

APPENDIX G: EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Table of Contents

I.	General Considerations	3
II.	Purpose.....	3
III.	Evaluation Criteria for Faculty	3
IV.	Evaluation Ratings	5
V.	Evaluation Procedures—Tenured Faculty	6
VI.	Evaluation Procedures—Tenure-Track Faculty.....	11
VII.	Evaluation Procedures—Adjunct and Grant-Funded*Faculty.....	20
VIII.	Evaluation Procedures—Coordinators, Nurses, and Healthcare Providers	26
IX.	Evaluation Forms	27
A.	<u>Tenured, Tenure-Track, and Adjunct Faculty</u>	
	1. Classroom Observation Form	
	2. Online Class Observation Form	
	3. Instructions for Administering Student Questionnaire (Classroom)	
	4. Instructions for Administering Student Questionnaire (Online)	
	5. Student Questionnaire (Classroom/Online)	
	6. Portfolio Review Form	
	7. Mandatory Self-Assessment Form	
	8. Dean/Responsible Administrator’s Assessment of Non-Teaching Responsibilities	
B.	<u>Faculty Coordinator</u>	
	1. Evaluation Form	
	2. Portfolio Review Form	
	3. Mandatory Self-Assessment Form.	
C.	<u>Counselor</u>	
	1. Observation Form	
	2. Student Questionnaire (Academic Counselor)	
	3. Student Questionnaire (Psychological Services Counselor)	
	4. Portfolio Review Form	
	5. Mandatory Self-Assessment Form	
	6. Dean/Responsible Administrator’s Assessment of Professional Responsibilities	

* Throughout this document, procedures and forms used for adjunct faculty also will be used for grant-funded faculty.

D. [Evaluation Forms—Librarian](#)

1. Faculty Questionnaire—Instruction
2. Observation Form—Reference or Other Public Service
3. Student Questionnaire—Reference Librarian
4. Student Questionnaire—Library Instruction
5. Portfolio Review Form.
6. Mandatory Self-Assessment Form
7. Dean/Responsible Administrator’s Assessment of Professional Responsibilities

E. [Evaluation Forms—Nurse or Other Healthcare Provider](#)

1. Observation Form
2. Student Questionnaire
3. Portfolio Review Form.
4. Mandatory Self-Assessment

F. [Evaluation Summary Forms](#)

1. Evaluation Summary for Tenured Faculty
2. Evaluation Summary for Tenure-Track Faculty
3. Evaluation Summary for Adjunct and Grant-Funded Faculty

G. [Performance Improvement Plan \(PIP\) Form](#)

H. [Faculty Evaluation Committee Orientation Document](#)

I. General Considerations

- A. The Board of Trustees, faculty, and administration share a responsibility for the process of evaluating the work performance of all faculty and for awarding tenure.
- B. The evaluation process upholds the principles of inclusivity, equal access, and opportunity, promotes diversity, and is fair and unbiased.
- C. The evaluation process is an affirmative means for evaluating the work performance of all faculty and for renewal of employment and awarding of tenure.
- D. The evaluation process fosters open communication among participants in order to assure fairness and opportunity for success.

II. Purpose

- A. The evaluation process should assist faculty in understanding the expectations for employment and tenure; developing skills and acquiring the experience to participate successfully in the educational process; and using the District's and other resources for professional growth.
- B. The evaluation process should assure that students have access to the most knowledgeable, talented, creative, and student-oriented faculty available. Therefore, periodic performance evaluations are conducted for all tenured, tenure track, and adjunct faculty. A four-year probationary period is provided for tenure-track employees.
- C. The evaluation process safeguards and assures the principles and practices of academic freedom as defined in District Policies and Procedures. Academic freedom applies equally to all tenured, probationary, adjunct, and grant-funded faculty.
- D. The evaluation process should assure quality of work performance and professional growth/development by providing a useful assessment of performance.

III. Evaluation Criteria for Faculty

- A. General Criteria. The following criteria will be used to assess all faculty.

- 1. Student Relations

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

- a. responds to the educational needs of students by
 - 1) communicating effectively, answering questions clearly, and assessing student learning consistently; and
 - 2) avoiding stereotypes and giving equal access and treatment to students regardless of national origin, religion, age, gender, gender identity, gender expression, race or ethnicity, color, medical condition, genetic information, ancestry, sexual orientation, marital status, physical or mental disability, or pregnancy or because they are perceived to have one or more of the foregoing characteristics, or based on association with a person or group with one or more of these actual or perceived characteristics;

- b. demonstrates respect for the right of the student to hold and to express divergent opinions and handles student concerns appropriately; and
- c. shows concern for student educational welfare by being available during on-site and online office hours, answering questions with courtesy, and responding to phone calls and emails in a timely manner.

2. Professional Responsibilities

The faculty member

- a. is knowledgeable about subject matter/assignment area/duties;
- b. is aware of recent, general developments/research in field/assigned area/duties;
- c. meets classes as set forth in the contract;
- d. performs assigned duties;
- e. participates in department, college, or other professional activities;
- f. maintains ethical standards as outlined in the SMCCCD Academic Senate Statement of Professional Standards;
- g. demonstrates commitment to the profession;
- h. participates in professional growth activities; and
- i. maintains and submits appropriate records in accordance with the collective bargaining agreement between the District and AFT 1493 and District Policies and Procedures.

