

CHAPTER 3: Certificated Personnel
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE NO. 3.20.1 (AP 2510, 7150)

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE
San Mateo County Community College District

Subject: AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure

Revision Date: 10/12

References: Education Code Sections 87610.1 and 87663; AFT Agreement, 2006-2009; ACCJC Accreditation Standard III.A.5

-
- The Board of Trustees, faculty and administration share a responsibility for the process of awarding tenure.
 - The tenure review process should safeguard and assure the principles and practices of academic freedom as defined in District Rules and Regulations.
 - The tenure review process should uphold the principles of inclusivity, equal access and opportunity, promote diversity, and be fair and unbiased.
 - The tenure review process is an affirmative means for awarding tenure based upon rigorous evaluation. It is a continuation of the selection process; hiring does not guarantee tenure.
 - The tenure review process should foster open communication among participants in order to assure fairness and opportunity for success.

I. Purpose

The tenure review process should assure that students have access to the most knowledgeable, talented, creative and student-oriented faculty available. To that end, a four-year probationary period provides sufficient time for contract employees:

- to understand the expectations for tenure;
- to develop the skills and acquire the experience to participate successfully in the educational process; and
- to use the District's and other resources for professional growth.

The tenure review process should assure teaching quality and professional growth and development by providing a useful assessment of performance. During the probationary period, contract faculty have the academic freedom that all other members of the faculty have, and the tenure review process should safeguard that basic right of the academic community.

II. Evaluation Criteria for Contract Faculty

The following criteria will be used, as appropriate, to assess faculty performance. During the first contract year, emphasis will be placed upon contract employees' meeting criteria related to their primary assignment.

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

A. Student Relations

In the performance of his/her professional duties, the faculty member:

1. responds to the educational needs of students by (a) answering questions clearly and following through to maximize student understanding; and (b) giving equal access and treatment to students regardless of ethnicity, cultural background, age, gender, and lifestyle, and by avoiding stereotypes;
2. demonstrates respect for the right of the student to hold and to express divergent opinions and demonstrates sensitivity to concerns of students; and
3. shows concern for student educational welfare by being available during office hours and answering questions with courtesy.

B. Professional Responsibilities

The faculty member:

1. meets classes as set forth in the contract;
2. participates in department, college or other professional activities;
3. maintains ethical standards as outlined in the SMCCCD Academic Senate Statement of Professional Standards;
4. demonstrates commitment to the profession;
5. participates in professional growth activities; and
6. maintains and submits appropriate records in accordance with District contract.

C. Performance by Classroom Faculty

The faculty member:

1. is knowledgeable about subject matter;
2. is aware of recent, general developments/research in field;
3. demonstrates effective communication with students;
4. provides students with a clear statement of grading, attendance, examination policies, and other course requirements;
5. uses effective teaching methods appropriate to the subject matter;
6. uses appropriate testing and assessment techniques to measure students progress; and
7. shows evidence of meeting course objectives as outlined in the catalog and official course outline.

D. Performance by Counselors, Librarians, and other Instructional and Student Services Faculty

The faculty member:

1. is knowledgeable about assignment area/duties;
2. is aware of recent, general development/research in assigned area/duties;
3. demonstrates effective communication with students;
4. uses effective methods appropriate to the assignment area/duties; and
5. shows evidence of meeting objectives appropriate to the assignment area/duties.

III. Tenure Review Committee

Standing Tenure Review Committees shall be division-based, shall have four members, and shall elect their own chairs. Each division shall determine the number of Tenure Review Committees needed to conduct tenure review for contract faculty. All permanent faculty members of the division constitute the initial pool of potential committee members.

Tenure Review Committees must have female and male membership; moreover, Committee members will include an officially trained inclusivity representative and a member from an affected ethnic minority. (The latter two requirements may be met by the same person.)

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

The appropriate division dean or designee (academic supervisor), who is a permanent committee member, and two permanent faculty members, chosen by lot, will constitute the core of the Tenure Review Committee. The first faculty member chosen shall serve a three-year term, and the second faculty member chosen will serve a two-year term. Thereafter, there will be two-year staggered terms.

The fourth committee member shall be a discipline expert chosen in a collaborative process by the division dean and the permanent faculty members appropriate to the discipline of the tenure candidate. The discipline expert will serve on the committee until a final tenure decision. If no discipline expert is available, a faculty member from a closely related discipline will serve as the fourth committee member. In this case, however, in order to provide discipline expertise during the peer classroom observation and discipline expertise as a resource to the committee, a fifth, ad hoc non-voting committee member may be chosen. In the case of unique programs, a practicing professional may be sought by the Tenure Review Committee.

If the committee does not meet diversity criteria, the name of the second person chosen by lot may go back into the pool and an additional name be selected from the appropriate diversity pool of division faculty; e.g., a specific gender pool or a pool of members of an affected ethnic minority. If diversity cannot be achieved within the division membership, a faculty name may be selected from a college-wide pool consisting of ethnically diverse permanent faculty members who have indicated a willingness to serve on Tenure Review Committees.

Replacements for rotating terms will be by lot from the appropriate division pool.

If a faculty member of the Tenure Review Committee is unable to complete her/his assigned term, a new member will be selected by the remaining members of the committee to serve the remainder of the term. If the dean or his/her designee is unable to complete the assigned term, a new member will be selected by the dean or the dean's successor.

IV. Roles of the Tenure Review Committee, Appropriate Vice President and College President

Tenure Review Committee

Members of the Tenure Review Committee have an obligation to uphold the confidentiality of the tenure review process, uphold the principles of inclusivity, promote and respect diversity, and conduct fair and unbiased evaluations for the purpose of reaching a tenure decision. Training regarding the tenure review process and procedures will be provided to all committee members.

The Tenure Review Committee has the following responsibilities:

1. to follow the procedure outlined in this policy;
2. to meet with the contract faculty to review criteria and methods of evaluation and the timelines of the tenure review process;
3. to gather and review all data obtained by the various evaluation methods employed;
4. to meet with the contract employee to discuss evaluation results and develop a plan for professional growth;
5. to determine a tenure recommendation; and
6. to forward their recommendation to the appropriate Vice President.

The above activities will be coordinated by the chair with the support of the division dean.

Appropriate Vice President

The appropriate vice president shares the obligation to uphold the confidentiality of the tenure review process and the principles of inclusivity and academic freedom, to promote and respect diversity, to assure fair and unbiased

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

evaluations for the purpose of reaching a tenure decision, and to maintain those educational principles which promote a quality faculty in his/her area of responsibility.

The appropriate Vice President has the following responsibilities:

1. to monitor tenure review and assure compliance with due process, District policy, timelines, and procedures;
2. to review the recommendation of the Tenure Review Committee for both process and substance;
3. to meet with the Tenure Review committee to discuss the difference of the committee, in the event that there is a split vote (2/2) of the Committee; and
4. to forward his/her own recommendation and that of the Committee to the College President.

