

**SAN MATEO COUNTY COMMUNITY  
COLLEGE DISTRICT**

**FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES**

**REVISED AUGUST 2007**

## **FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES**

### **Tenure Review Policy and Procedures**

#### **General Consideration**

- The Board of Trustees, faculty, and administration share a responsibility for the process of awarding tenure.
- The tenure review process safeguards and assures the principles and practices of academic freedom as defined in District Rules and Regulations.
- The tenure review process upholds the principles of inclusivity, equal access, and opportunity; promotes diversity; and is 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 fosters 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 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.

### **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; by (b) giving equal access and treatment to students regardless of ethnicity, cultural background, age, gender, and lifestyle; and by (c) 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 the 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 should have female and male membership; moreover, Committee members should include a member from an ethnic minority.

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 will 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 will 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 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 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 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; and
- 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 evaluation
2. faculty portfolio
3. peer observation
4. division dean observation

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

### Student Evaluation

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, small-group instructional feedback, or any other method mutually agreed upon by the contract employee and the Tenure Review Committee may be used. Except 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:

1. departmental, college or professional activities,
2. new course/services development,
3. development of new teaching methods,
4. publications,
5. community service,
6. awards and honors,
7. outside evaluations conducted by experts and/or licensing agencies, and/or
8. 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**

Immediately after the hiring of a tenure track faculty member, the division dean 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, by the seventeenth week of the academic year.

The same timeline is suggested for weeks 1-12 of the third year. Because 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.

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**

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 members 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.

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 members has the right to file a grievance on any of the above grounds as well as on a claim that the decision was "unreasonable."

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.

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.

**Performance Evaluation of Contract Faculty**

**Cover Sheet**

**COLLEGE** \_\_\_\_\_

**CONTRACT FACULTY MEMBER'S NAME** \_\_\_\_\_

**TEACHING DISCIPLINE** \_\_\_\_\_

**CONTRACT YEAR (Check one):** First \_\_\_\_\_ Second \_\_\_\_\_ Third \_\_\_\_\_ Fourth \_\_\_\_\_

Note: Tenure Review Policy and Procedures states “in the first year of employment, performance of the contract faculty’s primary duties shall be the fundamental basis for consideration of continued employment.

Names of the Tenure Review Committee members Serving During First and Second Contract Years:

Discipline expert (four-year member) \_\_\_\_\_

Three-year member \_\_\_\_\_

Two-year member \_\_\_\_\_

Dean \_\_\_\_\_

(Please indicate committee chair after the appropriate member’s name)

Name of the member who is the replacement for the Fourth Year \_\_\_\_\_

Name of the Member who is the replacement for the Third and Fourth Years \_\_\_\_\_

Date the Semester Began \_\_\_\_\_

Date of the end of:      Week 4 \_\_\_\_\_ Week 12 \_\_\_\_\_ Week 17 \_\_\_\_\_

Dates to be filled out below as the semester progresses are those indicated in the “Tenure Review Policy” under “Timelines”. Please see the next page for explanations. All references are to the Tenure Review Policy under “Timelines”.

DATE A \_\_\_\_\_ DATE D \_\_\_\_\_ DATE G \_\_\_\_\_

DATE B \_\_\_\_\_ DATE E \_\_\_\_\_ DATE H \_\_\_\_\_

DATE C \_\_\_\_\_ DATE F \_\_\_\_\_ DATE K \_\_\_\_\_

## DEFINITION OF DATES

- Date A:** This is the date of the orientation held for the tenure review committee members. Weeks 1-4
- Date B:** This is the date the committee meets without the contract faculty member and establishes a work schedule. Weeks 1-4
- Date C:** This is the date the committee meets with the contract faculty member to discuss the process. Weeks 1 – 4
- Date D:** This is the date the contract faculty member submits beginning documentation for the faculty portfolio. Weeks 1-4
- Date E:** This is the date the committee meets to review the results of the evaluation process. Weeks 13-17
- Date F:** This is the date the committee meets with the contract faculty member, discusses the evaluation results and develops with the contract faculty member a professional activity plan. Weeks 13-17
- Date G:** This is the date the committee completes the written report of its findings and recommendations, including the contract faculty member's professional plan. This must be done by the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> week of the semester.
- Date H:** This is the date the committee or a designated member of the committee meets with the contract faculty member to inform him or her of the committee's recommendations. Weeks 13-17
- Date K:** This is the date the committee's report is submitted to the vice president. This must be done by the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> week of the semester.

**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: _____

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.

