

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 508

JC 740 073

AUTHOR Zaharis, John L.  
TITLE Developing Guidelines for Faculty Reduction in a Multicampus College.  
INSTITUTION Miami-Dade Junior Coll., Fla.  
PUB DATE Apr 73  
NOTE 31p.  
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29  
DESCRIPTORS \*Administrative Policy; Administrative Problems; \*Community Colleges; Enrollment Influences; Enrollment Projections; \*Enrollment Rate; Evaluation Criteria; Guidelines; \*Job Tenure; Student Teacher Ratio; \*Teacher Dismissal; Teacher Qualifications; Teacher Supply and Demand; Teaching Quality

ABSTRACT

Miami-Dade Community College experienced continuous growth from 1960 through 1971. But the college suffered an unexpected sharp decline in enrollment for fall, 1972. A college-wide committee was formed to develop criteria to be used in the staff reduction program for the 1973-74 year. It was decided that, when it was determined that a department was overstaffed, the following approach would be used: (1) faculty and staff would be viewed as two groups, annual contract personnel and continuing contract personnel; (2) in general, annual contract personnel would be dismissed before continuing contract personnel; and (3) within each group, time of service would be immaterial. The following criteria would be used to select individuals to be dismissed: educational qualifications, efficiency in performance, compatibility, character, and capacity to meet the needs of the community. Although it was first anticipated that 84 professional staff would be released, normal attrition, retirements, etc. reduced the number to 56. Thirty-one faculty were transferred from North Campus to South Campus and Downtown Campus. Of those released, 51 were on annual contract and 5 on continuing contract. Two of the continuing contract employees were administrators. Of the 77 black professionals at the college, six were dismissed. A study was made of factors causing the decrease in enrollment, and the committee recommended specific recruitment efforts to the college to increase enrollment. (KM)

ED 087508

JC 740 073

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-  
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM  
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-  
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS  
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT  
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Developing Guidelines for  
Faculty Reduction in  
A Multicampus College

by

John L. Zaharis  
Miami-Dade Community College

## PREFACE

This paper is the result of the participation of the author in meetings of a campus committee to develop preliminary guidelines to be submitted to the College Committee, and participation in the all-college committee deliberations which produced the guidelines finally approved by the Board of Trustees.

Additional information required to place the necessity for faculty terminations in perspective was obtained from several sources. Mr. Gustave G. Wenzel, Director of Institutional Research, provided some of the statistics on student projections, and the information on the funding formula used to determine State revenues. Mr. Samuel La Roue provided some data concerning FTE's reported to the State for the Fall of 1971 and 1972, as well as figures on non-credit students.

Special recognition is due my mentor, Ambrose Garner, Vice President of South Campus, who made it possible for me to participate in all sessions devoted to development of the guidelines, and for providing me with all documents developed by the College Committee, as well as working documents used in implementation of the guidelines. His review and helpful suggestions in the completion of the final draft of this paper are greatly appreciated.

# Developing Guidelines For Faculty Reduction In A Multicampus College

## History of the College

Miami-Dade Community College is a publicly supported, two-year community college in the 28 member Florida System of Community Colléges with central administrative headquarters in Tallahassee, Florida. From 1960-1968, the College was governed by the local Dade County Board of Public Instruction and an appointive, five-member advisory committee assisting the College President.

Effective July 1, 1968, junior college districts were created as independent, separate legal entities for the operation of community junior colleges, by action of the Florida Legislature. Miami-Dade's Advisory Committee became the District Board of Trustees.

The District Board of Trustees is responsible to the State Board of Education and the State Commissioner of Education. Community College affairs are administered by a seven-member Council in the Division of Community Colleges of the State Department of Education.

During the first year of operation, 1,400 students registered for courses in portable buildings on temporary campus sites. By the fall of 1971, 38,106 students were enrolled on three campuses and six off-campus centers.

