

GREAT BASIN COLLEGE
PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL
February 25, 2014
1:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Mark Curtis (via phone), Lynn Mahlberg, Mike McFarlane, Tom Reagan, Kris Miller, Bret Murphy, Melinda Dailey, Alex Porter
ABSENT: John Rice
GUESTS: Mardell Wilkins, Janie Moore, Lynette Macfarlan, Stephanie Davis

1. Approval of Minutes – The minutes of the President's Council meeting on February 11, 2014, were approved.
2. Administrative Faculty Performance Review – Janie Moore and Mardell Wilkins presented an update on the Administrative Faculty Performance Review policy and procedure that the Faculty Senate Evaluation Sub-Committee has been working on. The policy will be presented to Faculty Senate as a first read on March 21st and then as an action item on April 18th. The members of the sub-committee are: Mardell Wilkins, Janie Moore, Pat Anderson, Heather Steel, Terri Thompson, Tami Potter, Sheri Baker, Sonja Sibert (ad hoc), Lynette Macfarlan (facilitator) and Stephanie Davis (facilitator). The new process starts with a current job description. Human Resources will conduct an audit and will notify senior administrators to request current job descriptions for employees who do not have current job descriptions. Current job descriptions will have to be on file by June 30, 2014.

The process is a self-evaluation. There are five roles:

- Role 1: Position Coordination
- Role 2: Collaboration and Productivity
- Role 3: Service to Institution
- Role 4: Service to Constituents and Community
- Role 5: Supervisory Role

Employees will evaluate themselves on four primary roles. Supervisors will have an additional role to evaluate themselves on under Supervisory Role. Each role will be weighted (established by the employee and approved by the supervisor). Goals will be established by the employee at the same time as the weights and must be approved by the supervisory.

The process must be approved as a pilot the first year so we can see where we compare with faculty on performance ratings to see if adjustments need to be made. The sub-committee members will use this system concurrently with the old system to see how it works.

The sub-committee has worked diligently to implement a system that would be comparable with the faculty evaluation system. A process has been created that takes the diversity of the positions into consideration.

3. SGA Update – Alex Porter reported on attendance at the student events. The student forum on tuition and fees was well attended. SGA is teamed up with Laurie Walsh on the 3rd annual Edibles for Education food drive which will benefit the Communities in Schools Hunger Prevention Program. Annual March Madness student events are scheduled and SGA is looking ahead to graduation planning. Alex will be attending the Board of Regents' meeting on March 6-7, 2014, in Las Vegas.
4. Faculty Senate Update – Tom Reagan
 - Amended Grade Appeal Procedure – the recommended change is that students may consult with the Office of the Vice President for Student Services in Berg Hall for assistance with the procedures and policies for appeals. The spirit of this is to help the student navigate through the steps. President's Council approved.
 - Merit Pay Award Policy – approved unanimously at Faculty Senate. Tom highlighted important parts: Moderate distribution plan; commendable and excellent level qualifies for merit. Each of the roles must be a minimum satisfactory. OCR score goes out to 100th of a percent. Supervisor can reduce or increase the OCR by one level. Teaching faculty has to assess two courses in a year or they won't be eligible for merit. The transition plan is for this coming fiscal year and merit will be award in July. The money will be distributed equally at the commendable and excellent level but not satisfactory. The following year it will be differentiated. Sonja Sibert stated that classified employees, employees above the dean level and adjuncts are under a different merit system. President's Council will approve at the next PC meeting.
 - Amended Emeritus Application – changed deadline to submit application from January 31st to last day in March. The application is new and improved and allows the applicant to provide more depth in the application. President Council approved.
5. Classified Council Update – Melinda Dailey reported the Classified Council Bake Sale was a success. The Classified Outstanding Employee nominations will be received in April. They are working on the spring fundraiser.
6. 5.21 Faculty Workload Policy Update Chapter 2.A – Second Read.
 - 5.21 Faculty Workload Policy, Chapter 2.A.f – Faculty Presence
Proposed new wording regarding presence on campus as recommended by Faculty Senate: *Instructional faculty are expected to spend a minimum of 35 hours on their assigned duties per week. Of these 35 hours, 5 will be on-campus office hours, while the remainder may consist of instructional activities, institutional service, professional development, or other duties, depending on the needs of specific faculty, departments and programs. 40 hours per week shall be the primary basis for determining the workload of non-instructional faculty.*

