS. However, departments are unsure of what the process actually is. Several concerns were discussed. It was decided that SIS Operations be invited to the next meeting to explain the process.

Strategic Plan

1. Departments are starting to put plans together. It was stated that the assessment committee has decided to concentrate on individual assessments within classes instead of program assessments. Because of this frame three is temporally on hold. Frame two, the strategic plan for individual departments, is available for areas to begin work on.

Branch Campus Directors’ Meeting

1. Directors from the branch campuses will be on campus February 19 and 20. Chairs were requested to stop by during the morning of February 20 in EIT 201 to discuss IAV courses for the fall 2009 semester.

Integrative Seminars

1. Time blocks for integrative seminar courses were discussed. Several different viewpoints were shared. Departments were requested to collect and analyze the data to see if it is a good idea to offer the courses during the different time blocks for future semesters.

Tenure Process Role of Personnel Committee

1. Faculty Senate is discussing the role of the personnel committee in the tenure process. The tenure committee selection process was explained. It is the impression that in the past the personnel committee was basically a pass-through. They took the recommendation of the tenure committee and forwarded the information to administration. However, recently it is not being handled that way.
2. It was explained that the personnel committee has reviewed the bylaws and policies and procedures. It is the consensus of the group that the role of the committee is to make sure that the rights of each candidate is being protected throughout the tenure process. One of the committee’s goals is to establish a process that if there is a concern or problem that it is addressed early in the process and not at the end. There isn’t anything inherently wrong with the current procedure it’s just how it’s been communicated.
3. It was recommended that the tenure committee should be the guardian of the tenure-track person and the personnel committee should be the guardian of the process. It is not appropriate for the personnel committee to determine the validity of a candidate’s tenure application. If the role of the personnel committee is to protect the process then it ultimately protects the tenure-track employee, the tenure committee and the college.
4. Currently nowhere in the process does it address the requirements of a portfolio binder. It was explained that the portfolios were created for documentation use only. It was suggested that if portfolios are required in the future then it should be between the applicant, the tenure committee, and administration.
5. The personnel committee will be presenting two proposals at the next faculty senate meeting. Chairs were asked to review the proposals and provide feedback to the personnel committee.