

GREAT BASIN COLLEGE
PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL

June 20, 2017

1:30 p.m.

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

ABSENT: Sonja Sibert, Jonathan Foster, Norm Whittaker, Angie DeBraga

1. Approval of Minutes – The minutes of the President's Council meeting on May 2, 2017, were approved.
2. SGA Update – Becky Linville introduced herself as new the SGA president. SGA summer meetings are scheduled. She attended the Board of Regents' meeting and the Nevada Student Alliance meetings at the beginning of month. SGA will be producing a newsletter that will be going out. Lisa Frazier said she could send the newsletter out in Web Campus. Lynn added there is a proposed policy on student publications that will be going to the Board of Regents for their approval.
3. Faculty Senate Update – John Rice
 - Assessment - 2.3 Institutional Assessment Policy & Procedure - some minor language changes. President Council approved.
 - Curriculum & Articulation – Reviewed new classes for the CISCO project and changes to the BA in Social Science. President's Council approved.
 - Personnel – 3.61 Mentoring Policy – President's Council approved.
 - General Education – Core Learning Outcomes – reviewed the draft of the general education learning outcomes. The nursing program has some additional requirements. We may not be able to have a one size fits all for learning outcomes. Certain programs like the nursing program require specific gen ed core classes that may not be the same for other programs.
4. 3.12 Adult Learning Centers Policy & Procedure – President Council approved.
5. Classified Council Update – Michelle Phay reported the Classified Council annual duck race raised \$760 for their scholarship program. Next week is the Classified Council BBQ. The new Classified Council officers start on July 1st. They are: Megan Amerigian and Jolina Adams, co-chairs, Brianne Warner, vice-chair, Kimberley Hess, secretary, and Teresa Campos Carrillo, treasurer.
6. Institutional Research Update – Cathy Fulkerson reported there is a Gateway Math success meeting tomorrow. There was a discussion the student ratings. There is some dissatisfaction among faculty with the IDEA ratings. It is in GBC's best interest to go to

completely online student ratings even for the live classes. Cathy will go out and pull together some information on vendors who offer class ratings, get costs, response rates, etc. so when semester starts the information can be given to the Evaluation Committee for their review. We are still waiting on the Climate Survey report. There was a 22% response rate for the Climate Survey.

7. Vice President Reports

- Business Affairs – No report.
- Student Services/Academic Affairs – Lynn Mahlberg reported the hiring of Alex Porter as the new Gear Up Ambassador. Alex is a former GBC SGA president. Next week we will have the first Gear Up residency. It is a three day program that Cassie Stahke has been working on for several months. The students attending the Gear Up residency will be from Wells and Jackpot. The Shoshone Language Resident Program will begin on July 5 – August 4, 2017. Angie DeBraga has put a lot of work into this program. Twenty Elders will come in to present. There will be two cooks, two resident advisors and a lead instructor. Many of the Shoshone youth have not been exposed to the language and this is an approach to preserve and teach the language to the youth. The CISCO program is moving right along. There are 158 people enrolled in the CISCO program through Continuing Education. The Driver's License program will soon be converted to credit.

8. Dean/Director/Assoc. VP Reports

- Continuing Ed – Lynn Mahlberg reported for Angie that the driver's education course (formally TT 109) is being converted to non-credit from credit.
- Health Science & Human Services – Amber Donnelly reported a 100% pass rate for nursing students and a 100% pass rate for the paramedic students. There was one student in radiology who did not pass. Amber will be presenting at the ACCT conference in August at their annual convention which is in Las Vegas this year.
- Arts & Science – Tom Reagan reported hiring Jennifer Steiger as fitness center coordinator. The position is a $\frac{3}{4}$ contract. GBC was awarded the all-day preschool grant and hired an instructor. Carrie Meisner received a NSF grant for \$68,000 for field work and research. We should receive \$175,000 in scholarships for Teacher Education from the State. We will be partnering with UNR to host a rural summit to address teacher shortages in rural areas on September 15 in Winnemucca.
- Business & Technology – Bret Murphy reported that Rachel McAnany will be the new Administrative Assistant to replace Chris Marshall. The faculty evaluations are completed. Job descriptions for the new positions from the weighted student credit hour increase are almost done. We want to fill these new positions as quickly as possible. He is working on the support position job descriptions.
- Distance Education – Lisa Frazier talked about integrating Continuing Education with Web Campus. Continuing Ed uses Campus CE. We just received the cost estimate for this integrating Campus CE with Web Campus. The problem is that it will duplicate everything and right now that is unacceptable.
- GBC Foundation – Greg Brorby reported a planned giving seminar has been scheduled for August 3. Registration can be done online. Greg and Dr. Gavorsky have meet to review the Dinner with a Professor. Next year's event will be in the spring and not be

