

Section #2: Analysis

Qualification Analysis

Analysis of full-time faculty by occupational clusters shows lower ratios of faculty-to-enrollment in protective services, liberal arts and education. This analysis indicates that the health sciences are adequately staffed.

Review of full-time instructional faculty credentials reveals that 81% (120) have either masters or doctorate level degrees. Persons with bachelors or less (28) teach in occupational or specialized areas and possess certifications and/or training in their areas. Documents 1 and 2 provide the detail regarding faculty characteristics and education. TMCC is committed to recruiting and hiring qualified faculty in support of Strategic Goal #1: *To foster an institutional culture that values, demands and supports excellence in teaching and learning.* In the Strategic Plan document presented to the Board of Regents by President Ringle for TMCC, he states, “The college is committed to maintaining high quality instructional offerings for lifetime learning at an affordable cost...Promotion of academic excellence will ensure that TMCC makes continual progress in the following areas: keeping teaching and learning at the core of our mission, responding to the changing demographics of our community, supporting innovation and faculty development, recruiting and hiring qualified faculty, reviewing all programs, setting high expectations and helping students succeed” (page 4).

Strengths

- Enrollment has grown 60% from 1995 to 2003 (3434 AAFTE in 1995-96 to 5513 in 2003-04) and full-time faculty has grown from 81 in 1995 to 134 (65%) in 2003.
- TMCC has full-time faculty teaching in the program and occupational areas proportionally to student enrollment in most of the educational areas.
- TMCC uses enrollment data in determining hiring priorities and has already made efforts to close any discrepancies between enrollment and full-time faculty.
- Full-time faculty are qualified to teach in the area for which hired to teach.

Weaknesses

- Programs such as education, public service and possibly allied health do not have adequate full-time staff.
- Competition for qualified faculty in the allied health area is fierce as the shortage of nurses is a national issue, and despite efforts to add nursing faculty, some searches have remained unsuccessful for more than a year.

Part-time Faculty Qualifications Analysis

As with full-time faculty, only those part-time faculty with a Master's degree or higher teach the baccalaureate level classes. Those with less than a Master's degree teach in the applied science or skills programs.

A continued goal of the college is to improve the ratio of full- to part-time faculty to 60% full-time to 40% part-time. During our previous accreditation visit in 1995, the ratio was 43% full-time to 57% part-time. During fall 2003 full-time faculty taught 46% of the course credits and part-time faculty taught 54%. Even though we have been able to add new full-time faculty each year as enrollment grows, we offer more credits and need to hire more part-time faculty to teach them, so our ratio of full- to part-time improves only marginally.

Strengths

- More than 55% of all part-time faculty hired have master's degrees or higher
- Part-time faculty Support Office has improved its file management and data collection processes for maintaining information on adjunct faculty
- Slight improvement on the ratio of full to part-time faculty
- Improved communication and support for part-time faculty
- Improved recruitment and hiring procedures for part-time faculty

Weaknesses

- A lack of data makes it difficult to determine if part-time faculty are teaching in the area in which they received their degree.
- More than half of all classes are taught by part-time faculty.

Evaluation Analysis

The 1995 NWASC report cited evaluation as an area of significant concern. In fact, the 1995 report made evaluation changes part of a general recommendation, and a focused interim report responded in 1996-97. The general recommendation was as follows:

Where there are indicators that there are departments in the College closely following commission Policy 26 as it relates to faculty evaluation, some are not adhering to the utilization of multiple indices for this process. Therefore, it is recommended that the College achieve consistency in faculty evaluation across the campus by adhering to the provisions of Standard VII – Instructional Staff and Commission Policy 26 Faculty Evaluation.

TMCC took immediate steps to respond to this recommendation. After a period of planning in 1996, a college-wide process was instituted that involved the creation of faculty annual plans and the use of student and administrative evaluations in order to address the failure to consistently utilize “multiple indices” in evaluation. In July 1997,

the College reorganized and established four divisions, each headed by a dean. These deans, in conjunction with the dean of student development, began work to establish criteria for faculty evaluations. These criteria were discussed over a two-year period, and the plan was approved by the Faculty Senate and instituted in 1999. Also in 1999, student evaluation forms were revised, and steps were taken to ensure that every class at TMCC was evaluated by students (TMCC interim reports, 1997, 2000).

Although the issue of use of multiple indices for evaluation has been addressed, evaluation remains an area of concern at TMCC. In July 2004, TMCC President Philip Ringle charged the faculty senate with the task of completing a recommendation on a “faculty evaluation model.” An ad hoc committee was formed in 2004 with Andy Delaney as chair and membership from every area of the college. Before the first meeting of the committee, Delaney and faculty senate chair Bridgett Boulton interviewed the TMCC president, vice president of academic affairs, instructional deans, and department chairs in order to identify areas of concern. These groups identified a number of weaknesses in the current process such as:

- no link between evaluation and rewards or recognition of any kind
- a failure to place teaching excellence at the center of the process
- no mechanism for assessing the improvement of teaching skills over time
- continued concerns about uneven application of the evaluation process
- no link between the ranking of excellent and superior performance of any kind
- faculty perception that the system limits options for contributions to the college
- failure to establish a record of faculty performance over time

These findings mirror the findings of a survey of community college academic leaders across the country in 2000. That nationwide survey identified nine categories of recommended improvements (Andrews, 2001):

- improve supervisor training
- encourage development plans
- tie results to reward
- include observation of teaching
- link results to development
- simplify the process
- emphasize the need for evidence
- put focus on development

The ad hoc committee met for the first time September 17, 2004 and set the goal of submitting a revamped evaluation process to the faculty senate by March 1, 2005 for full implementation for the 2005-06 academic year.

The creation of the ad hoc committee on evaluation – comprised entirely of faculty – is an important first step by allowing faculty to shape a process that satisfies faculty and administration.

Analysis of Online Course Evaluation

The evaluation of online courses has presented a number of unique challenges. Regarding student evaluations, the response rate has been disappointing. For example, in Fall 2003, only 700 students (less than 20%) of online students completed the evaluation of instruction. In some courses, only one student completed the evaluation form. Efforts at increasing this response rate have been complicated by the different platforms in use. While the evaluation form has been in place in WebCT from the beginning of online instruction, other platforms have not offered the evaluation form until recently. The E-learning Office has taken a number of steps to address this. These efforts include but are not limited to the following: providing earlier the evaluation form earlier; sending at least one email message to online faculty encouraging them to request evaluations from students; seeking ideas from other community colleges; adding Moodle to the list of platforms that provide an opportunity for student evaluation; researching successful practices at other colleges; and placing placement of the link to the evaluation form prominently on the web course entry page.

Another challenge to online evaluation involves the online teaching experience of course evaluators. In a number of cases, the evaluator (usually a department chair) has no experience teaching online. While this does not mean that these evaluators are incapable of meaningful evaluation of these courses, some exposure or training in this type of instruction would almost certainly improve the quality and effectiveness of these evaluations. The E-learning office has initiated discussions about providing training for evaluators of online courses, but nothing is in place at this time.

A Brief Review of the Research on Faculty Evaluation

Overview – administrative vs. faculty views

Faculty members and administrators often differ over the purpose, procedure, and implementation of faculty evaluation – this information should not surprise anyone involved in academia. First and foremost, all constituencies have come to realize that meaningful post-tenure evaluation is here to stay (a moot point in Nevada because such evaluation is required in its governing Code). Given that reality, it becomes necessary to sort out the particulars such as the ultimate goal of evaluation, the appropriate methods to meet those goals, and the management of the contradictory or competing issues that emerge in any type of evaluation.

