

## **Standard Four**

### **Faculty**

#### **Historical Context**

TMCC places teaching excellence at the center of its mission to create “a supportive, intellectually, and culturally dynamic” learning environment for its students. The College strives to provide “lifelong learning opportunities” through the delivery of courses and programs that help students “achieve their goals, aspirations, and dreams.” More specifically, TMCC’s Strategic Goal for Achieving Academic Excellence notes the College’s commitment “to foster an institutional culture that values, demands, and supports excellence in teaching and learning” (*Strategic Planning*, pp. insert and 4). TMCC’s faculty members are undeniably central to the College achieving its goal of academic excellence. While faculty are not alone in creating an academically challenging and educationally rich experience for students, they are essential to the business of sustaining the highest quality of academic integrity at TMCC and of changing students’ lives both in the concrete terms of degrees, certificates, and new occupations and in those intangible ways that elevate and inspire students’ futures.

Between 1995 and 2000, TMCC went through a very difficult time, especially for faculty. TMCC experienced a rapid succession of presidents, a relative vacuum of leadership that resulted in a fair amount of uncertainty for faculty and instability for the institution.

Moreover, TMCC experienced financial difficulties during fiscal year 2000, which resulted in the cutting of course offerings, program development, and the hiring of new full-time faculty. Coming out of this period, faculty were notably concerned about the institution's commitment to faculty-specific issues, the continued hiring of full-time faculty, and improving the faculty evaluation process. Although much progress has been made in repairing issues, both perceived and real, that existed between faculty and administration, it is important to note that TMCC is still in the process of recovering from this difficult period.

### **Current Situation**

The Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges Evaluation Committee in 1995 found both TMCC's full- and part-time faculty to be well-qualified for their respective positions, an assessment that still holds true today. The Self-Study Standard 4 Committee undertook the evaluation of the current condition of TMCC's faculty, both in terms of issues of the faculty as a group and of issues connected to faculty in relationship to the institution as a whole, with a serious and conscientious approach that reflected the importance of its subject. The Committee's examination was unflinchingly honest; its recommendations were carefully considered. The report that follows reveals that TMCC's faculty is in excellent condition: highly qualified, committed, and well supported. It is hard to imagine that this faculty as a group of dedicated and skilled educators is not among the best in the nation. Importantly, the Committee also found that the administration has made a consistent and conscientious effort over the last three years to create fair policies and procedures in relation to faculty, and the administration did so

with considerable faculty input. More needs to be done, but it seems that much of the work needed is a continuation of work already begun, and this is a testament to the hard work and dedication of all members of the TMCC community (See Analysis and Appraisal and Next Steps sections of this standard for a fuller discussion).

## **Faculty Selection, Evaluation, Roles, Welfare, and Development (4.A)**

### **Faculty Qualifications (4.A.1)**

TMCC employs professionally qualified full- and part-time faculty whose primary commitment is to the College and the quality of its programs. TMCC's Faculty Qualifications Policy, approved in spring 2004, applies to both full- and part-time faculty and sets forth "standards that strengthen academic rigor and allow TMCC to maintain academic excellence and a reputation of providing high quality instruction" (See Exhibit 4.1, Faculty Qualifications Policy, p.1). The policy includes sections on general standards of qualifications, specific qualifications, certification of qualifications, guidelines for teaching in additional fields and interdisciplinary teaching, and qualifications for faculty with special skills. Moreover, as part of TMCC's ongoing commitment to academic excellence, the College hires full-time faculty for each field or program in which it offers major work.

As noted earlier, the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges Evaluation Committee in 1995 found both TMCC's full- and part-time faculty to be well-qualified for their respective positions. Review of faculty credentials indicates that this statement

still accurately describes the quality of TMCC’s faculty (See Mandatory Table 4.1, Institutional Faculty Profile). Full-time faculty members deployed in university transferable instructional areas are required to have a minimum of a master’s degree in the field. For professional and technical programs, full-time faculty members may have a degree commensurate with the highest standards in their field or a faculty member’s relevant work experience may be identified as more indicative of expertise than degree attainment. TMCC follows rigorous screening practices in the hiring of full-time and part-time faculty as well as non-teaching faculty and administrative and support staff (See 4.A.6 for a fuller discussion of faculty recruitment and hiring policies and procedures).

**Insert Mandatory Table 4.1, Institutional Faculty Profile**

In 1995 TMCC employed 81 full-time faculty members. In fall 2003, the number of full-time faculty members had reached 134. In making decisions regarding where to add new faculty positions, leadership considers enrollment demand, efficiency of classes (student to faculty ratios), full-to-part-time ratios in the program areas, and the quality of the available part-time faculty pool. Figure 4.1 depicts the program areas in which students are graduating and the percentage of full-time faculty present in each instructional area.

**Faculty Deployment by Program Area**

<b>Program Area</b>	<b>2002-03 Graduates</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>	<b>Full-time Faculty in</b>	<b>Percent of All Faculty</b>
---------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------

	<b>by Program</b>	<b>Degrees</b>	<b>Program Area*</b>	<b>in Program Area</b>
Health Sciences	78	16.0%	20	14.9%
Applied Industrial Tech	16	3.2%	10	7.4%
Architecture	3	0.6%	2	1.4%
Business	31	6.3%	10	7.4%
Computer Technologies	26	5.3%	9	6.7%
Criminal Justice	10	2.0%	2	1.4%
Culinary Arts	2	0.4%	2	1.4%
Education	12	2.4%	2	1.4%
Fire Science	24	4.9%	1	0.7%
General Studies & Other	49	10.0%		
Graphic Communications and Drafting	14	2.8%	4	2.9%
Paralegal	5	1.0%	2	1.4%
Transfer (AA, AS)	217	44.5%	70	52.2%
Totals	487	100.0%	134	100.0%

(Figure 4.1 –Source *TMCC FactBook 2004*)

---

\* Faculty count does not include counselors and librarians.

With the exception of the Health Sciences and Education programs, TMCC’s full-time faculty members are proportionately represented in the major degree areas. In 2004, TMCC hired more nursing faculty and additional education faculty to relieve that discrepancy. Although there are no full-time faculty specifically assigned to the General Studies program, quality of instruction in that degree program is ensured because the degree requires general education classes along with student-selected electives, which are taught across the curriculum by both full- and part-time faculty. Graduates in the public service areas--Criminal Justice and Fire Science programs--include students who attend the academies and earn credit through that program. It should be noted that the Fire Science program had two full-time faculty members in 2002-03, but one held an administrative title and thus is not included in the official faculty statistic.

Since TMCC’s graduation rate is relatively low, review of faculty FTE to student FTE by program may be a better indicator of faculty representation in the major fields. In the recent Facilities Master Plan and Academic Master Plan, Paulien and Associates grouped TMCC’s course offerings by occupational cluster and student FTE. Figure 4.2 represents their groupings and faculty associated with each program.

**Faculty Deployment by Occupational Cluster**

Occupational Cluster	Fall	Percent	Percent	Full-time	Percent
----------------------	------	---------	---------	-----------	---------

---

† Faculty count does not include counselors and librarians.

	<b>2003 FTE</b>	<b>Change of Total 2000- 2003</b>	<b>of Total FTE</b>	<b>Faculty<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>of Total Faculty</b>
General Business	369	3%	6.9%	11	8.2%
Computer Technology	349	-20%	6.5%	9	6.7%
Protective Services	247	22%	4.6%	3	2.2%
Professional/Trade Services	403	18%	7.5%	18	13.4%
Liberal Arts/Core and Transfer	2245	24%	42.1%	44	32.8%
Education/Child Care	123	8%	2.3%	2	1.4%
Engineering & Core Sciences	1077	9%	20.2%	27	20.1%
Health Sciences	509	35%	9.5%	20	14.9%
Total	5322			134	

(Figure 4.2 Source: Academic Master Plan)

#### **Faculty Roles (4.A.2)**

Through the Senate Executive Board, Faculty Senate and its standing committees, and the Planning Council, the members of TMCC faculty, as prescribed under UCCSN Code (*Board of Regents Handbook*, 1.4.6, 1.4.7, and 1.4.8), participate in the formation of general policies related to matters of “faculty welfare, faculty rights, and faculty

involvement in the College's primary missions" (TMCC Bylaws, p.190). To this end, faculty members make up a substantial presence on college-wide committees charged with academic planning, curriculum development and review, and institutional governance.