Accepted: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Vice President

**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.

Accepted: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Vice President

### 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

Rated section	A	B	C	Comments
4. Appropriates 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 in 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

Rated section	A	B	C	Comments
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?):				
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?):				

SIGNATURES:

EVALUATOR \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

EVALUEE \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

DIVISION DEAN/DESIGNEE \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

Rating Key:    A. Satisfactory            B. Needs Improvement            C. Not Enough Information/Not Applicable

### 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 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 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.

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF CONTRACT FACULTY**  
**PORTFOLIO EVALUATION**

**COLLEGE** \_\_\_\_\_

**NAME OF EVALUATOR** \_\_\_\_\_

**REQUIRED MATERIALS:**

1. Course Syllabi with explanation of grading procedures

Please check one: Satisfactory \_\_\_\_\_ Needs Improvement \_\_\_\_\_

Guidelines in rating this item: characteristics of the syllabi to be considered include appearance, completeness, organization etc. Syllabi should be typed and easy to read, should include information about office hours, textbook(s) and other materials used, testing and grading policies.

Comments of the evaluator:

2. Class Materials

Please check one: Satisfactory \_\_\_\_\_ Needs Improvement \_\_\_\_\_

Guidelines in rating this item: class materials include the official course outline, textbooks, book orders and class related printing orders, lab manuals, lecture materials, handouts, board work, etc. Appropriateness of these materials to the course should be considered: are the textbooks of the same level and scope as the ones included on the official course outline? Do the textbooks and other materials cover content as described in the official course outline? How old is the course outline? How recent are the textbook and other class materials? How clear is the board work? Can students read what is on the board? If diagrams, graphs and charts are drawn on the board or projected, are they available in the printed materials to the students?

Comments of the evaluator:

**3. Evaluating and grading students' performance.**

Please check one: Satisfactory \_\_\_\_\_ Needs Improvement \_\_\_\_\_

Guidelines in rating this item: evaluation methods include exams, quizzes, essays, projects, lab results, reports, etc. Appropriateness of the methods used should be considered. Are the exams recently developed? Are they legible?

Do they cover material presented in the course? Do they encourage development and improvement of writing skills and critical thinking skills?

Comments of the evaluator:

**ADDITIONAL MATERIALS:**

1. Departmental, college or professional activities
2. New course/service development
3. Development of new teaching methods
4. Publications
5. Community service
6. Awards/honors
7. Outside evaluations conducted by experts and/or licensing agencies
8. Other

SIGNATURE OF EVALUATOR \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

SIGNATURE OF EVALUEE \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

## **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, composition reflects diversity); committee membership 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:

### **Standard Evaluation**

- 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.

### **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.

**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.

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), and requests assessments from dean and evaluatees.
- Peer Observer is agreed upon by the dean and the evaluatee if evaluation is comprehensive.
- Completed student questionnaires are forwarded via the division office for processing (electronic tabulation of marked responses, recording of written comments); division office returns processed responses to Peer Committee.
- During Spring semester, the 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 the evaluation summary and submits the 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 the evaluatee, evaluatee's personnel file, and dean.
- Dean records results and schedules next evaluation and 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 nonrenewal 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
12. Method(s) of instruction (e.g., lecture, discussion, tutorial, seminar, demonstration, or a combination of methods):				
13. 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?):				
14. 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

Rated section	A	B	C	Comments
15. Appropriateness of assignments (i.e., is the work assigned during the observed class period commensurate with students' ability and the objectives of the course?):				
16. 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?):				
17. 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?):				
18. 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?):				
19. 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?):				
20. 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

Rated section	A	B	C	Comments
21. 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?):				
22. 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?):				

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:

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 the Peer Observer's Observation and Portfolio Review An explanation is attached.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Evaluatee

### 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 ensure 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 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 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.





## 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 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 Evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_  
Evaluatee's Name (Last, first) (Standard, Comprehensive)

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**

#### **ORGANIZATION**

##### **Evaluation Guidance Committee (One per College)**

**Purpose:** To provide all participants with guidance in the evaluation process  
To provide all training for the evaluation process  
To 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 ongoing orientation and training activities to ensure a consistent, constructive, and fair evaluation process.

##### **One Peer Review Committee for Each Division**

**Purpose:** To coordinate the evaluation process for the Division  
To 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, and
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.
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.

### **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, and
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, and
5. Portfolio

#### 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, and
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 its 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 allows 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.

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.

## **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 three years after completing tenure review.
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 Human Resources 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.

## **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.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

### 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

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

## Peer Observation Report

\_\_\_\_\_  
Evaluate

\_\_\_\_\_  
Semester/Year

### Portfolio Review Summary

Review included the following items:

The Portfolio materials are  
Comments:

\_\_\_\_\_ Satisfactory

\_\_\_\_\_ Unsatisfactory

### Observation Summary

Location/Nature of Professional Duties:

Comments (including commendations and/or suggestions):

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

**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)

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
Evaluee

**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 evaluee and responsible administrator. The original has been forwarded to the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources for placement in the evaluee’s personnel file.