Mike McFarlane recommended some minor changes: *Instructional faculty are expected to spend a minimum of 35 hours **per** week on their assigned duties. **At least 5 hours** will be **scheduled as** on-campus office hours. The remainder **will** consist of instructional activities, institutional service, professional development, or other duties, depending on the needs of*

specific faculty, departments and programs. 40 hours per week shall be the primary basis for determining the workload of non-instructional faculty. SGA agrees with these suggestions and discussed with it with academic affairs. As students some of the office hours are unreasonable like 7:00 to 8:00 a.m. With some faculty (not all) there is a lack of consistency in checking Web Campus in box. Perhaps there is a way for faculty to also set up more consistent office hours with groups of faculty members having the same office hours. President Curtis stated at other institutions he has been with the wording says the office hours should be staggered throughout the day and the week. Melinda suggested classified support staff should be trained in how to handle it when a faculty member is not being accountable for these hours and appointments. President's Council voted to approve Mike McFarlane's suggested changes. Tom Reagan will take it back to Faculty Senate. If Faculty Senate approves then it will not come back to President's Council.

7. President's Report – Mark Curtis reported yesterday a meeting between the Chancellor, the three northern community college presidents and two consultants (Campus Works). It was an all day retreat to prepare something for the shared services ad hoc committee meeting on Thursday. There were three possibilities that were analyzed and discussed some more radical than others. The final decision was to create a Shared Services Alliance. A variety of business processes could be centralized at various locations. The Chancellor will prepare a job description and hire an Executive Director for the Shared Services Alliance. There will be some overtones with SB 391. After the Executive Director is hired there would be a business process review to identify the differences in the business processes. This would probably happen before iNtergrate 2 is rolled out. The three community college presidents and the Chancellor are unanimous on how to approach this and will make the presentation to the ad hoc committee on service area on Thursday. Full implementation of shared services could take three to five years. Business Center North will keep everything that they have now. They would not be disbanded. SCS would remain intact mostly. The IT discussion was more about housing servers vs cloud. This is all NOT a done deal.

8. Miscellaneous

Lynn Mahlberg wanted to announce two new employees: Patricia Johnson, Adult Learner Concierge and Nicole Reggiatore, Pathways Specialist. Mike added the Institutional Scoreboard Coordinator and Instructional Designer positions are being filled as well.



REVISED DRAFT (2/20/14)

POLICY AND PROCEDURE

Title:	ADMINISTRATIVE FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW
Policy No.:	5.24
Department:	All Departments
Contact:	All Supervisors of Administrative Faculty

POLICY

The NSHE Code, Chapter 5, Section 5.12.1 and 5.12.2, establishes that written performance evaluations of academic faculty and administrative faculty shall be conducted at least once annually by department chairs, supervisors or heads of administrative units. One of the purposes of annual performance evaluations is to provide constructive, developmental feedback to the faculty member.

Every employee should have a current job description. When establishing weights for the performance review you and your supervisor should review the current job description and update it as necessary.

Administrative faculty will complete an annual performance review process consisting of two parts. The first part will consist of determining weight percentages for each role at the beginning of the academic year. The second part will be to complete their self-evaluation, compile their narrative and as needed their supporting documentation and review it with their supervisor each spring.

Constructive, developmental feedback between the administrative faculty member and the supervisor is the key to the successful continued improvement of the faculty member's skills within the institution. The total scores for each role developed during the self-evaluation multiplied by the weighted percentage for that role will provide each employee with their performance rating which will determine merit eligibility. The administrative faculty's supervisor will review all documents with the employee and will have the opportunity to include comments and adjust the scoring of each subcategory up or down one point upon discussion with the faculty member, any point changes must be documented by supervisor in the comment section of the performance review.

PROCEDURES

The establishment and determination of percentage weights for each role must be completed by each administrative faculty member and turned in to their supervisor by August 15 of each year. Each administrative faculty's supervisor will review the percentages, discuss the plan with the employee and approve the weight percentages by September 30. It is suggested that administrative faculty retain documentation throughout the year to be submitted with their self-evaluations as evidence of work practices exceeding the satisfactory level. Each administrative

faculty will complete their self-evaluation, including providing narratives and/or supporting documentation, and turn it in to their supervisor by April 15. The supervisor will review the self-evaluation and all narratives and/or supporting documentation, discuss the evaluation and documentation with the employee, make any adjustments, comments or suggestions they feel appropriate and turn the completed document into Human Resources by May 15.