College President

The College President shares the obligation

- to uphold the confidentiality of the tenure review process and the principles of inclusivity and academic freedom;
- to promote and respect diversity;
- to assure fair and unbiased evaluations for the purpose of reaching a tenure decision.

The College President has the following responsibilities:

1. to meet with the appropriate Vice President and the Tenure Review Committee if there is disagreement between the Vice President and the Committee;
2. to meet with all parties in the tenure review process if the President disagrees with the appropriate Vice President and Tenure Review Committee;
3. to notify the Committee, the Vice President, and the evaluatee of the final recommendation; and
4. to make the final recommendation via the Chancellor to the Board to award or deny tenure.

V. Procedures

Tenure recommendations shall be linked to rigorous evaluation in the first four years of employment. Probationary faculty will be evaluated each of the four years even though a single contract covers the third and fourth years. Criteria and methods of evaluation shall conform to those for regular faculty with the following exceptions:

1. Student questionnaire, peer observation, division dean observation, and faculty portfolio shall be mandatory;
2. In the first year of employment, performance of the contract faculty's primary duties shall be the fundamental basis for consideration of continued employment.

The following methods will be required to evaluate faculty performance against the criteria stated in Section II:

1. Student Questionnaire
2. Faculty Portfolio
3. Peer Observation
4. Division Dean Observation

Self-review is optional, at the request of the contract employee.

Student Questionnaire

A standard District questionnaire, approved by the AB 1725 Trust Committee, shall be used to gather information from students. In addition, an open-ended survey form, or small group instructional feedback or any other method mutually agreed upon by the contract employee and the Tenure Review Committee may be used. Except

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

in rare cases where student evaluation is not practicable due to unusual circumstances, student evaluation will be routinely done to assess faculty/student relations, faculty/student communication and use of teaching methods.

Faculty Portfolio

The contract employee shall supply a faculty portfolio, which includes current course syllabi, sample class materials, sample examinations, sample quizzes, if used, and an explanation of grading procedures. Additional materials may include written documentation of the following:

- a) departmental, college or professional activities
- b) new course/services development
- c) development of new teaching methods
- d) publications
- e) community service
- f) awards and honors
- g) outside evaluations conducted by experts and/or licensing agencies
- h) other

The information provided in a portfolio is confidential and may become part of the employee's personnel file. This portfolio information cannot be used outside the tenure review process without permission of the contract employee. Only current information (concerning activities of the past three years) will be considered in the tenure review process.

Peer Observation

The faculty members of the Tenure Review Committee will observe and assess the performance of the contract employee. This assessment may take place in the classroom, at the service site, or through observation of videotapes of actual classroom presentations, counseling sessions, etc. They will meet and review their observations and recommendations with the employee being evaluated. They will take into consideration any self-evaluation which the employee may provide, particularly his/her explanation of how the events observed by his/her evaluators relate to the goals and objectives of his/her professional activities, before they formulate a written report of their individual judgments of the employee's performance.

Division Dean Observation

The division dean or designee (academic supervisor) will observe and assess the performance of the contract employee. This assessment may take place in the classroom, at the service site, or through observation of videotapes of actual classroom presentations, counseling sessions, etc. Audiotapes may be used in special circumstances with the approval of the Tenure review Committee. The division dean or designee will meet and review his/her observations and recommendations with the employee being evaluated. The dean will take into consideration any self-evaluation which the employee may provide, particularly the faculty member's explanation of how the events observed by the evaluator relate to the goals and objectives of the his/her professional activities, before the dean formulates a written report of his/her individual judgment of the employee's performance. A written report of the observation will be part of the committee documentation. In addition, the division dean may submit to the committee any other information relevant to the employee's fitness for service.

Self-Assessment

The contract employee may request to provide a self-assessment of her/his performance as measured against the criteria stated in Section II.

VI. Timelines

The Division Dean, immediately after the hiring of a tenure track faculty member will, in consultation with the Academic Senate President, initiate the process to establish the committee that will conduct the tenure review process for that hire. In the first two years, the following timelines are suggested for committees to complete their review and make recommendations in a thoughtful and timely manner.

Weeks 1-4 of the Academic Year

1. Tenure Review orientation is held for all committee members.
2. The committee meets with the contract employee to discuss the process format, objectives, timelines and expectations.
3. The committee establishes a work schedule.
4. The contract employee submits beginning documentation for the faculty portfolio.

Weeks 5-12 of the Academic Year

1. Observations are made by all committee members, preferably no more than two members per visit. Post-visit discussions between committee members and the contract employee are to be held within one week of the observation. This activity is to be completed by the end of the tenth week of the semester.
2. Written reports of the findings of all observations are to be prepared by each committee member.
3. Student evaluation is to be conducted by the tenth week of the semester with written summaries completed by the twelfth week of the semester.
4. If the contract employee selects the self-evaluation method, he/she is expected to submit a written self-evaluation by the twelfth week.

Weeks 13-17 of the Academic Year

1. The committee meets to review the results of the evaluation process. Additional information may be requested by the committee or the evaluatee at this time.
2. The committee reaches its recommendation and, if the contract employee is to continue in service the following year, develops with the employee a professional activity plan.
3. A written report of the committee's findings and recommendations is completed by the fifteenth week of the semester.
4. The committee or designated committee representatives meet with the contract employee to inform her/him of the committee's recommendations.
5. Documentation of the process and its procedures is made available for review if required.
6. The recommendation of the Tenure Review Committee is submitted to the appropriate Vice President, and subsequently to the College President, the seventeenth week of the academic year.

The same timeline is suggested for weeks 1-12 of the third year. As there is no formal recommendation made during the third year, the only required activities for weeks 13-17 will be those of Step 1:

“The committee meets to review the results of the evaluation process. Additional information may be requested by the committee or the evaluatee at this time.”

In the fourth year, the entire timeline suggested for the first and second year should again apply.

VII. Tenure Review Options and Due Process

Although the law allows, in extraordinary cases, for the granting of tenure before the contract faculty member's fourth year of employment, the usual time required is four years.

The Tenure Review Committee will forward completed materials and their recommendation to the appropriate Vice President by February 15.

