Three Case Studies for Faculty Development at Community Colleges

Documentation as requested on announcement

1) Primary presenter information and curriculum vitae or short biographical sketch: The primary presenter is the designated point of contact for the presentation and will receive all information regarding the presentation. This person is responsible for sharing all communication with additional presenters.

Markus Pomper, Dean of Math and Science, Roane State Community College, pomperm@roanestate.edu

Dr. Pomper serves as the Dean of the Division of Math and Sciences at Roane State Community College. Previously he chaired the Mathematics Department at Indiana University East, where he implemented several online programs in Mathematics and dramatically increased the enrollment of the program. Dr. Pomper's research focuses on the community and collaboration in teaching and leadership.

2) Additional presenter information (if applicable):   Name, title, institution and email.

Kathy Arcangeli, Chair, Mathematics, Roane State Community College
Jala Daniel, Chair, Biology, Roane State Community College

3) Title of presentation: Maximum of 10 words.

Three Case Studies for Faculty Development at Community Colleges

4) Abstract: 25-50 words. If selected, the abstract you submit will become the basis for the session description in the conference program and on the website, therefore we recommend that you use a direct and active writing style that explains clearly what participants will learn during your session.

This interactive session explores ways in which an academic division at a community college developed a program of faculty development and evaluation. We will discuss teaching evaluations for faculty, mentoring in preparation for tenure, and developing of a support system for both probationary and adjunct faculty.

5) Keywords: Five (5) keywords about your presentation. These are used to help participants search for sessions in the conference proceedings.

Faculty development, mentoring, tenure, changing expectations.

6) Presentation topic themes: Faculty development

7) Target audience: <u>New</u>, intermediate, experienced or all department chairs.

8) Type of presentation: <u>Interactive workshop</u>, best practice presentation, or roundtable discussion.

9) Objective(s) of the presentation: Purpose of the session, what the audience can expect to gain from attending the session.

Participants will compare and contrast ways in which a program for development and evaluation of adjunct and full-time faculty can be created.

10) Description of the session (300 -500 words): Include the relevance of the session to chairpersons, presentation focus, recommendations that will be made for chairpersons, and how the audience will be involved.

The session will focus on creating a program for faculty development in response to changing expectations to faculty work and staffing patterns. Roane State Community College has eight campuses, and serves 6,500 students in a rural area. Recent growth in enrollment within the division was compensated through increased use of adjunct faculty. The tenure and promotion process at Roane State allows all tenured faculty members in the division to vote. Traditionally, faculty have relied on personal knowledge of tenure candidates in making their decisions. Similarly, department chairs used word-of-mouth in making decisions for reappointment of adjuncts. Because faculty are often based at one campus and have little interaction with faculty on other campuses, this system of evaluation was no longer feasible.

Session participants will be presented with descriptions of the problems and propose solutions. We will then present the approach taken at Roane State.

Mentoring the faculty

The first case study will consider our efforts in providing guidance to tenure probationary faculty. Being a community college, teaching is the primary criterion for tenure. We will show how we refined the focus of classroom observation, from a cursory review of single class periods to in-depth assessment of instruction, faculty-student interaction, and course design. As a second piece to the mentoring process, we will show how the use of annual promotion and tenure workshops was used to direct faculty in focusing their efforts throughout the probationary period on documenting success in the criteria for promotion and tenure.

Mentoring the mentors

At Roane State a tenured faculty member is assigned to guide the tenure-probationary faculty through the probationary period. In the second case study, we will describe how a mentoring program was developed to clarify mentor responsibilities and to achieve departmental consistency in the mentoring process. An essential component of the tenure-track faculty evaluation procedure is the tenure

portfolio. Our program describes the objectives for faculty mentors, including specific suggestions of evidence that mentors can encourage the faculty member to use as supportive evidence of the tenure portfolio.

Adjunct Faculty

With less full-time tenure track positions being offered at the college, we have come to rely on hiring adjunct faculty to teach our learning support and lower-level math/science courses. In order to help our adjuncts know they are a valued facet of our division we have developed a mentoring and review process to ensure adjunct success.

Much like tenure-probationary faculty, new adjunct faculty are observed several times during their first year, and their annual evaluation is based on the class observation reports. In order to better integrate the adjunct faculty into the division, we have to some degree standardized the curriculum. Our third case study will focus on the efforts taken by the Biology department. Here, we developed a series of descriptive lab schedules, which describe in detail the activities and the learning objectives for each lab session.

We will conclude the session with a question and answer period.