DUE DATES	REQUIRED PROCEDURE
August 15	Determine weights for each role, establish goals, turn in to Supervisor
September 30	Supervisor will review weights and goals, discuss them with the employee and give approvals
April 1	Complete self-evaluation including providing supporting narrative and/or documentation and reflection on stated goals to Supervisor
May 15	Supervisor will review self-evaluation and documentation with employee and turn into Human Resources

The established due dates are the final date due, completion prior to the due dates to accommodate work load schedules is acceptable. Each administrative faculty is responsible for completing and submitting the required portion of their performance review by the due dates. Should administrative faculty have difficulty obtaining their supervisor's approvals or participation in completing the performance review it is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to document attempts to comply with the due dates (i.e., copies of emails reminding supervisor).

WEIGHTS

Individual employees will assign a weighted value to each role depending on 1) whether or not the role is carried out within his/her job description and 2) if the role is relevant to his/her duties. The weights will be determined based on the amount of responsibility and time involved. The assigned weights may vary from year to year depending on annual work job responsibilities. It is the employee's responsibility to meet with their supervisor to address any changes to roles or job description during the review period and document those changes for their evaluation. The percentages will be set by the employee and approved by their supervisor at the beginning of the evaluation cycle. The supervisors' decision on appropriate weights will be final. The percentage weights of the roles will be within the following ranges:

ROLE #	DESCRIPTION	PERCENTAGE RANGE
1	Position Coordination	25 – 80 %
2	Collaboration and Productivity	10 – 25 %
3	Service to Institution	5 – 25 %
4	Service to Constituents & Community	5 – 25 %
5	Supervisory Role	0 – 40 %

Refer to the performance review for the specific sub-categories. The self-evaluation contains a button-link to the comments/role narratives page in each role to write a narrative explaining how they meet each role at the satisfactory or higher level. Ratings of Commendable or Excellent require that the self-evaluation include a narrative explaining how that rating has been achieved,

which may include additional documentation, to justify the increase in scoring. All additional documentation should be attached to the email to the supervisor when submitting the Performance Review. It would be beneficial to list any attachments within the role narrative so the supervisor will know how it relates to the performance review.

ADMINISTRATIVE FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The administrative faculty member will complete a self-evaluation each year. Each evaluation will include a review and scoring of the four primary roles (supervisors will score five roles) and a minimum of three sub-categories, maximum of five sub-categories in each role. Those categories with an "*" must be included in the categories you choose to rate. A narrative statement and, when applicable, supporting documentation must be included to support scores of Commendable and Excellent. Narrative statements will be made by using the comments/role narratives link button at the bottom of each role. It is strongly recommended that each administrative faculty member make notes and file documentation throughout the year rather than trying to gather all the necessary documentation while writing the self-evaluation.

The five roles the administrative faculty member will review are (1) Position Coordination; (2) Collaboration and Productivity; (3) Service to Institution (Internal to GBC), (4) Service to Constituents (External to GBC); and (5) Supervisory Role. It is understood that not all administrative faculty will have supervisory assignments as part of their duties; therefore, this section will only be issued a weighted percentage if the administrative faculty is a supervisor.

PERFORMANCE REVIEW RATINGS

As stated in the NSHE Code Title 4, Chapter 3 Section 4.2; all performance evaluations shall include a rating of:

Excellent - Rating of 5: Provides exemplary service above and beyond job description. In order to receive an excellent score of 5, provide verifiable evidence of 2 additional duties, activities and/or projects that you have carried out that exemplifies meritorious performance

Commendable - Rating of 4: Provides commendable service beyond job description. In order to receive a Commendable score of 4, provide verifiable evidence of 1 additional duty, activity and/or project that you have carried out that exemplifies meritorious performance

Satisfactory - Rating of 3: Fulfills job description adequately. In order to receive a satisfactory score of 3, write a general overview verifying how you adequately meet each role.

Unsatisfactory - Rating of Less than 3: Does not fulfill job duties; Unacceptable and Unsatisfactory work ethic.

