

GREAT BASIN COLLEGE
PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL

April 22, 2014

1:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Mark Curtis, Mike McFarlane, Lynn Mahlberg, Sonja Sibert, Tom Reagan, Bret Murphy, Kris Miller, Alex Porter, Dori Andrepont, Bryce Powell
GUESTS: Norm Whittaker, Demarynee Saili, Isaac Duran, Bryce Powell

1. Approval of Minutes – The minutes of the President's Council meeting on April 8, 2014, were approved.
2. Skills USA – Norm Whittaker and members of the Skills USA team requested \$5,000 to pay for registration at the national conference. The club will conduct some fundraising for this event, but the money is needed now as there is a deadline for registration. Norm said in years past Barrick has been a big support. SGA approved to advance the \$5,000 if the club agreed to pay it back. The Skills USA club is looking at many ways in which they can expand membership. Early childhood development will be involved next year, but as the club grows, it will need more funding. They need to find ways of funding the club. Bryce Powell said the club wants to work with the Student Nursing Organization to include phlebotomy and nursing skills for the competitions. The Skills USA competition was moved up a month. Mark added that Norm was in the process of going to Barrick, but John Rice told him that we had already approached them with a request for \$1million which handicapped the funding of the Skills USA for the national competition by Barrick.

Bret Murphy suggested using some of the money from the CTE scrap account to offset the \$5,000. The scrap account includes any sale revenue but Sonja says we track the CTE part. We are committed to supporting this in some way and see how we can help fund it. The deadline for registration is the 28th of April.

3. SGA Update – Alex Porter said this is his last meeting as president of SGA and introduced the new SGA officers: DeMarynee Saili, President and Bryce Powell, Vice President. They will take the oath of office on May 2nd. The tuition and fee vote will be at the June Board of Regents meeting. The revisions to the SGA Constitution has been approved by the students. The next step is for President Curtis to approved and then to the Chancellor. The students are excited for the President's Award Ceremony on April 24th. They have 5-6 students signed up for the Take Pride Clean Up Green Up day on April 19th. SGA is keeping an eye on the SB 391 bill and a representative from SGA will continue to attend those meetings. President Curtis thanked Alex for his service.
4. Professional Development Funding Request Procedures – 2nd Read. Action Item – President's Council approved. Sonja will work with Steve Theriault to get policy written and into the correct format.
5. Administrative Faculty Review Process – 2nd Read. Action Item – President's Council approved.

6. Faculty Senate Update – Tom Reagan

- Assessment: changes to Course Evaluation Requirements for Adjuncts – approved by Faculty Senate on Friday. All courses have to be assessed every five years. Adjuncts only have to do an assessment only if the course is not taught by an instructor. It is rare for courses to be only taught by adjuncts. President's Council approved recommendation.
- Department Chairs: Prioritize Math Position – The math position is recommended for rehire due to Richard Kampf's resignation. President's Council approved recommendation.
- General Education: Change to Gen Ed Requirements in Social Sciences – Faculty Senate approved to reduce the number of general education requirements by 3 credits for the Associate of Arts and Associate of Science Degree. This change is in line with Board of Regents policy. President's Council approved Faculty's Senate's recommendation to be effective FY16.
- Executive Committee: Propose renaming the EIT Building the Carl A. Diekhans Technology Center - Faculty Senate voted unanimously to recommend the naming of the EIT Building, "The Carl A. Diekhans Technology Center". President's Council approved the recommendation. The request will go to the Chancellor for approval to send to the Board of Regents.
- Faculty Senate Resolution to the Committee to Conduct an Interim Study Concerning Community Colleges – Tom Reagan will be submitting a faculty resolution for approval on Friday at Faculty Senate. The resolution will give support for community colleges to remain under the current governance structure.

7. Classified Council Update – Dori Andrepont reported that voting is happening this week for outstanding classified staff member. The duck race fundraiser is scheduled for May 7th.