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

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
Vice President

## **Evaluation Policy and Procedures for Adjunct Faculty**

### **General Consideration**

- 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).

### **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; by (b) giving equal access and treatment to students regardless of ethnicity, cultural background, age, gender, and lifestyle; and by (c) 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 by Classroom Faculty**

The adjunct faculty member

1. is knowledgeable about subject matter;
2. is aware of recent, general developments/research in the 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 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

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

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, and
- 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 by 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 by 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.

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 are

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 are

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.

## **Statement on Academic Freedom**

The San Mateo County Community College District is dedicated to maintaining a climate of academic freedom encouraging the sharing and cultivation of a wide variety of viewpoints. Academic freedom expresses our belief in inquiry, informed debate and the search for truth; academic freedom is necessary in order to provide students with a variety of ideas, to encourage them to engage in critical thinking and to help them understand conflicting opinions.

Academic freedom encompasses the freedom to study, teach, and express ideas, including unpopular or controversial ones, without censorship or political restraint. Academic freedom, rather than being a license to do or say whatever one wishes, requires professional competence, open inquiry and rigorous attention to the pursuit of truth.

The District's faculty have the right to express their informed opinions which relate, directly or indirectly, to their professional activities, whether these opinions are expressed in the classroom, elsewhere on campus or at college-related functions. In a search for truth and in a context of reasoned academic debate, students also have the right to express their opinions and to question those presented by others.

Employment by the District does not in any way restrict or limit the First Amendment rights enjoyed by faculty as members of their communities. Faculty members are free to speak and write publicly on any issue, as long as they do not indicate they are speaking for the institution.

Protecting academic freedom is the responsibility of the college community. Therefore, in a climate of openness and mutual respect, free from distortion and doctrinal obligation, the District protects and encourages the exchange of ideas, including unpopular ones, which are presented in a spirit of free and open dialogue and constructive debate.

#### **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.

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 are

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 are

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.

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ADJUNCT FACULTY**

**COVER SHEET**

**COLLEGE** \_\_\_\_\_

**NAME OF ADJUNCT FACULTY MEMBER** \_\_\_\_\_

**SEMESTER (Please check one)**      **First** \_\_\_\_\_ **Other** \_\_\_\_\_

**Note: During the first year of employment, the evaluation will not emphasize criteria related to the participation in department, college or other professional activities or participation in professional growth activities.**

**NAME OF THE PEER EVALUATOR** \_\_\_\_\_

**DATE THE SEMESTER BEGAN** \_\_\_\_\_

**DATE OF THE END OF WEEK 5** \_\_\_\_\_ **WEEK 8** \_\_\_\_\_ **WEEK 14** \_\_\_\_\_ **Week 16** \_\_\_\_\_ **WEEK 17** \_\_\_\_\_

Dates to be filled out below as the semester progresses are those defined on the next page.

**DATE A** \_\_\_\_\_ **DATE C** \_\_\_\_\_ **DATE E** \_\_\_\_\_

**DATE B** \_\_\_\_\_ **DATE D** \_\_\_\_\_

In addition to these dates, it is suggested that classroom observations be conducted by the Peer Evaluator and the Division Dean and these observations be discussed with the evaluatee individually. The class observations forms are to be completed and signed and the student questionnaires should be administered and summarized by week 13

- DATE A: This is the date the Peer Evaluator and the Division Dean meet without the adjunct faculty member to review evaluation criteria, methods, procedures and timelines. Suggested timeline: Weeks 1 – 5
- DATE B: This is the date the Peer Evaluator and the Division Dean meet with the adjunct faculty member to review evaluation criteria, methods, procedures and timelines. Suggested timeline: Weeks 6 – 8
- DATE C: This is the date the Peer Evaluator and the Division Dean meet fist without the adjunct faculty member and review the results of the evaluation process. This is also the date the Peer Evaluator and the Division Dean meet with the adjunct faculty member, discuss the evaluation results and develop a “Plan for Professional Growth” with the adjunct faculty member. Suggested timeline: Weeks 13 – 14
- DATE D: This is the date the “Evaluation Recommendation” form for the adjunct faculty member is completed and signed by the Peer Evaluator, the Division Dean and the adjunct faculty member. This is also the date that the completed text of the “Plan for Professional Growth” is submitted to the Peer Evaluator and the Division Dean, and is placed in the evaluatee’s official personnel file along with all the other evaluation related documents. Suggested timeline: Weeks 15 – 16
- DATE E: This is the date the committee’s report is submitted to the vice president. Suggested timeline: End of week 17