B. Criteria Specific to Faculty Who Teach in the Classroom/Online:

The faculty member:

- 1. provides students with a clear statement of grading, attendance, examination policies, and other course requirements;
- 2. uses effective teaching methods appropriate to the subject matter;
- 3. uses appropriate testing and assessment techniques to measure students' progress;
- 4. uses the District-designated course management system for online classes, hybrid classes, and face-to-face class support or links any non-District-designated course management system for online classes to the District-designated course management system for online classes
- 5. shows evidence of meeting course objectives and following the course outline of record.

C. Criteria Specific to Counselors, Faculty Coordinators, Librarians, Nurses, and other Student Services Faculty

The faculty member:

- 1. uses effective methods appropriate to the assignment area/duties; and
- 2. shows evidence of following and adhering to the appropriate duties and responsibilities assigned to the position.

D. During the first year of employment, tenure-track faculty will be evaluated only on criteria related to their primary assignment.

IV. Evaluation Ratings

- A. Exceeds Expectations: This rating should be used for faculty whose performance far exceeds expectations due to exceptionally high quality of work in all essential areas of responsibility, resulting in an overall quality of work that is superior.
- B. Meets Expectations: This rating should be used for faculty who perform assigned responsibilities well, consistently throughout the review period.
- C. Needs Improvement: This rating should be used for faculty who make a sincere effort to meet the Evaluation Criteria enumerated herein but need additional guidance to meet them successfully. Steps must be taken to further develop targeted areas, which will improve overall performance.
- D. Is Unsatisfactory: This rating should be used for faculty whose performance was below standard with regard to the Evaluation Criteria enumerated herein. Steps must be taken to improve overall performance.

V. Evaluation Procedures—Tenured Faculty

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

- A. It is the responsibility of the appropriate Vice President, District Academic Senate President, and AFT President or their designees to guide the evaluation process of the College and to resolve issues that arise during the evaluation process. When needed, these individuals will meet and be referred to as the Evaluation Guidance Committee. The Evaluation Guidance Committee's decisions are considered final, except that individual faculty members and the Union may grieve its decisions as allowed by the AFT/District grievance procedure and consistent with the grievance limitations set forth in this policy. At any time, any one of the participants in the process (Evaluation Committee member, evaluator, Dean/Responsible Administrator, evaluatee) can seek assistance from the campus Evaluation Guidance Committee.

It is also the responsibility of the Evaluation Guidance Committee to provide orientation to all participants (including evaluatees) and specific training to Evaluation Committees, evaluators, Deans/Responsible Administrators, and Vice Presidents. These orientation and training activities will occur by Week 2 of the fall (for tenure-track and adjunct evaluations) and spring (for tenured evaluations) semesters and will be coordinated throughout the District so as to be consistent from campus to campus. Orientation and training will be an ongoing activity, and all those conducting evaluations will participate in orientations that coincide with their service.

B. Evaluation Committee for Each Division

1. Purpose: To conduct evaluations and make recommendations for all tenured, full-time faculty in the division who are scheduled for evaluation.
2. Composition: Three to five tenured faculty members (number depends on size of division and number of evaluations, diversity among group) are recommended by division faculty and approved by the Division Dean/Responsible Administrator; the Evaluation Committee will be reasonably representative of academic disciplines in the division. The composition of the group will reflect consideration of gender and ethnic diversity. The Committee will select a faculty member as chair; she or he will be responsible for scheduling and conducting meetings and communicating with others in the process. All tenured full-time faculty members are encouraged to participate in the evaluation of their colleagues.

C. The Evaluation Process

Tenured faculty will be evaluated at least once every three years. The type of evaluation will alternate between Comprehensive and Standard as described below. A newly tenured faculty member will start with a Comprehensive evaluation three years after completing tenure review. The evaluation process will consist of the following:

1. Standard Evaluation:
 - a. A member of the faculty Evaluation Committee will conduct a Student Questionnaire, following the Instructions for Administering Student Questionnaire (Classroom or Online as appropriate). Student Questionnaires will be completed in each course that represents a separate preparation for the evaluatee, with a minimum of three sections total; for example, if the faculty member is teaching five sections of the same course, student questionnaires must be administered in at least three.
 - b. The Dean/Responsible Administrator will complete the Dean/Responsible Administrator's Assessment of Non-Teaching Responsibilities form.
 - c. The evaluatee will complete the Mandatory Self-Assessment form.

