

GREAT BASIN COLLEGE
PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL

July 26, 2016

1:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Mark Curtis, Lynn Mahlberg, Sonja Sibert, Lisa Frazier, Tom Reagan, Amber Donnelly, John Rice, Cathy Fulkerson, Mardell Wilkins, Greg Brorby, Chelsey Fox, Michelle Phay

ABSENT: Mary Doucette, Bret Murphy, Angie DeBraga, Jonathan Foster

GUESTS: Annie Hicks, Season Riley, Jacob Park, Tami Mette,

1. Approval of Minutes – The minutes of the President's Council meeting on June 14, 2016, were approved.
2. SGA Update – Chelsey Fox reported from Winnemucca. There will be an SGA meeting on June 29th. SGA will be looking at their constitution and bylaws and reentering the treasurer position. Chelsey also discussed the activities for the first week of school. They will not be doing the movie screenings this year because of decreased participation. There is another SGA meeting scheduled for August 8th to continue review of the bylaws and constitution.
3. CTE Internships – Annie Hicks, Pathway Specialist, TAACCCT grant project, provided an overview of the GBC Student Internship Program for CTE students. Students with internships get picked up quicker than not. The internships will be tailored to what the employee needs. There will be an open house on August 18 in the DCIT student lounge to kick off the program. All of the information will be on the website and they have produced high quality material to hand out. There will be 5 to 10 internships to start this year. Jacob Park, Veterans Resource Coordinator, then talked about internships for veterans. Jacob has been working with Barrick Gold, and Sheldon Mud with the Governor's Office on Economic Development on transitioning veterans. The result of several meetings is Operation Bravo Internship Program for Veterans. The hope is to get other companies on board. Kamatsu is interested. The internships will be for all disciplines. Barrick will pay the college to place the students in a January to January internship. Barrick will pay for 5 internships and one program coordinator. Barrick will pay for advertisement in GI JOBS yearly catalog and GI JOBS monthly magazine. Announcements about the internships will also be in military friendly school guides. Barrick has committed \$75,000 so far and we are aiming to get Newmont on board as well. Jacob then talked about the upcoming Warrior of the Canyon event in Lamoille Canyon on August 27th. It's a fun event to outreach to the younger veteran. Cliff Bars is a national sponsor of the event.
4. Academic Faculty Evaluation Policy – Sonja Sibert reported there are substantial changes to the policy that haven't been completed yet and certain things need to be clarified. The next Faculty Senate meeting is August 26. If the changes are indeed substantial the policy needs to be taken back to Faculty Senate by the September meeting.

5. Financial Aid Audit Response and Policy Revision – Lynn Mahlberg thanked everyone for helping with the Department of Education’s audit of our Financial Aid department. It was a comprehensive audit. The result was good. Financial Aid cannot pay for the \$10 application fee so we had to put a policy in place that states that we would not pay for the application fee. We are very pleased with the audit results. To prepare for the audit all the Financial Aid policies were reviewed to ensure consistency. The actual Financial Aid policy that we follow from NSHE is 180 pages, but our policies will be more general.
6. Faculty Senate Update – John Rice
 - Academic Standards – Grade Appeal Change to Step 4 – change was that the appeal goes to the Dean as opposed to the Vice President. President’s Council approved. The grievance procedure remains the same.
7. Classified Council Update – Michelle Phay had nothing to report.
8. Institutional Research Update – Cathy Fulkerson reported last spring we participated in a research project on culture of assessment nationwide survey. This fall, instructional faculty will be invited to participate in a nationwide survey on the culture of assessment from a faculty perspective.
9. Vice President Reports
 - Business Affairs – Sonja Sibert had nothing to report.
 - Student Services/Academic Affairs – Lynn Mahlberg announced two (2) Behavior Intervention Workshops tomorrow at 8:30 to 10:00 a.m. and 2:00 – 3:30 p.m.
10. Dean/Director/Assoc. VP Reports
 - Continuing Ed – no report.
 - Health Science & Human Services – Amber Donnelly reported the SNO club is sponsoring a 5K on Saturday. It starts and finishes in the parking lot by the Health Sciences building. The ambulance is finished and looks great. It would be great for parades. The Radiology room is painted.
 - Arts & Science – Tom Reagan reported that work is being finished in the common area in Lundberg where students can congregate and receive advising and tutoring.
 - Business & Technology – no report.
 - Distance Education – Lisa Frazier reported the evaluations for online courses went out last week. There is a summer boot camp scheduled for August 18 and 19 for instructors teaching online classes.
 - GBC Foundation – Greg Brorby reported the Foundation annual audit started this week. The final certification for the NEH Grant is due in five days. He is working on a proposal to present to Barrick next week. Newmont has also asked for information specific to the CTE program that he is preparing. The scholarship letters are completed. Greg talked with the UNR foundation to see how they handled department fundraising. Each department has their own fundraising representative (typically the Dean). After meeting with the foundation they can then go out to ask. For GBC it has been confusing because not all the donations come through the Foundation. The student organizations events haven’t gone through the Foundation. We need to caution students to not go out for large donations