The oldest and largest, in terms of enrollment as well as physical plant, is the North Campus, located on a 245 acre site in North Miami. Facilities include the Paul R. Scott Hall, with administrative offices and classrooms; the

Mitchell Wolfson Learning Resources Center, containing library, auditoriums, and audio-visual facilities; the J. Neville McArthur Hall of Science and Technology, with laboratories for technical studies; the William D. Pawley Creative Arts Center, housing art, music, and drama instruction facilities; the John F. Kennedy Health Center, with a 5,000-seat gymnasium; a student center; a number of reconditioned military buildings, and athletic fields.

In addition, a one-story experimental building for innovative instruction was just completed, and construction is now underway on a new classroom building, targeted for completion in 1973.

The second major center established by Miami-Dade Community College, South Campus, opened in January, 1967, after a year and a half interim operation in temporary quarters. Miami-Dade South is located on a 185-acre site 22 miles southwest of Miami-Dade North.

Present facilities include the Leonard A. Usina Hall of Science, with administrative offices and classrooms; the Niles Trammell Learning Resources Center, with library, auditoriums, and audio-visual facilities; the Alfred L. McCarthy Classroom Building, with faculty offices and classrooms; the Theodore R. Gibson Health Center, with gymnasium and swimming pool; a Fine Arts building, College Administration building, and athletic fields.

Newest member of Miami-Dade's multi-campus operation, the Downtown Campus, opened in the Fall of 1970, operating in temporary quarters pending completion of permanent facilities in 1973.

## Growth Pattern

The total college student enrollment for the years 1960 through 1971 was one of steady growth until the Fall Term, 1972 [Table I]. There was no indication in these figures that the decrease in credit student enrollment shown for 1972 was imminent.

TABLE I  
MIAMI-DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE ENROLLMENT - FALL TERM  
1960-72

---

<u>Year</u>	<u>Credit Students</u>	<u>Non-Credit Students</u>	<u>Total</u>
1960-61	1,388	40	1,428
1961-62	3,341	203	3,544
1962-63	5,735	403	6,138
1963-64	7,946	1,680	9,626
1964-65	10,822	1,511	12,333
1965-66	14,513	2,468	16,981
1966-67	18,531	2,402	20,933
1967-68	21,661	1,680	23,341
1968-69	24,098	2,251	26,349
1969-70	26,371	3,004	29,375
1970-71	28,233	5,591	33,824
1971-72	30,853	7,253	38,106
1972-73	28,025	8,499	36,524

NORTH CAMPUS

(For years 1960-1965, see above listing)

---

<u>Year</u>	<u>Credit</u>	<u>Non-Credit</u>	<u>Total</u>
1965-66	12,937	2,102	15,039
1966-67	14,396	2,044	16,440
1967-68	15,100	1,272	16,372
1968-69	15,982	1,521	17,503
1969-70	16,454	1,762	18,216
1970-71	16,873	3,136	20,009
1971-72	17,961	3,785	21,746
1972-73	15,889	3,149	19,038

SOUTH CAMPUS

---

<u>Year</u>	<u>Credit</u>	<u>Non-Credit</u>	<u>Total</u>
1965-66	1,576	366	1,942
1966-67	4,135	358	4,493
1967-68	6,561	408	6,969
1968-69	8,116	730	8,846
1969-70	9,917	1,242	11,159
1970-71	10,957	1,837	12,794
1971-72	12,037	2,840	14,877
1972-73	11,125	3,208	14,333

DOWNTOWN CAMPUS

---

<u>Year</u>	<u>Credit</u>	<u>Non-Credit</u>	<u>Total</u>
1970-71	403	618	1,021
1971-72	855	629	1,483
1972-73	1,011	2,142	3,153

Table II presents the Faculty/Staff Statistics for the years 1962-1972. These figures represent actual faculty employed.

TABLE II  
FACULTY<sup>1</sup>/STAFF STATISTICS

<u>Year</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Administrators</u>
1962-63	156	22
1963-64	230	22
1964-65	330	25
1965-66	431	41
1966-67	543	54
1967-68	678	52
1968-69	766	25 <sup>2</sup>
1969-70	860	42
1970-71	903	55
1971-72	936	60
1972-73	965	59

<sup>1</sup>Full-time faculty only

<sup>2</sup>A change in classification of administrator accounts for this lower number.