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

During the contract employee's first year, the Tenure Review Committee normally has two recommendation options:

1. Not enter into a contract for the following academic year.
2. Enter into a contract for the following academic year.

During the contract employee's second year, the Tenure Review Committee normally has two recommendation options:

1. Not enter into a contract for the following academic year.
2. Enter into a contract for the following two years.

During the contract employee's fourth year (before the end of the third contract), the Tenure Review Committee normally has two recommendation options:

1. Not enter into a contract for the following academic year.
2. Award tenure.

Right to Grievance

1. The probationary faculty member is employed for the first and second years by two one-year contracts. If the committee recommends non-renewal for either year, the faculty member has the right to file a grievance, but such grievance must be based solely on a claim of misinterpretation and/or misapplication of procedural aspects of this policy.
2. The probationary faculty is employed for the third and fourth years by a single two-year contract. If the committee recommends denial of tenure during the fourth year, the faculty member has the right to file a grievance on any of the above grounds as well as on a claim that the decision was "unreasonable."
3. Individuals may pursue their grievances over non-renewal of a contract on their own. The exclusive bargaining agent has no "duty of fair representation" with respect to these grievances.
4. The grievance procedure is contained in the contract between the Board of Trustees of the San Mateo County Community College District and the San Mateo Community College Federation of Teachers, AFT Local 1493, AFL-CIO.

VIII. Guidelines for Tenure Review Committee

1. Contract faculty must be informed as to what is expected of them during their probationary service.
2. If performance weaknesses are observed in the contract faculty, those weaknesses must be specifically identified to the probationary employee.
3. At the end of each contract, if a decision is made to retain an employee with observed weaknesses, a constructive process must be established to assist the employee to meet expectations.
4. Specific suggestions detailing precisely what an employee needs to do to meet expectations must be identified in a timely fashion.
5. A procedure must be established for regular, continuing evaluation of probationary faculty, so that probationary faculty understand how they are doing throughout their service.

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

6. Tenure decisions can only be based upon legitimate criteria.
7. Decisions cannot be based upon factors unrelated to performance of the employee's job.
8. Reviewers must strive to maintain objectivity and ensure that decisions regarding tenure do not contravene established principles of academic freedom.
9. Decisions cannot be based upon any political criteria nor can they be made arbitrarily, capriciously or unreasonable

**Evaluation Summary
(Non-Classroom Contract Faculty)**

Evaluee: _____ Semester/Year: _____

College: _____ Division: _____ Div Admin: _____

I. EVALUATION METHOD(S) USED:

- _____ Administrator Assessment
- _____ Self-Assessment
- _____ Peer Observation
- _____ Other (specify): _____

Based upon the above-stated sources, which are documented, and on file in the Division office, the following recommendations are hereby made for the Contract status faculty member:

Satisfactory: (check one below. See attached for comments regarding this recommendation)

- _____ Recommended for Contract II
- _____ Recommended for Contract III/IV
- _____ Recommended for Tenure (Regular) Status

Unsatisfactory (see attached for comments regarding this recommendation)

- _____ Not recommended for reemployment

SIGNATURES: TENURE REVIEW COMMITTEE

_____ (Chair) Date: _____

_____ Date: _____

_____ Date: _____

_____ Date: _____

_____ Date: _____

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

In signing this Evaluation Recommendation Form, the employee acknowledges having seen and discussed the complete report. The employee's signature does not necessarily indicate agreement with the conclusions of the evaluation.

I have participated in my Evaluation Review, have discussed it with the Committee, and have received copies of all related materials.

_____ on _____
(faculty member signature) (date)

Copies of all documents pertaining to this employee's evaluation will be placed in his/her official personnel file. The employee has a right to respond. If the employee chooses to do so, he/she may submit a response to this report, in writing, to the committee within ten (10) working days from the date of this report. That copy will be attached and filed in the employee's official personnel file.

**Evaluation Summary
Classroom Contract Faculty**

College: _____ Division: _____
Academic year of evaluation _____ Semester: _____
Name of the Contract Faculty: _____

This faculty member has been evaluated according to District policies in the following ways:

- _____ Student Evaluation
- _____ Faculty Portfolio
- _____ Peer Observation
- _____ Division Dean Observation
- _____ Self-Assessment
- _____ Other Options (specify)

Based upon the above-stated sources, which are documented and on file in the Division office,
_____ receives a recommendation of:
(faculty member)

- _____ Satisfactory
 - _____ Recommended for Contract II
 - _____ Recommended for Contract III
 - _____ Recommended for Tenure
- _____ Unsatisfactory (see attached reasons for this recommendation)
 - _____ Recommended for non-rehiring

SIGNATURES OF THE TENURE REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

| | | |
|--|---------|------------|
| | (Chair) | Date _____ |
| | | Date _____ |
| | | Date _____ |
| | | Date _____ |

In signing this Evaluation Recommendation Form, the employee acknowledges having seen and discussed the complete report. The employee's signature does not necessarily indicate agreement with the conclusions of the evaluation.

I have participated in my Evaluation Review, have discussed it with the Committee, and have received copies of all related materials.

_____ on _____
(faculty member signature) (date)

Copies of all documents pertaining to this employee's evaluation will be placed in his/her official personnel file. The employee has a right to respond. If the employee chooses to do so, he/she may submit a response to this report, in writing, to the committee within ten (10) working days from the date of this report. That copy will be attached and filed in the employee's official personnel file.

EVALUATION PROCESS: Implementation Guidelines for Regular Classroom Faculty

The following process will be used for the evaluation of all **regular**, classroom faculty.

ORGANIZATION

One Evaluation Guidance Committee for Each College

Purpose: To provide all participants with guidance and training; serves as appeal board in the evaluation process.

Composition: Three members: the presidents (or designees) of AFT, Academic Senate, and the College

It is the responsibility of the Evaluation Guidance Committee to guide the evaluation process of the College and to resolve issues that arise during the evaluation process. The Committee's decisions are considered final (except that they do not replace the normal grievance procedures available to all faculty under the AFT/District collective bargaining agreement). At any time, any one of the participants in the process (Peer Review Committee member, Peer Observer, Dean, Evaluatee) can seek assistance from the campus Evaluation Guidance Committee.

It is also the responsibility of the campus Evaluation Guidance Committee to provide orientation to all participants (including Evaluatees) and specific training to Peer Review Committees, Peer Observers, Deans and Vice Presidents. These orientation and training activities will be coordinated throughout the District so as to be consistent from campus to campus. Orientation and training will be an ongoing activity. The more experienced the participants, the more they will have to share with each other about how to conduct evaluations in a positive, constructive, and fair manner.

One Peer Review Committee for Each Division

Purpose: To conduct evaluations and make recommendations for all **regular**, full-time faculty in the division who are scheduled for evaluation.

Composition: Three to five **regular** faculty members (number depends on size of division and number of evaluations, diversity among group); group is recommended by division faculty and approved unanimously by the Evaluation Guidance Committee; the Peer Review Committee will be reasonably representative of academic disciplines in the division and will be reasonably representative of the gender and ethnic diversity of the student population. The committee will select its own chair who will be responsible for scheduling and conducting meetings and communicating with others in the process.