without the Foundation's knowledge or input. Greg will need to come up with some guidelines to share with President's Council.

11. President's Report – Mark Curtis reported the Emeriti wall has expanded and is updated. The NSHE system office is making the GBC IAC meetings more formal and more meeting intense. The chair is required to attend 4 meeting per year, plus 4 community college committee meetings, one Board meeting, and a leadership conference. Mardell will be arranging a meeting with GBC chair Matt McCarty to discuss the additional demands and to register a complaint. The September Board of Regents meeting we will present the GBC metrics on performance, enrollments, administrator salaries, cost of attendance, etc. The other institution reports have departed from just the facts and have gone into a full blown PR campaign. We will be doing the same and will focus on the Veterans Resource Center, the nursing and EMS program, MTC program, and Virtual Humanities Center. President Curtis reported on a code change that was passed to increase the compensation of faculty teaching upper division courses. President Curtis will attend a D&D meeting to hear about the change and what it means and how to phase it in and when. The increase would be paid in an overload. It is estimated to be \$97,000 per year plus fringe to follow the policy. President Curtis had a meeting with Regent Trachok about the state college agenda item. The meeting ended well. Regent Trachok asked President Curtis to schedule a meeting with Regent Geddes as well. President Curtis has also been in contact with GBC IAC member Vince Juaristi and Vince will be working on an idea to find out exactly what hurdle would we have to jump to get this done. How much money do we need in the bank or whatever the case. President Curtis went to Washington DC for the Basque Cultural event and met with Senator Reid and Senator Amoedi and the staff of Congressman Heller and they all specifically asked about the state college issue. They were good meetings.

12. Miscellaneous

The Continuing Education Administrative Assistant position has been filled by Dori Andrepont. Dori's former position will go out for bid as soon as possible.

Cathy Fulkerson is working with departments to do annual assessment reports.

John Rice reported Faculty Senate committee assignments have been made, but there will be some changes. John invited everyone to the summer theater production "As You Live It". The set is gorgeous.

Mardell Wilkins announced the college will be the venue for the Elko Chamber Business after Hours on August 18th at 5:30 by the Clock Tower. The event is for all area non-profits to network and get information out on their non-profits



POLICY AND PROCEDURE

Title:	Academic Faculty Evaluation
Policy No.:	----
Department:	Academic Affairs
Contact:	----

POLICY

All Academic Faculty shall be evaluated in writing at least once annually by supervisors or heads of administrative units. (NSHE code, 5.12.1).

PROCEDURES

All performance evaluations for faculty shall include a rating of (i) “excellent,” (ii) “commendable,” (iii) “satisfactory,” or (iv) “unsatisfactory.” The areas of evaluation and procedures for evaluation of academic faculty and administrative faculty shall be established in Board policies and institutional bylaws. All performance evaluations shall include a narrative addressing each area of performance, and at least every three years a narrative addressing progress toward tenure and/or promotion, if applicable. The three year narrative progress assessment shall be prepared in consultation with the appropriate tenure review committee or promotion committee, if any. Evaluations of instructional faculty shall include an assessment incorporating teaching evaluations completed by their students.