A difference, however, is that the last ten years have witnessed a significant burst of research into the meaning and effectiveness of faculty evaluation at the college level in general, and, in a number of cases, community colleges specifically. Although a number of issues were hotly debated in the 1990s, a consensus has started to emerge on the appropriate purposes and effective approaches to this difficult subject.

Purpose of Evaluation – summative vs. formative

A major area of contention in this area seems to have been resolved in the literature. In the 1970s and 1980s, a major area of debate revolved around whether or not faculty evaluation could be both summative – i. e. could evaluate and judge performance in ways that resulted in advancement or termination of evaluatees – and formative, i.e. designed to facilitate and enhance the faculty member’s professional growth. A series of articles (Cohen 1974; Seldin 1985) argued that these two purposes are contradictory and must be kept separate. The problem with this theory is that no institution was able to find away to effectively and efficiently conduct two separate evaluations on two separate tracks. Discussion continues, but a consensus has emerged that evaluation must and can serve both purposes (Licata and Andrews, 1992; Rifkin, 1995; Mills and Hyle, 1999).

Two approaches – Procedural vs. Developmental

The trick, then, is to find reasonable ways to both judge performance and encourage improvement within the same reasonably simple evaluation structure. Over the last two decades, two approaches to evaluation have emerged to address this: a procedural approach and a developmental approach (Redman, 1999). The procedural approach emphasizes a careful and regimented procedure. This type of review process begins with a pre-evaluation meeting during which goals, objectives, and outcomes for the year are discussed. At the end of the evaluation period, a dean or department chair “compiling of reports from peer groups, as well as student and self evaluations, and writing evaluations of faculty members based on these data, including the administrators’ own observations” (McGee, 1995). This approach is common in community colleges nationwide, and it describes the current TMCC evaluation procedure.

This approach is most effective for summative evaluation – if objectives are not met, the administrator’s written evaluation reflects this. Development can be encouraged and factored in to the evaluation, but the need to meet yearly objectives and to win the approval of students and administrators tends to put a chill on deeper professional development and experimentation. In addition, the nature of the procedure tends to limit faculty options, and the vast majority of the control of this evaluation system lies in the hands of the administrator and his or her interpretation of the data that is collected. These are the most common objections to this kind of system along with, most importantly, its tendency to place teaching excellence at its center (rather than as one of several faculty obligations).

Recently another model has emerged that seeks to place emphasis on teaching excellence and to empower the faculty member in the process while allowing for administrative summary judgments. This approach has been labeled the developmental approach, and it tends to center around the creation of a teaching or performance portfolio that is reviewed over longer periods of time. Some of the advantages of this method of evaluation are as follows:

- portfolios allow the evaluation to focus on our most important work – teaching – without ignoring service.

- portfolios allow faculty members to demonstrate their effectiveness in almost infinite number of ways.
- portfolios empower faculty to build successes over time.
- portfolios allow for the evaluation to consider information for a variety of sources. Student and peer evaluations can be supplemented with examples of student learning, descriptions of the efforts of faculty to try new and innovative techniques, and/or examples of important college service work.
- portfolios encourage a culture of evidence and allow faculty members to demonstrate their effectiveness and growth.
- portfolios provide the most flexible means of faculty evaluation.
- this approach has been successful at a number of community colleges including Flathead Valley Community College, a Northwest accredited college.
- evaluating portfolios every 3-5 years allows for deeper and more meaningful evaluation without adding significantly to faculty or administrative workload.
- finally, portfolios are well-suited to peer participation in the evaluation process. Peers can and should be included in the planning and evaluation stages of this process.

From a faculty member's point of view, this process has the potential to be more empowering and meaningful than the often sterile and passive procedural approach. It places teaching at the center of the process explicitly while allowing a faculty member to pursue, develop, and emphasize his or her strengths. From the administration's view, a developmental system based on a portfolio provides a more complete body of evidence on which to make evaluative judgments. Just as it allows excellence to shine – many different types and varieties of excellence – the placement of the burden of evidence on the faculty member will expose poor performance more clearly than a set of poor student evaluations and one peer observation that can easily be explained away. Detailed studies of this type of system in action (Centra, 1993, 2000) demonstrate that they are an effective and fair means of forming summative judgments by administrators while greatly increasing the teaching effectiveness of instructors, peer involvement in the process, and faculty ownership of evaluation as a whole.

References cited:

J. A. Centra, "Use of the Teaching Portfolio and student evaluations for summative evaluation." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 1993.

J. A. Centra, "Evaluation the Teaching Portfolio: A Role for Colleagues," *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, no. 83, Fall 2000.

Arthur M. Cohen, "Evaluation of Faculty," *Community College Review*, 2 (1974).

C. M. Licata and H. A. Andrews, Faculty Leaders' Responses to Post-tenure Evaluation Practices, *Community/Junior College Quarterly*, 16 (1).

R. L. McGee, Faculty Evaluation Process in 11 Western Community Colleges, *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 19 (4), 1995.

Michael Mills and Adrienne E. Hyle, "Faculty Evaluation: A Prickly Pair," *Higher Education* 38, 1999.

Kent D. Redmon, "Faculty Evaluation: A response to competing values," *Community College Review* Summer 99, Vol. 27.

Tronie Rifkin, "The Status and Scope of Faculty Evaluation, ERIC Digest, Report # EDO-JC-95-03.

Faculty Perspectives on Evaluation at TMCC

In 2004, TMCC surveyed its faculty twice regarding the evaluation process. The first, the 2004 TMCC Climate Study, was a broad survey of faculty perceptions that included four questions that addressed evaluation issues explicitly (Q19, Q20, Q21, Q22). The 2004 climate survey shows clear faculty satisfaction in two areas. For instance, 62% of faculty respondents think that there is an effective process in place for the evaluation by the immediate supervisor versus 53% in 2002. One significant change was made in this area during that interval: the placement of department chairs as the immediate supervisor in place of the dean. In addition, 69% of faculty members believe that the student evaluation process is effective. On the other hand, the survey revealed faculty dissatisfaction in two areas. First, the climate survey found that 41% of faculty respondents agree that there is an effective evaluation process in place for evaluation by the appointing authority (although this is a significant increase over the 34% in the 2002 survey). Furthermore, only 35% agree that there is an effective evaluation process in place for evaluation by peers, up from 25% in 2002. The former is difficult to interpret; unscientific questioning of instructional faculty suggests that there is confusion over the identity of the "appointing authority." This confusion seems justified as the president signs the contract as appointing authority, but deans sign the evaluation form as appointing authority (presumably as agents for the president). Regardless, the faculty seems to be expressing some dissatisfaction with evaluation above the level of immediate supervisor. The number for satisfaction with peer evaluation is even lower and calls out for work on more inclusion of peers in the evaluation process.

While the climate survey provides a general picture of faculty perceptions of evaluation, the Standard 4 Committee decided to solicit more detailed feedback from the faculty through a campus survey on the topic, and the Ad Hoc Faculty Evaluation Committee joined as a co-sponsor. The faculty survey expands on the climate survey as it asks more specific questions (Appendix #13). The survey focused on two areas: questions about the appropriate purpose of faculty evaluation in general and specific questions about the

current evaluation process at TMCC. Regarding evaluation's purpose, the most important results are as follows:

- the majority of respondents believe that evaluation should be both summative (evaluation of performance) and formative (encouraging professional growth). Only 15% believe that evaluation should focus on development only, while 28% believe it should focus on the documentation of performance and personnel decisions.
- the vast majority of respondents (67%) believe that tenured faculty should be evaluated every three years rather than every year (8%) or every five years (12%).
- Verbal and/or written recognition is considered the most appropriate reward for excellence; only 13% believe that excellent faculty members should receive any financial award.
- A majority (51%) believe that the department chair is the most qualified person to evaluate versus 38% who believe the dean is most qualified.