held on campus. A student will be paired with the professor and the theme will be the next 50 years going forward. The Spring 50 year celebration event will be at the Red Lion. Greg reported that we received a new endowment last week.

9. President's Report – Mark Curtis reported on his Farewell tour that began two weeks ago in Winnemucca. He attended the graduation ceremony at the Lovelock Correctional Facility. Five of our students received associate degrees and one with a certificate. There are some challenges teaching in a correctional facility. We are being encouraged to expand this to the Parhump area. Mark then attended the Board of Regents meetings in Las Vegas. Mark received the President Emeritus and Lynn was appointed Interim President. He then went to Ely to meet with generous and significant donors to the college. Then back to Las Vegas to meet with SH Architects on the Parhump campus design. Tomorrow he will meet with the Vice Presidents to finalize the budget. Mark thanked everyone for their collegiality the past five years. The expansion of President's Council has been good and productive.
10. Go-No-Go for Pennington Grant for Winnemucca HS Building - Amber Donnelly will be submitting this grant for a new building in Winnemucca to house all Health Sciences and offer some of the science classes as well. It will be six to seven million dollars for the whole project. Byron Smith is drawing up some building plans to get a vision of the project. We do not have to amend the facilities master plan. This opportunity has just come up in May so we need to strike when the iron is hot. President's Council approved.
11. Miscellaneous

Assessment Committee
May 12, 2017

Action Item

The Assessment Committee seeks Faculty Senate approval of the following changes to procedures 1.0 and 2.0 of GBC Policy 2.3:



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.

2.0 Adjunct Faculty Responsibility

Adjunct faculty will complete Course Assessment Report Form 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.

3.0 Department Chair Responsibility

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

Commented [GBC1]: Proposed change: All instructors under annual contract will assess one course each semester using the Course Assessment Report Form (or equivalent form approved by the Assessment Committee, associated department, and Dean). At a minimum, courses will be assessed on a five-year rotation; departments will be responsible for determining the rotation.

Commented [GBC2]: Change heading to: Part-Time Faculty Responsibility

Commented [GBC3]: Replace "Adjunct" with "Part-time"

4.0 Assessment Committee Responsibility

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

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.tncc.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, April 22, 2014

Approved by Faculty Senate: April 20, 2012, December 7, 2012, April 18, 2014

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

Report of the Curriculum and Articulation Committee

GBC Faculty Senate on May 12, 2017

The Curriculum and Articulation Committee met on May 1, 2017.

Items for approval:

- New Classes:
 - o CSCO 120 – CCNA Internetworking Fundamentals
 - o CSCO 121 – CCNA Routing and Switching Essentials
 - o CSCO 220 – CCNA Scaling Networks
 - o CSCO 221 – CCNA WAN Fundamentals
 - o CSCO 230 – Fundamentals of Network Security

Informational items:

- Changes to the BA Social Science: Dropping 6 credits of Science/Technology and ECON 307/PHIL 311. Add six upper division Social Science credits and one more general elective.
- Change to the BAS Land Surveying: Instead of the choice of SUR 450 or 455, students will have the choice of SUR 450, or SUR 255 *and* SUR 456.



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 supervising Dean.

The new faculty member and the member's Department Chair shall report their respective committee member choices to the supervising Dean. 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 Supervising Dean'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 ~~supervising Dean~~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 ~~two~~ 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 end of the mentoring process.