The areas of evaluation and procedures of evaluation of academic and administrative faculty performance are established here in accordance with NSHE policy.

Academic Faculty.

Academic faculty evaluations shall address Teaching, Professional, Service and Management roles. Each role will be assigned a weight by the faculty member to be approved by their supervisor. Each role will include performance components which will be assigned weights by the faculty member to be approved by their supervisor. The criteria for fulfilling role and component responsibilities shall be listed on the evaluation form.

Each faculty member shall create a list of goals for the evaluation period. Each faculty shall reflect on the achievement of goals established at the end of the evaluation period.

The role and component weight ranges, goals and reflections shall be listed on the evaluation form.

In addition to the evaluation procedures for Academic Faculty, Non-Tenured Tenure Track Faculty will adhere to the evaluation procedures as outlined in the GBC Tenure Policy, 3.60 and the GBC Mentoring policy, 3.61.

Role and component weights will be assigned, and goals for the evaluation period will be created by faculty and submitted for approval by supervisors by October 1 of each academic year.

(SUPERVISOR RESPONSE DEADLINE HERE)

Roles, Weights and Goals.

The foundation of the faculty evaluation system (FES) is based on role weights. Four major roles are defined: teaching, professional, service, and management. For each role there are Faculty Senate and President's Council approved ranges, ultimately adding up to 100 percent. Subcategories within these roles likewise have approved ranges adding to 100 percent for that individual role. Faculty select a percentage for each role and subcategories within each to reflect anticipated work for the year. The ability of faculty to select percentages reflecting individual work is the basis of the FES; providing faculty with the capacity to rank their work based on their expectations for a given academic year.

As part of the process of selecting percentages for roles and subcategories, faculty will submit a brief narrative justifying the weights selected.

Definitions

Teaching (50-80%) *Ranges might be discussed by Academic Standards, Assessment, and other Fac Sen committees.*

- Instructional Design (20-40%): the overall organization of a course including syllabi, assignments, discussion, exams, lectures, readings.
- Instructional Delivery (30-50%): the effectiveness of presenting course content to students as measure in student rating forms for each course taught.
- Course Assessment (10-20%): an analysis (quantitative and qualitative) of the effectiveness of meeting course learning objectives as measured by various means (assignment or exam scores, for example) in addition to planning for course improvement as needed.
- Instructional Management (5-20%): these are teaching duties related to course organization including activities such as maintaining grade books, arranging internships, making site visits to observe students, student conferences, maintenance of online links, etc.).

Professional (5-20%)

- Proficiency (25-100%): this relates to maintaining a current knowledge

base for disciplines taught in addition to obtaining and maintaining necessary licensure and/or permitting as needed.

- Scholarly/Creative(0-75%): this relates the generation of scholarly works such as an article published in a peer-reviewed journal or the creation of a work of art exhibited in a gallery. Scholarly/creative works are related to disciplines taught.

Service (10-30%)

- Institution (20-80%): this includes service on Faculty Senate committees, hiring, tenure, mentor and various other committees serving the mission of GBC. Other activities can be applied here with the approval of a supervisor. Faculty are required to serve on at least one Faculty Senate Committee.
- Students (20-80%): this relates to supporting student life at GBC including such activities as serving as a SGA approved club advisor, participating in club activities, creating student centered campus activities (i.e, a film showing), among others.

Management (0-35%)

- Department Chair (100%): this assigned and compensated position relates to the operation of academic department
- Program Supervisor (100%): this assigned and compensated position relates to the operation of Bachelor programs.
- Program Coordinator (100%): this assigned position relates to the operation of programs.