Regarding perceptions of TMCC's current evaluation procedure, the evaluation survey confirms and expands upon the results of the climate survey. The majority (51%) believe that the current system is mostly adequate and requires minor adjustments, while 31% believe it requires no change. One must be careful with the interpretation of this result, however, because more specific questions reveal that the majority of the faculty believe that the evaluation procedure could be better. For example, only 22% of the respondents believe that the current process focuses on teaching excellence, and 48% believe that it does not help them become better educators. In addition, a significant number – 58% -- do not agree that the current procedure encourages professional growth. Overall, 69% believe the system needs to be changed (Appendix #14).

Faculty Evaluation at TMCC								
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Unable to Evaluate	No Response	Total
The current faculty evaluation process								
<i>encourages professional growth.</i>	4 5%	25 34%	17 23%	18 25%	7 10%	0 0%	2 3%	73 100%
<i>focuses on teaching excellence.</i>	2 3%	14 19%	18 25%	25 34%	14 19%	0 0%	0 0%	73 100%
<i>does not encourage excellent performance .</i>	9 12%	12 16%	23 32%	19 26%	9 12%	1 1%	0 0%	73 100%
<i>balances institutional needs with the needs of individual faculty.</i>	6 8%	19 26%	19 26%	16 22%	7 10%	6 8%	0 0%	73 100%
<i>does not help me be a better educator.</i>	8 11%	27 37%	18 25%	15 21%	4 5%	1 1%	0 0%	73 100%
My evaluator understands what I do.	17 23%	31 42%	12 16%	9 12%	3 4%	1 1%	0 0%	73 100%

I have adequate appeal options if I disagree with the evaluation received.	6	22	16	9	3	17	0	73
	8%	30%	22%	12%	4%	23%	0%	100%

Overall, the current evaluation process and procedure for full-time faculty members at TMCC is

	#	%
Exceptional	3	4%
Adequate	20	27%
Mostly adequate but needs minor adjustments	37	51%
Inadequate and needs to be completely revised	13	18%
Total	73	100%

In order to determine the strengths and weaknesses in the area of evaluation, the Standard 4 Committee and the Ad Hoc Evaluation Subcommittee received input from interviews with the president, vice president of academic affairs, the deans, and the chairs (conducted by Ad Hoc Faculty Evaluation Committee Chair Andy Delaney) and through two surveys of faculty: the system-wide climate survey of 2004 and a fall 2004 TMCC survey of faculty opinion.

Strengths

- faculty satisfaction in two areas – 62% of faculty respondents think that there is an effective process in place for the evaluation by the immediate supervisor versus 53% in 2002. In addition, 69% of faculty members believe that the student evaluation process is effective.
- consistency across campus – one set of instruments – faculty evaluation criteria, annual plan format, and annual evaluation form – used for all instructional faculty
- modified instruments for non-instructional faculty that are identical in structure yet more suited to the tasks of non-instructional faculty
- a simple process that includes planning and follow-up at the end of the academic year
- clarity about the requirements necessary to achieve an excellent, commendable, or satisfactory evaluation
- a campus-wide effort to improve the training of supervisors including the sponsoring of trips to the Chair Academy, a proposed leadership academy on campus, and encouragement of all types of supervisory and leadership training

Weaknesses

First, the committee believes that the weaknesses identified through interviews and surveys of administrators and faculty to be valid.

- no link between evaluation and rewards or recognition of any kind
- a failure to place teaching excellence at the center of the process

- no mechanism for assessing the improvement of teaching skills over time
- concerns about uneven application of the evaluation process
- no link between the ranking of excellent and superior performance of any kind
- faculty perception that the system limits options for contributions to the college
- failure to establish a record of faculty performance over time
- too little peer input into evaluation of performance
- uncertainty about the identity of the immediate supervisor and appointing authority under the 2003 NFA contract

In addition, the committee adds the following list of weaknesses:

- faculty self-evaluations do not require supporting evidence for claims of success/improvement/activity. As part of a culture of evidence, an evaluation system should require that faculty members demonstrate and document satisfactory performance and growth.
- another weakness -- not uncommon in the academic world, but a weakness nonetheless -- is the difficulty of removing poorly performing tenured faculty members. Performance that would never be tolerated from a part-time instructor is often tolerated for years.
- a major weakness identified by both deans and chairs is the failure of evaluators to enforce the provisions of the annual plan. This is not true for all evaluators, but a consensus finds that it has been true for most. Moving evaluation to elected chairs has helped to identify problems more quickly, but the consensus among chairs is that the need to remain popular makes true enforcement of elements of the faculty responsibilities difficult.

--the definition of "active" service is not clear. "Active" service has not been enforced uniformly during evaluation. Even meeting attendance has not been tracked across campus.

--although the current evaluation process uses more than one source of data about performance college-wide, other indices used on other campuses such as colleague rankings, videotapes of classroom performance, and student achievement could provide a broader picture of faculty performance (ERIC Digest).

- --the evaluation criteria seem to be static -- they do not require continual growth and/or improvement with the exception of the requirement that faculty members "grow and change" in response to student evaluations.

-- faculty dissatisfaction in two areas – 41% of faculty respondents agree that there is an effective evaluation process in place for evaluation by the appointing authority, and only 35% agree that there is an effective evaluation process in place for evaluation by peers.

Workload Analysis

In the 1995 Northwest Commission report, most faculty members reported that the workload in their area was satisfactory and equitable to all. The report states “*Teaching loads appear to be reasonably determined. Department chairs had some concern about their workload and responsibilities*” (p. 11). In 1995, the Health Sciences department was particularly concerned about the workload issue because of its unique situation. The department workloads include internship, practicum and lab, as well as student to instructor ratios mandated by accrediting agencies. The Commission noted (p. 27) that a need for clarification about coordinator duties existed. As a result, the report contained a formal recommendation in the workload area:

It is recommended that the college examine the issues surrounding department chairs and program coordinators, including determination of whether such positions are necessary and appropriate to the institution and, if so, that the college take action to clarify policies and procedures regarding selection of department heads, delineation of their duties, determination of how those duties impact workload, and the distinction between department heads and program coordinators (Standard VIII) (p. 40).

Since the 1995 visit by the Commission, TMCC has submitted interim reports in 2000 and 2003. In 2000, TMCC reported “starting a process to review workload, especially in the occupational programs” (p.10). Although the Commission commended TMCC for taking steps toward several of the recommendations detailed in the 1995 report, they stated that the college had not completed the work to establish operating procedures which are clearly defined and understandable. They requested that “the College prepare a progress report in fall 2003 to again address General Recommendation 5 of the fall 2000 Regular Fifth-Year Interim Evaluation Report” (letter from the Commission dated January 16, 2003).