2. Comprehensive Evaluation:

- a. This evaluation will be conducted by a single tenured faculty member selected jointly by the evaluatee and Dean/Responsible Administrator. If the evaluatee and Dean/Responsible Administrator cannot agree on a mutually acceptable evaluator, the selection will be made by the Evaluation Committee.
- b. All of the components of the Standard Evaluation described above will be conducted, plus: (1) a classroom, online, or other performance observation and the completion of an observation form; (2) a review of evaluatee's portfolio and completion of the Portfolio Review form; and (3) completion of the Evaluation Summary form with commendations and recommendations as appropriate.
 - 1) Observation:
 - a) The evaluator shall observe and evaluate as many classes as necessary to cover all teaching modalities represented by the tenured faculty member's assignment. For example, if a tenured faculty member is teaching online, hybrid, and face-to-face classes, the evaluator shall observe all three. If the tenured faculty member is teaching only face-to-face or only online classes, the evaluator will observe at least one.
 - b) In order to enable evaluation of online classes, the evaluator will be given the role of "Non-editing teacher" for the evaluatee's online class(es) through the District-sanctioned online course management system and provided with any necessary passcodes by Week 4. The evaluator will have access to the evaluatee's online class(es) during Weeks 4-12, but will be able to evaluate materials for Weeks 1-3 if necessary. If desired by either party, the evaluator may meet with the evaluatee prior to the observation.
 - c) Additional observations may be requested by the evaluatee, evaluator, or Dean/Responsible Administrator; however, approval by the Evaluation Committee is required for additional observations. The evaluatee will provide class dates that are inappropriate for observation (e.g., exams, student presentations, field trips, guest speakers, films), on which the evaluator will not visit the class. The evaluator will not participate in class activity.
 - b) The evaluator will make only limited comments immediately after an observation (e.g., "I enjoyed sitting in on your class" or "Thanks for letting me observe") and will wait for all of the observations (if more than one) to be completed before making commendations and possible suggestions for improvement. However, an evaluator may ask the evaluatee to explain or clarify why she/he 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?").
 - c) Within ten days after the observation(s), the evaluator will meet with the evaluatee to discuss the observation(s) before submitting her/his findings to

the chair of the Evaluation Committee. The evaluatee may record any unresolved disagreement with the evaluation in the "Evaluatee's Comments" section of the Observation form; this allows the Evaluation Committee as a whole to consider both the evaluator's and evaluatee's points of view.

2) Faculty Portfolio

- a) The faculty member shall supply a well-organized, comprehensible, and succinct faculty portfolio in hard copy or as a PDF. See appropriate form for list of required items depending on assignment.
- b) The intent of the Faculty Portfolio is to assist the evaluator in understanding the instructional methodologies being employed in the courses currently taught by the evaluatee.
- c) The evaluator uses the Portfolio Review form to record her/his findings. When the form is completed, the evaluator will forward the form to the chair of the Evaluation Committee (along with any written response received from the evaluatee).

3. Follow-up Evaluation and Performance Improvement Plan

- a. If either a Standard or Comprehensive evaluation results in a rating of "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory," the Committee develops with the evaluatee a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) and schedules a Comprehensive evaluation for the next academic year. The intent of having the second evaluation one year after the initial evaluation is to allow the evaluatee sufficient time to receive coaching from the Dean/Responsible Administrator or mentoring from a peer and to initiate improvements.
 - 1) One very important goal of evaluation is professional development through feedback from peers. Mentoring is one way to accomplish this goal, and the Division Dean/Responsible Administrator or the Evaluation Guidance Committee may recommend a mentor (someone who is not part of the evaluation process) to assist the evaluatee in making improvements recommended in the PIP. Mentoring is voluntary, and mentors may be selected by the evaluatee in consultation with the evaluator.
 - 2) Most recent evaluation materials will be made available to evaluators responsible for performing follow-up evaluations triggered by a PIP.
- b. If the follow-up evaluation results in a Summary rating of "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory," a final follow-up evaluation will be scheduled for the next academic year.

If the final follow-up evaluation results in a Summary rating of "Needs Improvement," a limited re-evaluation focusing on the specific areas in need of improvement (per the ratings on the Observation, Portfolio Review, etc., forms) will be scheduled for the next academic semester.

If the final follow-up evaluation results in a rating of "Unsatisfactory," referral of the matter will be made to the appropriate Vice President who will consult with the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources and Employee Relations to determine what further action, if any, is warranted..

D. Timeline for Tenured Faculty Evaluation

1. Weeks 16-18 of fall semester:

- a. At the end of the fall semester, three to five tenured faculty members (number depends on size of division and number of evaluations, diversity among group) are recommended by division faculty and approved by the Division Dean/Responsible Administrator.
- b. The Division Dean/Responsible Administrator forwards them to the Academic Senate for approval.

2. Weeks 1-4 of spring semester:

- a. The Evaluation Guidance Committee provides evaluation orientations for Evaluation Committee members and evaluatees during Weeks 1 and 2.
- b. The Evaluation Committee selects a chair, establishes its schedule of work, notifies the evaluatee, arranges for conduct of student questionnaires (Division Office secures forms), and requests assessments from the Dean/Responsible Administrator and evaluatee.
- c. If the evaluation is comprehensive, an evaluator for each evaluatee is agreed upon by the Dean/Responsible Administrator and the evaluatee.
- d. In order to enable evaluation of online classes, the evaluator will be given the role of “Non-editing teacher” for the evaluatee’s online class(es) through the District-sanctioned online course management system and provided with any necessary passcodes by Week 4. The evaluator will have access to the evaluatee’s online class(es) during Weeks 4-12, but will be able to evaluate materials for Weeks 1-3 if necessary. If desired by either party, the evaluator may meet with the evaluatee prior to the observation.

