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Charge to Reengineering Task Force

To **examine and rethink** every aspect of our organization and operations, other than governance, in order to afford us the resources and opportunities needed to serve our students.
Charge to Reengineering Task Force II

Develop performance metrics for each of the reengineering recommendations ("10 Big Ideas")

Monitor progress on implementation of the recommendations

Continue to pursue new ideas
How Can I Become Engaged?

- Become familiar with the website (www.rethink.vccs.edu) and the initiatives underway
- Read the Chancellor’s emails to you
- Contact your CFAC representative or the various workgroup leads with questions or ideas
- Submit ideas to the Chancellor directly at rethink@vccs.edu
Faculty Evaluation
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Three Components of the Proposal

Faculty Evaluation

Annual Performance and Professional Development Objectives

Reward and Recognition System
Evaluation Ratings

Change from five ratings to two

From: Excellent / Very Good / Good / Fair….
To: Meets Expectations / Does Not Meet Expectations

1st year – two evaluations.
2nd and 3rd years – one per year.
Multi-year contracts – last year of contract.
Annual Performance and Professional Development Objectives

Faculty meet with dean each year to establish annual performance and professional development objectives.

Items will be developed to reflect the four sections of the Annual Performance and Professional Development Objectives:

- Teaching,
- Scholarly Engagement,
- Institutional Responsibility and Service.
Reward and Recognition

Designed to acknowledge “300 hitters”
– (Dr. Frank Friedman)

Each college will devise a plan to provide reward and recognition of outstanding service for teaching faculty whose performance exemplifies the highest standards in educational excellence.

Reward ~ bonus, travel, or percentage raise
Recognition ~ de minimus awards
Next Task

Design standards and criteria for evaluation:

Teaching, Scholarly Engagement, Institutional Responsibility and Service

What skills, behaviors, actions, activities, performance, talents, expertise, or talents are expected of faculty?

How might these standards and criteria differ by seniority level or by disciplines or course delivery method?
Got an Idea?

Want to review the proposal?

Want to comment?

Want the Chancellor to read your idea?

rethink.vccs.edu
Articulate Learning Outcomes to Enhance Student Success
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Articulate Learning Outcomes

Articulate learning outcomes for prerequisite courses and courses with high enrollment currently demonstrating low success rates and/or low persistence rates to subsequent courses and award completion.
Target ALO Outcomes

• Improve learning outcomes.
• Increase student success.
• Contain costs.
• Improve adjunct faculty integration.
• Facilitate SACS accreditation.
• Increase data-driven decision making.
• Provide focused professional development.
• Develop metrics.
Deliverables for Each Course System-wide Adoption

- Revised course description.
- Revised course prerequisites (if necessary).
- Detailed student learning outcomes.
- Student achievement metrics and benchmarks.
- Multiple assessment methodologies.
System-wide Options
Local Adoption

- Open-source or publisher provided learning objects.
- Research-based instructional standards and strategies.
- Professional development strategy.
- On-campus, hybrid, and online model courses.
The Faculty Role

• Faculty led
• Communication
  – 20+ Peer Group presentations
  – CFAC, deans, VPs, presidents, State Board
  – Rethink website & Chancellor’s emails
  – Faculty survey
Where We’ve Been, Where We’re Going

• How-To Guide created

• First three ALO Courses
  ▪ PSY 200: Spring 2012
    Dennis Abry, PVCC, chair
  ▪ BIO 101 & ACC 211: Fall 2012
PSY 200 ALO Curriculum Committee Process

• Feb.-March
  – Course goals and outcomes discussion

• March-April
  – Draft outcomes and assessment plans to faculty

• March-June
  – Revision and adoption
PSY 200 Process

• June
  – *Pilot Team applications due*

• June-August
  – Learning objects and best practices
  – Pilot Team awards
ALO Process

• September
  – PSY 200 deliverables submitted to VCCS governance process
  – Pilot Course development

• September
  – ACC 211 and BIO 101 Curriculum Committees constituted
New Faculty Roles
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Purpose

• Our goal is to create new faculty positions which will:
  – Provide greater flexibility in hiring part-time and full-time faculty
  – Create new types of faculty positions
  – Increase proportion of FT faculty positions
  – Provide opportunities for faculty to have other roles at the college (administrative, student services, etc.)
Workgroup Membership

- 1 College President – represents ACOP
- 5 Vice Presidents – represents ASAC
- 11 Dean’s/Coordinators – represents CODD
- 8 Faculty – represents CFAC
- 3 Human Resource personnel
- 2 Workforce Development personnel
- 1 Institutional Research representative
- 1 Vice Chancellor for Academic Services/Research
New Approved Roles
(effective Fall 2012)

• Associate Instructor (aka Lecturer)
  – One year contract (can be renewed)
  – Predominately teaching with student engagement (no governance)

• Part-time 9-month Teaching Faculty
  – Same expectations as FT 9-month teaching faculty; pro-rated to % less than FT

• 10-month Teaching Faculty
  – Intended for program heads and/or faculty teaching on non-traditional calendars
Roles Under Consideration

• 3 semester faculty
  – Same responsibilities as 9-month faculty but would teach fall, spring, and summer
  – Not intended for added administrative duties

• Distance Learning only faculty

• Contracted Adjunct
  – Would allow a college to offer an adjunct a contract for fall and spring

• Super teacher / Lead teacher concept
Current Activities/Timeline

• March 2012
  – Sub-workgroups working on the remaining new roles and developing proposals for any we’d like to add to the overall faculty spectrum

• April 2012
  – Next full workgroup meeting on April 3
  – Draft proposals sent to CFAC for input April 5-6
  – Draft proposals sent to CODD and ASAC for input
Current Activities/Timeline

• May 2012
  – Full workgroup will meet to refine all proposals
  – Proposals submitted to ASAC May 22-23

• June 2012
  – Any approved new roles will be submitted to ACOP for discussion
Questions and Comments