TMCC’s 2003 progress report noted several steps toward addressing the problems identified by the Northwest Commission:

- TMCC bylaws were reviewed, revised and approved by the UCCSN Board of Regents in 2002.
- The TMCC bylaws provide a road map for decision making and expectations of all employees.
- TMCC recently renegotiated an agreement with the NFA (Nevada Faculty Alliance) that delineates new procedures for faculty and academic leadership.
- The NFA agreement defines the role of department chairs and has “greatly contributed to consistent and understandable College operating procedures by settling issues such as supervision, duties and compensation” (p.2).
- The College President and Faculty Senate worked to determine a consistent workload policy that was presented on March 2003 and implemented on July 1, 2003
- A new workload policy established clearly defined and understandable operations procedures.

- A faculty and staff handbook was created to provide general information for all employees that is consistent with the Institutional bylaws, NFA contract and Administrative Manual.
- The Administrative Manual was reformatted and provides detailed information on administrative policies.
- The policies in the Administrative Manual addresses overload policies, reassigned time and distance education.
- Instructional Units are defined in the current policy and compensation formulas and are listed for independent studies, internships, practicum, private instruction; cable cast courses, reassigned time for department chairs, coordinators and faculty senate participation, other approved assignments and non-reoccurring assignment/medical leave.

The centerpiece of the efforts in this area is the TMCC workload policy (Appendix #1). At the time of the 1995 site visit, the TMCC workload policy, which was developed on September 20, 1990, was being used to determine workload. The 1995 TMCC self-study demonstrated concerns about the policy and its scope: “Our recent survey shows that workload policies and practices of assigning workloads need to be revisited in a cooperative effort between faculty and administration.” The policy was not clearly defined and failed to address the wide variety of faculty workloads” (p.27).

The new workload policy addresses these concerns in a number of ways. For one, an annual workload survey was implemented to create a consistent and auditable mechanism for determining workload. Each year the faculty completes a survey (http://www.tmcc.edu/inst_research/selfstudy/Standard4/Fall03_Scheduled_Teaching_Analysis.pdf) that requires the faculty member to divide his or her time into specific categories to help to determine workload content. The survey results are a tangible way to determine exactly how much of the faculty time is spent on professional development, community activities and chair or coordinator duties. The data demonstrated that chairs and coordinators spend far more time completing the duties of those positions than was originally thought. The survey results are an affirmation of the release time now being provided to chairs and coordinators through the collective bargaining agreement with the Nevada Faculty Alliance. The survey is available on the TMCC Institutional Research web page and is updated annually. It should be noted that in fall 2004, a more user-friendly and community college specific workload survey instrument was created and used for the first time.

The workload policy is a living document, and, after a recent review, a new version of the workload policy was implemented July 1, 2004. The workload policy enhances planning, budgeting, and scheduling processes, functions within our data system capabilities, and is an auditable process. The committee that drafted the current workload was able to clearly explain the parameters defining workload and compensation. A closer look was taken at occupational areas and distance education. Many of the occupational areas are required to work within program accreditation guidelines and ratio limits. Programs such as nursing created a detailed account of what each faculty member does during the course of a lab or clinical. This template helped the deans and Vice President for Academic Affairs to determine how best to quantify those hours spent on tasks not clearly defined in any

policy and do not correlate exactly with a traditional fifteen credit-hour week. This exercise also showed that not all labs are the same. Each area has a unique curriculum and workload based on the ratios and criteria the instructors are required to follow for each class/lab.

In the new workload policy, the load is measured in units of instructional (IUs) contact and applied universally throughout the instructional divisions. A standard of 15 IUs per week/semester is used to measure contractual workload for full-time instructional faculty. Summer faculty is required to teach 8 IUs for a full load. The policy details:

- overload procedures
- independent study
- internships
- practicum instruction
- class size
- A, B and B+ contracts
- co-teaching
- coordinator release time
- department chair release time
- special circumstances of release time such as for Faculty Senate chair

Strengths:

The college has worked diligently to identify areas that do not fit into the current workload policy. The committee sought faculty input to better meet the needs unique to their areas of instruction. The policy is fact-based making it easy to review and revise as needed. The college has embraced this process and is dedicated to self-evaluation in order to keep the policy relevant and current while meeting the needs of the college and faculty. With ERMA being used on a limited basis, the next components should fall into place. This will allow the college to track workload and have a more auditable system.

Weaknesses:

There is still work to be done in the technical and vocational areas to identify workload. For example, nursing is one of the specific areas of the workload that should be examined and evaluated. At their July 25, 2004 meeting, the Board of Regents voted to begin system-wide assessment of workload policies to determine if a single policy can be established system-wide. This development could lead to some change to the newly adopted workload policy. In addition, the system that can track workload is not up and running as of now.

Professional Growth Analysis

In fall 2003 and spring 2004, a survey of faculty was completed to determine the breakdown of faculty time spent out of the classroom. The survey was conducted and the information reviewed by the Institutional Research office. The results are published on the TMCC Self-study Data Inventory (http://www.tmcc.edu/inst_research/selfstudy/Standard4/Fall03_OutofClass_HrsPerWk.pdf). The survey demonstrates that on a weekly basis during fall 2003, faculty was

involved in 2.78 hours of professional growth and general scholarship. In addition, the faculty averaged 1.31 hours per week of public service and 3.31 hours per week on other research, additional scholarship and creative work.

The faculty at TMCC is involved in a variety of Public Service Activities that serves to strengthen TMCC's ties to the community (Exhibit #9 Faculty Workload Survey -- http://www.tmcc.edu/inst_research/selfstudy/Standard4/AY03-04_PublicServiceActivitySummary.pdf) 1.31 It allows the faculty to reach out to the community to and carry forth the mission of the college by serving the needs of a diverse population. Faculty participates:

- on advisory boards
- as guest lecture at seminars and meetings
- by working with charitable programs
- in collaboration with the Washoe County School District on K-12 issues

Strengths:

TMCC has put forth much effort to develop a professional development plan In the Strategic Planning Brochure (<http://www.tmcc.edu/planningcouncil/pdf/brochure.pdf>) the College clearly supports faculty development initiatives aimed at growth in content area, assessment, pedagogy, technology and curriculum development. (Exhibit # Planning Council brochure page 4) In order to meet these goals the college has implemented and/or created the following:

- A Center for Teaching Excellence with a full-time director
- The extension of the faculty contract to 172 days to allow more time for professional development activities.
- Professional training days prior to the start of each semester
- A significant investment in bringing national experts to campus as lecturers during professional development days.
- plans to create a Leadership Academy.

Weakness:

Faculty participation in professional development activities is limited in some areas and could be encouraged through more emphasis on professional development in faculty evaluation.

Part-time Workload Analysis

In the 1995 Self-Study (p. 242 paragraph 3) it was noted that part-timers who were surveyed felt they were adequately informed about their job description, TMCC policies and procedures and division policies and procedures. Most of these employees received information from the department chairs, directors, coordinators or other appropriate administrative staff on an individual basis.

With ever changing policies and procedures it was apparent that good communication with part-time employees was the answer to creating a climate of solidarity. The TMCC Part-Time handbook was developed to provide current information essential to all part-time faculty and to address issues involving personal and professional situations. The handbook contains information on:

- TMCC
 - History
 - Mission Statement
 - Goals
 - Accreditation
 - Organization and Management
 - Part-time faculty responsibilities
- Administrative Support Services
- Curriculum and Instruction
- Student Support Services
- Faculty Support Services
- TMCC Department of Public Safety

Deans, Department Chairs and Coordinators are responsible for orienting part-time and adjunct faculty to the specifics of their instructional duties. The faculty is made aware of any timelines, job description/duties and other department specific items that are required. When a faculty member is hired they are informed by the Dean, Department Chair or Coordinator of the specifics of the contract such as conditions of employment, beginning and ending dates of service, salary, credit load and job description. In addition, a Faculty Senate standing committee is dedicated to part-time issues and welcomes all part-time faculty to join or attend the meetings.

