

GREAT BASIN COLLEGE
PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL

April 8, 2014

1:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Mark Curtis, Mike McFarlane, Lynn Mahlberg, Sonja Sibert, Bret Murphy, Tom Reagan, Alex Porter

ABSENT: John Rice, Dori Andrepont, Kris Miller

1. Approval of Minutes – The minutes of the President's Council meeting on March 11, 2014, were approved.
2. SGA Update – Alex Porter won't know until the Board of Regents' agenda comes out if the tuition and fees will be discussed at the April special meeting. SGA has been discussing SB 391 and President Curtis has attended SGA meetings to provide information. SGA is preparing for elections week. SGA will be updating their constitution. Revisions have been made and sent to John Albrecht, general counsel, for review. Constitutional changes will have to be approved by the Chancellor and the Board of Regents. They are planning on phasing out the treasurer position. The treasurer duties will be absorbed by the other executive positions. All changes have been reviewed by Pat Anderson and Adriana Mendez. There will be a Nevada Student Alliance meeting on Monday, April 14.
3. Faculty Senate Update – Tom Reagan reported that the work load language was approved by FS.
 - Mentoring Policy – President's Council reviewed policy as a 1st read. No changes were made and PC approved policy. It does not have to come back for a 2nd reading.
 - Gen Ed Changes for Certificates – President's Council approved recommendation to adopt NSHE phrasing and have Math requirement for the certificate program to say, "Computation...3 credits and to more specifically define computation. Additional wording was recommended by PC to include any math prefix, BUS 110 or demonstrated as embedded in the program.
 - Professional Development Funding Request Procedures – 1st Read; FS will vote on next Friday. Always have to report in the accreditation report. We are missing the portion that is paid for out of the department. Some suggestions will be taken back to comp and benefits.

Tom reported that he is working on a faculty resolution statement for the SB 391 for public comment. The statement will be voted on at the next Faculty Senate meeting. It would state that any change that required additional bureaucratic infrastructure would be a step in the wrong direction. The SB 391 meeting on April 23rd will have the faculty senate chairs testifying.

4. Classified Council Update – Melinda Mott reported that they will borrow the ducks from the Museum for their duck raise fundraiser. They will do a test run to determine if it will

work. The new SGA Battle Born Veterans Club will fish the ducks out of the water if needed.

5. President's Report – President Curtis reported he made the circle around the state and met with the four school superintendents of our new increased service area. He received a warm reception from Dan Fox in Pershing County. They are happy with what we've been doing and want to expand Math and community education classes. Mineral County does not have broad band at the high school. We can probably use the Ag extension office which most likely has broad band. We will have Bob Hannu take a trip down to see what is required. Esmeralda County doesn't even have a high school. The high school kids get bussed into Tonopah. Lincoln County superintendent Niki Holton was very enthusiastic. The high school in Alamo is being served by CSN for the dual credit, but we will take that over. President Curtis told each of the superintendents that this trip was just the first contact and we will be having more trips in the future by the Vice Presidents and Bob Hannu.

President's period evaluation process is being scheduled. Mardell Wilkins will be contacting people to schedule meetings with the evaluation committee

6. Miscellaneous

Lynn Mahlberg reported the College Career Fair is April 16th from 9:00 a.m. to noon in the GBC Fitness Center. The Career Fair is open to the public.

Mike McFarlane reported that there will be hoop house coming to campus May 2. It is a 30 by 48 foot greenhouse made of PVC and plastic. The UNR Ag extension is putting on a 2-day session to show the construction of it and how to do a business structure. George Kleeb is very excited about it.

Sonja Sibert reported that the iNtegrate 2 project has received five proposals and the committee is in the process of scoring the proposals.