8. President's Report – President Curtis reported a busy month for May leading up to graduation. He will be attending the special Board of Regents meeting on April 25th in Las Vegas. The Presidential Periodic Review will be conducted the week of April 28th. For graduation celebrations at the other centers, Lynn Mahlberg will be attending Battle Mountain's and Winnemucca's and President Curtis will attend in Ely and Pahrump.

President Curtis has talked to Jeanne Bleeker from Round Mountain who is this year's Community Service Award recipient and will be attending graduation. Don Zumwalt will be the recipient of the Distinguished Alumni award. John Pryor is the recipient of the Honorary Baccalaureate Degree and will be the commencement speaker. John is one of the founders of the GBC Foundation. It will be a standing practice to invite the Honorary Baccalaureate Degree recipient to be the commencement speaker. We have a record number of graduates this year – 520 with 285 scheduled to walk at graduation.

9. Miscellaneous

Lynn Mahlberg reported that she and July Byrnes, Pat Johnson and Lisa Campbell will be attending a professional development opportunity at TMCC on April 25th.

Mike McFarlane reported the unfilled positions list is diminishing. We will still need to recruit/hire for the library position and the math position.

Bret Murphy reported that interviews for the diesel position have been scheduled for next week. The instrumentation position is being advertised.

Sonja Sibert reported all institutions have completed review of the five responses for the RFP for iNtegrate 2. A meeting is scheduled for May 1st to determine which proposals will advance. Between now and June Sonja will be busy preparing budgets for the next several years. Then her time will be focused on employee contracts and merit.

Tom Reagan said he will be presenting the faculty survey on the president's performance to the Presidential Periodic Review committee on April 29th.

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 review applications for worthiness and forward to the appropriate VP for funding consideration via other sources.

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 \$3000 available, \$1500 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.). After the close of the filing deadline each semester, unallocated funds from that semester pool, could be distributed on an equal

- share basis according to need, to those applications that were approved for funding initially or deemed worthy of funding.
- 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 (i.e. – you a presenter at the conference). 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 recommendation of funding.

GREAT BASIN COLLEGE
FACULTY SENATE COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS COMMITTEE
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUNDS REQUEST FORM

Name: _____ Event: _____
Dates: _____ Location: _____

Purpose of Conference or Event:

Benefit to College:

How this will improve my teaching and/or department:

Method of Transportation:

ESTIMATED COST *

Transportation: _____
Lodging: _____
Registration: _____
Meals: _____
Other: _____
Total Estimated Cost: _____

Meal Estimates:

See the "Per Diem" handout
Lodging Estimates:
See the "Lodging" handout
Mileage:
See the in-state Mileage Map
and the
"Per Diem" handout.

When traveling out-of-state, all receipts, except food, must be submitted: e.g., taxi, parking, motel, etc.

Applicant's Signature _____

_____ Date

Department Chair or Vice President Approval _____

_____ Date

Please attach all relevant documents that could help the committee make a decision. (i.e., conference brochures, etc.)

APPROVAL:

Amount: _____

Faculty Senate Compensation and Benefits Chair

Date

Amount: _____

Prof Development/Vice President-Academic Affairs

Date

GREAT BASIN COLLEGE

FACULTY SENATE COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS COMMITTEE