## The Crisis

Miami-Dade Community College had experienced a period of continuous growth through the years 1960-1971. No change in the growth patterns was anticipated when enrollment projections for the Fall semester, 1972-73 were made (Table III). These projections were made in October 1971. As admission applications and early registration figures were received, it was not apparent during July and August 1972 that Miami-Dade would be experiencing a sharp decline in enrollment for Fall, 1972.

TABLE III  
PROJECTED  
OPENING ENROLLMENT  
FALL 1972-73

---

	NORTH CAMPUS	SOUTH CAMPUS	DOWNTOWN CAMPUS	TOTAL COLLEGE
CREDIT STUDENTS	19,000	12,950	1,050	33,000
FTE's	13,800	9,200	700	23,700

---

Table IV compares registration statistics for nearly exact dates in August, 1971 and 1972. An examination of these data fails to reveal any clues to the actual decrease in enrollment realized at the final registration on August 22, 1972. Fall semester classes began August 24, 1972. These registration statistics are for South Campus only, and are presented only as an indicator, as comparable data for the other campuses

were not available.

TABLE IV  
REGISTRATION STATISTICS  
SOUTH CAMPUS  
AUGUST, 1971 AND AUGUST, 1972

	AUGUST 10, 1971 REPORT	AUGUST 14, 1972 REPORT
TOTAL REGISTERED % OF EXPECTED FINAL ENROLLMENT	7,550 61	7,636 80
F.T.E.'s REGISTERED	5,750	8,500
F.T.E.'s EXPECTED	8,650	9,200
% OF F.T.E.'s EXPECTED	66	69

The total decrease in credit students for Fall, 1972 as compared to Fall, 1971 was 2,828 [Table I]. There was an increase in the number of non-credit students in the comparable period of 1,216. It is important to make a distinction between these two classes of students because of differences in funding by the State.

The Minimum Foundation Program (MFP) used to allocate State funds to community colleges is based on total FTE credit students reported for Fall Term, and for Spring-Summer Terms. No funds are provided for adult non-credit courses which do not meet the criteria for the MFP. Courses which are avocational, recreational, or for personal enrichment do not meet the criteria for the MFP.

Of the total number of non-credit students reported in Table I for Fall Term, 1972-73, 732 FTE's met the MFP criteria, while 292 FTE's did not. This compares to 558 and 258 FTE's respectively, for Fall Term, 1971-72.

While Table III presents the projected Fall 1972 enrollment by Campus and total college, Table V shows the actual credit student enrollment (FTE's) for Fall 1971-72 and Fall 1972-73 for the total college. The Fall 1972 figure represents a 10.8% decrease from the enrollment in the Fall of 1971 and a 15.75% decrease from the enrollment projected.

Faculty employed for the Fall Term, 1972 numbered 965, an increase of 29 over that of the preceding year, yet credit student enrollment was at the 1970 level, when the college employed 903 faculty members.

TABLE V  
ACTUAL  
OPENING ENROLLMENT

---

	FALL, 1971	FALL, 1972
CREDIT STUDENTS	30,853	28,025
F.T.E.'s	22,385	19,965

---

## Guidelines For Reduction of Faculty

A college-wide committee was formed to attempt to develop criteria to be used in the staff reduction program for the 1973-74 college year. The committee was comprised of the President, the Executive Vice President, the Director of Personnel, the Campus Vice Presidents, and Deans of Academic Affairs of the respective campuses, two representatives from each of the respective Faculty Senates, and one Division Director from each campus. The latter two members, Directors of North and South Campus Humanities Division, were invited because they represented the two largest divisions where the greatest number of faculty members would be affected by a reduction.

The decisions regarding development of the guidelines were based upon advice obtained from the College and State Department of Education attorneys, State Board of Education Regulations, and existing Miami-Dade policy and procedure.

As a general approach, it was decided that, as soon as a collegewide enrollment projection for the 1973-74 academic year had been officially adopted, each campus would determine staff requirements, based upon Winter Term, 1974 enrollment projections as a base. The Winter Term has characteristically had a lower enrollment than the Fall Term, and staffing projections have always been based upon this term, with additional Fall Term instructional requirements met by part-time

instructors and overload. In addition to enrollment projections, a collegewide faculty productivity figure would be considered as a criterion for determining faculty needs.