Administrative Faculty will assign these ratings to each role sub-category, the performance review form will then take the average of the sub-categories and the weighted percentage to achieve the rating score for each role. Administrative faculty must achieve a minimum rating of satisfactory in each role to be considered for any merit pay. The weighted percentages will be

submitted by the employee and reviewed by the supervisor no later than September 30 of each year. The percentage for each role must be within the established range for that role or you will receive an error message. Performance rating scores must be in whole numbers, decimal places may not be used. If the administrative faculty member supervises other employees check the supervisory role box under job title and role five will drop into place on the performance review. The total of all percentages entered must equal 100%. Once all percentages and sub-category rating numbers are entered into the performance review the employee will see an overall total score at the top and bottom of the roles section. That score will place the employee in the following performance level:

OVERALL PERFORMANCE LEVEL	RATING SCORE
Excellent	4.60 – 5.00
Commendable	3.80 – 4.59
Satisfactory	3.00 – 3.79
Unsatisfactory	< 3.00

GOALS AND REFLECTION

The administrative faculty member will set annual goal(s) for their professional and/or personal growth. The goals will be determined by the administrative faculty member by August 15 of each year and discussed with the supervisor by September 30 each year. The goals will not function as part of the Administrative Faculty Performance Review. The goals will be reviewed annually and each employee will provide a written reflection of the goals on the Performance Review Annual Summary tab on the Administrative Faculty Performance Review form by April 15.

OVERALL RATING OF UNSATISFACTORY

Academic or administrative faculty members receiving an overall rating of “unsatisfactory” on their evaluation shall be provided with constructive feedback in the written evaluation for improving their performance. This constructive feedback must include a written plan for improvement, which must be specific and must be provided at the time of the first “unsatisfactory” rating. (NSHE Code Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 4.6.,)

EMPLOYEE REJOINDER

Academic and administrative faculty who disagree with the supervisor’s evaluation may submit a written rejoinder, as provided in the NSHE Code, Section 5.16, NSHE Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 4.5, and GBC Bylaws 5.3. Following the provisions in these two references, GBC uses the peer review process to address faculty objections to an adverse annual evaluation rating. The result of the peer review will be a recommendation to the president for a final decision. Whether the president accepts or rejects the peer review recommendation, the president must include a signed addendum on the front of the original evaluation stating the change, if any, and the reasons for the change or the reasons for a denial of a recommended change. See GBC Bylaws 5.9 for more detail on the peer review process.

GREAT BASIN COLLEGE

Administrative Faculty Performance Review

Fiscal Year Review: 14

Employee Name: Employee Name

Job Title: Job Title

☒ *Supervisory position*

Weight assignments and Goals must be assigned by August 15 of each year

Employee performance ratings must be completed by April 15 of each year

Performance Rating	
Excellent	4.60 - 5.00
Commendable	3.80 - 4.59
Satisfactory	3.00 - 3.79
Unsatisfactory	<3.00

Performance Rating score for this review: **0.00**

ROLES	WEIGHT	
Role 1: Position Coordination (25% - 80%)	%	
*1. Demonstrates the knowledge and technical skills necessary to perform the job duties effectively as stated in the job description.	PERFORMANCE RATING	0
*2. Complies with policies, procedures, codes, external laws and regulations; department, institution, NSHE, State and Federal regulations. Demonstrates support and compliance with general conditions of employment, AA/EEO, security and workplace safety policies.		
*3. Manages projects/programs effectively, including meeting objectives, timelines/deadlines and responsibly manages resources.		
<i>Additional Categories</i>		
4. Other:		
5. Other:		
Role 1 Score: Rating 0		Weighted 0.00
Role 2: Collaboration and Productivity (10% - 25%)	%	
*1. Demonstrates effective communication and interpersonal skills by maintaining accountability, adapting to change, demonstrating willingness to learn, applying new skills or methods, listening to diverse opinions and demonstrating sound decision making skills.	PERFORMANCE RATING	0
*2. Demonstrates leadership, collaboration and teamwork effectively by cooperating and supporting colleagues in accomplishing the goals of the department and the college. Supports and encourages a collegial work environment.		
*3. Maintains or improves the quality, timeliness, volume and scope of services provided. Meets required deadlines and effectively prioritizes workload.		
<i>Additional Categories</i>		
4. Other:		
5. Other:		
Role 2 Score: Rating 0		Weighted 0.00
Role 3: Service to Institution (5% - 25%)	%	
*1. Participates in a Senate standing committee, a Senate ad-hoc committee, or on a recognized non-Senate committee.	PERFORMANCE RATING	0
*2. Presents and/or participates in trainings/workshops.		
*3. Supports GBC's Mission, Core Themes and Strategic Plan.		
<i>Additional Categories</i>		
4. Actively engages in college sponsored activities.		
5. Other:		
Role 3 Score: Rating 0		Weighted 0.00
Role 4: Service to Constituents and Community (5% - 25%)	%	
*1. Addresses issues of key importance to external stakeholders; processes and distributes information in context, provides a clear understanding of one's subject matter and offers an informed position.	PERFORMANCE RATING	0
*2. Works with constituents to achieve desired results, maintains positive relationships, and projects professionalism		
<i>Additional Categories</i>		
3. Develops, maintains, or improves educational, public, legislative, interagency, and other key relations.		
4. Actively engages in non-institutional organizations or service to the community.		
5. Other:		