Article VI sections 6.1 – 6.1.6 of the Faculty Senate Bylaws establishes the criteria for the Senate Executive Board (See Exhibit 4.2, Faculty Senate Bylaws and Figure 4.3, Faculty Senate Committees).

**Insert Figure 4.3 Faculty Senate Committees**

The Senate Executive Board meets at least once prior to each Faculty Senate meeting, advises the Senate Chair, and determines agenda issues. The Senate Executive Board consists of the following six members: Faculty Senate Chair, Chair Elect, Chair of Academic Standards, Chair of Curriculum, Chair of Professional Standards, and Chair of Salary, Benefits, and Monetary Concerns.

Article IX sections 9.1 – 9.14 of the Faculty Senate Bylaws establishes the following standing committees as part of the Faculty Senate:

- The Academic Standards Committee recommends policies on academic standards including but not limited to grading, academic dishonesty, admission, registration, retention of students, requirements for all degrees and certificates, approval for new certificates and degree programs, changes made to existing certificates and

degree programs, and formation of the academic and summer school calendar. In concert with the Curriculum Committee, the Academic Standards Committee publishes a guide to curriculum and program development procedures.

- The Curriculum Committee approves new courses and changes to existing courses, reviews the criteria used to accept courses that satisfy General Education requirements in degrees and certificates, and coordinates curricula with TMCC's articulation officer, Admissions and Records, and Academic Standards Committee.
- The Salary, Benefits, and Monetary Concerns Committee deals with budgetary changes and funding requests in academic programs. The Committee makes recommendations for the biennium budget, monitors part-time salary funds, recommends salary proposals, promotes workload equity, and recommends the criteria for selection and eligibility for awarding merit pay for those at the top of the salary scale.
- The Professional Standards Committee recommends criteria for the selection of new faculty members and the process of evaluating faculty and administrators. The Committee also evaluates and ranks sabbatical proposals.
- The Library Committee recommends policy changes and implements programs and events. The Committee also schedules guest lectures and performers under

the auspices of the library and mediates when there are problems between faculty and library staff.

- The Part-time Faculty Issues Committee makes recommendations regarding compensation, benefits, support services, training and integration, and hiring and retention of part-time faculty.
- The Social Activities and Professional Recognition Committee plans social events for faculty and staff and works with administration to create annual public forums at which TMCC recognizes faculty and staff achievements.

Senators are elected by their constituents and vote in their interests (Article IV, Section 4.2 – 4.6). Faculty Senate meets at least eight times during the academic year and is open to all interested persons (Article VII, Section 7.6).

The Planning Council, created in fall 2002 by President Ringle to review and revise the TMCC Mission Statement and Strategic Plan, is an important college-wide body with significant faculty presence and input in its policy decisions. The Planning Council consists of forty members from various college constituencies, including students, administrators, classified staff, and faculty representatives. The Planning Council continues to revisit and revise the Strategic Plan and its constituent goals in response to perceived shifts over time of TMCC's needs and/or when the Planning Council confirms that a specific goal has been accomplished. The Planning Council is currently serving as

the steering committee for the 2005 Accreditation Self-Study; in 2005-06, the Planning Council will return to its original charge as the college-wide governance committee overseeing TMCC's commitment to and progress in meeting its mission and strategic goals.

TMCC's instructional faculty members are not involved in academic advising, except on an informal level. Counselors, who are by contract tenure-track, full-time faculty members, are actively involved in academic advising and counseling (See Standard 3.B and 3.D for further discussion of counseling and academic advisement services). TMCC offers many opportunities for academic advising. TMCC has the Dandini-based Advisement Center, located in the V. James Eardley Student Services Center, which until recently was staffed by two full-time professional advisors, academic faculty advisors, and peer advisors.<sup>‡</sup> Currently, the Advisement Center is staffed by three full-time advisors, peer advisors, and an advisor specifically for international students. Other academic advisement services include:

- The TMCC Career Center (Dandini Campus) helps with educational and career planning. Career advisors also offer work shops, placement activities, and internship opportunities and coordinate job prospects and interviews for students.
- Student Outreach Services (Meadowood Center) offers advisement for students preferring this location.

---

<sup>‡</sup> Academic faculty advisors are no longer available at the Advisement Center. The Advising and Counseling Department found that professional advisors provided a more comprehensive and current advising session for students. As a result, the Advisement Center is replacing the academic faculty advisors with a third professional full-time advisor as of summer 2005.

- The Student Outreach Resource Center (SOURCE) (Dandini Campus) advises students participating in programs housed in the retention center, such as student mentoring and first generation programs.
- The Re-Entry Center (Meadowood Center) offers advisement and assistance to students returning to school or the workplace. The Re-Entry center is home to the Educational Partnership Program, Displaced Homemakers of Washoe County, and Project Wings.
- Veterans Upward Bound (Meadowood Center) advises veterans preparing for college-level courses and other postsecondary training.
- QUEST (Dandini Campus) is a customized academic advising and educational planning program focused on first year student success.
- TMCC High School (Dandini Campus) works with juniors and seniors who are simultaneously attending high school and taking college courses.
- The Student Services Division offers a variety of orientation programs— G.O.L.D, Silver, QUEST, and general orientations--that include academic advisement sessions (See Standard 3.B an 3.D for a fuller discussion of each of these orientation options).

### **Faculty Workloads (4.A.3)**

Faculty workloads at TMCC reflect the mission and goals of the College and utilize in appropriate ways the talents and competencies of faculty. President Ringle presented a revised workload to the faculty on July 1, 2004 (See Exhibit 4.3, TMCC 2004 Workload Policy). This revised workload policy became effective on that date and supersedes other

policies in place at the time. The culmination of recommendations brought forth by a college-wide committee formed to study and evaluate the previous workload, the new workload policy outlines several key indicators: workloads determined by instructional units; criteria for an A, B, B+ contract; distance education stipends; lab, clinical, and art studio instructional rates; industrial technology faculty workload; nursing faculty workload. The new workload policy clearly defines faculty allocation of time for instructional activities. As currently conceived, a faculty member's workload takes into consideration such variables as course preparation time, student advisement, and professional development activities necessary to maintain quality instruction.

The workload policy is a living document. The workload policy enhances planning, budgeting, and scheduling processes, functions within TMCC's data system capabilities, and is an auditable process. The committee that drafted the current workload policy was able to clearly explain the parameters defining workload and compensation. The committee took a closer look 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 contact hour. This template helped the deans and the Vice President for Academic Affairs to determine how best to quantify those hours spent on tasks not clearly defined in any policy and that 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. Based on this,

adjustments were made to individualize workload to reflect the area's requirements.

Workload policy is now included in the NFA Contract.

### **Professional Growth and Development (4.A.3 cont.)**

Faculty members must include professional development activities in their annual plans and report on actual activities in their annual self-evaluations. In order to move from step to step or column to column on the TMCC pay schedule, faculty must meet the specific criteria listed in their annual plan (including professional growth) as detailed in the Faculty Employment section of the Faculty/Staff Handbook. Under the Faculty Evaluation Criteria list, professional development is considered a separate category from primary job responsibilities and community service. As of July 1, 2005, the Faculty Evaluation Criteria will have the category of professional development listed more globally under community and college service (See 4.4, Comparison of Previous and Current Faculty Evaluation Criteria Lists). The evaluation of professional development for tenure-track and tenured faculty is identical, as it is for all evaluation categories. Faculty members must receive an evaluation of satisfactory or better to receive merit and move up one step on the pay schedule.