Tom Reagan reported the new executive director for the Nevada College Coalition has been selected. It is Frank Woodbreck, the former director of the Nevada Department of Training and Rehabilitation. President Curtis reported that structure of the coalition is that the three community college presidents will be the board of directors for the coalition. It is good for NSHE to have such a well-connected person leading the Coalition

Imported upcoming events:

May 8th is the Stan Popeck BBQ

May 9th is staff recognition/reception

May 9th is the Aggie's Dinner

April 24th is president's award ceremony

May 15th is the end of year employee BBQ

Week of April 28th is the Presidential Periodic Review



POLICY AND PROCEDURE

Title:	Mentoring
Policy No.:	3.61
Department:	Academic Affairs
Contact:	Vice-President for Academic Affairs

Policy

To promote high quality instruction in all disciplines, GBC requires all new academic faculty members to undergo a period of mentorship. GBC tenure-track faculty shall do this as part of the tenure process (Policy 3.60). New faculty members not eligible for tenure in accordance with NSHE Code (Title 2, Chapter 4, Section 4) shall follow the mentoring procedures established here for the initial period of employment as described below.

The major objectives of mentoring are to provide a faculty of high ability, committed to excellence in teaching and service to GBC. Faculty positions not designated as tenure-track positions must follow the mentoring procedures provided here. Part-time, benefits-eligible contract instructional faculty must also follow the mentoring process. In the event that a non-tenure-track faculty member moves to a state funded, tenure-track position, procedures must then be followed toward tenure as per Policy 3.60. If a tenured faculty member makes the transition to a non-tenure position, the tenure process is sufficient and further mentoring is not required.

Completion of the mentoring process described here does not provide any assurances of continued employment beyond those stated in individual contracts. Non-tenure track faculty may be terminated without cause within certain notice periods under any conditions.

Procedures

These procedures are implemented effective for all non-tenure track faculty members as of the time of approval of this Policy.

1.0 Mentoring Committee

1.1. Committee Formation. During the beginning of the first semester of hire, a three-person mentor committee shall be formed for each new faculty member. The composition of the committee shall be of tenured faculty members or faculty members who have completed the mentoring process from these selections:

- a) One member selected by the department of the faculty member;
- b) One member (from any department) selected by the faculty member; and
- c) One member selected by the VPAA.

The new faculty member and the member's Department Chair shall report their respective committee member choices to the VPAA. The committee should be consolidated by mid-semester of the first semester of employment.

Once faculty members are placed onto a committee, they may continue through sabbaticals or into retirement should they wish and if they can maintain their commitment. If it is necessary to replace a committee member, the VPAA's office will coordinate the process. The vacated member from the list above will be replaced with a member in the same category, if possible.

In the event a non-tenure-track faculty member is placed in a tenure-track position after initial employment, the mentor committee will normally continue and serve as the tenure committee.

1.2. Confidentiality. Upon agreeing to serve as a member of a mentoring committee, committee members must adhere to all standards of personnel confidentiality.

1.3. Committee Meetings. During each semester of the probationary period the mentored faculty member shall arrange for full committee meetings as described below:

- a) At the first meeting of the first semester of employment the committee shall select a Chair who is responsible for preparing reports and forwarding those to the VPAA and supervising Dean (if applicable) together with any other business that needs to be completed. If a change in Chair is required, this is approved by the VPAA.
- b) At the first meeting the committee shall review the time frame for completing the mentoring process. Completion is generally at the end of the second year after hire unless there is a recommendation to extend the period. When a faculty member has been hired to begin teaching full-time starting in January, that spring semester counts as the first full year.
- c) Within the mentoring process, there shall be no years granted toward completion in consideration of prior experience.
- d) During fall meetings the committee works with the faculty member to establish role percentages for the faculty annual evaluation system. The VPAA or supervising Dean approves percentage settings.

1.4. Initial Screening. Before the end of February of the spring semester of the first year of employment, the committee alone shall meet with the VPAA and supervising Dean (if applicable) to discuss the faculty member in terms of overall initial performance exhibited by the employee. This is an important initial screening for the new faculty member.