Some divisions may have difficulty assembling a committee that meets the desired level of diversity. In such cases, the Dean should seek review and advice from the campus Evaluation Guidance Committee. That committee may recommend proceeding without the desired diversity or may recommend that volunteers be sought outside the division.

PROCEDURES

Evaluation Procedures:

Faculty will be evaluated at least once every three years. The type of evaluation will alternate between *Standard* and *Comprehensive* as described below. A newly tenured faculty member will start with a *Comprehensive evaluation* three years after completing tenure review. To start the alternating cycle of evaluations for all other faculty, approximately half will start with a *Standard evaluation* and the other half with a *Comprehensive evaluation*. Each division will use a lottery method to determine who receives which type of evaluation when they are next evaluated. The evaluation process will consist of the following:

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

Standard Evaluation consists of the following:

- A member of the faculty will conduct a student survey, using instructions listed in the DIRECTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING STUDENT SURVEY. Standard questionnaires will be completed in each course that represents a separate preparation for the Evaluatee—normally, with a minimum of three sections total. Results of the survey will be tabulated electronically by District ITS. The division Dean will be responsible for the typing or the voice recording of the student comments for the Committee.
- The Dean will complete the “DEAN’S ASSESSMENT OF NON-TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES” form.
- The Evaluatee will complete the FACULTY ASSESSMENT form.

Comprehensive Evaluation:

- All inputs of *Standard Evaluation* as described above, plus
- Evaluation by a single peer consisting of (1) completion of a CLASS OBSERVATION form; and (2) a review of Evaluatee's portfolio assembled according to guidelines listed in PORTFOLIO INFORMATION form. The Peer Observer will be jointly selected by the Evaluatee and Dean. If the Evaluatee and Dean cannot agree on a mutually acceptable observer, the selection will be made by the Peer Review Committee.

(1) Peer Observation: A minimum of one class meeting will be observed. Additional observations may be requested by the Evaluatee, observer, or Dean; however, approval by the Peer Review Committee is required for additional observations. The Observer and Evaluatee will mutually agree on an appropriate window of time (e.g., two weeks), during which the observer will visit the class. The Observer will not participate in class activity and will try not to disrupt the class in any way.

Ordinarily, the Observer will make only limited comments after an observation (e.g., “I enjoyed sitting in on your class.” “Thanks for letting me observe”)—preferring to wait for all of the observations (if more than one) to be completed and to have sufficient time to organize his/her thoughts and possible suggestions for improvement. However, an Observer may ask the Evaluatee to explain or clarify why he/she did certain things in class—or to clarify the subject matter presented (e.g., “Is it correct to assume that most of what you were doing today was review?”; “I noticed that several students came in late. What are the expectations about attendance and what have you told your students about the consequences about being absent or late?”)

The Peer Observer will meet with the Evaluatee to discuss the observations and portfolio before submitting his/her findings to the chair of the Peer Committee. The Evaluatee may record any unresolved disagreement with the Observer's evaluation on the REPORT OF PEER OBSERVATION AND PORTFOLIO REVIEW.

(2) Portfolio: The intent of the portfolio is to assist the Peer Observer in understanding the instructional methodologies being employed in the courses currently taught by the Evaluatee. It should be a relatively simple task for the Evaluatee to assemble sample copies of tests, syllabi, class project descriptions, and key handouts.

The Peer Observer uses the REPORT OF PEER OBSERVATION AND PORTFOLIO REVIEW form to record his/her findings. When the form is completed, the Observer will forward the form to the chair of the Peer Review Committee (along with any written response received from the Evaluatee).

Follow-up Comprehensive Evaluation

If either a *Standard* or *Comprehensive evaluation* results in a rating of "unsatisfactory," a *Comprehensive evaluation* is scheduled for the next academic year. If that evaluation also results in a rating of "unsatisfactory," then a more thorough evaluation is done the following year according to the same procedures as specified for a second year tenure review process. If that evaluation is "unsatisfactory," referral of the matter will be made to the appropriate Vice President for suitable action.

It is anticipated that having one year between unsatisfactory evaluations allows the Evaluatee sufficient time to receive coaching from the Dean or mentoring from a peer and to initiate improvements.

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

The division Dean or the Evaluation Guidance Committee may recommend a mentor (someone who is not part of the evaluation process) to assist the Evaluatee in putting together a portfolio, making improvements recommended in a prior evaluation, etc. One very important goal of evaluation is professional development through feedback from clients and peers. Mentoring is one way to accomplish this goal. A mentor is selected by the Evaluatee with the guidance of the Dean or Committee.

Evaluation Sequence

- At the beginning of Fall semester, the Dean determines who is scheduled for evaluation during the year.
- Division faculty and the Dean recommend divisional faculty who will serve on Peer Review Committee.
- Evaluation Guidance Committee approves recommendations by divisional faculty.
- Evaluation Guidance Committee provides training for new Peer Review Committee members and orientation for Evaluatees.
- Peer Review Committee selects a chair, establishes its schedule of work, notifies Evaluatees, arranges for conduct of student evaluations (Division Office secures forms), requests assessments from Dean and Evaluatees.
- Peer Observer is agreed upon by Dean and Evaluatee if evaluation is comprehensive.
- Completed student questionnaires are forwarded via Division Office for processing (electronic tabulation of marked responses, recording of written comments); Division Office returns processed responses to Peer Committee.
- During Spring semester, Peer Review Committee gathers all evaluation materials and deliberates.
- Either the evaluatee or the Peer Review Committee may request a meeting of both parties to discuss the final evaluation summary.
- Peer Review Committee prepares evaluation summary and submits results to appropriate Vice President on the Evaluation Summary form, which indicates whether or not the evaluation is satisfactory and states any commendations and recommendations from the Peer Review Committee to the Evaluatee.
- Vice President reviews materials and forwards copies to: Evaluatee, Evaluatee's personnel file, and Dean.
- Dean records results and schedules next evaluation, confers with Evaluatee as needed.

Dean's Role

Faculty evaluation is essentially a peer process. For that reason, the Dean's role is somewhat limited. The Dean initiates the process of selecting peer evaluators and identifies those who need to be evaluated. The Dean assists the Peer Evaluation Committee by ensuring that student questionnaires are tabulated and that written comments are recorded. The Dean provides a written assessment of the Evaluatee, focused primarily on non-teaching responsibilities such as committee work and professional development activities. If substantive praise or complaints have been received from students and/or peers, the Dean reports that when completing the assessment form.

In all cases, it is expected that the Dean will function as a "coach," helping faculty do their best. If evaluations are positive, he/she ensures proper recognition. If evaluations are weak, he/she tries to help the faculty member make needed improvements.

In appropriate cases, disciplinary or non renewal procedures may be undertaken by the administration independent of the evaluation process.