Much has been done since 1995 to include part-time and adjunct faculty in the informational circle of the college. The Faculty Handbook for Part-Time Instructors has been developed and updated/revised on an annual basis to provide instructors with the newest available information. The TMCC website is a wealth of information for the part-time faculty on everything from employment opportunities within the college to institutional policies, financial aid requirements and library resources.

Strengths:

The Part-Time Faculty Handbook has been instrumental in providing part-time faculty with college policies critical to job performance. In addition, the personnel orientation by supervisors is held every semester to ensure that part-time instructors are armed with the knowledge they need to work effectively and within the system guidelines.

Weaknesses:

Faculty who are hired after the semester begins or who are hired for summer do not have the formal orientation that others receive. Even though the supervisors make every attempt to make sure the employees receive all the information necessary to work within

the guidelines of the institution, there is no tracking in place to prevent someone from falling through the cracks.

Analysis of Institutional Policies Regarding Part-time Workload

In spring 2001, the Board of Regents approved the creation of a Part-Time Faculty Task Force in response to part-time faculty concerns regarding pay, benefits and working conditions. The Task Force collected information on part-time faculty in the University and Community College System of Nevada. The reports were based on fall 2000 and spring 2001. The institutions provided data on the disciplines in which the faculty were hired, the number of credits taught, the pay per credit, ethnicity, gender and total number of part-time faculty.

Upon discovering that each institution collected data on part-time faculty in different ways, the Task Force recommended (p. 2) that each institution annually maintain and report data on:

- the aggregate number of part-time faculty hired each semester
- the aggregate number of credit hours taught per semester by part-time faculty
- the gender and race/ethnicity of its aggregate part-time faculty workforce
- data collection by college/department or subject area was encouraged

The Task Force also recommended that the individual institutions address weaknesses as noted in the summary of response for their specific institution.

The Task Force recommends that:

1. Part-time salary schedule establishing a per-credit standard (p. 2, paragraph 1) contingent on legislative funding.
2. An enhancement request be prioritized by the Board of Regents to fund 50% of the proposed salary schedule in the first year of the 2003-2005 biennium and 50% in the second year of the biennium.
3. The institution reaffirms the rights of each institution, if desired to offer differential pay rates based on academic discipline and/or type of course taught. These pay rates can not be less than the minimum salaries stated in the proposed Part-Time Faculty Salary schedule.
4. The Board of Regents' Campus Environment Committee (CED) set targets for the recruitment and hiring of underrepresented part-time faculty along with existing targets set by the CEC for full-time faculty, staff and students.
5. Each UCCSN institution maintain data on the gender and race/ethnicity of its part-time faculty workforce.
6. The UCCSN Personnel/Benefits Committee examine recruitment procedures for part-time faculty and make recommendations to the chancellor.
7. The posting of full-time positions at each institution, with information provided about the methods by which such information may be regularly assessed.

8. Each campus institute an orientation session and/or an orientation handbook for all part-time faculty and further recommends that all Orientation handbooks be reviewed by the System legal counsel prior to dissemination.
9. That better communication of benefits to part-time faculty through orientation handbooks and/or training, including information about the academic freedom right of part-time faculty.
10. It reaffirms the right of each institution to offer two-semester contracts to part-time faculty if doing so is in the best interests of the institution and the faculty member. Such contracts are to be written so as not to imply promise of reemployment beyond the terms of the stated contract.
11. Each institution provide timely information to part-time faculty about their teaching assignments, including any changes that may occur to class times, locations or class rosters.
12. Each institution set a goal to provide to part-time faculty access to a mailbox, telephone, email account, campus publications, library resources, office supplies, and a secure place to store belongings.
13. Each institution provide credentials to part-time faculty that are required for access to email accounts, library holdings, computer labs, and other services that might require an identification card or other documentation of employment status.
14. Each institution work toward providing a designated space (e.g., conference room, classroom, or lounge) in which part-time faculty can meet privately with students, including access to keys as necessary for after-hours meetings.
15. Academic departments/divisions consider inviting part-time faculty to departmental meetings where appropriate, depending upon the stipulations contained in departmental bylaws.
16. Academic departments/divisions regularly inform part-time faculty about departmental decisions that impact the curriculum, course materials and teaching methods.
17. A commitment to professional development for part-time faculty urges each institution to implement programs for continuous improvement of all faculty.
18. Encourages institutions to continue providing, or to begin offering teaching excellence seminars and to make such programs available to part-time as well as full-time faculty.
19. The Board's position on mandatory teaching evaluations of all faculty each semester, whether full-time or part-time.
20. Each institution offer part-time faculty the opportunity for peer evaluation if requested.
21. Each institution provide opportunities for mentoring of part-time faculty by members of the full-time faculty.
22. The UCCSN Personnel/Benefits Committee examine available options for offering self-paid health and life insurance packages to part-time faculty and make a recommendation to the chancellor.
23. Each campus form a committee, or use an existing committee, to enact the principles and recommendations contained in this report. As part of its charge, the campus committee will prepare an annual report to the Board of Regents' Academic, Research, and Student Affairs Committee. The report will include

longitudinal data on the demographics of each institution's part-time faculty and progress toward the goals and recommendations contained in the final Part-time Faculty Task Force.

Overall, the report found the TMCC provides the best support for part-time instructors in the state. In fact, TMCC had taken independent action on a number of the recommendations before the publication of the report.

Strengths:

As shown by the UCCSN Part-time task force, TMCC leads the state in providing support for its part-time faculty members. In addition, TMCC has two entities that monitor and work to continually improve part-time working conditions – the Part-time Support Center and the Part-time Faculty Issues Committee. As a result of implementing recommendations the institution continues to recruit quality part-time instructors that help TMCC to meet the strategic goals mapped out to fulfill the College mission. The goal is to offer a sensitive and supportive environment that helps the college to recruit qualified, diverse and dedicated part-time instructors who want to teach at TMCC.

Weakness:

--At this time, TMCC does not have a formal process that assesses institutional monitoring part-time faculty members as required in standard indicator 4.A.10. Annual monitoring allows the college to make changes that help the institution to best manage its human resources. Reviewing the data can help the college to change, correct or improve current procedures that might be indicated as problematic based on the data.

- TMCC does not have a formal way of tracking retention and turnover which has opened the door for discussions regarding this procedure. Concern has been voiced regarding part-time instructors and continuity within courses taught by part-time instructors.

Scholarship/Art Analysis

Unfortunately, scholarship at TMCC is still regarded by some as unimportant, peripheral, and inappropriate to the community college mission. A large number of TMCC's faculty, however, have chosen to ignore this institutional perception and have as a result produced a remarkably impressive body of scholarly and artistic work. These faculty members have understood and have acted upon the importance of this work to the College's teaching mission as expressed in the introduction to Standard 4.B.: **“Through scholarship, which may entail creation, application, synthesis, or transmission of knowledge, faculty acquire and sustain their expertise, thereby contributing to the validity and vitality of their teaching. Faculty scholarship is necessary to maintain effective instruction in all institutions of higher education. It also provides students the opportunity to observe and develop an understanding of scholarly activity.”** In

addition, Standard 4.B. states clearly that this is true “regardless of the size or nature of the institution.”