2.0 Mentoring Period Reporting

2.1. Reports. The mentoring period shall include years of uninterrupted employment. Each semester of the mentoring period, the committee shall prepare a written report that is submitted to the VPAA and supervising Dean (if applicable). Each semester report shall include a general summary that includes identification of professional strengths and weaknesses with suggestions for improving performance. The combination of all semester reports from the mentoring period will demonstrate in part how a faculty member is progressing in becoming a fully established instructor.

2.2. Report Content. Report content and submission:

Fall Semester Report: This is due to the VPAA and supervising Dean (if applicable) by finals week. This progress report provides a general overview of performance including the standards listed below. At least one teaching observation of at least an hour and fifteen minutes of a class period (coordinated with the instructor), or the online equivalent, is required for this report. The observer should introduce her or himself, explain the purpose of the visit, and encourage students to provide constructive feedback on the student rating forms at the end of the term. A short written report on the teaching observation shall be included in the semester report.

Spring Semester Report: This is due to the VPAA and supervising Dean (if applicable) by finals week. The spring report is more detailed and should generally be about 2-4 pages long. The report should address IDEA ratings for fall courses of the academic year and spring IDEA ratings from

the previous year if available. There should be at least one teaching observation in the spring following the same guidelines as the fall observation. The report should address teaching observations for each semester, the Faculty Evaluation scores for the academic year, the Teaching and Service Standards in general, and any other relevant information.

3.0 Standards for Non-tenured Faculty

3.1. Standards. Standards to be evaluated and addressed in mentoring reports are in the areas of teaching and service. Rubrics for evaluating these are provided within the form at the end of these procedures.

Standard One: Teaching. Faculty members are required to achieve an excellent rating for teaching by the third year of service.

Standard Two: Service. The measures of service shall be within the areas of student advisement, collegiality, and service to the college. Faculty members must achieve a satisfactory rating in student advisement and service to the college and a commendable rating for collegiality.

3.2. Committee Evaluation of Standards. For Standard 1, the committee shall use Faculty Evaluation ratings for Teaching Design, Assessment, and Management and the Teaching Delivery scores from the IDEA reports. (The form accompanying this procedure provides more detail.) The committee shall examine fall and previous spring student rating forms for any course taught. The committee may review original IDEA forms, report summaries, the student written comments, and grades and consider these in the evaluation, but are reminded that this information is confidential. Classroom observations and student comments should be considered. The committee shall use the GBC form to determine the evaluation rating.

For Standards 2A and 2C the committee shall review the Faculty Evaluation sections that directly apply to these parts of service. The committee shall use the accompanying GBC form to determine the evaluation rating.

Standard 2B is evaluated using the rating rubric found in the accompanying GBC form. This evaluation is based on discussions with department chairs, program supervisors, other department members, the supervising Dean and/or VPAA, and any other persons with direct knowledge of a faculty member's interactions with colleagues and students. The committee shall use the GBC form to determine the evaluation rating.

The committee should review any information within the faculty member's personnel file during the mentoring period. Any other information that may affect the overall evaluation of the faculty member may also be reviewed. All information may be considered in all reports and evaluations and is confidential outside of committee discussions and reports.

3.3. Committee Reporting on Standards. For each Standard the committee shall provide details that support the evaluation along with suggestions or recommendations for improvements as needed. For the spring semester report, include the GBC evaluation form provided at the end of this procedure to evaluate the candidate for the following Standards with a clear report heading for each:

- A. Standard 1: Teaching
- B. Standard 2A: Student advising
- C. Standard 2B: Interactions with colleagues and students (collegiality)
- D. Standard 2C: Service to the college
- E. Summary: Performance and progress toward tenure (include recommendations in this section)

Reports are reviewed and signed by all committee members and the faculty member. By signing the report the faculty member acknowledges receipt and review of the report but the signature does not necessarily

indicate agreement with the report. If the faculty member disagrees with any aspect of the report, a written rejoinder may be attached.