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~~final 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 established mentoring deadlines. Mentoring deadlines are the last working day of March following the full mentoring period for faculty initially hired for the spring semester or the last working day of October following the full mentoring period for faculty initially hired for the fall semester ~~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 the~~ 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.

GBC RATINGS FOR MENTORING FACULTY		
The ratings below will be made during the second and fourth semester of the mentoring process, spring semester when faculty evaluations are being prepared. Fall and spring IDEA scores and those from the spring of the previous year shall be available in the spring and shall be provided by the mentoring committee member. Attach this form to the second and fourth semester detailed spring report. The ratings made here will be discussed in detail in the spring report submitted to the VPA and supervising Dean (if applicable).		
Standard 1: Teaching Mentored faculty members are required to earn an excellent rating in teaching by the second year of employment. Use the Faculty Evaluation Form (FEF) and IDEA rating scores for this section.		
GBC Teaching Role: Design, Assessment, Management average score as indicated on the FEF	A. Excellent B. Commendable C. Satisfactory D. Unsatisfactory	Rating:
GBC Teaching Role: Delivery Average of all scores in annual evaluation on IDEA summary reports per class (fall and previous spring scores)	IDEA Score 4.0 to 5.0 = Excellent IDEA Score 3.5 to 3.9 = Commendable IDEA Score 3.0 to 3.4 = Satisfactory IDEA Score 0 to 2.9 = Unsatisfactory	Rating:
Overall Teaching Rating	The overall score is an average of the two ratings above. Both must be excellent to achieve an excellent rating. <u>Use IDEA scale ranking for final score here.</u>	Evaluation:
Standard 2: Service GBC assesses performance in three areas for Standard 2. Using information from the FEF forms for guidance, along with discussions of activities with faculty member, the committee rates the following Standards. A satisfactory or higher rating is required for sections A and C and a commendable or higher rating is required for section B.		
Service A—Student Advisement. Use the FEF "Service to Students" section as a guide.	A. Excellent B. Commendable C. Satisfactory D. Unsatisfactory add	Evaluation:
Service B—Interactions with Colleagues and Students This is assessed by the mentoring committee in conjunction with the VPA or supervising Dean and department chair/members, program supervisors, etc., using the rubric provided here.	Excellent —is present in the department; works and communicates with department, programs, colleagues, and students very effectively and with professionalism, courtesy, and integrity; responds to department, program, and colleague needs in a timely fashion; volunteers for and contributes to many departmental/program activities; and completes assigned tasks in a timely fashion. Works with colleagues and students above and beyond basic needs. Commendable—is present in the department; works and communicates with others effectively and with professionalism, courtesy, and integrity; responds to department, program, colleague, and student needs in a timely fashion; contributes to departmental/program activities; and, completes assigned tasks in a timely fashion. Works with colleagues and students exceeding basic needs. Satisfactory—is present in the department on a minimal basis; works and communicates minimally with others; minimal contributions to departmental/ program activities; completes tasks in a timely fashion. Meets the basic needs. Unsatisfactory—does not meet the minimum requirements for a satisfactory rating.	Evaluation:
Service C—Service to the College. Use the FEF "Service to Institution" section as a guide.	A. Excellent B. Commendable C. Satisfactory D. Unsatisfactory <u>Use IDEA scale ranking for score here.</u>	Evaluation:

Formatted: Normal

Approved by President's Council: April 8, 2014

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

Draft General Education Core Learning Outcomes — 8 May 2017 — 33.5 hours

	<u>GBC</u> 0.5	<u>NSHE</u> --
<u>INT-100: Orientation</u> [Courses: INT 100 or 24 credit hours transferred]		
<u>Written and Oral Communications</u>		
• Written Communications [Courses: ENG 101; substitutions]	3	3
1. Utilize written genres appropriate to task		
2. Express ideas clearly and compelling in text		
3. Effectively identify and address various audiences and contexts		
• Oral Communications [Courses: COM 101; THTR 102; THTR 221]	3	--
1. Organize oral presentations appropriate to context and audience		
2. Deliver compelling and clear oral communications		
3. Demonstrate an understanding of interpersonal communications in a variety of contexts		
• Evidence-Based Communication [Courses: ENG 102; substitutions]	3	3
1. Correctly interpret and analyze source materials and readings		
2. Determine source appropriateness/credibility according to context		
3. Effectively incorporate and cite sourced material in communications		
<u>Critical and Artistic Reasoning</u>		
• Mathematical Reasoning [Courses: MATH 120; MATH 126; MATH 128; MATH 181]	3	3
1. Demonstrate knowledge of mathematical notations and concepts		
2. Apply mathematical concepts and operations in proper written or graphical format at an appropriate level		
3. Apply relevant mathematical skills in solving real world problems		
• Scientific Reasoning [Courses: Any 100-199 Science courses or ANTH 102]	3	3
1. Demonstrate an understanding of the scientific methodologies used in various disciplines		
2. Effectively interpret and apply scientific principles and concepts		
3. Apply scientific reasoning to the evaluation, analysis, or interpretation of models and theories developed in the sciences		
• Scientific Data Interpretation and Generation [Courses: Group A Science Lab courses]	3	3
1. Effectively apply mathematical principles and quantitative methods to collect and analyze scientific data		
2. Utilize the scientific method to arrive at informed conclusions		

Critical and Creative Reasoning [continued]**• Artistic Reasoning - [Courses: Fine Arts block]**

<u>GBC</u>	<u>NSHE</u>
3	3

1. Demonstrate a clear understanding of basic fine arts concepts and language.
2. Demonstrate an effective use and application of artistic tools and processes.
3. Apply knowledge of the creative process in order to practice artistic interpretations.

Human Societies and Experience**• Structure of Society - [Courses: SOC SCI block minus HIST 101/102 or PSC 101]**

3	3
----------	----------

1. Demonstrate understanding of the processes that influence human behavior and structure of society.
2. Demonstrate understanding of the processes that influence social stratification and/or inequality
3. Demonstrate understanding of the methodologies used to study human social systems.

• American Constitutions and Institutions - TENTATIVE [Courses: Any HIST-101/102, PSC 101]

3	--*
----------	------------

1. Demonstrate an understanding of American constitutions and institutions and their development.
2. Demonstrate understanding of processes of social stratification and inequality in American society.
3. Demonstrate knowledge of the methods used to study American society.

• Humanities – TENTATIVE [Courses: Current Humanities block]

3	3
----------	----------

1. Trace the sources and development of western cultural traditions, and its diversity of experiences and voices
2. Identify how arts, technologies, scientific knowledge, political ideologies, and religious beliefs contributed to the western identity.
3. Compare ethical principles and notions of morality or justice in the varying western cultural traditions.

Technological Proficiency**• Technological Proficiency – TENTATIVE [Courses: CS 135; GIS 109; GRC 119; IS 101]**

3	--
----------	-----------

1. Analyze a problem, and identify and define the technology requirements appropriate to its solution
2. Describe professional, ethical, legal, security, and social issues and responsibilities for technology users
3. Develop skills to continuously learn fundamentals of existing and new technology

<u>TOTAL GEN ED CORE REQUIRED AA/AS</u>	<u>33.5</u>	<u>24</u>
--	--------------------	------------------

NSHE: Minimum general education hour requirements established by NSHE.

--: No hours required in this category by NSHE

*: The Constitution Requirement would continue to be met by PSC 101 or HIST 101/102. NSHE requires this, but it is basically an unfunded mandate.



POLICY AND PROCEDURE

Title:	ADULT LEARNING CENTERS
Policy No.:	3.12
Department:	Academic Affairs
Contact:	Director, ABE/ESL

Policy

The mission of the Adult Basic Education and English as a Second Language Department is to provide all eligible and interested adults with the highest quality coursework available so that they may develop skills according to the goals they have set for themselves. These goals include literacy, numeracy, and English language skills for work, family, achieving an HSE (High School Equivalency) or HS diploma, and for some, entering postsecondary education at Great Basin College. Particular emphasis is placed on students achieving workplace skills so that they are more readily employable or can pursue a better job.