Professional Development Funding Request Checklist

Criteria	Points Earned/Points Possible
1) <i>Applicant is applying for re-certification and/or licensing for His/her technical field (Violates the committee's boundaries)</i>	<i>Application not considered</i>
2) <i>Applicant is applying for summer travel (Violates the committee's boundaries)</i>	<i>Application not considered</i>
3) The deadline for submission of request has been met (Submission must be received by Committee Chair prior to deadline below for Committee consideration) <i>Fall Semester - October 31st – Spring Semester - March 30th</i>	____/ 1 point
4) Constitutes allowable submissions per this container for the academic semester (Number of Container Voting Reps denote allowed submissions)	____/ 1 point
5) Applicant is a presenter or co-presenter at this conference or event.*(see below) (Must include documentation in request packet)	____/ 3 points
6) Amount of time that has transpired since last application approval. 0 point = Applicant received funds within one year. 1 point = Applicant has not applied for funding within last year. 2 points = Applicant has never applied for funding.	____/0-2 points
7) Level of critical benefit to the institution. 0 point = no impact; personal development only 1 point = impact is at department/program level only 2 points = impact is across several departments/program levels. 3 points = significantly impacts the institution and/or majority of the student population.	____/0 – 3 points
8) Degree of travel required for this Conference or event. 1 point = the rest of the 48 contiguous states 2 points = in a state bordering Nevada 3 points = within the state of Nevada	____/ 1 – 3 points
Total Points Earned	____/13 Possible

(1 point score minimum on bold items is mandatory for funding consideration)

*Presenters are eligible for an additional 10% funding in excess of the established ceiling

ADMINISTRATIVE FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW

March 2014

ADMINISTRATIVE FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW **BACKGROUND AND TIMELINE**

Administrative Faculty Evaluation Sub-Committee

- Tasked with revising the current administrative faculty evaluation.
- Guidance provided by Lynette Macfarlan and Stephanie Davis.
- Goal is to create an evaluation that is similar to teaching faculty (Faculty evaluation took six years to complete).
- The current evaluation makes it difficult for staff to receive Excellent category:

Total Admin Faculty - 54
Total Evaluations Received: 41

Excellent - 2
Commendable - 35
Satisfactory - 4
Unsatisfactory - 0

Sub-Committee Timeline

November 2013
First presentation to Administrative Faculty on proposed changes
Based on the feedback that the committee received – omitted peer review process

December 2013
Met with Administrators and Teaching Faculty to evaluate how our process was working compared to teaching faculty and to seek support for the process.

January 2014
Forms for both the Performance Review and Policy documents were developed
Performance Review process and forms reviewed by System Attorney John Albrecht
Met with Administrators again for Review and Support

February 2014
Second presentation to Administrative Faculty for review of process and documents.
Decision made to include weights, change weights to reflect equal distribution of weights
Decision made to keep evaluation cycle on fiscal year
Presentation to Administrators on updated process

ADMINISTRATIVE FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW PROCESS

CURRENT JOB DESCRIPTION

- A MUST HAVE for the process
- HR will be performing an audit to determine who needs one
- Collaborate with supervisor to ensure current job description is ready and available for use in the process

Roles

- Performance review is arranged into roles and subcategories
- 5 major roles
 - Position Coordination
 - Collaboration and Productivity
 - Service to Institution
 - Service to Constituents and Community
 - Supervisory

Subcategories

- 5 subcategories underneath each role
- Subcategories are ranked 0-5
- Role score is average of subcategories

Annual Timeline and Procedures

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

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

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

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

GOALS AND REFLECTION

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

- Each administrative faculty member is responsible for writing goals and a reflection on those goals each year.
- Goals and reflection will not be used as part of the Performance Review

SCORING SUBCATEGORIES

MINIMUM of three
• is a MUST HAVE

MAXIMUM of five

Select from drop down box:
Excellent – 5
Commandable – 4
Satisfactory – 3
Unsatisfactory – Below 3

• Narrative statement required
• and excellent
• to demonstrate commendable
• supporting documentation
• when applicable

Rule 2: Collaboration and Productivity (10% - 25%)

2.1. Monitor and respond to requests for assistance, support, and resources.
2.2. Monitor and respond to requests for assistance, support, and resources.
2.3. Monitor and respond to requests for assistance, support, and resources.
2.4. Monitor and respond to requests for assistance, support, and resources.
2.5. Monitor and respond to requests for assistance, support, and resources.

Rule 2: Collaboration and Productivity (10% - 25%)

2.1. Monitor and respond to requests for assistance, support, and resources.
2.2. Monitor and respond to requests for assistance, support, and resources.
2.3. Monitor and respond to requests for assistance, support, and resources.
2.4. Monitor and respond to requests for assistance, support, and resources.
2.5. Monitor and respond to requests for assistance, support, and resources.