When it had been determined that a department was overstaffed, the following approach was to be used in determining who would be retained and who would be dismissed:

- a. Faculty and Staff were to be viewed as constituting two groups, annual contract personnel and continuing contract personnel.
- b. Annual contract persons would be dismissed before continuing contract persons, except in rare instances.<sup>1</sup>
- c. Within each of the two groups, time of service would be immaterial to the review.

The following criteria were to be used in selecting the individuals in a given group who were to be considered as surplus personnel:

1. a. Educational Qualifications - as judged by written evaluations by performance as a faculty member, educational preparation, and professional growth as outlined in the criteria for academic rank in the Manual of Policy, section II, page 41 (Appendix A).
1. b. The written evaluations were to be related to an individual's present assignment, or to a projected assignment, in the event of a transfer to another campus.
2. Efficiency in Performance - as determined by existing written evaluations in an individual's personnel file.

<sup>1</sup>These exceptions had to be justified, in writing, to the President, and the justification was to be based on the irreplaceability of the individual in a given program.

3. Compatibility - here defined as the individual's support of the community college philosophy and his disposition to maintain satisfactory working relationships as determined by:
  - a. The immediate administrative supervisor.
  - b. Anonymous peer evaluations, where possible.
  - c. Any statements about compatibility in extant evaluations.
  
4. Character - defined as behavior in an acceptable professional manner on and off campus in all situations where the good name of the teacher and the college are involved (Criteria for academic rank, Section B-4) as evaluated by:
  - a. Extant written statements in professional evaluations and anonymous peer evaluation completed on a systematic basis, where possible.
  
5. Capacity to Meet the Needs of the Community, as determined by:
  - a. Shifts in enrollment
  - b. Changes in program
  - c. Evidence of service to the community
  - d. Technological advancement in education

When the surplus faculty and staff had been identified on each campus, based upon application of the foregoing criteria, each unit of the College was required to exchange information in regard to those who might be qualified to fill positions on any campus within the College.

There still remained the problem of deciding the right of an individual to displace, or bump, a member of a similar department on other campuses. To resolve this issue, the following principles were to apply:

- a. Annual contract persons would not have any right to bump annual contract persons on any other campus. They could, however, be transferred to other campuses with the agreement of appropriate administrative personnel.
- b. Continuing contract persons had substantial legal rights to their positions at Miami-Dade, and could bump annual contract persons in the same teaching fields on other campuses, provided student enrollment justified the position.
- c. In each case of bumping, and assuming equal contract status, the receiving campus would have the right to evaluate all candidates and make a choice among them.
- d. Each campus would be permitted to identify specialized personnel, who performed specialized functions, and who would not, therefore, be bumped. Such identified functions and personnel would have to receive the concurrence of the President, as a special group.
- e. All other cases would be considered home campus problems to be solved by that campus.

In other decisions related to dismissal, the institution decided to request waiver of continuing contract for third-year annual contract personnel who were eligible for the 1973-74 academic year. The basis for such a request was the decreased student enrollment. Those who agreed to the waiver would be recommended for the additional salary paid for continuing contract status.

In addition, the College committed itself to a first priority review of the applications for reemployment for any faculty vacancies in the near future.

All annual evaluations of faculty would be completed on an accelerated schedule, in order to identify those persons to be dismissed and to notify them by the end of the Fall Term, 1972.



Following the development of the guidelines by the committee, they were submitted to the District Board of Trustees, where they were approved on November 1, 1972.

District personnel responsible for determining enrollment projections did so for each campus for Fall Term, 1973. On the basis of historical data, the expected decrease for Winter Term, 1973-74 was determined and staffing needs calculated. This calculation was based upon enrollments projected by course, multiplied by credit hours assigned to a course, and then divided by the average productivity ratio per FTE faculty, which for non-occupational courses was 395-400. This calculation generated the number of faculty needed in each department.