Salaries Analysis

UCCSN salary and benefits policies are clearly stated in the Board of Regents Handbook which is available on the UCCSN Web site at www.nevada.edu. Specific institution policies on faculty salaries and benefits are clearly stated in the TMCC Faculty\Staff Handbook and the NFA contract available. Both are on the TMCC Web site at www.tmcc.edu.

Procedures for initial placement and movement on the salary schedule have been refined since the last self-study, and a collective bargaining agreement has been implemented. The new policies include definitions for vocational faculty members whose skills and training were not addressed in the previous policy. The new policies provide advancement paths for this segment of the faculty, which better addresses the complete mission of the college. However, there is some indication that Title 4, Chapter 3, section 31 of the Board of Regents handbook has not been consistently complied with throughout the college, specifically in the technical areas. Faculty at the TMCC IGT center have requested information on how non-credit training can be used for column movement. Section 31 provides a provision for using contact hours for advancement, but it may not be implemented at TMCC. The Professional Standards committee is seeking to remedy the situation and approved the following motion at their October 7, 2004 meeting: “The Professional Standards committee supports equitable movement by all faculty across the salary scale in accordance with UCCSN Board of Regents Handbook.” The motion is on the agenda for the December Faculty Senate meeting.

A 2003-2004 UCCSN Salary Study reported a mean salary of \$49,423 at peer community colleges in the area. TMCC’s mean salary of \$54,868 compares favorably with the salaries offered by peer colleges in the area. However, it should be noted that the salaries of former administrators who have returned to teaching might have skewed TMCC’s mean salary. This is illustrated by the maximum Professor salary for a 9-month contract as shown in the table below. This maximum is significantly higher than the top of the current pay scale.

		SALARY			
CONTRACT	RANK	Minimum	Median	Maximum	Mean
FT Fac (11 - 12 Months)	Instructor	34,219.00	41,247.00	44,000.00	40,178.25
	Professor	39,547.00	51,970.50	90,573.00	54,667.00
	Total	34,219.00	46,063.00	90,573.00	51,769.25
FT Fac (9 - 10 Month)	Instructor	28,085.00	41,100.00	52,980.00	42,232.78
	Professor	38,582.00	61,325.00	125,451.00	61,534.67

	Total	28,085.00	52,612.00	125,451.00	55,352.03
Total	Instructor	28,085.00	41,100.00	52,980.00	42,050.16
	Professor	38,582.00	59,525.00	125,451.00	60,467.84
	Total	28,085.00	51,459.50	125,451.00	54,867.87

One issue of contention is the policy for awarding merit to faculty members who have reached the top of the salary scale. As of fall 2004, 18 TMCC faculty members fall into that category. In 1996, memo #96-2 from the UCCSN Chancellor outlined a process for awarding merit to these faculty members. The problematic issues center around the requirement that faculty at the top of the scale have to receive an excellent rating and show leadership in order to get the merit money. Some affected faculty perceive this as discriminatory and believe that they are held to a higher level of accountability simply by virtue of their years of service. This results, they feel, in de facto age discrimination and a perception that they are punished for longevity.

According to current Faculty Senate Chair Bridgett Boulton, the system faculty senate chairs have discussed this for at least three years. The Chancellor's office has advised the senate chairs to accept this policy because pursuit of this subject could draw attention to the fact that UCCSN faculty are the only group of state employees with an option to receive salary increases above the existing salary scale. Pursuit of this topic, then, could do more harm than good.

Benefits Analysis

The State Insurance Plan has experienced higher costs and has passed many of those costs along to employees in the form of higher contributions and deductibles, as well as reduced benefits. As provided for in the NFA contract and UCCSN policies, faculty members were actively involved in the benefit plan decisions. While insurance costs have increased, there is no data to suggest that the costs have hindered the institution in recruitment or retention of faculty.

A benefits survey for part-time faculty was conducted for the last report, but more current data is not available. The FICA alternative plan may make it more difficult to attract and retain part-time faculty as a number of part-time faculty work specifically to achieve FICA credits.

Retention Analysis

With faculty retention data showing the average tenure of full-time faculty at 10.1 years (and those with the rank of professor at 13.2 years), it would appear that there are no college-wide issues affecting retention of faculty.

Faculty Participation Analysis

The 1995 Northwest Committee report contained one strong suggestion that applied to faculty participation:

. . . it is strongly suggested that the college continue to develop and implement both formal and informal mechanisms through which faculty have a legitimate role in the development of college policies (p. 40).

As of 2004, significant gains have been made in this area, and numerous formal and informal mechanisms for faculty input are in place and functioning.

Regarding formal input, the Faculty Senate and its committees are the most important voice for faculty. Under the protection of the UCCSN code, TMCC Bylaws, Faculty Senate Bylaws, and the TMCC Faculty and Staff Handbook, faculty members are able to participate in the decision-making process regarding academic planning, curriculum development and review, academic advising, and institutional governance. They volunteer for service on the Senate Committee of their choice, elect their own Senators, and are free to attend all Senate meetings (see EX 3).

Faculty members make up approximately 32% of Planning Council, which allows another venue for faculty to participate in institutional governance. Faculty members not serving on the Council have the opportunity to attend meetings and are encouraged to share comments and suggestions.

In the 2004 TMCC Climate Study, 55% of faculty agreed that this institution has a shared sense of direction and 76% agreed that we are committed to assessing our effectiveness at achieving our educational mission. Institutional governance seems to be the one area that needs to be addressed. The Climate Survey asked if communication between faculty and administration is effective and only 41% agreed.

Regarding part-time faculty, the 2002 system-wide survey revealed that 64% of the part-timers who participated felt they had the freedom to select materials used in their courses, while only 18% felt they had opportunities to be involved in decisions regarding curriculum and course offerings. The Task Force recommended that academic departments keep part-time instructors apprised of decisions that impact curriculum, course materials, and teaching methods (page 6). Even though TMCC has addressed many of the recommendations of the task force, this is one area that seems to need attention.

Regarding informal faculty input into policy decisions, campus forums on important topics have become a standard practice through which the faculty can comment upon and influence policy decisions.

As for academic advising, TMCC offers students many opportunities in this area. They opened the Career Center on August 19, 2004 and served 408 students in the first month.

Other centers served over 19,000 students in 2003/04. Advisement centers work with the general student population as well as special groups, such as veterans and returning students.

Faculty Recruitment Analysis

TMCC has a well established and orderly process for the recruitment and appointment of full-time faculty. Procedures are listed in the Administrative manual and are enforced through the NFA contract. The NFA contract also establishes criteria for selection of members of a screening committee, which includes a representative from the Affirmative Action office.

Academic Freedom Analysis

Question 10 of the 2004 Climate survey addresses whether or not TMCC's atmosphere encourages open expression of ideas. While the term "academic freedom" is not mentioned specifically, "open expression of ideas" is at the heart of that philosophy. The results of the survey show that 68% of faculty agreed with the statement (page 19). This is an increase over the 2002 survey, which shows 48% of faculty agreed that the atmosphere encouraged open expression of ideas.

Questions about academic freedom continue among the faculty, particularly in the areas of assessment and political expression. Discussions should continue between the faculty and the administration until both sides better understand the parameters of academic freedom at TMCC.

Section #3: Recommendations and Timelines

Qualification Recommendations

Recommendations

- Continue to analyze enrollment patterns and use data to make decisions regarding the allocation of full-time faculty positions.
- Use state workforce predictions to prepare for areas where new programs should be added.
- Initiate data analysis early enough to be able to advertise for new faculty at least six months prior to start of new year.