PORTFOLIO INFORMATION

For each distinctly different course you are currently teaching, please provide examples of materials you have prepared:

1. Course syllabus, including description of grading policy, textbook (title, author, publisher and date) and description of supplemental material used in course such as computer software used in lab and student guide.
2. Sample quiz(es), mid-term(s), and final examination.
3. Key information handouts.
4. Assignments (e.g., typical assignments, key projects).
5. Other information you feel should be included to adequately describe the instructional strategies employed in the course. Be brief.

CLASS OBSERVATION

Instructor: _____ Evaluator: _____

Class/Section: _____ Date: _____ Scheduled Time: _____

Type of Class Observed (e.g., lecture, lab, demonstration, performance) _____

Number of Students Attending: _____ Time Class Began: _____

Note to Observer: Please review the course outline and description kept in the Division Office and the catalog description PROIR to your observation. Describe precisely and evaluate the student contact observation, attaching additional sheets if necessary. Subject Matter Covered (e.g., the primary subject matter focused upon during the session): _____

Teaching performance: To determine whether the instructor gives evidence of mastery of subject matter and demonstrates proficiency in teaching ability.

| Rated section | A | B | C | Comments |
|--|---|---|---|----------|
| 1. Method(s) of instruction (e.g., lecture, discussion, tutorial, seminar, demonstration, or a combination of methods): | | | | |
| 2. Knowledge of subject matter (e.g., does the instructor show awareness of recent developments and researching the field; does the instructor show a sufficient understanding of the technical aspects of the field; does the instructor demonstrate a command of facts as well as interpretations of the material?): | | | | |
| 3. Appropriateness of subject matter (i.e., does the subject matter relate to and contribute to the course objectives, as outlined in the college catalog and official course outline?): | | | | |

Rating Key: A. Satisfactory

B. Needs Improvement

C. Not Enough Information/Not Applicable

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

| Rated section | A | B | C | Comments |
|--|---|---|---|----------|
| 4. Appropriateness of Assignments (i.e., is the work assigned during the observed class period commensurate with students' ability and the objectives of the course?): | | | | |
| 5. Evidence of Subject Matter Organization (e.g., has the instructor used the class period efficiently; has the instructor designed the lesson in a logical manner so that the objectives are clear and logical?): | | | | |
| 6. Evidence of Preparation (e.g., has the instructor provided necessary material for the class in an organized fashion; has the instructor anticipated students' questions about materials?): | | | | |
| 7. Forms of Instructional Delivery (e.g., does the instructor appropriately and effectively use educational facilities [such as the board or seating arrangements], visual or audio aids, or other forms of technology; are teaching aids current?): | | | | |
| 8. Personal form of Delivery (e.g., does the instructor speak clearly and modulate the pace of his or her speech appropriately; does the instructor show enthusiasm for the subject matter and the students through physical movement and speech?): | | | | |
| 9. Evidence of Creativity (i.e., has the instructor attempted to present the subject matter imaginatively in a way that engages students and increases their mastery of the lesson?): | | | | |

Rating Key: A. Satisfactory

B. Needs Improvement

C. Not Enough Information/Not Applicable

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

| Rated section | A | B | C | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|----------|
| <p>10. Communication with Students (e.g., does the instructor listen to the students; does the instructor answer questions clearly, pursuing discussion to ensure students' understanding; does the instructor encourage all students to participate in discussion and to express divergent opinions; is the climate conducive to promoting respect and confidence among the students and among the instructor and students; does the instructor encourage equal participation among students, regardless of ethnicity, cultural background, age, gender and lifestyle?):</p> | | | | |
| <p>11. Critical Thinking Skills (i.e., does the instructor stimulate critical thinking by presenting material inductively or otherwise promoting independent thinking and the precise evaluation of ideas or principles?):</p> | | | | |

Rating Key: A. Satisfactory

B. Needs Improvement

C. Not Enough Information/Not Applicable

REPORT OF PEER OBSERVATION AND PORTFOLIO REVIEW

Person being evaluated: _____ Sem/Year: _____
Print: Last name, first name

PORTFOLIO REVIEW

The portfolio review indicates that the following items were present:

- _____ Course syllabi, including description of grading policy, textbook and supplemental material
- _____ Sample quizzes, tests
- _____ Key information handouts
- _____ Typical assignments, key projects
- _____ Other (explain) _____

These portfolio materials are: Satisfactory: _____ Unsatisfactory: _____

Comment:

OBSERVATION REPORT

The following comments are offered regarding my observation of the evaluatee's performance.

COMMENDATIONS:

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

RECOMMENDATIONS:

COMMENTS OF THE EVALUEE:

I have met with the Evaluatee and discussed the results of my Observation and Portfolio Review.

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Peer Observer

EVALUEE RESPONSE

I have met and discussed the Observation and Portfolio Review with the Peer Observer and

_____ AGREE with the Peer Observer's Observation and Portfolio Review

_____ DISAGREE with Peer Observer's Observation and Portfolio Review. An explanation is attached.

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Evaluatee

DIRECTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING STUDENT SURVEY

To faculty member being evaluated:

The survey will take students approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. You will be asked to leave the room during this time.

To person conducting survey:

Please read the following statement to students before they begin their response to the survey:

All faculty are evaluated periodically and your instructor is being evaluated this semester. The opinions of students in this class are an essential part of the evaluation.

Evaluation is a valuable process for the instructor, the college, and future students. The intent is to assure teaching quality and professional growth by providing a useful assessment of performance. Therefore, please take time to answer each question thoughtfully and candidly. Your answers should be for this instructor and for this class only.

In answering the Scantron questionnaire, write the name of the class, the instructor's name, and today's date at the top of the form. Use a #2 pencil to respond to the numbered items 1 through 20 for marking ALMOST ALWAYS, SOMETIMES, ALMOST NEVER or NOT APPLICABLE as appropriate for this class. In addition, use the back of the questionnaire to write your responses to questions A, B, and C.

Do not put your name on the form. The questionnaire is anonymous and the responses and comments will be typed before being shared with the instructor.

THANK YOU.

FACULTY EVALUATION REPORT

Academic Year of Evaluation: _____ Standard Comprehensive

Instructor: _____ Division: _____

This instructor has been evaluated according to district policies in the following ways:

- Peer Observation
- Student Questionnaire
- Self-evaluation
- Portfolio
- Other (specify) _____

Based upon the above stated sources, which are documented and on file in the Division Office, it is recommended that _____
(Instructor's Name)

- Continue in current status. Next evaluation _____ *Standard / Comprehensive*
(academic year) (circle one)
- Evaluation during _____ required for the following deficiencies:
(academic year)

Peer Committee: _____ Date: _____
_____ Date: _____
_____ Date: _____
_____ Date: _____

Minority Report Yes (attached) No

Division Dean: _____ Date: _____
Comments attached.