In order to support faculty development, TMCC provides travel funds in the amount of \$300 per faculty member per year. These funds are located within the academic departments, and each department determines the means by which these funds are distributed. In addition, the Faculty Senate Professional Standards Committee controls additional monies to fill in any gaps in funding (\$5,000 in 2004-05). Academic year

2004-05 is the first year of this new travel fund request procedure; previously, the Faculty Senate Professional Standards Committee controlled all of TMCC's faculty travel funds. In addition, it should be noted that the new policy was accompanied by a significant increase in the amount of money available for travel. While only \$7,500 was allocated in 2003-04, leadership budgeted \$49,800 for professional development related travel in 2004-05.

Board of Regents policy authorizes another form of support for faculty development, annual sabbatical awards. In keeping with NRS 284.345, interpretations of that statute by the Attorney General, and previous Board of Regents' rulings, the number of sabbatical leaves granted for each succeeding academic year shall not exceed a number equal to two percent of the academic faculty in the current year. Those whose primary responsibility is administrative in nature are not eligible for sabbatical leave (See Exhibit 4.5, Sabbatical Application Documents). With five positions allocated currently, TMCC is meeting the sabbatical needs of the faculty, according to the UCCSN formula. The TMCC Bylaws, Title V, Chapter 4, authorizes annual sabbatical awards. The faculty applications for sabbaticals are judged and ranked by a sub-committee of the Faculty Senate Professional Standards Committee. Five sabbaticals were authorized in fall 2004 for the 2005-06 academic year (See Exhibit 4.6, Five Granted Sabbatical Applications for 2005-06).

In addition, faculty members can take advantage of special project grants, Perkins grants, and a multitude of in-service workshops available at little or no cost to employees. Several days of professional development workshops are held before each academic

semester. Some examples of the topics covered in these workshops are sexual harassment issues, competency-based curriculum development, collective bargaining (Nevada Faculty Alliance Contract), Power Point training, multicultural diversity issues, and internet and distance education course development (See Exhibit 4.7, Professional Development Workshop Materials).

Finally, TMCC provides grant-in-aid to full-time faculty for credit courses at UCCSN institutions; part-time faculty members receive grant-in-aid for themselves and their families to attend TMCC courses in proportion to the number of credits taught the previous semester (not to exceed six credits per semester) (See Standard 4.A.4 for a fuller discussion of grant-in-aid as a component of part-time instructors' benefits).

#### **Faculty Salaries and Benefits (4.A.4)**

TMCC's faculty salaries and benefits are generally adequate to attract and retain competent faculty members. The salary plan for Nevada community colleges is defined in Title 4, Chapter 3 of the *Board of Regents Handbook*. In March 2002, the Board of Regents added five columns to reflect the promotion from instructor to professor with commensurate pay increases (See Standard 6.C.9 for a fuller discussion of this process). The academic salary schedule ranges from a minimum of \$26,157 to a maximum of \$84,356 (Faculty/Staff Handbook, p. IP 37). The Board of Regents may recommend cost of living adjustments to the overall salary schedule. These cost of living adjustments (COLA) must be approved by the state legislature and governor. There is no mandated

review cycle for COLA; however, the salary schedule was most recently changed for the 2004 academic year to reflect a 2.5% COLA increase.<sup>§</sup>

Policies regarding salaries and benefits are clearly stated, widely available through the Human Resources Office or on the TMCC Web site, and equitably administered. The academic salary schedule for full-time faculty defines 5 salary columns with 30 steps.

Column assignment is based on educational attainment:

- Column 1      Less than a bachelor's degree.
- Column 2      Bachelor's degree or associate's plus approved contact hours of occupationally related discipline, or associates plus 60 upper level credit hours in an approved instructional field(s).
- Column 3      Master's degree or a bachelor's degree plus approved contact hours of occupationally related discipline, or a bachelor's degree plus 30 graduate credits in an approved instructional field(s).
- Column 4      Master's degree with a minimum of 60 graduate credits in an approved instructional field(s), or equivalency or a bachelor's degree plus approved contact hours of occupationally related discipline, or a bachelor's degree plus 60 graduate credits or equivalency in an approved instructional field(s).
- Column 5      Earned doctorate. Equivalence can be approved by the President for a master's degree plus approved occupational contact hours or academic credits.

---

<sup>§</sup> As of July 1, 2005, the faculty pay schedule will reflect a 2% COLA for the fiscal year 2005-06 and a 4% COLA for fiscal year 2006-07. Faculty members are also eligible for a merit increase of 2.5% for fiscal year 2005-06 if they receive a satisfactory or better annual evaluation.

Each of these columns includes two possible placements: one for instructors and the other for tenured professors. Specific salary levels are defined in 30 steps, and initial placement depends upon previous teaching experience. Each step typically represents one year of service. A maximum of 10 years of experience can be counted for initial placement purposes at the time of hire. The salary policy provides for placement at higher levels if a documented need exists, as is often the case with instructional areas with limited recruitment options, and the President approves of the placement level (See Exhibit 4.8, *Administrative Manual* Policy for Placement). Movement from step to step on the academic salary schedule is based upon the faculty member's annual evaluation. Each faculty member typically receives one step annually, if evaluated as satisfactory or above.

Faculty members may advance from one column to the next with additional academic achievements defined in Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 31 of the *Board of Regents Handbook*. Faculty may advance from the instructor column to the professor column upon receiving tenure. In addition, community college faculty members who have reached the top step of their appropriate salary range may be considered for a merit-based increase upon a performance evaluation in accordance with policy criteria and the process as detailed by the Chancellor's Office (See Exhibit 4.9, Chancellor's Memorandum #96-2). In 1996, the Chancellor outlined a process for awarding merit to qualified faculty members who had reached the top year of service in the pay schedule (See Exhibit 4.10, Eligible Faculty for Merit Increase-Step 30). In short, faculty members who have attained

step 30 on the pay schedule are required to receive an excellent rating and show leadership as a part of their annual plan in order to receive a merit increase.

The Nevada Faculty Alliance (NFA) Contract also specifies a procedure for determining compensation for special assignments and projects and for equitably assigning those projects (See Exhibit 4.11, Comparison Documents of 2003-05 NFA Contract and 2005-08 NFA Contract).<sup>\*\*</sup> For example, the contract requires all eligible faculty members receive email notification of any open position at least ten days prior to the hiring decision (NFA Contract 3.4).

In terms of benefits, full-time faculty members are eligible for group health insurance on the first day of the first full month of employment (See Exhibit 4.12, Employee Medical Benefit Plan Materials). The plan covers medical, dental, and vision care. Faculty members also receive coverage for life, personal accident, business travel accident, and long-term disability insurance, and they can purchase supplemental insurance plans for such concerns as cancer care, supplemental term life, and auto/homeowners/renters.

Administrative and academic faculty who are hired on a twelve month A contract or a ten month faculty B contract of at least 50% are provided with a defined contribution 401(a) retirement plan commencing on their date of hire. Faculty who were State of Nevada PERS (Public Employees' Retirement System) participants at the time of hire must continue to participate in PERS. Under the terms of the Retirement Plan Alternative

---

<sup>\*\*</sup> During spring 2005, NFA leadership met with President Ringle and other members of his leadership team and updated some elements of the collective bargaining contract. In particular, issues connected with department chairs underwent substantial revisions, and the Contract now includes workload policy.

Plan, employees must contribute 10.5% of their gross salary to their 401(a) retirement plan. The State of Nevada matches the 10.5% employee contribution. Both the employee and employer contributions are vested immediately. Employees select their retirement plan fund sponsor (TIAA-CREF, VALIC, or Fidelity). Employees may also participate in two Voluntary Retirement Plans, the Tax Sheltered Annuity 403(b) Plan and the Deferred Compensation 457 Plan with tax deferred dollars. Along with retirement plan options, TMCC offers several types of leave to all full-time faculty, including annual, sick, FMLA, sabbatical, and 11 holidays per year (See Exhibits 4.13 and 4.14, Retirement Plan Options and Professional Staff Leave Information Materials).