3. Weeks 5-12 of spring semester:

- a. Evaluator begins observations as early as Week 5 and completes them by Week 12.
- b. If the evaluation is comprehensive, the evaluatee shall provide the evaluator, prior to the evaluation, with materials and/or documents necessary to provide a context for the class observation.
- c. If applicable, student questionnaires are administered by Week 10 and shared with the evaluatee at the last meeting of the Committee.
- d. If the evaluation is comprehensive, individual committee members discuss their observation with the evaluatee and provide an overview of the student questionnaires to the evaluatee within ten workdays of the observation. The tabulated student questionnaires will be made available to the evaluatee after grades are posted.
- e. If the evaluation is comprehensive, the evaluatee completes and submits a portfolio to her/his division office by Week 11.
- f. The evaluatee completes and submits the mandatory self-assessment to the evaluatee’s division office by Week 12.

4. Weeks 13-17 of spring semester:

- a. The Dean/Responsible Administrator completes the Dean/Responsible Administrator’s Assessment of Non-Teaching Responsibilities (if appropriate) by Week 13.
- b. Prior to meeting with the evaluatee, the Committee meets to review the results of the evaluation process and reaches its recommendation.
- c. The Committee meets with the evaluatee to inform her/him of the Committee’s recommendations; if the evaluatee receives an overall rating of “Needs Improvement” or “Unsatisfactory” on the evaluation summary, the Committee develops with the evaluatee a Performance Improvement Plan and schedules a follow-up evaluation for the next academic year.
- d. The Evaluation Committee prepares an evaluation summary and submits the results to the 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 Evaluation Committee to the evaluatee, by Week 17 of the spring semester.

- e. The appropriate Vice President reviews materials and forwards copies to the evaluatee, the evaluatee's personnel file, and the Dean/Responsible Administrator.
- f. The Dean/Responsible Administrator records results, schedules the next evaluation, and confers with the evaluatee as needed.

E. Division Dean/Responsible Administrator's Role

- 1. Faculty evaluation is essentially a peer process. For that reason, the Division Dean/Responsible Administrator's role is somewhat limited. However, it is expected that the Dean/Responsible Administrator will support faculty and help them to achieve their full potential. The dean should assure that all positive results are clearly communicated and that all negative results are constructively delivered.
- 2. The Dean/Responsible Administrator facilitates the process of selecting peer evaluators and identifies those who need to be evaluated. The Dean/Responsible Administrator assists the Evaluation Committee by ensuring that Student Questionnaires are tabulated; Student Questionnaire results will be available through a passcode-protected hyperlink on the District website. The Dean/Responsible Administrator provides a written assessment of the evaluatee, focused primarily on non-teaching responsibilities such as committee work and professional development activities.

VI. Evaluation Procedures—Tenure-Track Faculty

For all Tenure Review Committees established between 7/1/2017 and 6/30/2019, no matter how long the committees exist, the following procedures shall apply. Prior to 7/1/2019, AFT and the District shall mutually agree on whether to continue these procedures for any committees established after that date.

A. Tenure Evaluation Committees

1. Each Tenure Evaluation Committee (TEC) shall be division-based and comprised of three tenured faculty members and one Division Dean/Responsible Administrator, and shall elect its own Chair from among the three faculty members. Each division shall determine the number of Tenure Evaluation Committees needed for the evaluation of tenure-track faculty. All tenured faculty members of a division constitute the initial pool of potential committee members.
2. TEC members shall be chosen from within the division, if possible, and at least one of the three faculty members shall be a “discipline expert” chosen in a collaborative process by the Division Dean/Responsible Administrator and the tenured faculty members appropriate to the discipline of the evaluatee. If no discipline expert is available from the Evaluatee’s campus, a discipline expert from one of the other two colleges in the District or from another community college district or from the community (retiree), in that order, shall be selected. In the case of unique programs or extreme circumstances, one committee member may be a practicing professional from the community. If a discipline expert from the above pools is not available, a tenured faculty member from a related discipline may serve as the discipline expert. If a discipline expert from the above sources subsequently becomes available, the expert from the related discipline will be the first to rotate off of the committee.
3. Three of the TEC members are permanent: the Chair, the discipline expert, and the Division Dean/Responsible Administrator. If the chair also serves as the discipline expert, one other tenured faculty member shall also be a permanent committee member. One tenured faculty member shall rotate onto the TEC in years three and four as follows:

Years 1 and 2:

- (A) Chair; (B) Discipline Expert (or tenured faculty member serving a four-year term, if the Chair also serves as the Discipline Expert); (C) Dean/Responsible Administrator; (D) tenured faculty member serving a two-year term for Years 1-2.

Years 3 and 4:

- (A) Chair; (B) Discipline Expert (or tenured faculty member serving a four-year term, if the Chair also serves as the Discipline Expert); (C) Dean/Responsible Administrator; (D) new tenured faculty member serving a two- year term for Years 3-4.