3.4. Administrative Evaluation. Each year as part of the annual evaluation process, the supervising administrator (VPAA or Dean) of a faculty member shall include in the written portion of the annual evaluation a statement on progress in acquiring the needed knowledge and skills required to become an effective instructor. This shall be shared with the committee, and shall include any concerns about performance that the administrator has and what actions should be taken in regard to these concerns.

4.0 Completion of Process

4.1 Final Committee Report. The end of the mentoring period shall be at the end of the second year of teaching unless there is a determination to extend the process. At this time the faculty member shall request a final recommendation and report from the mentoring committee.

The recommendation shall be in a cover letter to the report, signed by all committee members, that provides one of three recommendations based on performance. The recommendation may be that the faculty member, 1) has shown sufficient competency that no further mentoring is required, or, 2) needs to make further progress in certain specified regards and that mentoring should continue on a year-to-year basis, or, 3) has not displayed significant proficiency or progress and should be terminated.

The report accompanying the letter (2 - 4 pages) shall describe and substantiate the competency of the instructor in the following regards:

- a) Competency within the field for which the individual was hired;
- b) Excellence as an instructor in the instructional setting;
- c) Participation in advising students with interest and ability;
- d) Performance of all duties required of teaching faculty of GBC, including a full workload and departmental and college service;
- e) Works effectively and collegially with members of the department and the college;
- f) Follows proper college procedures in all regards;
- g) Other items deemed notable.

The faculty member shall compile a notebook (no thicker than approximately 1 to 1.5") of information to substantiate performance. This shall include tabs for identifying the following components:

- a) Official mentoring completion application form (TBA);
- b) A complete and detailed current professional *Curriculum vitae* (reflecting all professional experience and activities at GBC and elsewhere);
- c) Committee progress reports for each semester;
- d) Faculty annual evaluation forms for each year, including the VPAA's or supervising Dean's summary;
- e) IDEA reports, including student comments, for each course taught; and
- f) Other materials as appropriate or needed.

All materials shall be submitted to the immediate supervisor, either a Dean or the VPAA, by the end of finals week of the last semester of the mentoring period. A copy of the recommendation letter and report must also be delivered to the faculty member by the committee.

4.2. Review and Determination of Performance. At the time that the final performance report has been completed and submitted, the following steps shall occur:

- a) The VPAA and supervising Dean (if applicable) shall review the letter of recommendation, report, and notebook. The VPAA, in consultation with the supervising Dean (if applicable), makes a determination that, 1) sufficient competency has been demonstrated such that no further mentoring

- is required, or, 2) further progress needs to be made in certain regards and that mentoring should continue on a year-to-year basis, or, 3) significant proficiency or progress has not been demonstrated such that that employment should be terminated.
- b) If the determination is made that the mentoring process has been sufficient, a letter shall be sent by the VPAA or supervising Dean to the faculty member with the information of this decision. This determination shall be communicated to the President.
 - c) If the determination is made for extending the mentoring period, the faculty member shall be informed in writing by the VPAA and/or supervising Dean. The VPAA and/or supervising Dean shall also meet with the applicant to discuss the determination and the exact deficiencies in performance that must be addressed. A written plan for improvement shall be created, and mentoring shall continue for at least another year. This determination shall be communicated to the President.
 - d) If the determination is made for termination of employment, the VPAA and/or supervising Dean will send this written recommendation to the President, copied to the faculty member, and will meet with the President to discuss this decision. The President's final decision will then be sent to the faculty member in writing. If the faculty member disputes the decision, a written request to the President must be received by the President within 15 business days after receipt of the decision. If requested by the faculty member, the VPAA and/or President will meet with the faculty member to discuss the decision. If a means of resolution is possible, this shall be provided to the faculty member in a written response within 15 days of the meeting or receipt of the letter, whichever occurs last.

Approved by President's Council: April 8 2014

Contact the assistant to the President for any questions, changes, or additions.