ROLES			WEIGHT	
	Role 4 Score:	Rating	0	Weighted 0.00

ROLES			WEIGHT	
Role 5: Supervisory Role (0 - 40%)			0	%
*1. Sets clear performance standards for the employees. Provide all employees with constructive feedback concerning performance. Record and address significant employee' performance events when they occur. Include both positive and negative performance issues.			PERFORMANCE RATING	0
*2. Completes timely evaluations for employees. Coordinates with employee in determining a mentoring and action plan for growth and improvement. Arranges for training, provides resources, encouragement and developmental opportunities so employees can achieve their responsibilities and goals.				
*3. Coordinates, disseminates and provides assessment of operational work flow, best practices, and achieving efficiencies internally and externally. Ensures positive customer relations are maintained by employees.				
Additional Categories				
4. Maintains the strategic plan in an up to date and functional format.				
5. Other:				
Your weight must equal 100%			0	%
Role 5 Score: Rating 0.00			Weighted	0.00
			OVERALL TOTAL:	0.00

0 %

GREAT BASIN COLLEGE
Administrative Faculty Performance Review

FY: 14

Name: *Employee Name*

Comments/Role Narratives

Role 1: Position Coordination

Role 2: Collaboration and Productivity

Role 3: Service to Institution

Role 4: Service to Constituents

Role 5: Supervisory

GREAT BASIN COLLEGE
Administrative Faculty Annual Summary

FY: 14

Name: *Employee Name*

Performance rating score for this review: 0.00

GOALS

(due to your Supervisor by August 15 of each year)

REFLECTION

(due to your supervisor by April 15 of each year)

SUPERVISOR COMMENTS

(completed and approved by May 30 of each year)

Employee Signature

Date

Supervisor Signature

Date

Reviewer Signature (Optional)

Date

GBC Merit Pay Award Plan

The Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) Board of Regents approves guidelines for the development of college faculty salary plans. Plans are developed by the individual college and merit pay awards are applied as they may be funded through the state and system budget allocation processes, and according to the college and NSHE guidelines. Once the college plan is developed and approved by the Faculty Senate, the president approves the final plan regarding merit pay awards for each eligible faculty member. The action of the president is submitted to the Nevada System of Higher Education for review and final approval. Upon NSHE approval, the college generates "Faculty Employment Contracts" according to the provisions of the faculty salary plan.

Policy:

The amount of merit pay award for each faculty member is determined by that faculty member's final performance evaluation rating. To receive a merit salary award, a faculty member must receive a final evaluation result of "Excellent" or "Commendable" and meet all qualifying steps for consideration.

Merit salary increases are distributed to academic and administrative faculty by a "share" distribution plan. Under this proposal, faculty who receive a "Commendable" or "Excellent" final overall composite score (OCR) will be awarded a merit salary increase equivalent to the Merit Unit Award (MUA) as designated under the Moderate Distribution Plan developed by Dr. Areola within his book "Using OCR in Promotion, Merit Pay, and Post Tenure Review Decisions". Additional qualifying factors are listed under the **Initial Merit Consideration Qualifiers** heading in this document.

A faculty member with an "Excellent" or "Commendable" final evaluation may not be able to receive all of the prescribed merit award increase added to their salary if the increase would cause the person's salary to exceed the maximum allowed for the person's range. In this case, the portion of merit pay increase that exceeds the maximum salary limitation will be awarded as a one-time, non-cumulative merit bonus.

Merit pay is mutually exclusive from COLA (Cost of Living Allowance). COLA will be awarded in years when the Legislature funds such increases.

Faculty who do not have a performance evaluation for the preceding year because they are returning from a one-year leave of absence (sabbatical, etc.) will return in July at the same salary they had when they took leave (plus COLA, if any was given). Their last evaluation will be used to determine their Merit Award for the new academic calendar year.