I AGREE / DISAGREE with the decision contained in this report.
(circle one)

Instructor: _____ Date: _____
Comments attached

Vice-President: _____ Date: _____

EVALUATION SUMMARY

For: _____ Year _____ Type of Eval: _____
Evaluatee's Name (Last, first) Standard, Comprehensive, Tenure Rev)

The Peer Review Committee for the _____ Division at _____ College has reviewed all evaluation materials for the evaluatee and, after careful deliberation, rates the professional performance of the evaluatee as follows:

- ___ SATISFACTORY
- ___ UNSATISFACTORY

The Peer Review Committee makes the following Commendations, Recommendations to the evaluatee:

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Chair, Peer Review Committee

This Evaluation Summary has been received by me, reviewed for completeness, and forwarded to the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources for placement in the evaluatee's personnel file. Copies have also been delivered to the evaluatee and to the division dean.

The next evaluation for the evaluatee should take place: Year: _____

The next evaluation should be: _____
Standard, Comprehensive, Tenure Review

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Vice President

Evaluation Process Regular Non-Classroom Faculty

I. ORGANIZATION

Evaluation Guidance Committee (One per College)

Purpose: Provide all participants with guidance in the evaluation process
Provide all training for the evaluation process
Serve as an appeal board whose decisions are final but do not preclude grievance procedures contained in the collective bargaining agreement

Composition: Three members—the presidents (or designees) of AFT, Academic Senate, and College

Responsibilities:

1. Oversee the evaluation process of the College.
2. Approve the membership and composition of divisional Peer Review Committees.
3. Resolve issues that arise during the evaluation process.
4. Provide on-going orientation and training activities to ensure a consistent, constructive, and fair evaluation process.

Peer Review Committee (One per Division)

Purpose: Coordinate the evaluation process for the Division
Make evaluation recommendations

Composition: Three to five regular full-time faculty recommended by Division faculty and unanimously approved by the Evaluation Guidance Committee. Reasonable representation of assignments within a division, gender, and ethnic diversity of the student population will be sought. If reasonable representation cannot be obtained, the responsible administrator will seek the advice of the Evaluation Guidance Committee regarding composition of the Peer Review Committee.

Exception: For Librarians, the Peer Review Committee will be a district-wide committee. It will report to the Evaluation Guidance Committee at the evaluatee's home campus, and it will have the following composition:

1. One SMCCCD Librarian (rotated among the regular full-time librarians)
2. One classroom faculty from the evaluatee's home campus
3. One Peninsula Library System Librarian or a second faculty member from the evaluatee's home campus.

Responsibilities:

1. Select a chairperson who is responsible for scheduling and conducting meetings, communicating with others involved in the evaluation process, and receiving all relevant forms and information from participants.
2. Select a peer observer if the evaluatee and responsible administrator cannot mutually agree upon a selection.

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

3. Decide on the number, location, and timing of observations if the evaluatee and peer observer cannot mutually agree upon a plan.
4. Review all documentation and make an evaluation recommendation for each evaluatee.
5. Consult with the Evaluation Guidance Committee.
6. Complete an "Evaluation Summary" form for each evaluatee and forward it to the appropriate Vice President.

Responsible Administrator

Responsibilities:

1. Initiate the process of selecting members of the Peer Review Committee.
2. Identify those scheduled for evaluation.
3. Consult with the Evaluation Guidance Committee.
4. Oversee the distribution and tabulation of standard questionnaires.
5. Complete the "Administrator's Assessment of Professional Responsibilities" form.
6. Follow through with evaluatees at the end of an evaluation to ensure recognition for positive results or assistance and support to make needed improvement.

Peer Observer

Selection: The evaluatee and the responsible administrator will select one peer observer. If agreement cannot be reached on a mutually acceptable peer observer, the Peer Review Committee will make the selection.

Responsibilities:

1. Review the Portfolio.
2. Conduct a minimum of one observation of the evaluatee performing her/his professional assignment.
3. Complete the "Peer Observation Report" form including commendations, recommendations and comments.
4. Discuss the findings with the evaluatee.
5. Submit the Report to the Peer Review Committee.

II. PROCEDURES

Faculty will be evaluated at least once every three years. Evaluation will alternate between the following types.

Standard Evaluation includes:

1. Questionnaires distributed to individuals who directly receive the services of the evaluatee
2. Assessment by the responsible administrator
3. Self-assessment

Comprehensive Evaluation includes:

1. Questionnaires distributed to individuals who directly receive the services of the evaluatee
2. Assessment by the responsible administrator
3. Self-assessment
4. Peer observation
5. Portfolio

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

Follow-up Comprehensive Evaluation (when any evaluation results in a rating of unsatisfactory) includes:

1. Questionnaires distributed to individuals who directly receive the services of the evaluatee
2. Assessment and observation by the responsible administrator
3. Self-assessment
4. Peer observation
5. Portfolio

Questionnaires: A standard questionnaire will be used to survey individuals who directly receive services. Alternative survey methods may be used at the request of an individual or a department *if* approved by the Peer Review Committee and the Evaluation Guidance Committee. Results of the standard questionnaire will be tabulated electronically and written comments will be typed or voice recorded for the evaluatee and Peer Review Committee. The responsible administrator is accountable for the distribution and summary of standard questionnaires.

Administrator Assessment: The responsible administrator will complete the “Administrator’s Assessment of Professional Responsibilities” form and provide it to the Peer Review Committee.

Self-Assessment: The faculty member will complete the “Faculty Self-Assessment” form and provide it to the Peer Review Committee.

Peer Observation: The peer observer and evaluatee will mutually agree on an appropriate window of time during which the observation will take place. The peer observer will not participate in any activities undertaken by the evaluatee during the observation session. Permission will be requested and received from a student in any situation in which confidentiality is of a concern. The peer observer will complete the “Peer Observation Report” form and provide it to the Peer Review Committee.

Ordinarily the peer observer will refrain from evaluative comments or suggestions until all observations have been conducted and the peer observer has had sufficient time to organize her/his thoughts, comments, and possible suggestions for improvement. However, the peer observer may ask the evaluatee questions for clarification immediately following an observation. The peer observer will discuss her/his findings with the evaluatee. The evaluatee may record any unresolved disagreement with the peer observer’s findings and evaluation and attach that record to the report form prior to it being submitted by the peer observer to the Peer Review Committee.

Portfolio: Due to the variety of non-classroom faculty assignments, the portfolio is the means for the evaluatee to present materials relevant to her/his assignment(s). Sample materials could include key information handouts, brochures, flyers, relevant letters/memos, committee assignments, special projects, worksheets, student educational plans, a brief (one page) description of the evaluatee’s assignment, etc. The intent of the portfolio is to assist the peer observer in understanding how the evaluatee conducts her/his professional duties.