4. TECs should strive to have a diverse membership; moreover, committee members will be provided a Faculty Evaluation Committee Orientation document prepared by the Office of Human Resources that addresses non-discrimination and diversity during the evaluation orientation.
5. If a faculty member of the TEC is unable to complete her/his assigned term, a new member will be selected by the remaining members of the TEC to serve the remainder of the term. If the Dean/Responsible Administrator is unable to complete the assigned term, the Dean/Responsible Administrator’s successor shall serve on the Committee.

B. Roles of the Tenure Evaluation Committee, Responsible Vice President, and College President

1. Tenure Evaluation Committee:

- a. Members of the Tenure Evaluation Committee have an obligation to uphold the confidentiality of the evaluation process, uphold the principles of inclusivity, promote and respect diversity, attend all meetings, and conduct fair and unbiased evaluations for the purpose of reaching an evaluation decision. The Evaluation Guidance Committee will offer orientation regarding the evaluation procedures to all committee members and evaluatees.
- b. The Tenure Evaluation Committee has the following responsibilities:
 - 1) to follow the procedure outlined herein;
 - 2) to meet with the evaluatee to review criteria and methods of evaluation and the timelines of the evaluation process;
 - 3) to gather and review all data obtained by the various evaluation methods employed;
 - 4) to meet with the evaluatee to discuss evaluation results and develop a plan for professional growth;
 - 5) to complete Observation, Portfolio Review, and Evaluation Summary forms with commendations and recommendations as appropriate;
 - 6) to determine an evaluation recommendation; and
 - 7) to forward their recommendation to the responsible Vice President.
- c. The chair will coordinate the above activities with the support of the Division Dean/Responsible Administrator.

2. Responsible Vice President

- a. The responsible Vice President shares the obligation to uphold the confidentiality of the evaluation 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 an evaluation decision; and to maintain those educational principles that promote a quality faculty member in her/his area of responsibility.
- b. The responsible Vice President has the following responsibilities:
 - 1) to monitor and assure compliance with evaluation procedures, due process, District Policies and Procedures, and timelines;
 - 2) to review the recommendation of the Tenure Evaluation Committee for both process and substance;
 - 3) to meet with the Tenure Evaluation Committee to discuss any difference of opinion within the Tenure Evaluation Committee and forward her/his own recommendation and that of the Tenure Evaluation Committee to the College President.

3. College President

- a. The College President shares the obligation to uphold the confidentiality of the evaluation 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 that promote a quality faculty member in her/his area of responsibility.

b. The College President has the following responsibilities:

- 1) to meet with the responsible Vice President and Tenure Evaluation Committee if there is disagreement between the Vice President and the Committee regarding the evaluation decision, or if the President disagrees with the Vice President and Tenure Evaluation Committee regarding the evaluation decision;
- 2) to make the final recommendation via the Chancellor to the Board to award or deny tenure or grant a subsequent contract; and
- 3) to notify the Committee, the Vice President, and the evaluatee of his or her recommendation via the Chancellor to the Board.

C. Procedures for Tenure Review

1. The tenure review process begins the first fall semester of employment. Tenure recommendations shall be linked to rigorous evaluation in the first four years of employment. Tenure-track faculty will be evaluated each of the four years even though a single contract covers the third and fourth years. During the entire tenure review process, and, in particular, during the evaluatee's third year, a tenured faculty member from within the division will provide mentoring to the evaluatee.

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

a. Faculty Who Teach in the Classroom/Online

- 1) Classroom/Online Observation
- 2) Student Questionnaire
- 3) Faculty Portfolio
- 4) Mandatory Self-Assessment
- 5) Division Dean/Responsible Administrator Observation
- 6) Division Dean/Responsible Administrator Assessment of Non-Teaching Responsibilities

b. Counselors, Faculty Coordinators, Librarians, Nurses, and other Student Services Faculty

- 1) Observation
- 2) Student Questionnaire
- 3) Faculty Portfolio
- 4) Mandatory Self-assessment
- 5) Division Dean/Responsible Administrator Observation (as appropriate)
- 6) Dean/Responsible Administrator Assessment of Non-Teaching Responsibilities

c. Observation

- 1) The faculty members of the Tenure Evaluation Committee will observe and assess the performance of the evaluatee. This assessment may take place in the classroom, at the service site, or through observation of digital recordings of actual classroom presentations, counseling sessions, etc. They will take into consideration any of the evaluatee's comments regarding the observation, particularly her/his explanation of how the events observed by her/his evaluators relate to the goals and objectives of

her/his professional activities, before they formulate a written report of their individual judgments of the evaluatee's performance.