The final report of the Part-Time Faculty Task Force was presented at the Board of Regents meeting in March 2002 (See Exhibit 4.15, UCCSN Part-time Faculty Task Force Report). The Task Force conducted a system-wide, confidential survey of part-time faculty in fall 2001 through the auspices of the Cannon Center for Survey Research at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. The survey response rate was 50% with a total of 1,151 part-time faculty responding. In general, the responses to the survey were very positive about working conditions for part-time faculty. The survey asked the respondents questions about salary, tuition benefit, definition of part-time, academic freedom, hiring, contracts, working conditions, professional development, annual evaluation, and insurance benefits. As expected, the area of greatest concern was compensation. Part-time faculty also expressed some interest in certain kinds of employee benefits, but responses tended to reflect whether respondents' primary

employment was part-time teaching versus those who already had full-time employment elsewhere.

Since this report, TMCC has actively pursued increased benefits for part-time instructors. The administration has asked for salary increases at every legislative session since the last accreditation cycle and was successful in raising the salary from \$625 to \$650 per credit in 2003. The UCCSN Personnel/Benefits Committee was asked to examine available options for offering self-paid health and life insurance packages to part-time faculty. All of the UCCSN insurance vendors were asked to provide this service, but the lack of a data bank reflecting the claim histories and the demographics of all the part-time instructors system-wide proved to be a major obstacle in obtaining this benefit option for part-time instructors. Only Western Insurance Specialties, with some exceptions for eligibility, was able to offer coverage (underwritten by John Alden Life Insurance Company) to part-time instructors, their spouses, and dependent children. Applicants must meet medical approval, and the cost of the plan depends upon the applicant's health, age, and the selected coverage. The plan covers medical and prescription drug benefits. For an additional cost, part-time instructors can purchase vision and dental insurance under this plan. Western Insurance Specialties began offering this plan in fall 2003 to UCCSN employees (See Exhibit 4.16, Part-time Instructors Medical Plan Materials). If a part-time employee works over 50% or .50 FTE, he or she becomes eligible for group health insurance benefits. Coverage begins on the first of the month following 90 days of continuous full-time employment.

Per federal mandate, newly hired part-time instructors will no longer pay into Social Security. Instead, their deductions will be directed to a FICA alternative plan beginning July 1, 2005. However, continuing part-time instructors will pay into Social Security unless they leave and return to service at a later date, at which point they will qualify for the FICA alternative. Any part-time instructor who had been working during the past fiscal year has the option of continuing in FICA or joining the FICA Alternative Retirement Plan. If there should be a break in service longer than one-year, the part-time employee will then be required to go into the FICA Alternative Retirement Plan. This shift for part-time instructors away from Social Security to FICA plans potentially removes an important benefit option for a number of part-time instructors.

All part-time instructors may participate in TMCC's voluntary retirement plans, the Tax Sheltered Annuity 403(b) Plan, or the Deferred Compensation 457 Plan. Under the terms of the FICA Alternative Retirement Plan, employees may contribute 7.5% of their gross salary to the plan commencing on their date of hire. The employee pre-tax contributions are invested into a 457 account. There are two retirement investment fund companies to choose from, ING Financial Services and The Hartford.

TMCC created the Office of Extended Day Services in 1997. The office later changed its name to the Part-time Faculty Support Center (PFSC); the PFSC offers mail services, voice mail service, GroupWise E-mail accounts, key services, printing, work space, computer stations, student conference space, test scanning, classroom supplies, and social space for all TMCC part-time instructors. Part-time instructors learn of these services

when they attend the orientation held jointly by the PFSC and academic departments at the start of each semester. TMCC was commended in the Part-time faculty Task Force Report for being ahead of the other UCCSN campuses in offering these services.

Another important part-time instructor benefit is the tuition waiver, which can be used by the part-time instructor, his or her spouse, and dependent children.<sup>††</sup> The fee waiver cannot be used at another institution, for Workforce Development and Continuing Education courses, or for summer school classes. Part-time instructors must use the tuition for the next regular semester following service at TMCC. Credits cannot be saved from one semester to another. The number of credits allowed is based upon the number of credits the part-time instructor taught for TMCC the previous semester up to a maximum of 6 credits.<sup>‡‡</sup> Lab fees, technology fees, and one-time application for admission fees are not included in the waiver.

The success of TMCC's efforts to improve the working lives of and benefits for part-time instructors is reflected in the final report of the UCCSN Part-time Faculty Task Force (See Exhibit 4.15, UCCSN Part-time Faculty Task Force Report). In this report, TMCC's support for part-time instructors was rated the highest overall among UCCSN institutions. Despite these positives, a number of factors involving part-time instructor benefits are beyond TMCC's control.

---

<sup>††</sup> Academic and administrative employees who are employed on a Letter of Appointment for less than .50 FTE are also eligible to receive grant-in-aid to pay for them or their families to enroll in TMCC classes.

<sup>‡‡</sup> Non-teaching faculty members earn equivalent credit waivers based on the formula of one credit for each 15 hours worked during the previous semester. Written verification of hours must be provided to the Part-time Faculty Support Center by the department in which the non-teaching faculty worked.

**Faculty Salary and Benefits—Retention (4.A.4 cont.)**

TMCC’s full-time faculty have worked at the College for as little as a year or less (10%, N = 15) to as many as 31 years. The mean among full-time instructors was 3.0 years, and the mean among tenured professors was 13.2 years. Overall, the average number of years of service for all full-time faculty members was 10.1 years, and the median was 7.5 years. Seventy-five percent of full-time faculty members reported that they had worked at TMCC for 5 years or more (Figure 4.4, Years Worked at TMCC).

**Years Worked at TMCC**

Years at TMCC	N	%
1 - 4 yrs	37	25%
5 - 9 yrs	51	34%
10 - 14 yrs	18	12%
15 - 31 yrs	42	28%
Total	148	100%

(Figure 4.4 Source: Human Resources Office)

The 2004 Survey on Campus Climate provides additional self-reported data on retention of faculty. When asked what their expectations were concerning their anticipated length of affiliation with TMCC, 76% of respondents reported that they plan on working at TMCC until retirement. Eleven percent planned to work several more years at TMCC and retire elsewhere. Six percent reported that they plan to leave in the near future and retire

elsewhere. Eight percent reported they had some “other” retirement plan (See Exhibit 4.17, 2004 Survey on Campus Climate for complete results of all faculty-specific questions. The complete results of this survey are also available on the TMCC Web site).

#### **Faculty Evaluation (4.A.5)**

Consistent with Policy 4.1, TMCC provides for regular and systematic evaluation of faculty performance in order to ensure teaching effectiveness and the fulfillment of instructional and other faculty responsibilities. TMCC’s faculty evaluation guidelines are outlined in the *Board of Regents Handbook* (Title 4 3.3 and Title 5 Section I 1-3).

UCCSN mandates that all faculty members be evaluated “at least once annually.” At TMCC, full-time faculty members complete an annual plan for each academic year in consultation with their immediate supervisors. The annual plan contains a list of tasks, duties, and responsibilities to be completed during the upcoming academic year drawn from a common menu (See Exhibit 4.4, Comparison of Previous and Current Faculty Evaluation Criteria Lists).<sup>§§</sup> Faculty members include a statement in their annual plan indicating their expected rating for having successfully completed their stated goals.