Timelines

Changes implemented by August 1,2006

Part-time Qualifications

Recommendations

- Improve database on part-time faculty to include degree(s) earned, area(s) of concentration, and subject(s) hired to teach
- Continue to improve full to part-time faculty ratio

Timelines

- Database – August 1, 2005
- Ratio -- on-going

Evaluation Recommendations

The Standard 4 Committee recommends the following actions in the area of evaluation:

- continued dialogue between the faculty (as represented the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee and the Faculty Senate) and the administration in order to modify the current evaluation system. The revised process and procedure should be driven by the faculty but should be responsive to the administration's desire that the evaluation should encourage excellence, facilitate continual professional growth, and demand satisfactory performance in all areas.
 - Timeline: revised plan submitted to Faculty Senate for discussion and approval by August, 2005. Full implementation by academic year 2006-07.
- Regardless of the elements of the new procedure, the administration must insist that evaluators hold the faculty accountable to the performance standards. If evaluators are not willing or able to hold tenured faculty members accountable to

- elements of the performance standards, those standards should be removed. One example is the use of statistical data in the evaluation of counselors. Either this data should be collected and used consistently in evaluation or it should be removed from the faculty evaluation criteria for counselors.
- Review of the faculty evaluation criteria for counselors. It is apparent that a number of criteria are not being utilized (especially those for which no data is being collected).
 - Regarding elements of this plan, the Standard 4 recommends the following in no particular order:
 - place teaching excellence at the center of the process.
 - ensure that the process requires faculty members to provide evidence of satisfactory performance in the various job duties.
 - allow supervisors to make distinctions on the quality of performance, not the quantity of tasks completed.
 - include more indices of performance in the evaluation. Student evaluations and infrequent (and often announced) peer visits are not adequate to measure the effectiveness of teaching.
 - provide a means to encourage, track, and demand professional growth over time.
 - provide a means for peers to become more involved in the evaluation process.
 - The Standard 4 Committee acknowledges that no evaluation system is perfect or will please everyone. An investigation into research and study of this topic, however, has uncovered an approach at several community colleges that addresses many of these issues in a positive and faculty-centered manner. This approach has been labeled the “developmental approach,” and it centers around the production and evaluation of a faculty portfolio every three years. The Standard 4 Committee recommends that this approach be seriously considered. Some of the advantages of this method of evaluation are as follows:
 - Portfolios allow the evaluation to focus on the college’s most important work – teaching – without ignoring service.
 - Portfolios allow for the evaluation to consider information for a variety of sources. Student and peer evaluations can be supplemented with examples of student learning, descriptions of the efforts of faculty to try new and innovative techniques, and/or examples of important college service work.
 - Portfolios encourage a culture of evidence and allow faculty members to demonstrate their effectiveness and growth.
 - Portfolios empower faculty to build successes over time.
 - Portfolios provide the most flexible means of faculty evaluation.
 - Evaluating portfolios every three years allows for deeper and more meaningful evaluation without adding significantly to faculty or administrative workload.
 - Finally, portfolios are well-suited to peer participation in the evaluation process. Peers can and should be included in the planning and evaluation stages of this process.

Two articles are recommended for more discussion of this topic: Kent D. Redmon, "Faculty Evaluation: A Response to Competing Values," *Community College Review*, Summer 99; John A. Centra, "Use of the Teaching Portfolio and Student Evaluations for Summative Evaluation," Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Atlanta, Ga., April 12-16, 1993). Both articles are available through EBSCO.

Workload Recommendations

- The Board of Regents did not specify a timeline for their system-wide evaluation of workload, so the validity of the newly adopted workload at TMCC should be assessed in the face of possible changes coming from the Board of Regents.
- The TMCC IT operations should continue to develop the ERMA module and DEMOS system in order to create a database that automates the implementation of the TMCC workload policy.
- Regarding workload equity, the administration should recognize and acknowledge the service contributions of faculty members that go beyond their contractual obligations.
- In addition, the vice presidents should mandate that chairs, directors, and deans ensure an equitable distribution of service tasks among the faculty.
- The administration should examine the use of release time to ensure that the recipients of this release time are not working more or less than is appropriate.
- Regarding part-time faculty, TMCC should implement formal process to assess institutional policies part-time faculty members as required in standard indicator 4.A.10. The committee recommends that this analysis take place once every two years.

Workload Timeline

All of these issues should be examined during the 2005-06 academic year, and any adjustments should be in place by August 2006.

Professional Growth Recommendations

- The Center of Teaching and Learning should be operational as scheduled.
- TMCC should encourage and increase faculty-driven public presentations and dialogues on issues of intellectual or topical interest

Part-time Faculty Retention Recommendations

- The committee recommends that some type of retention form be developed that can track the departure of faculty members and the reasons for this departure.
- It is also important to document that the part-time faculty are meeting the student needs for continuity in classes that directly relate to one another.
- More needs to be done to include part-time instructors in the professional development activities.
- TMCC needs to create a way to track which part-time instructors do or do not receive a formal orientation.

- TMCC needs to investigate more formal and required training sessions for part-time faculty.
- Departments need to be encouraged to initiate more interaction between full-time and part-time faculty.

Timeline:

- Significant progress on all of the above should be documented by August 2007.

Salary and Benefits Recommendations

The college has made significant progress since the last report in implementing a fair and uniform salary schedule. The addition of sub-categories for tenured faculty has also provided an additional reward for faculty who achieve tenure. The college and the UCCSN should be commended for these efforts.

Two issues still require attention.

--The college should address issues raised by faculty who have reached the top of their pay scale. The policy for dealing with these faculty members has been defined in a memo from the chancellor. The college should continue to refine that policy as it is implemented at TMCC to ensure that it is comparable to the interpretation used at other state community colleges.

-- The college should also address the remaining issues regarding placement and movement of occupational/technical faculty immediately. The following actions and deadlines are recommended:

Action	Deadline
Faculty Senate approve motion	December 2004
President agree to abide by 4.3.31	December 2004
Dean(s) notify affected faculty of policy	February 2005
Interested faculty complete required documentation	May 2005
Implement earned column movement	July 1, 2005

Recommendations/Timelines

In order to meet the requirements of Standard 4.B., the administration should take steps to support a change in TMCC's culture to one that fully honors, respects, and explicitly supports scholarship and artistic creation. Specifically, the Standard 4 Committee recommends the following:

- A statement from the President or VPAA that demonstrates understanding that scholarship is a crucial part of the development of college teachers, especially those who have achieved the highest degree in their field.
 - Timeline: mention in a newsletter by December 1, 2005.
- The administration should review, in consultation with faculty in the academic areas, the policies and procedures regarding scholarship at TMCC.
 - Review should occur in academic year 2005-06, and the revised policies should appear in the Administrative Manual by October 1, 2006.
- A sabbatical every seven years is not adequate to support faculty scholarship at the community college level. Heavy teaching loads are the most significant barrier to this kind of work. Release time – three to six credits a semester – is awarded to faculty members for administrative tasks on a regular basis. Similarly, release time should be awarded to faculty members engaged in important scholarly activities.
 - The Administration should investigate this possibility in the fall of 2005 and announce findings to the Faculty Senate by March 1, 2006.

Faculty Participation Recommendations

Recommendation: That the Part-time Issues Committee be charged with conducting a survey of part-time faculty to determine which departments need to establish stronger communications with part-timers and encourage them to come up with a working strategy for improvement.

Timeline: This should begin right away and be completed by the end of spring semester 2005.

Faculty Recruitment Recommendations

None.