- 2) In order to enable evaluation of online classes, the evaluators will be given the role of "Non-editing teacher" for the evaluatee's online class(es) through the District-sanctioned online course management system and provided with any necessary passcodes by Week 4. The evaluators will have access to the evaluatee's online class(es) during Weeks 4-12, but will be able to evaluate materials for Weeks 1-3 if necessary. If desired by either party, the evaluators may meet with the evaluatee prior to the observation.
- 3) The evaluatee will provide class dates that are inappropriate for observation (e.g., exams, student presentations, field trips, guest speakers, films), on which the evaluators will not visit the class. The evaluators will not participate in class activity.
- 4) The evaluators will make only limited comments immediately after an observation (e.g., "I enjoyed sitting in on your class" or "Thanks for letting me observe") and will wait for all of the observations (if more than one) to be completed before making commendations and possible suggestions for improvement. However, an evaluator may ask the evaluatee to explain or clarify why she/he 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?").
- 5) Within ten days after the observations, the evaluators will meet individually with the evaluatee to discuss their observations before submitting their findings to the chair of the Tenure Evaluation Committee. The evaluatee may record any unresolved disagreement with the evaluation in the "Evaluatee's Comments" section of the Observation form; this allows the Tenure Evaluation Committee as a whole to consider both the evaluators' and evaluatee's points of view.

d. Student Questionnaire

The Tenure Evaluation Committee shall use the appropriate "Student Questionnaire" (<https://surveys.smccd.edu/n/PETFSurvey.aspx>) in Section IX to gather information from students.

e. Faculty Portfolio

- 1) The faculty member shall supply a well-organized, comprehensible, and succinct faculty portfolio in hard copy or as a PDF to the Chair of the Evaluation Committee, which shall include those items set forth in the appropriate Portfolio Review Form.
- 2) The intent of the Faculty Portfolio is to assist the Tenure Evaluation Committee in understanding the instructional methodologies being employed in the courses currently taught by the evaluatee.

- 3) Each evaluator shall use the Portfolio Review Form to record her/his findings regarding the evaluatee's portfolio. When the form is completed, the evaluator will forward the form to the chair of the Evaluation Committee (along with any written comments received from the evaluatee, as indicated by the Portfolio Review Form).
- 4) The information provided in a portfolio is confidential and may become part of the evaluatee's personnel file. This portfolio information cannot be used outside the evaluation process without permission of the evaluatee. Only current information (concerning activities of the past three years) will be considered in the evaluation process.

f. Mandatory Self-Assessment

The evaluatee completes the appropriate Mandatory Self-Assessment form set forth in Section IX.

g. Division Dean/Responsible Administrator Observation

The Division Dean/Responsible Administrator or designee (academic supervisor) will observe and assess the performance of the evaluatee. This assessment may take place in the classroom, at the service site, or through observation of digital recordings of actual classroom presentations, counseling sessions, etc. Audio recordings may be used in special circumstances with the mutual agreement of the Tenure Evaluation Committee and evaluatee. The Division Dean/Responsible Administrator or designee will meet and review her/his observations and recommendations with the employee being evaluated. The Dean/Responsible Administrator will take into consideration any of the evaluatee's comments regarding the observation, particularly the faculty member's explanation of how the events observed by the evaluator relate to the goals and objectives of her/his professional activities, before the Dean/Responsible Administrator formulates a written report of her/his individual judgment of the evaluatee's performance. A written report of the observation will be part of the Committee documentation.

h. Division Dean/Responsible Administrator Assessment of Non-Teaching Responsibilities

The Division Dean/Responsible Administrator completes the Division Dean/Responsible Administrator's Assessment of Non-Teaching Responsibilities form.

3. During the first year of employment, tenure-track faculty will be evaluated only on criteria related to their primary assignment.

4. Performance Improvement Plan

NOTE: Most recent evaluation materials will be made available to evaluators responsible for performing follow-up evaluations triggered by a PIP.

a. First-year Evaluation

- 1) If a first-year tenure evaluation results in a rating of "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory" in any category or on the Evaluation Summary, the Tenure Evaluation Committee develops with the evaluatee a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) for the next academic year. The PIP will provide focus for the evaluation in the following year.

- 2) One very important goal of evaluation is professional development through feedback from peers. Mentoring is one way to accomplish this goal, and the Division Dean/Responsible Administrator or the Tenure Evaluation Committee may recommend a mentor to assist the evaluatee in making improvements recommended in the PIP. Mentoring is voluntary, and mentors may be selected by the evaluatee in consultation with the Tenure Evaluation Committee.

b. Second-year Evaluation

- 1) If a second-year tenure evaluation results in a rating of “Needs Improvement” in any category or on the Evaluation Summary, the Tenure Evaluation Committee develops with the evaluatee a PIP for the next academic year. The PIP will provide additional focus in the overall evaluation for the following year.
- 2) If a second-year tenure evaluation results in a rating of “Unsatisfactory” in any category, the Tenure Evaluation Committee develops with the evaluatee a PIP for the next academic year. The PIP will provide additional focus in the overall evaluation for the following year.
- 3) If a second-year tenure evaluation results in a second rating of “Unsatisfactory” on the Evaluation Summary, and if the Tenure Evaluation Committee recommends not to enter into a contract for the following academic year, then the matter will be referred to the appropriate Vice President who will consult with the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources and Employee Relations to determine whether continued employment is warranted.

c. Third-year Evaluation

- 1) If a third-year tenure evaluation results in a rating of “Needs Improvement” in any category or on the Evaluation Summary, the Tenure Evaluation Committee develops with the evaluatee a PIP for the next academic year. The PIP will provide additional focus in the overall evaluation for the following year.
- 2) If a third-year tenure evaluation results in a rating of “Unsatisfactory” in any category, the Tenure Evaluation Committee develops with the evaluatee a PIP for the next academic year. The PIP will provide additional focus in the overall evaluation for the following year.
- 3) If a third-year tenure evaluation results in a Summary rating of “Unsatisfactory,” the Tenure Evaluation Committee develops with the evaluatee a PIP for the next academic year. The PIP will provide additional focus in the overall evaluation for the following year.