After supervisory approval, the annual plan is signed by the faculty member and his or her supervisor. At the end of the academic year, the faculty member submits a self-

---

<sup>§§</sup> As noted in 4.A.3, the Faculty Evaluation Criteria list has recently been revised and approved by the Faculty Senate. The new Faculty Evaluation Criteria will apply to both tenured and non-tenured faculty and will drive the formation of annual plans and the subsequent faculty evaluation process for the academic year 2005-06. Tenured faculty members under the newly revised criteria will undergo a three year evaluation cycle while non-tenured will continue to be evaluated each year. The NFA Contract also codifies evaluation criteria in accordance with the terms established by the Faculty Senate Professional Standards Committee and later approved by the Faculty Senate.

evaluation that details the degree to which the annual plan was fulfilled. The evaluator uses this self-evaluation and other mandated data – student, peer, and administrative teaching evaluations – and optional information such as peer evaluations collected by the evaluator over the course of the year. As prescribed in the *Board of Regents Handbook*, the faculty member may receive one of four ratings: excellent, commendable, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. Each evaluation option in the rating system is defined in a short narrative paragraph, and the definitions are made available to faculty (See Exhibit 4.18, Evaluation Rating System Materials).

Similar processes and procedures for evaluation are used for non-instructional faculty. Both librarians and counselors follow the above procedure, but these faculty members create annual plans using different criteria menus that are more appropriate for their positions (See Exhibit 4.19, Non-Instructional Faculty Evaluation Criteria). For example, the librarian evaluation criteria list substitutes the category “perform general collection development” in place of criteria referring to classroom teaching. The counseling department criteria make similar substitutions. For instance, counseling responsibility S15 requires counselors to “participate in maintaining the center’s goal of 75% direct student contact.” In both cases, these alternative faculty evaluation criteria lists went through a process of construction and revision with the Faculty Senate Professional Standards Committee and were later approved by the Faculty Senate, the Vice President of Academic Affairs, and the President. Questions posed by a Self-Study Standard 4 Committee member to library faculty revealed that the majority think their evaluation criteria are effective and fair. In contrast, counseling faculty reported that statistics

relevant to criteria S13 and S15 are no longer being used in the evaluation of counselors. In spring 2005, subsequent to Vice President of Student Services Chrysanthou's arrival, the counseling faculty met to revise their form. The results should be available for Faculty Senate approval in fall 2005.

TMCC has a similar but separate evaluation procedure for part-time instructors. Section 5.3 (i) of the NFA Contract directs department chairs to “[c]oordinate/oversee mentoring and evaluating [of] part-time faculty.”\*\*\* To accomplish this objective, department chairs receive and review student evaluations of part-time instructors every semester. The student evaluation forms are distributed and collected by the PFSC. This center scans and types student comments before distributing them to the appropriate dean's office. Copies are kept in the PFSC for three years. The PFSC distributes an “Instructor Self-Appraisal” form to part-time instructors, which they are encouraged but not required to complete. In addition, department chairs perform classroom observations of part-time instructors. Since part-time instructors work semester-to-semester, no yearly evaluation paperwork is completed. If an instructor performs poorly, he or she is given a reasonable opportunity and period of time, as determined by the department chair, to improve. If the department chair sees little evidence of improvement, the part-time instructor is not rehired.

Regarding evaluation instruments, TMCC has made an effort to standardize both the form and the implementation of the evaluation process. Faculty Senate considered a

---

\*\*\* As noted in 4.A.4, the NFA Contract recently went through a process of revision. The new NFA Contract begins July 1, 2005. Therefore, references to specific sections and content of the NFA Contract in this section refer to the NFA Contract that was operative the past two academic years (See Exhibit 4.11, 2004-05 NFA Contract and Future NFA Contract-July 1, 2005).

standard peer evaluation form in 2004, but, as of fall 2004, at least two different peer evaluation forms were in use across the campus (See Exhibit 4.20, Peer Evaluation Forms).

Faculty Senate chose one student evaluation form for use for both full-time and part-time instructors in 2003 (See Exhibit 4.21, Student Evaluation Form). Another aspect of student evaluation involves the evaluation of online courses. In fall 2003, TMCC offered 88 distinct courses (133 total sections) with an unduplicated student headcount of 2,184 and 659 FTE. In order to address the unique challenges of online education, the Teaching Technologies Office created two evaluation instruments that were designed for online courses. The student evaluation of online instruction differs from the form used in traditional classes by replacing questions specific to face-to-face instruction with questions that are appropriate for online instruction (See Exhibit 4.22, Online Student Course Evaluation Form). For example, onsite classroom categories like “began on time” and “full use of classroom hour” are replaced with online specific criteria like “homepage clarity” and “ease and efficiency of communication between student and instructor.” These forms were developed in the Teaching Technologies Office and the Faculty Senate Professional Standards Committee and approved by Faculty Senate, April 2004. The student evaluation of courses process is identical for both full-time and part-time instructors.

TMCC is equally committed to creating instruments for designing, improving, and evaluating the curricula, structure, and pedagogy of a given course for both full-time and

part-time instructors. For example, the Teaching Technologies Office developed and distributed two documents to assist faculty with the construction and evaluation of their web-based courses. Most significantly, the Teaching Technologies Office developed a list of 25 best practices to guide new instructors toward good online teaching practices and designed and implemented a separate informal self-evaluation sheet to provide guidance for instructors in the first term of online teaching. The Teaching Technologies Office developed this list by combining research into proven online teaching techniques and lessons learned through experience at TMCC. In addition, the Teaching Technologies Office distributed a November 2003 memo to department chairs and deans with four specific suggestions: (1) encourage best practices; (2) use the standardized form for web evaluation; (3) support faculty efforts to improve teaching online; (4) help to identify problems/solutions (See Exhibit 4.23, Teaching Technologies Memo-November 2003).

#### **The Recruitment and Appointment of Full-Time Faculty (4.A.6)**

TMCC has an orderly process for the recruitment and appointment of full-time faculty. TMCC's personnel policies and procedures are published and made available to faculty and are commensurate with system-wide guidelines and state and federal laws. The Human Resources Office Web site provides a full complement of TMCC manuals and handbooks, information regarding available positions, how to apply, and the application process (See Exhibit 4.24, Human Resources Employment Information). It also provides information for those seeking part-time positions.

In accordance with Title 2, Chapter 5, Section 5.4.1 of the UCCSN Code, recruitment and appointment procedures for new full-time faculty are in the *TMCC Administrative Manual*, Sections 2,507 - 2,510. Moreover, in accordance with TMCC's Bylaws, the NFA Contract articulates the process for recruitment in Chapter 4, Sections 8.1 and 8.2. These procedures begin with the initiation of the Position Opening Request by the hiring department, which includes: date of announcement, position title and position number, qualifications required, description of position, date position is available, application deadline, materials required from applicant, application procedures, terms of employment, affirmative action statement, salary or salary range, and funding source (See Exhibit 4.25, Position Opening Request Forms for 2005-06 Hiring Cycle).

TMCC subscribes to a broad-based recruitment campaign. Professional employment job opportunities are advertised globally via the Internet. Moreover, job opportunities are advertised nationally, regionally, and locally through a variety of publications, such as the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, HigherEdJobs.com, local and regional papers, and discipline-specific journals, publications, and list serves. TMCC is particularly cognizant of the need to advertise in publications read by ethnic minorities, females, disabled persons, and other protected groups pursuant to TMCC's equal employment opportunities philosophy and practices. TMCC also posts all job announcements on its Web site. Depending upon the nature of the job recruitment, the Human Resources Office may utilize direct mail options.

**Academic Freedom (4.A.7)**

Academic freedom for all UCCSN faculty is protected under Section 2.1.2 of the UCCSN Code, which states that faculty “shall not be subjected to censorship or discipline by the University and Community College System of Nevada on grounds that faculty member has expressed opinions or views which are controversial, unpopular, or contrary to the attitudes of the University and Community College System of Nevada or the community.” Additionally, UCCSN fosters freedom of expression for all its members in Section 2.3 of the UCCSN Code, which states faculty members are granted full freedom in research and publication of research results, literary, academic, and technical work (2.3.1 and 2.3.2). Faculty members are ensured full freedom in classroom discussions (2.3.3). When speaking, acting, or writing as a private citizen, a faculty member is free from institutional censorship or discipline (2.3.4). Academic freedom is not directly addressed under the terms of the NFA Contract. The NFA Contract serves as an addendum to the UCCSN Code. Therefore, anything not specifically addressed in the NFA Contract is subject to policy as articulated in the UCCSN Code.