It is worth noting that this method of calculation was not a new technique, but was the method used routinely by the College. What was new, for one campus at least, was the productivity figure used. It was higher than the figure generally acceptable at North Campus, and was intended to strengthen accountability on a campus that had experienced the greatest over-staffing as a consequence of the enrollment drop.

The service staff was calculated on a formula of one(1) staff member to 150 FTE faculty in Fall.

Each campus department chairman and division director was directed to identify surplus faculty and to forward names and basic profiles to the Vice President of the respective campus by December 5, 1972. In addition, faculty on leave were identified, and contacted to determine their intention to return to the College or to resign. Those faculty members who were one year replacements for faculty returning from leave were placed in the pool of those to be dismissed.

Each department was required to conduct a review of all annual contract people and establish an order of priority by which they would be dismissed, if they had to go. In addition, each department which could justify additional faculty, and had official approval for the addition(s), was required to submit a notice of the opening(s) and a description of the requirements of the position(s).

All reviews of all people by the department chairmen were to be kept in the strictest confidence. All persons identified as surplus were not to be notified, nor were those placed in the campus pool from which some might be dismissed, bumped, or transferred. All decisions were to be made institutionally, and department chairmen were cautioned to refrain from negotiating on that administrative level.

Final decisions regarding dismissal were made by the Executive Committee, which consists of the President, the Executive Vice President, and the three Campus Vice Presidents.

All personnel to be dismissed were notified by registered letter by the President. It was first anticipated that 84 professional staff would be released. Normal attrition reduced the number to 79, and 23 persons requested retirement, or leave of absence, reducing the number of necessary terminations to 56.

Thirty-one (31) faculty were transferred from North Campus, 13 to South Campus, and 18 to the Downtown Campus.

A total of 33 of the professional staff were affected by position reductions at North Campus, while 16 were lost from South Campus. Downtown Campus had 2 terminations and District dismissed 5.

Fifty-one persons released were on annual contract and 5 on continuing contract. Two of the continuing contract employees were administrators. Of the 77 black professionals at the College, six were notified of dismissal.

## Aftermath

As might be expected, campus morale was very low, even among tenured faculty who felt reasonably secure in their positions. It came as a surprise to all that, after so many years of continued growth, there should suddenly develop a recession in enrollment, when no clues appeared in prior years to warn of its arrival. No leveling off preceded the drop, such as might normally occur in population growth patterns.

In faculty senate meetings, the question of the reliability of those responsible for projecting student enrollment figures was raised, especially as it might apply to the next academic year. Faculty had reluctantly and unhappily accepted the facts which were presented for Fall, 1972 enrollments, but they did not wish to face the possibility of a recurrence of this experience in the Fall of 1973.

Despite the assurances of the chief administrators that the persons responsible for determining student enrollment projections had been extremely accurate in their projections in prior years, and that no obvious factors were apparent to account for the failure to anticipate the decrease in enrollment which occurred in the Fall of 1972, some of the faculty could not be persuaded that there were extenuating factors that could not have been identified to anticipate the decrease.

In response to reports available in early September, reports which revealed that the College was likely to have an 8 or 9 percent decrease in credit students instead of the 7 percent increase that was projected, the College Research Committee conducted an extensive study of the factors potentially affecting student enrollment at Miami-Dade. The objective was to attempt to provide answers to two questions: 1) Why are fewer students enrolled for the Fall term, 1972? 2) What future enrollment trends may be expected for the Fall Term, 1973?

The following factors were determined to be responsible for the decrease in enrollment in the Fall Term, 1972:

1. Greater local employment opportunities were available than the year before;
2. The use of CLEP and departmental credit-by-examination had increased appreciably over preceding years;
3. The opening of the new Florida International University, and other expanded opportunities for enrollment elsewhere, had successfully competed for Miami-Dade's sophomore students, in-service teachers, and new freshmen.
4. An increasing graduation rate for Miami-Dade students decreased the number of returning students over that of previous years.

With respect to enrollment trends that might affect Fall Term, 1973, it was determined by the College Research Committee that enrollment would continue at about the same level as the Fall of 1972. This assessment was based on information gathered from high school seniors by means of interviews and a questionnaire.