d. Fourth-year Evaluation

- 1) If a fourth-year tenure evaluation results in a rating of “Needs Improvement” in a category for which a PIP has not been issued in a previous evaluation, the Tenure Evaluation Committee develops with the evaluatee a PIP. The PIP will provide focus for the evaluatee’s first Comprehensive Evaluation as a tenured faculty member.
- 2) If a fourth-year tenure evaluation results in a rating of “Unsatisfactory” in any category for which a PIP was issued in a previous evaluation or a second consecutive “Unsatisfactory” on the Evaluation Summary, the Tenure Evaluation Committee will forward its determination of tenure denial to the appropriate Vice President.

D. Timeline for Tenure Review

1. Weeks 16-18 of spring semester:
 - a. At the end of the spring semester, four tenured faculty members are recommended by division faculty for each tenure-track faculty member's Tenure Evaluation Committee and approved by the Division Dean/Responsible Administrator.
 - b. The Division Dean/Responsible Administrator forwards them to the Academic Senate for approval.
2. Weeks 1-4 of fall semester:
 - a. An evaluation orientation is held for all committee members during Weeks 1 and 2.
 - b. The Committee meets with the evaluatee to discuss the process format, objectives, , and expectations.
 - c. The Committee establishes a work schedule.
 - d. In order to enable evaluation of online classes, the evaluator will be given the role of "Non-editing teacher" for the evaluatee's online class(es) through the District-sanctioned online course management system and provided with any necessary passcodes by Week 4. The evaluator will have access to the evaluatee's online class(es) during Weeks 4-12, but will be able to evaluate materials for Weeks 1-3 if necessary. If desired by either party, the evaluator may meet with the evaluatee prior to the observation.
3. Weeks 5-12 of fall semester:
 - a. Evaluators begin observations as early as Week 5 and complete them by Week 12. Each committee member observes and reports on her/his observations.
 - b. Prior to the observation, the evaluatee shall provide the evaluator with materials and/or documents necessary to provide a context for the class observation.
 - c. Student questionnaires are administered by Week 10.
 - d. Individual committee members discuss their classroom observation and provide an overview of the student questionnaires to the evaluatee within ten workdays of the observation. The tabulated student questionnaires will be made available to the evaluatee after grades are posted.
 - e. The evaluatee completes and submits a portfolio to her/his division office by Week 11.
 - f. The evaluatee completes and submits the Mandatory Self-Assessment to the evaluatee's division office by Week 12.
4. Weeks 13-17 of fall semester:
 - a. The Dean/Responsible Administrator completes the Dean/Responsible Administrator's Assessment of Non-Teaching Responsibilities by Week 13.
 - b. Prior to meeting with the evaluatee, the Tenure Evaluation Committee meets to review the results of the evaluation process and reaches its recommendation.
 - c. The Committee meets with the evaluatee to inform her/him of the Committee's recommendations and, if the evaluatee receives an overall rating of "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory" on the evaluation summary, develops with the evaluatee a Performance Improvement Plan.
 - c. The Tenure Evaluation Committee submits its recommendation to the appropriate Vice President, and subsequently to the college president, the seventeenth week of the academic year.
5. Although years three and four are covered by a single contract, evaluations follow this timeline for all four years.

E. Tenure Review Evaluation Options and Due Process

1. During the evaluatee's first year, the Tenure Evaluation Committee has two recommendation options:
 - a. To enter into a contract for the following academic year.
 - b. Not to enter into a contract for the following academic year.
2. During the evaluatee's second year, the Tenure Evaluation Committee has two recommendation options:
 - a. To enter into a contract for the following two academic years.
 - b. Not to enter into a contract for the following two academic years.
3. During the third year, evaluation procedures are the same as in the first and second years. A tenured faculty member from within the division may provide mentoring to the evaluatee if appropriate and available; a PIP may be issued, but no further action will be taken.
4. During the evaluatee's fourth year (before the end of the third contract), the Evaluation Committee has two recommendation options:
 - a. Award tenure
 - b. Deny tenure

F. Right to Grievance

The tenure-track faculty member is employed for the first and second years by two one-year contracts. If the Committee recommends non-renewal or if the District non-renews a faculty member after the first or second year, the faculty member has the right to file a grievance, but such grievance must be based solely on a claim that the District or Committee violated, misinterpreted, or misapplied any of its policies and procedures set forth this Policy.

The tenure-track faculty member is employed for the third and fourth years by a single two-year contract. If the Committee recommends denial of tenure during the third or fourth year or if the District denies tenure, the faculty member has the right to file a grievance based on allegations that the District made a negative decision that to a reasonable person was unreasonable, or violated, misinterpreted, or misapplied, any of its policies and procedures set forth in this Policy.

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.