UCCSN policy on academic freedom is available to faculty in the Faculty/Staff Handbook (Section Faculty Employment, p.11). The complete articulation of the UCCSN policy on academic freedom is available on TMCC’s Web site. During the process of compiling information for this report, the Self-Study Standard 4 Committee discovered that the UCCSN policy on academic freedom was not published in the Part-time Faculty Handbook; this oversight has since been corrected.

Within the last two years, a campus-wide discussion occurred regarding academic freedom issues. In 2003, a panel on the impact of assessment on academic freedom was held during the Nevada Community College Conference hosted by TMCC. Professor John Yarnevich represented TMCC on the panel, which included representatives from other community colleges in the state and representatives from NFA. About 40 faculty members attended the session, most from TMCC, and although the lively discussion yielded no solutions, it served to highlight the fact that faculty have some concerns about issues of academic freedom and that leadership needs to provide further forums for discussion.

#### **Qualifications of Part-Time Faculty (4.A.8)**

As noted in 4.A.1, TMCC's Faculty Qualifications Policy applies to both full- and part-time faculty and sets forth "standards that strengthen academic rigor and allow TMCC to maintain academic excellence and a reputation of providing high quality instruction." TMCC's part-time instructors are qualified by academic background, degree(s), and/or professional experience to carry out their teaching assignments and other prescribed duties and responsibilities in accordance with TMCC's commitment to the highest level of academic excellence. According to the *2004 TMCC FactBook*, in fall 2003, TMCC employed 389 part-time instructors. The PFSC recruits potential hires based on their academic background and expertise. The PFSC maintains personnel files on all applicants in their specific interest pools. As department chairs and deans determine the number and types of classes in need of part-time instructors, they review the resumes, transcripts, applications, and previous evaluations, if any, of those potential instructors

maintained in the appropriate discipline-specific application pool. The department chair or program coordinator then interviews applicants prior to hire.

Starting in summer 2004, the PFSC began tabulating part-time faculty by degree only. Since this self-study report uses fall 2003 as the target term, the PFSC staff had to manually research old files and were able to substantiate the following statistics (See Figure 4.5, Part-Time Faculty Degrees).

**Part-Time Faculty Degrees**

<b>Terminal Degree</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>% of pt faculty</b>
Bachelors	55	19.6%
Master's	124	44.1%
Doctorate	29	10.3%
Associate or Certification	29	10.3%
Not on file	44	15.7%
Total	281	100%

(Figure 4.5)

**Dissemination of Information to Part-Time Faculty (4.A.9)**

All part-time instructors are invited to attend an orientation meeting prior to the beginning of the fall and spring semesters. The employees are welcomed by the President, Vice President of Student Services, and Associate Dean of the PFSC. They also meet with the dean of their respective division, sign their contracts, receive a Part-

time Faculty Handbook, and listen to a variety of presentations delineating college policies and procedures. The administration addresses the importance of part-time and adjunct faculty and their contribution to TMCC. TMCC also hosts faculty training and technology workshops for all part-time instructors prior to the start of each semester. The training day workshops include hands-on technology training and a wide range of presentations centered on student learning, curriculum and grading, syllabus preparation, safety issues, and benefit materials (See Standard 4.A.4 for a fuller discussion of part-time faculty benefits).

#### **Policies Concerning the Use of Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty (4.A.10)**

As noted in 4.A.4, TMCC has evaluated its policies concerning the use of part-time and adjunct faculty and has aggressively lobbied the UCCSN for changes in part-time salary formula and work conditions. TMCC and the UCCSN have conducted surveys of part-time instructors. The most recent surveys were the 2002 UCCSN Part-time Faculty Task Force report and the fall 2002 TMCC Survey of Full-time Faculty regarding the role of part-time faculty at TMCC (See Exhibits 4.15 and 4.26, UCCSN Part-time Faculty Task Force Report and 2002 TMCC Survey of Full-time Faculty). Although the Task Force report placed TMCC at the top of UCCSN institutions for the quality of part-time instructor support –TMCC had already supplied part-time faculty members with email accounts, open-access computers, a designated meeting space, and voice mail accounts as recommended – the College is working to implement some of the other recommendations of this report. For example, TMCC has initiated a series of meetings to discuss ways to increase the number of under-represented minority part-time faculty members; it has

published the academic freedom rights of UCCSN faculty in the Part-time Faculty Handbook; and it has established a peer mentoring process organized through the PFSC. These changes respond to specific recommendations in the report (See Exhibit 4.15, UCCSN Part-time Faculty Task Force Report, pp. 4-6). The survey of full-time faculty members indicated a high level of enthusiasm for more interaction with and decision-making involvement of part-time faculty members. It is unclear to what extent departments and/or divisions have acted on this information and have or have not increased the role of part-time faculty members in the TMCC governance process.

## **Scholarship, Research, and Artistic Creation (4B)**

### **Relationship to Mission (4.B.1)**

As with the majority of community colleges, TMCC's institutional mission does not acknowledge scholarship, research, or artistic creation as a primary objective of the College or its faculty. Regardless of this fact, an impressive number of TMCC faculty members engage in some sort of scholarly or artistic endeavor as a part of their annual professional development, pursuit of expertise in their field, and commitment to knowledge and excellence in teaching.

As a part of the self-study process, in fall 2004 TMCC compiled a list of the scholarship and artistic work of its full-time faculty (See Exhibit 4.27, List of TMCC Faculty Scholarly and Artistic Production). This list reveals an impressive breadth and depth of scholarly and artistic production generated from the TMCC community. Examination of

this list reveals that faculty in the academic areas – particularly the humanities, social sciences, and the sciences – were especially active and productive. For example, as evidenced in faculty *Curriculum Vitae*, TMCC faculty members have published a number of full-length texts and journal articles as well as delivered presentations at numerous professional conferences (See Exhibit 4.28, Sample of Faculty Publications). Most of these efforts are a direct reflection of the faculty member’s subject of expertise; a smaller percentage of research and writing focus directly on the subject of pedagogy and practice.

In the arts, TMCC’s faculty produce and display works of art on a regular basis on the campus, in the greater Reno community, and even in locations outside of Nevada (See the Exhibit Room—Sample of TMCC Artistic Productions). Photography seems to be an area of particular strength. Similarly, in the performing arts, faculty members produce and direct public performances on a regular basis, and music faculty, in addition to directing TMCC students, perform annually in professional organizations such as the Reno Philharmonic Orchestra (See Exhibit 4.29, Performing Arts Materials).

#### **College Policies Regarding Scholarship, Research, and Artistic Creation (4.B.2-4)**

TMCC’s institutional policies and procedures, including ethical considerations, concerning scholarship, research, and artistic creation, are clearly communicated in UCCSN publications and in some TMCC publications. The *Administrative Manual* contains several policies regarding scholarship, research, and artistic creation: the President may grant a one-year leave of absence for faculty to pursue research and, presumably, art projects (p. 149); sabbatical projects may involve research as long as that

research is “directly related” to the faculty member’s work at TMCC (p. 150); faculty members may have access to student records for research purposes if they have written permission of the students and the President (p. 162); the UCCSN intellectual property policy is reprinted (p. 230). Regarding the use of human subjects in research, permission must be granted through the Human Subjects Review Board (See Exhibit 4.30, Human Subjects Policy). This policy was distributed to all TMCC faculty members through email.