Professional Development Funding Request Procedures

As a means of providing clearer guidance to all faculty who wish funding consideration by the Compensation and Benefits Committee, this document will answer several questions and concerns that have been raised in previous years. The actual Professional Development Funding Request application process includes a two page document to be submitted to the committee, along with any supportive documentation available to aid the committee in their consideration of your request.

The premise for this document is that funding is allocated by the college for the purposes of Professional Development for the academic year. Should there not be a Professional Development funding pool for that academic year at Great Basin College, then the Committee will have no recourse in consideration of requests but to deny recommendation due to lack of funds.

Additionally, the applicant must meet the minimum requirements as outlined in this document, the Funding Request Form, and the Funding Request Checklist. Timely submission of all documents is critically important when limited funds are available to ensure consideration. The Professional Development Funding Request applies to all faculty, regardless of their contract status.

Procedural Updates:

- a) The current written process bases funding request submissions on specific calendar dates for consideration. These have been extended to allow more time for faculty to submit their request for funding. See the revised Checklist for specifics dates.
- b) Current unwritten process dictates an “annual approach” to funding requests as it is on a “first-come, first-serve” basis. It has been considered by many who have voiced concerns to committee members as less collegial than GBC faculty desire because Spring conferences in the past that have been deemed worthy, have gone unfunded due to the funding pool depletion in the Fall. Going forward, the pool of funds available will be split between the Fall and Spring semesters equally (i.e. If we have \$5000 available, \$2500 will be available for each semester for faculty consideration).
- c) The current written “Checklist” calls for a “first-come, first-serve” funding consideration. Faculty have advised the Committee that this is deemed unfair to all departments and not collegial. Typically the Committee would receive multiple requests from limited departments early in the Fall semester leading the committee to possibly fund several requests from a department and deny some worthy requests later due to a lack of available funds.

Starting with the Fall 2014 semester, faculty applications will be considered per the Checklist with one potential request approval per voting rep in the Faculty Senate Containers and the “first-come, first-serve” approach previously employed no longer the policy. Additional requests from the same department will have to pursue alternative funding (i.e. departmental budgets, Senior Administration, etc.). Surplus funds in the budget unallocated at the end of the Fall semester, if any, will roll over to the Spring semester.

- d) Current procedures are largely undocumented and implemented by recollections of previous committee members, consultation with senior administration, interpretation of loose guidelines, and/or following unspecified “norms”. This document is meant to provide clearer guidance to the Committee and faculty as of the start of the Fall 2014 academic year. However, it is by no means all-encompassing or entirely definitive. As with all procedures at the college, it is subject to revision in the future.
- e) Current unwritten procedures do not specifically identify the amounts to be awarded per request and Committee recommendations. Due to the limited funding for Professional Development by the college as a result of budgetary restrictions, at the first meeting of the Compensation and Benefits Committee each Fall, a decision will be made as to the maximum monetary amount that will be considered for faculty funding requests in that academic year. If the fund provided by GBC is less than \$4,000, the funding consideration will be limited to the cost of conference registration or the maximum ceiling designated by the committee for that academic year if it exceeds the registration. This does not mean that all who are funded will receive the maximum amount as other factors will be weighed in the Committee recommendation to senior administration. This will be communicated by the Compensation and Benefits Committee Chair at the first Faculty Senate meeting and in an email communication to faculty. It is hoped that knowing ahead of time what the ceiling is for possible funding, the faculty member can then pursue their likely additional funding needs proactively rather than reactively.
- f) The Travel Request Checklist” has been updated and renamed the “Professional Development Funding Request Checklist” to more accurately reflect the intent of the Committee. It has been incorporated with the Fund Request Form into a single two page document. Additionally, the checklist has been revised to include changes in criteria and possible point totals that can be achieved. The applicant must score a minimum of 4 points on the mandatory items highlighted in bold. At that point, the committee will weigh other factors and points in their decision to either recommend or not recommend for funding and at what monetary level.