SIGNATURE OF THE PEER EVALUATOR\_\_\_\_\_

DATE\_\_\_\_\_

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ADJUNCT FACULTY**  
**EVALUATION RECOMMENDATION**

**COLLEGE** \_\_\_\_\_ **DIVISION** \_\_\_\_\_

**ACADEMIC YEAR OF EVALUATION** \_\_\_\_\_ **SEMESTER** \_\_\_\_\_

**NAME OF ADJUNCT FACULTY MEMBER** \_\_\_\_\_

This instructor/counselor/librarian/nurse/other discipline has been evaluated according to District policies in the following ways: (Please check all the apply)

\_\_\_\_ Student Evaluation

\_\_\_\_ Faculty Portfolio

\_\_\_\_ Performance Observation by \_\_\_\_ Peer and \_\_\_\_ Division Dean

\_\_\_\_ Professional Responsibilities

\_\_\_\_ Self-assessment (Optional)

\_\_\_\_ Other options (if used)

Based upon the above-stated sources, which are documented and on file in the Division Office,

\_\_\_\_\_ receives a recommendation of :  
(Name of Adjunct Faculty Member)

Satisfactory \_\_\_\_\_

Unsatisfactory \_\_\_\_\_ (see attached reasons for this recommendation)

Recommended for non-rehiring \_\_\_\_\_

**SIGNATURES OF EVALUATORS:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Peer Evaluator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Division Dean

\_\_\_\_\_  
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 Peer Evaluator and the Division Dean, and have received copies of all related materials.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Adjunct 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 his 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.

### 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
23. Method(s) of instruction (e.g., lecture, discussion, tutorial, seminar, demonstration, or a combination of methods):				
24. 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?):				
25. 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

Rated section	A	B	C	Comments
26. Appropriateness of assignments (i.e., is the work assigned during the observed class period commensurate with students' ability and the objectives of the course?):				
27. 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?):				
28. 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?):				
29. 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?):				
30. 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?):				
31. 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

Rated section	A	B	C	Comments
32. 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?):				
33. 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?):				

SIGNATURES:

EVALUATOR \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

EVALUEE \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

DIVISION DEAN/DESIGNEE \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

Rating Key:    A. Satisfactory            B. Needs Improvement            C. Not Enough Information/Not Applicable

## 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 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 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.

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ADJUNCT FACULTY**  
**PORTFOLIO EVALUATION**

**COLLEGE** \_\_\_\_\_

**NAME OF ADJUNCT FACULTY MEMBER** \_\_\_\_\_

**NAME OF EVALUATOR** \_\_\_\_\_

**REQUIRED MATERIALS:**

1. Course syllabi with the explanation of grading procedures

Please check one: Satisfactory \_\_\_\_\_ Needs Improvement \_\_\_\_\_

Guidelines in rating this item: characteristics of the syllabi to be considered include appearance, completeness, organization, etc. Syllabi should be typed and easy to read, should include information about office hours, textbook(s) and other materials used, testing/grading policies.

Comments of the evaluator:

2. Class Materials

Please check one: Satisfactory \_\_\_\_\_ Needs Improvement \_\_\_\_\_

Guidelines in rating this item: class materials include the official course outline, textbooks, book orders, and class related printing orders, lab manuals, lecture materials, handouts, board work, etc. Appropriateness of these materials to the course should be considered: Are the textbooks of the same level and scope as the ones included on the official course outline? Do the textbooks and other materials cover content as described in the official course outline? How old is the course outline? How recent are the textbook and other class materials? How clear is the board work? Can students read what is on the board? If diagrams, graphs and charts are drawn on the board or projected, are they available in the printed materials to the students?

Comments of the evaluator:

3. Evaluating and grading students' performance.

Please check one: Satisfactory \_\_\_\_\_ Needs Improvement \_\_\_\_\_

Guidelines in rating this item: Evaluation methods include exams, quizzes, essays, projects, lab results, reports, etc. Appropriateness of the methods used should be considered. Are the exams recently developed? Are they legible? Do they cover material presented in the course? Do they encourage development and improvement of writing skills and critical thinking skills?

Comments of the evaluator:

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS:

1. Departmental, college or professional activities
2. New course/services development
3. Development of new teaching methods
4. Publications
5. Community service
6. Awards/honors
7. Outside evaluations conducted by experts and/or licensing agencies
8. Other

SIGNATURE OF EVALUATOR \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

SIGNATURE OF EVALUEE \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_