In addition, the Committee recommended that the college direct its collective efforts to the following:

- a. Concentrate and coordinate efforts to recruit current high school seniors.
- b. Increase its program of supplying information to high school counselors and students about opportunities available at Miami-Dade.
- c. Provide additional information about financial aid and part-time job opportunities available through the College.
- d. Make a specific effort to attract the many non-returning former students.
- e. Alleviate students' problems with scheduling and registration.

As of the time of writing (April 2, 1973) no litigation has resulted from the College's action. Six faculty members who were notified in December that their contracts would not be renewed have filed appeals with the Faculty Review Committee. Two faculty members of the North Campus Music Department have filed charges with the Economic Employment Opportunities Commission that they have been discriminated against. These two instructors hold third-year annual contracts while a black faculty member on first-year annual contract is being retained. The college has assumed the position that it will retain the same percentage of black faculty members as it had before the cut-back was made, in order to support the affirmative action plan implemented earlier.

Three tenured faculty and two tenured administrators were included in the termination action. The three faculty members were in departments that suffered substantial student enrollment decreases, and their academic preparation was of such a specialized nature as to make it impractical to transfer them to other disciplines within the College (Aerospace and Fashion Modelling).

The two administrative positions were eliminated.

#### General Principles

Miami-Dade Community College made every effort to develop guidelines for termination of faculty which were consistent with the recommendations of the AAUP.

The 1968 Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure advises that "faculty members shall be able to have the issues reviewed by the faculty, or by the faculty's grievance committee, with ultimate review of all controverted issues by the governing board." Such a mechanism has been provided for by establishment of the Faculty Review Committee.

In another part of the AAUP Statement . . . , it is recommended that "the institution will make every effort to place affected faculty members in other suitable positions." Miami-Dade placed advertisements in publications of wide

circulation, such as the Chronicle of Higher Education, and the Community and Junior College Journal. In addition, a brochure was printed and sent to colleges and placement bureaus across the country containing the resumes of the faculty who were being separated and who wished to be included.

Additionally, the AAUP Statement specifies that "the released faculty member's place will not be filled by a replacement within a period of two years, unless the released faculty member has been offered reappointment and a reasonable time within which to accept or decline it." Although some annual contract positions have been filled by transfer of continuing contract personnel, the spirit of the AAUP recommendation has been followed, for it was made in relation to tenured faculty. Miami-Dade has extended this AAUP recommendation to non-tenured faculty who are to be terminated by committing itself to a first priority review of their applications for reemployment when vacancies develop.

The AAUP Standards of Notice for Nonreappointment (Winter 1967) were observed in part. As the Standards apply to nonreappointment for reasons of financial exigency, written notice is required:



- 1) "Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination."
- 2) "Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if an initial two-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination."
- 3) "At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years in the institution."

Miami-Dade notified all by December 20, but made no distinction between first, second, and third year contracts.

John Gillis, in his article entitled Academic Staff Reductions in Response to Financial Exigency (1971), cites the AAUP's 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure as follows:

"Termination of continuous appointment because of financial exigency should be demonstrably bona fide."

Bona fide is interpreted as "discontinuance of a program or department of instruction." As applied to the two tenured administrative positions, I believe this requirement has been met. Not so, in the case of the tenured faculty positions.

With regard to the College's decision to postpone granting of tenure, AAUP is opposed to such a decision extending the probationary period (or to put a temporary freeze on awarding of tenure) in response to a financial crisis. Its position

is based on the premise that postponement of a decision will weaken the standards for permanent appointment, and may lower the quality of the faculty

#### Conclusion

The decisions forced upon the administrators of Miami-Dade Community College were difficult and unpalatable, but forced none-the-less. The situation which led to the reduction in faculty is not unique to this College, and in fact, is becoming a common occurrence in higher education in the United States. The techniques employed by institutions for saving money in a financial crisis (Gillis, 1971) are, with increasing frequency, failing to forestall action to terminate faculty, both non-tenured and tenured. This action is contrary to AAUP recommendations, and is playing a major role in stimulating union interest among college faculties. Increased legislative concern in the validity of academic tenure is also adding to the impetus for collective bargaining. Despite its efforts in developing fair and equitable guidelines for faculty reduction, with the fiscal constraints placed upon it, Miami-Dade Community College will soon find itself actively engaged in collective bargaining as an administrative reality.