Follow-up Comprehensive Evaluation: If any evaluation (standard or comprehensive) results in a rating of unsatisfactory, then a Follow-up Comprehensive Evaluation is conducted the next academic year. It is intended that the one year time frame allow the evaluatee sufficient time to receive assistance from the responsible administrator and/or mentoring from a peer and to initiate improvements in her/his performance. The responsible administrator or the Evaluation Guidance Committee may recommend someone who is not part of the evaluation process as the mentor.

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

If the first a Follow-up Comprehensive Evaluation results in a rating of satisfactory, then the faculty member returns to the regular evaluation cycle. If it results in a rating of unsatisfactory, a second a Follow-up Comprehensive Evaluation is conducted the next academic year. If the second evaluation results in a rating of unsatisfactory, referral of the matter is made to the appropriate Vice President for suitable action.

III. EVALUATION SEQUENCE

1. At the beginning of the fall semester, the responsible administrator determines who is scheduled for evaluation during the academic year. To start the alternating cycle, a lottery method will be used to determine who receives which type of evaluation when they are next evaluated. A newly tenured faculty member will start with a Comprehensive Evaluation.
2. Division faculty and the responsible administrator recommend members of the Peer Review Committee to the Evaluation Guidance Committee.
3. The Evaluation Guidance Committee approves the members of the Peer Review Committee.
4. The Evaluation Guidance Committee provides training for members of the Peer Review Committee and orientation for evaluatees.
5. The Peer Review Committee selects a chairperson, establishes its work schedule, and notifies all participants in the evaluation process.
6. The Peer Observer is selected.
7. The Peer Review Committee gathers all required evaluation materials and deliberates.
8. The Peer Review Committee makes recommendations and submits the results on an "Evaluation Summary Form" to the appropriate Vice President.
9. The Vice President reviews materials and forwards copies to the evaluatee, District Personnel Office, and the responsible administrator.
10. The responsible administrator records the evaluation results, schedules the next evaluation, and confers with the evaluatee as needed.
11. Disciplinary or non-renewal procedures may be undertaken independent of the evaluation process.

A. Administrator's Assessment of Professional Responsibilities

Please assess in writing the performance of _____ in the following areas:

1. Participation in division and department meetings and other activities related to the area of professional responsibility.
2. Participation in shared governance activities.
3. Participation in professional growth activities.
4. Complete, accurate, and timely submission of paperwork, required reports and/or other information related to the area of professional responsibility and/or lead assignment.
5. Professional relationships with colleagues and students.
6. General conduct of professional responsibilities.
7. Substantive praise or complaints that have been received from students and/or peers.

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

Signature

Date

B. Self Assessment

Please assess in writing your performance in the following areas:

1. Effectiveness in your assignment(s).
2. Relationships with students and colleagues.
3. Participation in department and division activities.
4. Participation in College/District activities.
5. Engagement in professional development related to your discipline, lead assignment, or area of growth.
6. Publications, presentations, and job-related community activities.
7. Awards, honors, external evaluations by experts and/or licensing agencies.
8. Other

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

Signature

Date

C. Peer Observation Report

Evaluate

Semester/Year

Portfolio Review Summary

Review included the following items:

The Portfolio materials are:

_____ Satisfactory

_____ Unsatisfactory

Comments:

Observation Summary

Location/Nature of Professional Duties:

Comments (including commendations and/or suggestions)

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

I have met with the evaluatee and discussed the results of my observation and portfolio review.

Signature _____ Date _____

I have met and discussed the results of the peer observation and portfolio review with the peer observer.

_____ I agree with the results _____ I disagree with the results and have attached my response.

Signature _____ Date _____

D. Evaluation Summary

Evaluee: _____ Evaluation Year: _____

Type of Evaluation: _____ (Standard, Comprehensive, Follow-Up)

PART I: (to be completed by the Peer Review Committee)

The Peer Review Committee for the _____ Division has reviewed all evaluation materials and, after careful consideration, rates the professional performance of the evaluee as:

_____ **Satisfactory**

_____ **Unsatisfactory**

The Peer Review Committee makes the following commendations, recommendations, and/or comments to the evaluee (attach additional sheets if necessary):

Signature _____ Date _____

Chairperson, Peer Review Committee

PART II: (to be completed by the Evaluee)

RESPONSE TO EVALUATION: (please complete and sign Part II, then return to Division administrator)

___ I agree ___ I disagree with the overall rating of the evaluation.

COMMENTS: (attach additional sheets if necessary)

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____
Evaluatee

PART III: (to be completed by the Vice-President or designee)

This Evaluation Summary has been received and reviewed for completeness. Copies have been forwarded to the evaluatee and responsible administrator. The original has been forwarded to the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources for placement in the evaluatee's personnel file.

The next evaluation should take place in _____, and should be _____.
(Standard, Comprehensive, Follow-Up)

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____
Vice President

E. Directions for Completing a Questionnaire

All faculty are evaluated periodically. Your opinions and comments are an essential part of the evaluation process. Evaluation is valuable for the faculty member, the College, and future students. The intent of the process is to assure quality of services for students and professional growth for the faculty member by means of a comprehensive assessment of performance.

Please take time to answer each question thoughtfully, candidly, and specifically for this faculty member only. Write the name of the faculty member and today's date at the top of the Scantron form. Use a #2 pencil to mark your responses. For items 1 through 16, mark **STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, STRONGLY DISAGREE, or DOES NOT APPLY** as appropriate to your experience with this faculty member. Mark **YES** or **NO** for items 17 and 18. Respond in writing on the back of the Scantron form to questions A and B. **Do not put your name on the form.**

Please return the completed form to _____ by _____.

This questionnaire is anonymous, and all responses and comments will be typed and summarized before being shared with the faculty member.

Thank you for helping us to provide quality services for our students.

Adjunct Faculty Evaluation Policy

General Considerations

- The Board of Trustees, faculty and administration share a responsibility for the process of evaluating adjunct faculty.
- The evaluation process assures that quality instruction is taking place.
- The adjunct faculty evaluation process safeguards and assures the principles and practices of academic freedom as defined in District Rules and Regulations.
- The adjunct faculty evaluation process upholds the principles of inclusivity, equal access and opportunity, promotes diversity, and is fair and unbiased.
- The adjunct faculty evaluation process is conducted by full-time faculty and is an affirmative means for reviewing performance.
- The adjunct faculty evaluation process fosters open communication among participants in order to assure fairness and opportunity for success.

I. Purpose

The adjunct faculty evaluation process should assure that students have access to the most knowledgeable, talented, creative and student-oriented faculty available.