Overall score
Total Score for Role – All scores will be added up for each role for final

ASSIGN WEIGHTS

Weight percentages are to be set by employee within the permitted ranges and approved by supervisor

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 %

Rule 2: Position Coordination (25% - 80%)

2.1. Monitor and respond to requests for assistance, support, and resources.
2.2. Monitor and respond to requests for assistance, support, and resources.
2.3. Monitor and respond to requests for assistance, support, and resources.
2.4. Monitor and respond to requests for assistance, support, and resources.
2.5. Monitor and respond to requests for assistance, support, and resources.

OVERALL SCORE

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

Self-Evaluation, narratives, documentation must be submitted

Performance Review Scores will be reviewed by the committee and Frank Daniels after all Administrative faculty have submitted the new performance reviews to ensure equity before contracts are issued July 1, 2015

**ADMINISTRATIVE FACULTY
PERFORMANCE REVIEW
FORMS**

**ADMINISTRATIVE FACULTY
PERFORMANCE REVIEW
QUESTIONS**



REVISED DRAFT (3/3/14)

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 one through four. Those employees who are supervisors will also assign a weighted value to role five. The percentage of the weight should be decided depending on 1) how vital the role is within his/her job description and 2) if the role is highly or moderately relevant to his/her duties. The weights will be determined based on the amount of responsibility and time involved. Non-supervisory employees may decide to weight each of the roles, one through four, equally using the 25% weight value. Employees who find they have very few duties in a role, such as service to constituents and community, may weight other roles higher and rate role four at 5-10%. The assigned weights may vary from year to year depending on annual work job responsibilities. It is the employee's responsibility to have a discussion 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. When the employee opens the performance review they will note tabs on the bottom of the page that will take the employee to the performance review directions, the review form, narrative and documentation section and the goals and reflections section. 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 and Community (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:		
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

Great Basin College
Assessment Committee Action Item
Faculty Senate Meeting, 4/18/2014

The Assessment Committee seeks Faculty Senate action on the following revisions and additions to Great Basin College, Institutional Assessment Policy No. 2.3, Procedures 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, and 4.0. All proposed revisions and additions are noted:

POLICY AND PROCEDURE

Procedure:	Institutional Assessment
Policy No.:	2.3
Department:	Office of the President
Contact:	Vice President for Academic Affairs

Policy

The Assessment Committee serves to periodically review and make recommendations relevant to the standards, educational quality, implementation, oversight, and assessment of the instructional programs of the College. This committee maintains any items necessary to assess related student learning outcomes (*Faculty Senate Bylaws* description of the Assessment Committee).

The information gained from this process of assessment will help instructors, departments, and programs make necessary changes in courses and programs to improve student learning.

Procedures

1.0 Regular Faculty Responsibility

All instructors under annual contract will assess one course each semester using the Course Assessment Report Form. At a minimum, courses will be assessed on a five-year rotation; departments will be responsible for deciding on the rotation.

Comment [GBC1]: Wording change from "Instructor Responsibility" to "Regular Faculty Responsibility"

2.0 Adjunct Faculty Responsibility

Adjunct faculty will complete Course Assessment Report Forms only for courses that are not offered by full-time regular faculty. At a minimum, courses will be assessed following their initial offering and on a five-year rotation thereafter; departments will be responsible for deciding on the rotation.

Comment [GBC2]: New

3.0 Department Chair Responsibility

Department Chairs will acknowledge by signature the completion of Course Assessment Report Forms by each department's faculty.

Comment [GBC3]: Procedure number changed from 2.0 to 3.0

4.0 Assessment Committee Responsibility

The Assessment Committee will be responsible for assuring that this rotation is completed.