Frequency:

The merit plan shall require faculty evaluation once annually.

Appeal:

Faculty may appeal the results of their evaluation through the Faculty Appeals Procedure as outlined in the current Great Basin College By-Laws.

Review:

The college system of evaluation and merit award shall be reviewed periodically. The review process shall provide for the involvement of all college personnel holding faculty rank. Recommendations for change shall be approved by a majority of the college personnel holding faculty rank by vote by container representatives in the Senate, before submission to the president of the college for final approval and implementation. If the recommended changes are not approved, the president should submit recommended modifications to the proposed plan back to the college personnel holding faculty rank, via the Faculty Senate, for further consideration and resubmission. In the meantime, the existing plan would remain in effect.

Due to the fact that we do not have solid historical Administrative Faculty Evaluations data on a scale comparable to the Academic Faculty using the OCR ratings, the first allocation of merit after the inaugural transition awarding of July 2014, will be based on the raw OCR scores for both faculty classifications. After the Merit Awards have been issued on or about July 2015, the college will conduct a statistical analysis of the Academic and the Administrative Faculty data to determine if a Standard Normal Distribution should be instituted going forward for the July 2016 awards of merit. The Compensation and Benefits Committee will be charged with reporting the results of the analysis to Faculty Senate for consideration.

Academic Freedom:

Evaluation shall not be used to restrain faculty members in their exercise of constitutional rights or academic freedom as set forth in TITLE 2 - Nevada System of Higher Education Code, Chapter 2, Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

Evaluation Procedural Guidelines for Merit Award Considerations:

The standard approved GBC annual evaluation forms and the rating numbers they produce shall be used by supervising Dean, VP, or President as the primary basis for arriving at an overall evaluation rating of each full-time faculty member in each evaluation year. This rating shall be the primary basis for the award of any merit pay. Only in the event of egregious acts or acts requiring disciplinary action may the evaluation rating be reduced more than one level, or the individual eliminated from consideration for merit by the supervising Dean, VP, or President as appropriate. Supporting documentation for these cases must be available to the affected faculty member, and if not agreed to by the faculty member, established procedures of grievance and appeal may be followed. Only faculty supervisors (Dean, VP, or President) shall be involved in any adjustment of annual evaluation ratings for merit consideration.

1. Faculty salary increases will be awarded on a college-wide basis rather than on a divisional basis. In other words, all Faculty at the college who receive a given overall

composite rating will receive the same Merit Award based on the share value in that given year and the distribution method in place at that time.

2. Faculty who have reduced load contract responsibilities will have their teaching and administrative responsibilities evaluated on a proportional basis.
3. These procedures become college policy beginning with the Fall 2014 semester evaluation period.

Initial Merit Consideration Qualifiers:

1. Faculty must have completed and submitted their evaluation within the time frame specified by senior administration.
2. Must achieve a minimum of "Satisfactory" in all categories or roles of the Faculty Self-Evaluation form totals that specifically apply. If no Management or Supervisory duties are part of the faculty's normal responsibilities, then that category will not be included in the evaluation.
3. Must currently be employed as a Faculty Member. Adjunct Faculty, Classified Staff, and those with a rank of Dean or higher are excluded from merit award per NSHE guidelines.
4. The Legislature, and subsequently the Board of Regents, must fund the college specifically for Merit Pool allocations.
5. Understanding that a "share" of the pool will vary in monetary amounts depending on the size of the pool allocated. A "share" does not equal to a percentage of the faculty member's current or base salary.
6. Merit allocation gets added to current base salary to establish a new salary for the next year. It is not awarded as a one-time bonus with the exception of those faculties who are at the top of their salary range.
7. Merit shall be awarded based on the score a member received with the criteria indicated on the Faculty Self-Evaluation forms, with additional consideration given by the final evaluator (Dean, VP, or President).
8. Mandatory completion and inclusion of the two course assessments under the Instructional Design section of the Evaluation for Academic Faculty.
9. At final level of evaluation, the Dean, VP, or President could either downgrade or upgrade the faculty member's Self-Evaluation form but it will be just one category (i.e. Excellent to Commendable, or Satisfactory to Commendable). When multiple monetary award levels are part of a category, then the Faculty Member will be awarded Merit Pay at the highest level within the downgraded category (i.e. Commendable 4.59) or lowest level within an upgraded category (i.e. Excellent 4.60).
10. Great Basin College, to assure Faculty of transparency in Merit Awarding, will provide a report at the conclusion of each merit award cycle that includes a breakdown of the OCR scores and their accompanying monetary awards confirming full allocation of available funds.