TMCC faculty members have a role in the development and administration of research policies and practices at the College. For example, the Faculty Senate Professional Standards Committee created the current sabbatical policy and procedures, and through the efforts of Psychology Professor Armida Fruzzetti, TMCC developed a human subjects research policy commensurate with national standards for such policies; all TMCC based human subject research projects are monitored by a faculty committee based at the University of Nevada, Reno.

Because TMCC’s exclusive mission is teaching, faculty scholarship has not been an institutional priority in the past. In fact, a perception remains among some in the administration and the faculty that scholarly and artistic work is somehow “inappropriate” and “antithetical” to the community college mission. Sabbatical awards can be given for projects involving research, but the faculty member must show the direct and explicit impact of a research-based sabbatical project to teaching and ultimately TMCC’s students’ success. The nature of the wording of the sabbatical application as it

currently stands reflects this philosophical antagonism, or lack of understanding, between the college culture as it has existed and the perception of more recently hired faculty members (See Exhibit 4.31, Sabbatical Application). For these faculty members, scholarship and artistic production are inextricably intertwined with their classroom success and approach. As a result of this generational shift within the faculty, TMCC's culture is beginning to change as more and more faculty insist upon seeing the connection between their scholarly and artistic work and their success as teachers in the classroom.

#### **Faculty Assignments and Opportunities (4.B.5)**

Sabbatical awards are the main demonstration of support for faculty work in these areas. Faculty members can also use their scholarly and artistic work to satisfy criteria under the professional development category of their annual plan. The only other potential reward is more informal. Faculty scholarly and artistic accomplishments are noted in the TMCC weekly E-Newsletter; on occasion, the President will make mention of these faculty accomplishments in his newsletter or in the State of the College address.

#### **Grant Funded Research (4.B.6)**

While TMCC does not directly sponsor any faculty grant-funded research, in recent years a number of faculty members have conducted research funded by federal and state grants. For example, a TMCC English professor co-authored a three year Eisenhower grant with a member of the University of Nevada, Reno, Education Department and a representative of the Washoe County School District. The grant was used to fund the training of part-time faculty teaching in TMCC's Developmental English program and to conduct

research into the ways that high school English teachers, forced to teach to standards that do not correlate with college level writing expectations, necessarily create the number of students entering into UCCSN institutions with developmental writing skills (See Exhibit 4.32, TMCC-UNR-WCSD Eisenhower Grant Materials).

Faculty members in the sciences have been particularly active in research. Between 1995 and 2000, a number of TMCC chemistry and biology faculty were funded through the Nevada Teaching and Research-Enhancement and Collaboration Program (NV TREC) (See Exhibit 4.33, NV TREC Grant Materials). This grant was part of a National Science Foundation program funding collaborative research projects for community college and university faculty. A physics and astronomy professor has been funded to do research with NASA. Currently, a biology faculty member is participating in a 5 year grant-funded project through the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The overall grant is for 17.4 million and is designed to improve biomedical research infrastructure statewide. This grant is funded for approximately \$200,000 per year, and the faculty member will design and run a program for incoming first year students from targeted populations to increase their success in introductory life science courses (Exhibit 4.34, NIH Grant Materials).

#### **Academic Freedom (4.B.7)**

As noted in 4.A.7, some faculty members have expressed concerns about issues of academic freedom in the classroom and in terms of public discussion. Hence, TMCC has hosted, and hopefully will continue to hold, lively debate on the issue of academic freedom, public discourse, and assessment concerns. In contrast, there is no correlating

concern regarding academic freedom and scholarly or artistic pursuits. The Self-Study Standard 4 Committee found no indication of infringements on or concerns about academic freedom to pursue individual scholarly or artistic projects as a part of faculty professional development.

### **Analysis and Appraisal**

The Self-Study Standard 4 Committee recognizes that TMCC has a well-qualified and dedicated faculty. TMCC has clearly made a particularly strong commitment to its faculty, and in doing so to its goal of academic excellence, in the following six ways:

1) TMCC holds to a very high standard in hiring both full-time and part-time faculty. 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. TMCC is clearly committed to recruiting and hiring qualified faculty in support of its first strategic goal: “To foster an institutional culture that values, demands and supports excellence in teaching and learning” (*Strategic Planning*, p. 4). 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 for TMCC 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 TMCC has been able to add new full-time faculty each year as enrollment grows, the College offers more credits with continued growth and needs to hire more part-time faculty to teach them, so the ratio of full- to part-time faculty has only improved marginally.

2) TMCC has shown a demonstrable increase in its commitment to shared governance. The 1995 Northwest Committee report contained one strong recommendation that applied to the issue of shared governance and faculty participation. The Committee noted that “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 the area of shared governance, and numerous formal and informal mechanisms for faculty input are in place and functioning. Faculty members make up approximately 32% of the Planning Council, the primary committee reflecting TMCC’s commitment to shared governance. Along with those faculty members serving on the Planning Council, faculty members have the opportunity to attend Planning Council meetings and can participate in the questions and comments portion of the meeting.

In the 2004 TMCC Climate Study, 55% of faculty agreed that TMCC has a shared sense of direction, and 76% agreed that the College is committed to assessing its effectiveness at achieving its educational mission. While overall the numbers demonstrated that faculty members have a much better sense of their own participation in institutional

governance, the Survey on Campus Climate indicates 41% of faculty agreed that communication between faculty and administration was effective, perhaps reflecting some room for continued growth in the future regarding shared governance.

3) TMCC's faculty members make salaries that are among the highest in the mountain west region. UCCSN salary and benefits policies are clearly stated in the *Board of Regents Handbook*. Specific institution policies on faculty salaries and benefits are clearly stated in the TMCC Faculty\Staff Handbook and the NFA Contract. Procedures for initial placement and movement on the salary schedule have been refined since the last self-study cycle, 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 TMCC's complete mission.

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 TMCC, specifically in the technical areas. Faculty members at the IGT Applied Technology 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 this section may not be implemented at TMCC. The Faculty Senate Professional Standards Committee is seeking to remedy the situation and approved the following motion at their December 10, 2004 meeting: "The Professional Standards Committee supports equitable movement by all faculty across the salary scale in accordance with

UCCSN Board of Regents Handbook.” TMCC leadership is currently reviewing the professional advancement procedure and expects to present their findings to Faculty Senate in fall 2005.

4) TMCC has instituted a clear workload policy that ensures fair distribution of TMCC’s work and compensation. 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 included internship, practicum and lab, as well as student to instructor ratios mandated by accrediting agencies. The Commission noted that a need for clarification about coordinator duties existed (p. 27). As a result, the report contained a formal recommendation in the workload area:

It is recommended that [TMCC] 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 Northwest Accreditation 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 TMCC 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 indicated that the College was taking a number of positive steps to address TMCC’s workload policy (See Exhibit 4.35, 2003 Accreditation Progress Report). However, with the articulation of its most recent workload policy, TMCC has made great strides in addressing the issue (See Exhibit 4.3, 2004 TMCC Workload Policy). The new workload policy addresses the 1995 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 faculty members complete a survey that requires them to divide their time into specific categories to help to determine workload content. The survey results are a tangible way to determine exactly how much faculty time is spent on professional development, community activities, teaching, 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 in the NFA Contract. 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.

5) TMCC has developed a comprehensive and equitable evaluation system that is generally fairly applied. The 1995 Northwest Accreditation report cited faculty evaluation as an area of significant concern. In fact, the 1995 report made evaluation changes part of a general recommendation, precipitating a focused interim report 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, leadership instituted a college-wide evaluation process that involved the creation of faculty annual plans and the inclusion of student and administrative evaluations in the process. In July 1997, TMCC 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 some concern at TMCC and one that continues to garner attention from both administration and the Faculty Senate (See Exhibit 4.36, Supplemental Standard 4 Analysis Document for greater depth of current discussion regarding faculty evaluation process).