Modification of Role Weights

- In the event work load changes during the course of the academic evaluation year (added committee duties, for example), in consultation with a supervisor, faculty can adjust the weights at any time during the evaluation period.
- If a supervisor disagrees with the faculty defined weights and the justification, a supervisor must provide a substantiated rationale for changing weights based on the individual faculty member's workload (as opposed to a general expectation). This shall be written and provided to the faculty member for review and consideration.
- A faculty member may challenge supervisor suggested changes in weights. If consensus cannot be reached informally, a faculty member can ask the Faculty Senate Chair to appoint a mediation team in accordance with the GBC Academic and Administrative Grievance Procedure, as outlined in the Great Basin College Bylaws, section 5.9.

Completing the Annual Evaluation

Faculty will complete and submit the annual evaluation form by the Friday following Spring Commencement ceremonies. Failure to complete the evaluation form by the Friday following Spring Commencement may result in an unsatisfactory annual evaluation.

For the completion of each evaluation role component for the evaluation period, faculty must provide documentation supporting commendable or excellent ratings.

Evaluation Outcomes

In accordance with Section 5.13.1 of the NSHE Code, it is the policy of GBC to expect the continued commitment of its faculty to excellence after the granting of appointments with tenure as defined in Section 5.11 of NSHE Code. Faculty will be encouraged to realize the academic community's expectations to such excellence in their future performance.

In accordance with NSHE Code 5.13.1, if the annual performance evaluations result in a tenured faculty member receiving an overall unsatisfactory rating for two consecutive years, a hearing in accordance with NSHE Code 5.13 shall be held for the purpose of determining if the tenured faculty member should be retained in employment. The President of the college has final authority in the decision.

Academic Faculty who receive a less than satisfactory or unsatisfactory in the teaching role of the evaluation shall receive no more than a satisfactory overall rating. In this event, faculty will be required to participate in a mentoring program. The mentoring program for this purpose will follow the policy and procedure for earning tenure outlined in the GBC Mentoring Policy, 3.61, with the provision the mentoring period commence immediately upon acceptance of the evaluation and be complete by the end of the immediately following evaluation period. The purpose of the mentoring process is to return the faculty member's performance in the teaching role to the "satisfactory" level or above by the end of the immediately following evaluation period.

Faculty who receive a less than satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating in the Instructional Delivery component may receive an overall unsatisfactory evaluation. In this event, faculty will be required to participate in a mentoring program. The mentoring program for this purpose will follow the policy and procedure for earning tenure outlined in the GBC Mentoring Policy, 3.61, with the provision the mentoring period commence immediately upon acceptance of the evaluation and be complete by the end of the immediately following evaluation period. The purpose of the mentoring process is to return the faculty member's performance in the teaching role to the "satisfactory" level or above by the end of the immediately following evaluation period.

Additionally, a faculty member who receives two consecutive semesters of "less than satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" in any course in the Instructional Delivery component of the Teaching Role may require the faculty member to participate in the mentoring program outlined in the GBC Mentoring Policy, 3.61, with the provision the mentoring period commence immediately upon acceptance of the evaluation and be complete by the end of the immediately following evaluation period. The purpose of the mentoring process is to return the faculty

member's overall evaluation performance in that class to the "satisfactory" level or above by the end of the immediately following evaluation period. Statistical validity shall be considered in these cases.

In accordance with NSHE Code 5.13.1, an overall "less than satisfactory or unsatisfactory" rating in two consecutive annual performance evaluations shall be cause for a hearing in accordance with NSHE Code 5.13 to be held for the purpose of determining if the tenured faculty member should be retained for employment.

In the event of two consecutive less than satisfactory or unsatisfactory evaluation outcomes, notwithstanding the provisions of Subsections 6.12.4, 6.13.1 and 6.14.2 of the NSHE Code, the only option for recommendations or decisions upon the completion of the hearing or appeal process is the continuation or termination of employment of the tenured faculty member. If, after the hearing or appeal process is completed, the decision is made to continue the tenured faculty member's employment, the annual performance evaluations which initiated the hearing shall be revised to eliminate the unsatisfactory ratings. The burden of demonstrating that termination of employment should occur lies with the administrative authorities of the System institution.