The specific purposes of adjunct faculty evaluation are as follows:

- to recognize and acknowledge good performance;
- to enhance satisfactory performance and help employees who are performing satisfactorily further their own growth;
- to identify weak performance and help employees to achieve needed improvement; and
- to document unsatisfactory performance.

The adjunct faculty evaluation process should assure teaching quality and professional growth and development by providing a useful assessment of performance. The adjunct faculty have the academic freedom that all other members of the faculty have, and the adjunct faculty evaluation process should safeguard that basic right of the academic community.

II. Evaluation Criteria for Adjunct Faculty

The following criteria will be used, as appropriate, to assess adjunct faculty performance. During the first year, evaluation will not emphasize the criteria listed under B (2) and B (5).

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

A. Student Relations

In the performance of his/her professional duties, the adjunct faculty member:

1. responds to the educational needs of students by (a) answering questions clearly and following through to maximize student understanding; and (b) giving equal access and treatment to students regardless of ethnicity, cultural background, age, gender, and lifestyle, and by avoiding stereotypes;
2. demonstrates respect for the right of the student to hold and to express divergent opinions and demonstrates sensitivity to concerns of students; and
3. shows concern for student educational welfare by being available during office hours and answering questions with courtesy.

B. Professional Responsibilities

The adjunct faculty member:

1. meets classes as set forth in the contract;
2. participates in department, college or other professional activities;
3. maintains ethical standards as outlined in the SMCCCD Academic Senate Statement of Professional Standards;
4. demonstrates commitment to and enthusiasm for the profession;
5. may participate in professional growth activities; and
6. maintains and submits appropriate records in accordance with District contract.

C. Performance Criteria

1. Performance by Classroom Faculty

The adjunct faculty member:

- a. is knowledgeable about subject matter;
- b. is aware of recent, general developments/research in field;
- c. demonstrates effective communication with students;
- d. provides students with a clear statement of grading, attendance, examination policies, and other course requirements;
- e. uses effective teaching methods appropriate to the subject matter;
- f. uses appropriate testing and assessment techniques to measure students progress; and
- g. shows evidence of meeting course objectives as outlined in the catalog and official course outline.

2. Performance by Adjunct Counselors, Librarians, and other Instructional and Student Services Faculty

The adjunct faculty member:

1. is knowledgeable about assignment area/duties;
2. is aware of recent, general development/research in assigned area/duties;
3. demonstrates effective communication with students;
4. uses effective methods appropriate to the assignment area/duties; and
5. shows evidence of meeting objectives appropriate to the assignment area/duties.

III. Evaluation Procedures and Methods

Adjunct faculty will be evaluated in the first year of employment. In the SMCCCD, adjunct faculty will be evaluated in the first semester of service. Thereafter adjunct faculty shall be evaluated at least once

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

every six (6) regular semesters. In accordance with District policy, the evaluation will be completed by the end of the semester in which it is begun.

The following methods will be used to evaluate adjunct faculty performance against the criteria stated in Section II.

Required:

1. Student questionnaire

A standard District questionnaire, approved by the AB 1725 Trust Committee, shall be used to gather information from students. Except in rare cases, in which student evaluation is not practicable due to unusual circumstances, student evaluation will be required to assess faculty/student relations, faculty student communication, and use of teaching methods.

2. Adjunct faculty portfolio

The adjunct faculty shall supply a faculty portfolio, which includes current course syllabi, sample class materials, sample examinations, sample quizzes, if used, and an explanation of grading procedures. Additional materials may include written documentation of the following:

- a) departmental, college or professional activities
- b) new course/services development
- c) development of new teaching methods
- d) publications
- e) community service
- f) awards and honors
- g) outside evaluations conducted by experts and/or licensing agencies
- h) other

The information provided in a portfolio is confidential and may become part of the adjunct faculty's personnel file. This information cannot be disclosed to other employees without permission of the adjunct faculty. Only current information will be considered in this process (concerning activities of the past three years).

3. Performance assessment by peer evaluator

This assessment may take place in the classroom, at the service site, or viewing videotapes of actual classroom presentations, counseling sessions, etc.

Optional:

1. Adjunct faculty self-assessment

This information should describe the individual's goals and objectives and provide an explanation of how the events demonstrated during the performance assessment relate to those goals and objectives.

2. Performance assessment by Division Dean (at his/her own discretion or at the request of the peer evaluator or of the evaluatee). This assessment may take place in the classroom, at the service site, or viewing videotapes of actual classroom presentations, counseling sessions, etc.

IV. Role and Responsibility of Tenured Peer and Division Dean

Role of Peer Evaluator

As soon as possible after the hiring of a new adjunct faculty member, existing faculty in the discipline will assign one tenured discipline faculty to serve as the peer evaluator for that new hire. All permanent faculty members of the discipline constitute the initial pool of potential peer evaluators.

AP 3.20.1 Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure (continued)

The tenured peer conducting the adjunct faculty evaluation has an obligation to uphold the confidentiality of the evaluation process, uphold the principles of inclusivity, promote and respect diversity, and conduct fair and unbiased evaluations.

Responsibilities of Peer Evaluator

1. to meet with the adjunct faculty, prior to the start of the process, to review evaluation criteria, methods, procedures, and timelines.
2. to conduct a performance assessment;
3. to administer, tabulate and summarize student questionnaires;
4. to meet with the adjunct faculty to discuss the results of the a) performance assessment and b) student questionnaires;
5. to review all additional data;
6. to prepare a written report of the assessment;
7. to meet with the adjunct faculty and division dean to discuss all evaluation materials and plans for professional growth;
8. to determine, with the division dean, a joint evaluation recommendation; and
9. to prepare and forward the recommendation to the appropriate Vice President.

Role of Division Dean

The appropriate Division Dean shares the obligation to uphold the confidentiality of the adjunct faculty evaluation process and the principles of inclusivity and academic freedom, to promote and respect diversity, to assure fair and unbiased evaluations, and to maintain those educational principles that promote a quality faculty in his/her area of responsibility.

Responsibilities of Division Dean

1. to monitor adjunct faculty evaluation to assure compliance with District policy timelines and procedures;
2. to conduct a performance assessment, at his/her own discretion or at the request of the peer evaluator or evaluatee, and to prepare a written report of the assessment, as appropriate;
3. to meet with the evaluatee following the (Dean's) performance assessment to discuss the results;
4. to present to, and discuss with, the peer evaluator any other information relevant to the evaluatee's fitness for service;
5. to meet with the adjunct faculty and peer evaluator to discuss all evaluation materials and plans for professional growth;
6. to determine, with the peer evaluator, a joint evaluation recommendation; and
7. to prepare and forward the recommendation to the appropriate Vice President.

V. Right to Grievance

The adjunct faculty member has the right to file a grievance, but such grievance must be based solely on a claim of misinterpretation and/or misapplication of procedural aspects of this policy.