Academic Freedom Recommendations

Recommendation: That the President initiate a Faculty Senate examination into academic freedom issues at TMCC. In particular, this examination should examine issues arising from assessment and political activity. This discussion should include at least one open campus forum on the topic.

Timeline: a charge to the Senate by May, 2005, a public forum by March, 2006, and a report from the Senate by May 2006.

Closing Statement

Reading TMCC's 1995 self-study report reads like a report from a different institution. The 1995 report is the report of a small and relatively young college on the verge of a new era. A large number of the faculty names would be unfamiliar to most of TMCC's faculty today; many were among the first cohort of TMCC faculty who started it the 1970s, and only a handful of those remain in our ranks.

In reflecting on the 1990s, one can see the institution suffering pains caused by remarkable growth, an unfortunate lack of stability in the administration (including some poor and destructive administrative actions), and increasing expectations placed upon educators at every level – accountability in particular. All of those issues combined to reduce faculty morale considerably during that decade, and the impact of that era, though fading, can still be felt at times.

In this context, one can put TMCC's progress over the last three years into perspective. President Ringle and his entirely new upper-level administration (no vice president or instructional dean assumed his or her position before 1999) set out to restore the trust of the TMCC faculty through systematic and open examination of the College's goals, policies, and procedures, all done with considerable faculty input. The consistent goal of these reforms was a set of policies and procedures that were fair, uniformly applied, and built around the goal of allowing for the best possible performance of faculty duties.

That said, it seems that TMCC finds itself in another time of transition. A considerable amount of trust has been restored, and morale has increased significantly. The College is now poised to move into the ranks of the best community colleges in the nation. It is this committee's belief that the recommendations in this report, if followed, will ensure that the faculty has the support, motivation, and morale to move to this next level.

Standard 4 Recommendations Summary

Recommendation	Timeline	Responsible Person/Dept.
Continue to analyze enrollment patterns and use data to make decisions regarding the allocation of full-time faculty positions.	On-going	President's Cabinet
Use state workforce predictions to prepare for areas where new programs should be added.	In place by August 1, 2006	President's Cabinet
Initiate data analysis early enough to be able to advertise for new faculty at least six months prior to start of new year.	In place by August 1, 2006	President's Cabinet
Improve database on part-time faculty to include degree(s) earned, area(s) of concentration, and subject(s) hired to teach	Improvements in place by August 1, 2005.	Human Resources
Continue to improve full to part-time faculty ratio	Ongoing	President's Cabinet
Continued dialogue between the faculty and the administration in order to modify the current evaluation system. The revised process and procedure should encourage excellence, facilitate continual professional growth, and demand satisfactory performance in all areas.	Revised plan submitted to Faculty Senate for discussion and approval by August, 2005. Full implementation by academic year 2006-07.	President's Cabinet/Faculty Senate
Regardless of the elements of the new procedure, the administration must insist that evaluators hold the faculty <u>accountable</u> to the performance standards. If	Implement new evaluation policy and procedure for 2006-07 academic year.	VPAA, Deans

evaluators are not willing or able to hold tenured faculty members accountable to elements of the performance standards, those standards should be removed.		
Review of the faculty evaluation criteria for counselors. It is apparent that a number of criteria are not being utilized (especially those for which no data is being collected).	Implement new evaluation policy and procedure for 2006-07 academic year.	VPSS
Consider implementation of a developmental evaluation model that utilizes a portfolio system.	Implement new evaluation policy and procedure for 2006-07 academic year.	President's Cabinet/Faculty Senate
Assess validity of the newly adopted workload at TMCC in the face of possible changes coming from the Board of Regents	Examined during the 2005-06 academic year, adjustments in place by August 2006.	President's Cabinet
The TMCC IT operations should continue to develop the ERMA module and DEMOS system in order to create a database that automates the implementation of the TMCC workload policy.	Examined during the 2005-06 academic year, adjustments in place by August 2006.	IT Department
Regarding workload equity, the administration should recognize and acknowledge the service contributions of faculty members that go beyond their contractual obligations.	Examined during the 2005-06 academic year, adjustments in place by August 2006.	President's Cabinet
The vice presidents should mandate that chairs, directors, and deans ensure an equitable distribution of service tasks among the faculty.	Examined during the 2005-06 academic year, adjustments in place by August 2006.	VPAA, VPSS
The administration should	Examined during the 2005-	President's Cabinet

examine the use of release time to ensure that the recipients of this release time are not working more or less than is appropriate.	06 academic year, adjustments in place by August 2006.	
Regarding part-time faculty, TMCC should implement formal process to assess institutional policies part-time faculty members as required in standard indicator 4.A.10. The committee recommends that this analysis take place once every two years.	Examined during the 2005-06 academic year, adjustments in place by August 2006.	VPAA
The Center of Teaching and Learning should be operational as scheduled.	September 1, 2005	VPAA
TMCC should encourage and increase faculty-driven public presentations and dialogues on issues of intellectual or topical interest	Significant progress by August 2007.	VPAA
The committee recommends that some type of retention form be developed that can track the departure of faculty members and the reasons for this departure.	Significant progress by August 2007.	Human Resources
Create system to document that the part-time faculty are meeting the student needs for continuity in classes that directly relate to one another.	Significant progress by August 2007.	VPAA
More needs to be done to include part-time instructors in the professional development activities.	Significant progress by August 2007.	VPAA
Departments need to be encouraged to initiate more interaction between full-time and part-time faculty.	Significant progress by August 2007.	I-Deans

The college continue to refine the “Top of the Salary Scale” policy as it is implemented at TMCC to ensure that it is comparable to the interpretation used at other state community colleges	Policy reviewed and any changes implemented by September 1, 2005.	VPAA
The college should also address the remaining issues regarding placement and movement of occupational/technical faculty immediately.	Implemented by July 1, 2005	President’s Cabinet/Faculty Senate
A statement from the President or VPAA that demonstrates understanding that scholarship is a crucial part of the development of college teachers, especially those who have achieved the highest degree in their field	Mention in a newsletter by December 1, 2005.	President or VPAA
The administration should review, in consultation with faculty in the academic areas, the policies and procedures regarding scholarship at TMCC.	The Administration should investigate this possibility in the fall of 2005 and announce findings to the Faculty Senate by March 1, 2006.	President’s Cabinet/Faculty Senate
Release time should be awarded to faculty members engaged in important scholarly activities.	The Administration should investigate this possibility in the fall of 2005 and announce findings to the Faculty Senate by March 1, 2006.	President’s Cabinet/Faculty Senate
Charge the Part-time Issues Committee to conduct a survey of part-time faculty to determine which departments need to establish stronger communications with part-timers and encourage them to come up with a working strategy for improvement.	Completed by May 1, 2005.	President/Faculty Senate
That the President initiate a	Charge to the Senate by	President/Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate examination into academic freedom issues at TMCC. In particular, this examination should examine issues arising from assessment and political activity. This discussion should include at least one open campus forum on the topic	May, 2005, a public forum by March, 2006, and a report from the Senate by May 2006	
---	--	--

Appendix List

1. Workload Policy
2. Sabbatical Policy
3. January 2005 prof. develop scheulde
4. Chancellor memo 96-2
5. Evaluation criteria
6. UCCSN Evaluation form
7. Library performance critiera
8. counselor performance criteria
9. Online Student evaluation of instruction
10. Part-time instructor handbook
11. Part-time Task Force Report
12. Faculty Scholarship/Art list
13. Evaluation Survey Instrument
14. Evaluation Survey Results