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 Survey on Campus Climate shows clear faculty satisfaction in two areas. For instance, 62% of faculty respondents think that there is an effective process in place for evaluation by the immediate supervisor versus 53% in 2002. One significant change was made in this area during that interval: the designation 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 2004 Survey on Campus Climate 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, faculty members seem to be expressing some dissatisfaction with evaluation above the level of immediate supervisor. The number for satisfaction with peer evaluation is even lower and clearly indicates a desire for more inclusion of peers in the evaluation process.

While the Survey on Campus Climate provides a general picture of faculty perceptions of evaluation, the Self-Study 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 Survey on Campus Climate as it asks more specific questions (See Exhibit 4.37, Supplemental Survey on Faculty Evaluation Process). 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 Survey on Campus Climate. 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 faculty members believe that the evaluation process 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.

6) The Self-Study Standard 4 Committee commends TMCC for its extensive support of part-time faculty as evidenced by the UCCSN Part-time Faculty Task Force results.

While there is still work to be done, especially in terms of compensation and medical benefits, TMCC has demonstrated a consistent willingness to lobby the UCCSN and the Board of Regents on behalf of its part-time instructors and to think in innovative ways to address the daily work environment of this significant constituency.

### **Next Steps**

In order for TMCC to achieve its full potential, the Self-Study Standard 4 Committee recommends that leadership consider the following recommendations:

- hire more faculty members in crucial public service areas such as Health Sciences (nursing in particular).
- raise the number of courses taught by full-time faculty to sixty percent.
- continue examination of faculty evaluation procedures to put greater emphasis on teaching excellence and faculty development.
- continue examination of the distribution of release time and campus service to ensure equity.
- continue examination of the workload of faculty in Health Sciences and Industrial Technology to ensure that they are compensated fairly and in keeping with national standards.
- provide more opportunities for part-time instructors to develop their teaching skills, content knowledge, and understanding of TMCC policies.

- continue to develop the collection of data on all faculty members to allow ready access to information regarding qualifications, workload, and reasons for leaving the institution.
- recognize the role played by faculty scholarship/art/performance as crucial to faculty professional development and teaching excellence in many of the academic disciplines.
- continue lobbying efforts to increase full-time faculty salaries (particularly in response to rising area housing costs) and to stop the gradual erosion of benefits.
- continue lobbying efforts to increase part-time salaries.
- increase the participation of part-time faculty in academic departments.
- continue recruitment of under-represented minority faculty in both full-time and part-time faculty ranks.
- examine academic freedom in theory and practice at TMCC to ensure that both faculty and administration understand its parameters and importance, and that all are vigilant of any encroachments on that freedom.

### **Closing Statement**

Reading TMCC's 1995 Self-Study report reads like a document from a different institution. The 1995 report is the product 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 in 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. TMCC 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.

**Note to Brandy: Significant page break here before next section: policy 4.1**

## **Faculty Evaluation (Policy 4.1)**

### **Integrity of the Faculty Evaluation Process (Policy 4.1.A-D)**

The internal evaluation plans and procedures for TMCC's full-time faculty were developed during negotiations between TMCC's bargaining unit – the Nevada Faculty Alliance (NFA) – the Faculty Senate, and administration. The terms of the current contract were finalized in spring 2003; the faculty evaluation procedure is outlined in Article 7 of that contract.<sup>†††</sup> The plans and procedures for the evaluation of part-time faculty were a part of this negotiation process as well. In addition, non-instructional faculty in counseling and TMCC's libraries participated in the creation of modified performance criteria for their areas.

The faculty evaluation process includes an assessment of faculty members' content knowledge and pedagogical success in delivering that content in the classroom via the inclusion of student evaluations as a primary evaluation tool. The primary evaluation data – student evaluations and administrative evaluations of teaching – are delivered directly to the faculty member's immediate supervisor. In the case of part-time faculty, the PFSC collects evaluation data and delivers the results to the instructor's direct supervisor.

Since teaching and learning are at the center of TMCC's mission and academic excellence is its first strategic goal, the faculty evaluation menu reflects in its criteria list teaching excellence as a faculty member's primary responsibility. The faculty evaluation

---

<sup>†††</sup> During spring 2005, NFA and administration revised the NFA Contract primarily around department chair compensation and responsibilities and workload policy. The new NFA Contract becomes official July 1, 2005.

criteria menu includes items S.1, S.2, and S.9 that require faculty members to meet classes and to receive “satisfactory” student evaluations and administrative classroom/lab observations. Multiple indices are used as follows:

- Student evaluations of instruction are distributed and collected in every TMCC course section. Beginning in fall 2003, department chairs began to observe full-time faculty as well as part-time faculty in the classroom. Because department chairs are faculty members and not administrators, this added an element of peer assessment to the evaluation process. The evaluation process stipulates that deans are the final evaluating authority. In this process, student, peer, and administrative evaluations of instruction take place on a yearly basis.
- The production of research/scholarship/art is not part of TMCC’s mission, and the evaluation process does not place these kinds of activities at its center; however, scholarly and artistic projects are often an important element of ongoing faculty development, and as such are considered professional development activities in annual plans and annual evaluations. For example, faculty evaluation criteria option E.12 allows a faculty member to achieve the rank of excellent in the area of professional growth through the publication of professional materials.
- Elements of service are incorporated into the annual plan and are measured during the annual evaluation. Faculty members may earn credit toward a commendable or excellent evaluation by belonging to and serving in professional organizations. This type of service is a choice and not required. The annual plan lists service on one Faculty Senate committee and at least one screening committee (as needed) in order to achieve a satisfactory evaluation. Other types of service – e. g. service on

Faculty Senate or a probationary committee – count toward a commendable ranking. The form requires that faculty members “actively” participate in college service activities. Community service is factored into the menu as well, and service in this area can help a faculty member achieve a ranking of commendable or excellent (See Exhibit 4.4 Comparison of Previous and Current Faculty Evaluation Criteria Lists).

- Untenured faculty members compile a tenure binder that tracks and documents their performance in the areas of teaching, professional development, and service. Based on the requirements outlined in the *Board of Regents Handbook*, TMCC’s tenure guidelines require narrative summaries and collections of evidence that demonstrate competency in the areas of teaching effectiveness, service to the TMCC community and the public, ability to work with colleagues, and personal integrity (See Exhibit 4.38, Tenure Filing Materials).
- Professional counseling faculty members are evaluated using substitute indices of performance. In addition to student evaluations and observations by the counseling director, measurable performance standards (completion of note screens and participation toward a 75% direct student contact goal) are included in the counseling faculty evaluation criteria (See Exhibit 4.19, Non-Instructional Faculty Evaluation Criteria).

Section 9.2 of the NFA Contract details the process for dealing with an unsatisfactory evaluation for a tenured faculty member. In short, upon receiving an unsatisfactory

evaluation, the faculty member is instructed to form a committee – a Faculty Support Committee – to guide the faculty member to an improved performance. That committee forms a plan with the faculty member. After approval by the evaluator, the committee works to assist the faculty member with that plan. This committee submits a report to the faculty member’s evaluator at the end of the academic year that details his or her progress.

When a faculty member’s performance needs improvement but falls short of an unsatisfactory evaluation, it is the responsibility of the immediate supervisor to identify these areas and to require that a plan of improvement be created and followed. The yearly evaluation is the tool through which these identifications are expressed to the faculty member. In combination with the annual plan, the supervisor and faculty member can agree on a specific plan for improvement if necessary. For example, faculty evaluation criterion S.2 requires faculty members to use student evaluations “as a means to grow and change.”

The process for non-tenured faculty is considerably more intensive. Non-tenured faculty members meet twice yearly with their tenure committee to ensure that progress is being made toward the standards of tenure, and a member of this committee observes the faculty member in the classroom every semester. In addition, a department chair or dean observes the faculty member in the classroom once per year before tenure. If the faculty member’s performance is not satisfactory and does not improve with coaching from the tenure committee and/or the supervisor, the faculty member may be given a notice of

termination (See Exhibit 4.39, Spring 2005 Board of Regents Policy on Notice of Termination).