## Bibliography

- Byse, Clark and Louis Joughin. Tenure In American Higher Education: Plans, Practices and the Law. University Press, Ithaca, N. Y. 1959.
- Carr, R. K. Uneasy Future of Academic Tenure. Educational Record. Vol. 53: 119-127. Spring, 1972.
- College Research Committee Report. Factors Affecting The Enrollment of Miami-Dade. Miami-Dade Community College. November 1, 1972.
- Furniss, W. T. Giving Reasons For Nonrenewal of Faculty Contracts. Educational Record. Vol 52: 328-37. Fall, 1971.
- Gillis, J. W. Academic Staff Reductions In Response To Financial Exigency. Liberal Education. Vol 57: 364-77. October, 1971.
- Kurland, J. E. Reducing Faculty Positions: Considerations of Sound Academic Practice. Liberal Education. Vol 58: 304-09. May, 1972.
- Miami-Dade Junior College Catalog. Vol. XII. No. 1, 1972/73.
- "On Institutional Problems Resulting From Financial Exigency: Some Operating Guidelines. AAUP. Washington, D. C. September, 1972.
- "On Not Being Fired, Just Not Rehired." Change. Vol 3, No. 8 (Winter, 1971-72). pp. 52-54.
- "1968 Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure." AAUP Bulletin. Vol. 54, No. 4 (Winter, 1968) pp. 448-52.
- "Standards of Notice for Nonreappointment." AAUP Bulletin. Vol. 53, No. 4 (Winter, 1967). pg. 407.
- "1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure." AAUP Bulletin. Vol. 56, No. 3. (Autumn, 1970). pp. 323-26.

"Statement on Procedural Standards In The Renewal or Non-renewal of Faculty Appointments." AAUP Bulletin. Vol. 57, No. 2. (Summer, 1971). pp. 206-10.

"Summary on Tenure Panel's 47 Recommendations." Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Vol. XII, No. 25 (March 26, 1973). pg. 6.

"Tenure Practices - Redefined." Junior College Journal. Vol. 39, No. 8. (May, 1969). pp. 26-29.



# MANUAL OF POLICY

TITLE	ACADEMIC RANK	NUMBER II - 41
LEGAL AUTHORITY	ACTION BY DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES	PAGE 2 of 4

- (9) Breadth and diversity of interests: Activities and interests which enable a teacher to develop wider sympathy for, more effective communication with, and deeper understanding of his students.

## 2. Administrative activities (where applicable)\*

- a. Attraction and selection of capable personnel.
- b. Stimulation of faculty enthusiasm and creativity.
- c. Facilitation of regular communication between upper and lower echelons.
- d. Provision of necessary materials for optimum working environment.
- e. Equitableness and fairness in dealing with subordinates.

\*Note: Academic rank for full-time administrative and supervisory personnel shall be assigned on the recommendation of the President. He shall use the same criteria as have been established for the faculty in the several ranks, plus other pertinent criteria and evaluations related to the individual's administrative and/or supervisory responsibilities.

## 3. Non-teaching activities

- a. Work on faculty and other college committees.
- b. Extracurricular work with students.
- c. Contributions to curriculum development.
- d. Effective and willing assumption of responsibility in departmental matters.
- e. Interest in individual students as evidenced by personal conferences and informal discussions.
- f. Implementation of college policies and procedures.

## 4. Professional conduct

- a. Behavior in an acceptable professional manner on and off campus in all situations where the good name of the teacher and the college are involved.

## C. Experience and Length of Service

1. Instructor: No previous teaching experience necessary.
2. Assistant Professor: Minimum of three years' college teaching and/or other relevant teaching experience and/or other experience relevant to the person's position at the college.