The ABE/ESL Department offers classes at a variety of locations throughout the GBC service area with main Adult Learning Centers located in Elko, Winnemucca, Pahrump and Battle Mountain. Programs are also available in West Wendover and Owyhee.

Supported by federal funds, these programs are free of charge for students and made available at times that fit varying work schedules.

Procedure

Potential students must be at least 18 years old*. Pre and post-testing is required. A minimum number of hours of study is also required. Further information can be found online at <http://www.gbcnv.edu/alc/index.html>, or by calling the Elko Director at 775-753-2109, or the Accountability Specialist at 775-753-2126.

*16 and 17 year old students can attend the program if they have an excuse from compulsory public school attendance

Approved by President's Council: March 21, 2007, June 20, 2017
Contact the assistant to the president for any questions, corrections, or additions.

Great Basin College Grants and Projects Go/No Go Decision Making Worksheet

Project Agency and Title: Pennington Foundation Grant– Radiology Room Addition and Equipment Request											Decision: ☐ Go ☐ No Go	
Bid Factors	Weighted Decision Criteria										Estimated Rating	
	Negative				Neutral			Positive				
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		10
1. Fit with College mission, Strategic Plan, research findings	Does not align with the College mission and plan				Marginally matches the College mission and plan			Helps fulfill the College mission and plan			10	
2. Background (expertise of College in project area)	Weak in area or totally new area to college				Average experience in this area			Strong expertise in this area			10	
3. Proposed College Principal Investigators	Poor in-house team				Good in-house team			Excellent in-house team			8	
4. Financial Potential	Poor short term, poor long term, likely to cost College				Questionable short-term, questionable long-term			Excellent short- and long-term, likely to yield a margin			8	
5. Team Members (College's partners and major subcontractors)	Partners and subcontractors dilute/weaken effort				Partners and subcontractors have no major effort			Partners and subcontractors have enhancing effect			7	
6. Advance information on request for proposal (RFP) (Adequate information to respond)	Did not expect RFP, unprepared				Generally up to date with RFP, no major negatives			Good favorable information, ready to respond			8	
7. Capability to effectively respond	Do not have staff time to adequately respond				Stresses staff time, but are able to respond			Have staff time to develop highly competitive proposal			8	
8. Competitive Assessment (competition and funding probabilities)	Competition is very strong, odds under 10%				Open competition, odds are 10-50%			Open competition, odds exceed 50%			8	
9. Funding Agency contact, history, and rapport	College is unknown to this agency and staff				College is known to this agency and staff			College has well-developed working relationships			9	
10. College Resources (space, personnel, matching funds, reporting requirements)	Requires significant investment of college resources				Requires marginal investment of college resources			Requires minimal investment of college resources			7	
Total Score (sum of scores for each factor evaluated)											83	

Proposed idea or grant proposal has been reviewed by Chair(s) and Deans of affected department(s), if applicable.

YES ☒ NO ☐

Vice President Signature _____

Date _____

**Great Basin College Grants and Projects
Go/No Go Decision Making Worksheet
Definitions**

1. Fit with College mission, Strategic Plan, research findings

How well does the grant/project support GBC's mission, strategic plan and any needs assessments GBC has conducted? Yes

2. Background (expertise of College in project area)

What level of experience does GBC, as an institution or its faculty/staff, have regarding the grant/project that is proposed? Will this experience ensure that the project will be successful? We have submitted and been awarded grants from the Pennington Foundation. Being in good standing with the Pennington Foundation on previous submissions will be beneficial.

3. Proposed College Principal Investigators (PIs)

Who will take the lead (be designated as the Principal Investigator) for the grant/project? PIs will also be considered the project coordinators/directors if the grant is awarded. Do the people who want to pursue the project have appropriate experience to lead such a project? Will the PIs have enough time to devote to the project? The Dean of Health Science and Human Services will be the PI. The Center Director and onsite faculty have the experience and knowledge to make this project successful. Those faculty include David Ellis Paramedic coordinator and two Nursing Faculty Stacy Rust and Staci Warnert. There will be adequate time for the PI to see the project through to completion.