Comment [GBC4]: Procedure number changed from 3.0 to 4.0

The Course Assessment Report Form, along with an explanation of how to use it, is available on the Faculty Evaluation System under the Teaching Role: Assessment, as well as on the Assessment Reports, Assessment Committee, and the Evaluation Committee web pages.

After the yearly evaluation cycle has been completed, the Course Assessment Reports are downloaded by the Office of the VPAA and formatted as .pdf files. The Assessment Committee is responsible for reading through the assessment reports, creating a brief summary of the assessment results for the Office of the VPAA, and assessing the assessment process. This committee may also make suggestions for professional development based on this summary and will pass these on to the Professional Enrichment Committee.

Completed Course Assessment Reports will be published on the GBC webpage under a link titled Assessment Reports. This link will include discipline and course assessments as well as program reviews and the summary report from the Assessment Committee. (To see an example of what this might look like, go to <http://www.tmcc.edu/assessment/car/>.) Publication of these reports will (1) ensure that the assessment process is transparent and (2) make assessment results available to any interested parties.

Approved by PC: May 8, 2012, December 11, 2012

Approved by Faculty Senate: April 20, 2012, December 7, 2012

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

April 15, 2014

Overwhelmingly, Department Chairs voted to approve the math instructor position be filled for the fall semester and recruitment for position begin this semester. This of course places this position at the top of the priority list.

Thanks!

Pete

**General Education
Faculty Senate April, 2014
Action Item**

Action Item:

The General Education Committee voted on April 7, 2014 to reduce the general education credit requirement for the Associate of Arts and Associate of Science Degrees by 3 credits in Social Sciences.

Timeframe: Because the catalog has been completed for 2014-2015, this wouldn't go into effect until 2015-2016 catalog year. This will give degree programs time to adjust their course requirements, if needed.

Rationale:

1. After credit review of NSHE requirements(attached) and a general education credit requirement grid comparison to TMCC, WNC and CSN this change would put GBC in alignment with TMCC and WNC(attached). We will still be 3 credits higher than TMCC and WNC.
2. NSHE requirement is 9 credits total for Social Science, Humanity and Fine Arts. We currently require 21 credits of SS(12), Humanities(6) and Fine Arts(3) for the AA degree and 18 credits for the AS degree of SS(9), Humanities(3) and Fine Arts(3).
3. Decreasing general education requirements to allow some departments to add associate degrees. Currently, due to the general education requirements the departments can't make the degree specific requirements fit into the 60 credit requirement.
4. Workload requirements were discussed, however, it was felt by the committee workload should not dictate general education requirements for students.



April 18, 2014

TO: Committee to Conduct an Interim Study Concerning Community Colleges
Subcommittee on Academics and Workforce Alignment

ATTN: Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick, Chair

The Great Basin College Faculty Senate passed the following resolution unanimously at the April 18, 2014 meeting:

"The Faculty Senate at Great Basin College advocates remaining under the administration of the Nevada System of Higher Education as governed by the Board of Regents."

The service area of Great Basin College covers over 86,000 square miles and 10 counties. Defining levels of local control would be problematic as counties have unique needs and receive services accordingly. GBC's mission involves serving rural Nevada through workforce development, transfer articulation, and continuing education. We wish to retain the autonomy necessary to be responsive to the entire service area as appropriate.

Serving the needs of rural Nevada and enriching peoples' lives includes offering baccalaureate degrees not typically available at community colleges. GBC offers select baccalaureate degrees in nursing, teacher education, integrative studies, and applied science. System alignment within NSHE and the other bachelor degree granting institutions is important for these programs.

Although recent budget issues have constrained GBC, greater emphasis from NSHE on the role and needs of the community colleges should be part of the path forward. The recent hiring of the Executive Director of the Nevada College Collaborative may serve as that emphasis, allowing for a more concerted effort in efficiency with shared services and responsiveness to the State's workforce development.

Respectfully Submitted,

Thomas S. Reagan
Faculty Senate Chair

cc: Dr. Mark Curtis