Administrative Action outside of the Evaluation Process

Regardless of an evaluation outcome and with the substantiated cause and appeals processes provided in NSHE Code, supervisors may revise the final outcome on an evaluation.

If a supervisor has substantiated cause and can show that a faculty member has performed unsatisfactorily in spite of a satisfactory or better evaluation outcome, supervisors may utilize the provisions of NSHE Code 6.2.1, outlining a variety of prohibited activities.

NSHE Code 6.2.1 outlines "prohibited activity" of a faculty member. 6.2.1(a) states "failure to perform the duties for which the faculty member is employed." Additionally, NSHE Code 6.2.1(b) states a prohibited activity as the "failure to maintain a required level of performance as provided in Section 5.12 of the [NSHE] Code" (satisfactory).

If supervisors can substantiate a faculty member's performance is unsatisfactory in accordance with the standards of NSHE Code 6.2.1, supervisor may revise final outcome of an evaluation. Faculty members will enjoy the rights and privileges of appeal outlined in NSHE Code as well. The burden of demonstrating a faculty member's performance is unsatisfactory even though their evaluation outcome is satisfactory or better lies with the supervisor.

Administrative Faculty.

See GBC Policy 5.24

Review of Evaluations. Faculty evaluation forms will be completed by the first Friday following Commencement Ceremonies of each academic year. Supervisors will complete and respond to the evaluations by (DATE/TIMELINE.)

Adverse Evaluation. In the event a faculty member receives an adverse annual evaluation, a review of the evaluation will be provided in accordance with Section 5.16 of the NSHE Code.

Review of Evaluations and/or Denial of Salary Increase. (NSHE Code 5.16)

Review of evaluations which result in the denial of merit award or salary increase shall be conducted in accordance with NSHE Code 5.16.

Review of an Unsatisfactory Evaluation

An unsatisfactory annual evaluation may result in the denial of a salary increase or merit.

As provided for in NSHE Code, if a faculty member receives an unsatisfactory evaluation and is denied a salary increase or merit, the faculty member may engage in the following review process:

- a. Reconsideration pursuant to the NSHE Code, Section 5.2 (except that the supervisor is not required to state reasons for an adverse annual evaluation under Section 5.2.3 if the reasons for the evaluation are stated in the evaluation); Rev. 268 (12/15) Title 2, Chapter 5, Page 31
- b. Grievance pursuant to the NSHE Code, Section 5.7;
- c. Peer review pursuant to Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 4(5); or

In addition to the procedure for review adopted in this policy and procedure, the faculty member also has the right to submit a rejoinder as specified in Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 4(5) of the NSHE Code.

The President shall have the final authority to accept or reject any recommendation regarding the annual evaluation.

President's Responsibility.

After the completion of the annual performance evaluations, the President shall submit an annual report to the Board of Regents detailing the process and outcomes of the annual performance evaluations.

GBC Academic Standards Committee

Minutes

May 5, 2016

Online Meeting

Committee members voting: Susanne Bentley, Chair; Dale Griffith, Danny Gonzales, Barbara Canton, Mike Elbert, George Kleeb, Scott Gavorsky, Jan King, Doug Hogan

No Vote: Steven Scilacci

The committee reviewed and revised Step 4 in the grade appeal process.

Background: Step 4 has historically gone to the VPAA, and that position will be vacant at GBC. The committee reviewed a proposal to change the language of Step 4 to move the final decision (Step 4) to the appropriate dean.

Proposed Change:

Step Four: If the issue is still unresolved to the satisfaction of either party, a written request of review must be lodged with the appropriate academic Dean within three calendar days of issuance of the Academic Standards Committee's recommendations. The Dean will, after reviewing the documentation of the previous three steps, issue a written decision which will be the final determination.

The committee reviewed the request and voted via-email. Voting closed on May 5 at 5 p.m.