4. Financial Potential

How much will the grant/project benefit GBC in the short and long term? Will there be any costs to GBC, and will they be recouped in the short or long term? In the short-term students will be able to have classroom space, lab space, academic study areas and office space for staff. Currently space is very limited for all programs in Health Science. The long-term benefit is that the building will continue to attract students to Health Science programs as well as the Science degrees we are not offering this will increase enrollment. The up-front cost will be related to the architect and design/pre-construction elements but will potentially be recouped with increased enrollment and completion of graduates.

5. Team Members (College's partners and major subcontractors)

Who, from outside of GBC, will be involved? What outside experience will be provided for the proposed grant/project? How will the proposed partners strengthen the grant/project? Does the project strengthen GBC's networking capabilities or provide for future opportunities? Lombard Conrad Architects will be involved in the design and development phase, construction phase, bidding or negotiation phase, construction phase-administration of the construction contract. Public works and eventually a chosen construction company to complete the building. Assurances from Lombard Conrad Architects who have a long-standing relationship with GBC will make assurances that they additional contactors for construction come with adequate experience. Within the rural communities, having a state of the Art Pennington Health Science building in Winnemucca will provide opportunity for rural students to complete Health Science and Science degrees with the much needs space strengthening the public and personal partnerships within the Winnemucca County and surrounding counties.

6. Advance information on Request for Proposal (RFP) (Adequate information to respond)

How much time is available to put together a strong, competitive grant proposal/project? How complex is the RFP? How much information for the project is available? We have 30 plus days to put the grant together and feel this is a tight time frame but we could ask to submit it in October if we need to extent the time frame. We have submitted a RFP to the Pennington Foundation so are familiar with the requirements. The majority of the information for this project will be available and adequate for submission.

7. Capability to effectively respond

What other deadlines is the Grants Director under? Is there enough time to craft a strong grant proposal? Will anyone else assist with writing the proposal? There is adequate time to prepare the grant request for submission. The Dean of Health Science and Human Services along with the Center Director of Winnemucca will assist the Grants Director.

8. Competitive Assessment (competition and funding probabilities)

How many awards will be given? Approximately how many applicants will there be? How much total funding is available? One award will be given. I not aware of how many applicants will apply. We will be requesting 6-7 million in the grant submission.

9. Funding Agency contact, history, and rapport

Does GBC have any connection with the funding agency? Does GBC have any connection with the agency's program officers, other staff or board members? Has GBC received funding from this agency before? Does GBC know what the agency's mission and goals are? GBC has been awarded previous grants from the Pennington Foundation. There are not personal connections to the funding agency or program officers, staff or board members. We are aware of the mission and vision of the Pennington Foundation.

10. College Resources (space, personnel, matching funds)

What will GBC need to provide for the project to ensure it is successful? Are matching funds required (or looked upon favorably)? Will current GBC personnel be needed to work on the project to ensure its success? How extensive are the reporting requirements if the grant is funded? GBC will need to cover the cost of the Architects and Physicist fees for this project. Any funding that GBC is able to commit will be looked at favorably. Current GBC personnel will be need to work on the project to ensure success. The reporting requirements are minimal for the funding.

Total Score (sum of scores for each factor evaluated)

How close is the score to 100? The closer the score is to 100, the more likely the decision is a "Go" for the grant/project. 83

Proposed project/grant proposal has been reviewed by Chair(s) and Deans of affected department(s), if applicable.

If a project/grant affects any departments in any way, all appropriate Chairs and Deans are aware of the project/grant and believe it provides a benefit to their departments/areas. The Dean of HSHS is supportive of this grant as well as the faculty that would be impacted with this grant submission.

Vice President Signature & Date

Appropriate Vice President must sign the form to indicate that the checklist score is accurate to the best of his/her knowledge.

GBC Mission:

Great Basin College enriches people's lives by providing student-centered, post-secondary education to rural Nevada. Educational, cultural, and related economic needs of the multicounty service area are met through programs of university transfer, applied science and technology, business and industry partnerships, developmental education, community service, and student support services in conjunction with certificates and associate and select baccalaureate degrees.

NSHE Board of Regents, December 2011