# MANUAL OF POLICY

TITLE	ACADEMIC RANK	NUMBER II - 41
LEGAL AUTHORITY	ACTION BY DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES	PAGE 1 of 4

DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES' APPROVAL      7/1/68 and 3/12/69  
DATE

POLICY:

A. The criteria for placement and promotion in Academic Rank have been classified into five categories: (1) performance as a member of the faculty, (2) experience and length of service, (3) educational preparation, (4) professional standing and growth, and (5) community service. It is not intended for a person to qualify for assignment in or promotion to a higher academic rank in all of the five categories. Outstanding performance or ability in one or several categories should be regarded as compensatory for a lesser performance in other categories. Where no specific achievements are indicated in the table of criteria, it is expected that a higher rank would demand more distinguished performance than a lower rank.

B. Performance as a Member of the Faculty

1. Teaching activities (including activities of guidance counselors, librarians, etc.)

Evidence of professional potential:

a. With respect to subject matter:

- (1) Knowledge of subject
- (2) Interest in subject
- (3) Breadth and perspective; ability to relate subject matter to broader areas

b. With respect to techniques:

- (1) Clear and intelligent presentation of subject matter.
- (2) Illumination of subject matter through concrete illustrations, pertinent subsidiary information, applications to practical situations, etc.
- (3) Stimulation of lively, well-directed discussions.
- (4) Arousal of student interest in subject matter and stimulation to independent thought and effort.
- (5) Organization of and preparation for each activity.
- (6) Rapport with student.
- (7) Adjustment of techniques and subject matter to the range of abilities of students.
- (8) Development of student ability to appreciate and engage in critical thinking.

# MANUAL OF POLICY



TITLE	ACADEMIC RANK	NUMBER II - 41
LEGAL AUTHORITY	ACTION BY DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES	PAGE 3 of 4

3. Associate Professor: Minimum of seven years' college teaching and/or other relevant teaching experience and/or other experience relevant to the person's position at the college. At least three years of this experience must be at Miami-Dade Junior College.

4. Full Professor: Minimum of ten years' college teaching and/or other relevant teaching experience and/or other experience relevant to the person's position at the college. At least three years of this experience must be at Miami-Dade Junior College.

#### D. Educational Preparation

1. Instructor: Florida Teacher's Certificate

2. Assistant Professor: Minimum of a Master's degree or equivalent, plus either: 15 credits of significant and related graduate work or equivalent, or 10 years' teaching experience or the equivalent. At least two years of this experience must be at Miami-Dade Junior College.

3. Associate Professor: Minimum of a Master's degree and thirty hours in a subject field, or a majority of the hours in the subject field and the remainder in an area considered important or relevant to the junior college philosophy. Possession of a regular Florida teaching certificate and a recommendation for continuing contract at Miami-Dade Junior College.

4. Associate Professor Senior: Minimum of a Master's degree and forty-five hours of significant and related graduate work or the equivalent are required. Possession of a regular Florida teaching certificate and a recommendation for continuing contract at Miami-Dade Junior College.

5. Full Professor: The Doctor's degree or its equivalent should ordinarily be a requirement for this rank. Possession of a regular Florida teaching certificate and recommendation for continuing contract at Miami-Dade Junior College.



# MANUAL OF POLICY

TITLE	ACADEMIC RANK	NUMBER II - 41
LEGAL AUTHORITY	ACTION BY DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES	PAGE 4 of 4

Educational preparation includes: (1) advanced study with recognized teachers (e.g. in Fine Arts); (2) practical experience in related non-academic fields, including travel.

E. Professional Status, Growth, and Development

1. Professional recognition--grants for research, consultantships with government and private agencies, publishers, etc.
2. Participation in workshops, seminars, and conferences.
3. Evidence of continued and independent study.
4. Pure and applied research.
5. Productivity--publications, including books, articles, and films; planning and production of materials for the mass media; composition and performance in applied arts and sciences.
6. Membership and/or offices in professional organizations

F. Community Service

Contributions made over a period of time to the community which reflect credit on the college.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.  
LOS ANGELES

MAR 5 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR  
JUNIOR COLLEGE  
INFORMATION

<i>Robert Horn</i>	<i>1/14/71</i>	<i>Peter Maske</i>	<i>1-14-71</i>
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT	DATE	PRESIDENT	DATE