*Other guidelines
are provided for
Classified
Adjunct*

Merit Award Plan Distribution:

In the spirit of continued collegiality, Great Basin College Faculty has chosen the following “Moderate Distribution” plan for implementation at the start of the 2015 – 2016 academic calendar year when merit pay is funded by the Legislature and NSHE. A transitional plan, to be identified later in this document, has been developed to allocate the current funds available on July 1, 2014.

Plan Specifics:

1. All faculty regardless of funding sources are eligible for merit award.
2. Faculty who are not state funded (i.e. contract, grant, self-funded, etc.), are to build merit consideration into their funding source.
3. State funded faculty will be awarded Merit based on a share of available budgeted funds per the guidelines of the plan.
4. Qualifiers are identified within the section titled “**Initial Merit Consideration Qualifiers**”.
5. Faculty must have an overall composite rating (OCR) of at least 3.80 to be considered for merit award and have achieved at least a “Satisfactory” rating on each role or category within their evaluation.
6. Mandatory completion and inclusion of the two course assessments under the Instructional Design section of the Evaluation for Academic Faculty.
7. The merit pool will be distributed using the following mathematical principles and formula.
 - a. Given facts:
 - i. Total number of faculty who qualified for merit award, who are included in the state fund allocation.
 - ii. Total sum of money available in the Merit pool.
 - b. Calculations:
 - i. All qualifying faculty OCR scores are to be summed.
 - ii. The total is divided into the fund allocated for merit award.
 - iii. This arrives at a Merit Unit Award (MUA).
 - iv. The MUA is multiplied by the OCR score for each faculty member achieving meritorious service levels to establish the individual monetary award that is added to the faculty member’s coming year salary.
 - v. The total of all awards combined is to be equal to the entire fund allocated to the college for merit.

The Transition Plan:

Great Basin College faculty has overwhelmingly stated their preference that equity and fairness continue to be the norm for all faculty. To that end, all faculty members who are deemed qualified for merit award on July 1, be awarded an equal share of the fund pool regardless of the particular OCR rating each achieve as long as they are at the minimum Commendable level. This award will be added to their base salary for the coming 2014 – 2015 academic year.



POLICY AND PROCEDURE

Title:	EMERITUS/EMERITA STATUS
Policy No.:	2.22
Department:	College
Contact:	President

Policy

The following criteria shall be used to determine eligibility of faculty and professional staff for Emeritus status as an honor after a distinguished and long-term achievement and service to Great Basin College as specified in NSHE Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 40:

- Emeritus status may be granted to a member who has entered retired status after completing a minimum of ten years of continuous, professional, full-time service at Great Basin College.
- Copy of letter of intention to retire with retirement date.

Procedures:

1.0 Recommendation for Emeritus Status

1. The Faculty Senate shall initiate an annual request for application for Emeritus status from the College community.
2. Recommendations are encouraged from any member of the College community who believes that someone may be qualified or a person may recommend themselves.
3. Recommendation must be submitted to Personnel Committee by the last Friday in March [changed from Jan 31].
4. The Personnel Committee will notify the eligible employee recommended for emeritus.

2.0 Application for Emeritus Status

1. Each application should include a list of professional achievements and examples of achievement. [deleted phrase "that demonstrate the fulfillment of criteria established for this designation"]
2. The annual deadline for the submission of the completed application and recommendations to the Personnel Committee will be by the last Friday in January. At the meeting following the deadline, the Personnel Committee will review the individual application. Faculty Senate will send recommendations to the appropriate VP. The VP will forward the recommendation to the President, who is the granting authority.
3. Each employee may apply for consideration of Emeritus status one time only.

3.0 Award of Emeritus Status

The President shall approve Emeritus status and the honor will be acknowledged during the award [changed from "graduation"] ceremony immediately following the appointment.

4.0 Rights, Privileges and Responsibilities of an Emeritus Faculty

In addition to any generally available rights and privileges for retired personnel, rights, privileges, and responsibilities of emeriti faculty shall include the following:

- Listing in College catalog for the first year of emeritus status;
- Invitations to College public ceremonies such as academic processions, convocations, and appropriate social functions;
- Use of the title *Emeritus, Great Basin College*;
- Invitation to serve as an ambassador for the college at mutually agreed-upon events within the community;
- E-mail account, Great Basin College Faculty list;
- Grants-in-aid for emeritus faculty and professional staff, their spouse, and their financially dependent children. (NSHE Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 11)
- Library privileges will remain the same as full-time employees.
- The Emeritus faculty member must continue to conform to the NSHE Code. Failure to conform to NSHE Code may result in Emeritus status being revoked.

References:

NSHE Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 40

NSHE Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 11

Approved by PC: October 23, 2007, March 23, 2010

Approved by Faculty Senate: October 18, 2007, February 19, 2010

Contact the assistant to the president for any questions, corrections, or additions.

Great Basin College
Application for Emeritus Status

Application Date: _____

Emeritus Status for: _____

Department: _____

Years of service: _____

Recommended by: ☐ Applicant ☐ Colleague(s): _____

PART I: *Applicant provide the following information*

Completion and submission of the application packet is the responsibility of the applicant.

Application Packet

1. Please attach a current curriculum vita with this application.
2. In no more than two pages:
 - a. Describe your outstanding professional performance and recognition that exemplifies excellence and meritorious performance.
 - b. Describe your continued professional growth at GBC.
 - c. Describe your service to GBC and the communities it serves.
 - d. Describe any other activities and awards.
3. Attach two letters of recommendation from colleagues within or outside of the GBC community.
4. Provide a brief summary of approximately 100 words of your career highlights for use during recognition ceremonies.

****Note:** Incomplete packets will not be considered. Applicants are reminded that each employee may apply for consideration of Emeritus status one time only.

PART II: *Applicant provide the following summary information*

Name: _____ Home Phone No.: _____

Home Address: _____

Highest Earned Degree: _____ Institution and Year: _____

Department and Campus location: _____

Years of full-time service to the institution: _____ Actual Retirement Date: _____

Exact title as agreed upon by the unit and the faculty/professional member:

NOTE: This is the title that will appear on the award certificate and in publications such as the college catalog if Emeritus status is granted. (Options: Contract title at time of retirement, highest rank during service, etc.)

Emeritus Faculty/Professional may elect to maintain their college e-mail account and may continue to serve the university in an adjunct or volunteer capacity, therefore, be listed in the Great Basin College directory. Please indicate your preferences below:

☐ I wish to maintain my Great Basin College e-mail account. My e-mail address is:

☐ I wish to continue to be listed in the GBC on-line and print directories. My information is as follows:

E-mail _____

☐ I do not wish to maintain an e-mail account or be listed in the directories.

Applicant's signature/date: _____

PART III: *For Personnel Committee and Human Resources use only*
Return this form to the Personnel Committee

- ☐ Meets requirements for years of service for Emeritus Status
- ☐ Does not meet requirements for years of service for Emeritus Status

_____ Number of years of service applied to Emeritus

(Human Resources Department Signature)

- ☐ The candidate has satisfied the requirements for Emeritus
- ☐ The candidate has not satisfied the requirements for Emeritus

(Supervising Vice President Signature)

Personnel Committee Decision:

☐ Recommended

☐ Not Recommended

Comments:

Approval by President (Signature)

Date

Change of faculty workload policy 5.21, procedure 2.A.f regarding presence on campus to:

Change of faculty workload policy 5.21, procedure 2.A.f regarding presence on campus to:

Instructional faculty are expected to spend a minimum of 35 hours on their assigned duties per week. Of these 35 hours, 5 will be on-campus office hours, while the remainder may consist of instructional activities, institutional service, professional development, or other duties, depending on the needs of specific faculty, departments and programs. 40 hours per week shall be the primary basis for determining the workload of non-instructional faculty

Suggested revision:

*Instructional faculty are expected to spend a minimum of 35 hours **per week** on their assigned duties. **At least 5 hours** will be **scheduled** on-campus office hours. The remainder **will** consist of instructional activities, institutional service, professional development, or other duties, depending on the needs of specific faculty, departments and programs. 40 hours per week shall be the primary basis for determining the workload of non-instructional faculty.*

Current language reads:

Faculty must be on campus not less than 35 hours per week to perform their duties, unless assigned off-campus duties contributing to the total of 35 hours per week. 40 hours per week shall be the primary basis for determining the workload of non-instructional faculty.