G. Guidelines for Tenure Evaluation Committee

1. Evaluatees must be informed as to what is expected of them during the tenure review process.
2. If weaknesses are observed in a evaluatee's performance, specific suggestions detailing precisely what an evaluatee needs to do to improve and meet expectations must be identified and recorded on a PIP.
3. At the end of each contract, if a decision is made to retain an evaluatee with observed weaknesses, a constructive process must be established through which to carry out the PIP and assist the evaluatee.
4. Tenure decisions can only be based upon the Evaluation Criteria specified herein.
5. Decisions cannot be based upon factors unrelated to performance of the evaluatee's job.
6. Reviewers must strive to maintain objectivity and ensure that decisions regarding tenure do not contravene established principles of academic freedom.
7. Decisions cannot be based upon an evaluator's or an evaluatee's political views, nor can they be made arbitrarily, capriciously, or unreasonably.

VII. Evaluation Procedures—Adjunct and Grant-Funded[▲] Faculty

- A. For each adjunct faculty member to be evaluated, the Division Dean/Responsible Administrator and the evaluatee will jointly select one full-time faculty member to conduct the evaluation, preferably from the same or a related department/discipline. If the evaluatee and Dean/Responsible Administrator cannot agree on a mutually acceptable evaluator, the selection will be made by the Evaluation Guidance Committee. If an evaluator is not available at a particular college, the Dean/Responsible Administrator may seek a department/discipline-related full-time faculty member from one of the other colleges in the District. All full-time faculty members of the discipline constitute the initial pool of potential faculty evaluators. In addition, the Division Dean/Responsible Administrator conducts the Dean/Responsible Administrator’s Assessment of Non-Teaching Responsibilities.
- B. The Full-Time Faculty Evaluator has an obligation to:
1. uphold the confidentiality of the adjunct faculty evaluation process and the principles of inclusivity and academic freedom; promote and respect diversity; and conduct fair and unbiased evaluations;
 2. communicate with the adjunct faculty member, prior to the start of the process, to review evaluation criteria, methods, and procedures;
 3. conduct a classroom observation and online observation (if applicable), and/or performance assessment and complete all related forms;
 4. administer student questionnaires;
 5. review the adjunct faculty’s portfolio and self-assessment;
 6. meet (face-to-face, if possible) with the adjunct faculty member to discuss the results of the classroom observation, online observation, or performance assessment, as appropriate, and student questionnaires;
 7. complete the Observation, Portfolio Review, and Evaluation Summary forms with commendations and recommendations as appropriate;
 8. meet with the adjunct faculty member and Division Dean/Responsible Administrator to discuss all evaluation materials and prepare a Performance Improvement Plan if the determination of the evaluator is that the adjunct faculty member “Needs Improvement” or that her/his performance is “Unsatisfactory”; and
 9. prepare, with the Division Dean/Responsible Administrator, a joint evaluation recommendation.
- C. The Division Dean/Responsible Administrator has an obligation to:
1. uphold the confidentiality of the adjunct faculty evaluation process and the principles of inclusivity and academic freedom; promote and respect diversity; and conduct fair and unbiased evaluations;
 2. maintain those educational principles that promote a quality faculty member in her/his area of responsibility;
 3. monitor adjunct faculty evaluation to assure compliance with District Policy and Procedures;
 4. determine and report on whether the adjunct faculty member submits grades and other information in a complete, accurate, and timely manner, is respected by colleagues and students, and fulfills professional responsibilities (refer to Criteria for Evaluation);
 5. conduct a classroom observation, online observation, or performance assessment at her/his own discretion or at the request of the peer evaluator or evaluatee, complete the appropriate forms, and meet with the evaluatee to discuss the results;

[▲] Throughout this document, procedures and forms used for adjunct faculty also will be used for grant-funded faculty.

6. meet with the adjunct faculty and full-time faculty evaluator to discuss all evaluation materials and prepare a Performance Improvement Plan if the determination of the evaluator is that the adjunct faculty member “Needs Improvement” or that her/his performance is “Unsatisfactory”;
7. prepare, with the full-time faculty evaluator, a joint evaluation recommendation; and
8. forward the recommendation to the appropriate Vice President.

D. Adjunct and Grant-Funded Faculty Evaluation Procedures

1. Adjunct faculty will be evaluated in the first term of service (fall, spring, summer).
 - a. After the initial evaluation, adjunct faculty who have assignments in fall or spring semesters and whose evaluations meet or exceed expectations shall be evaluated at least once every four (4) semesters (fall, spring) during the following eight semesters of employment. After the eighth semester, faculty shall be evaluated every six semesters provided their evaluations meet or exceed expectations.
 - b. After the initial evaluation, adjunct faculty whose evaluations meet or exceed expectations and who have assignments only during the summer shall be evaluated every third summer session.
 - c. In accordance with District policy, the evaluations will be completed by the end of the term in which they are begun; see timelines below.
 - d. If no full-time tenured faculty evaluator on the evaluatee’s campus and in the evaluatee’s division is available during summer session, the Dean/Responsible Administrator will identify an appropriate full-time tenured faculty member from another college in the District to conduct the evaluation. Full-time tenured faculty members who conduct summer evaluations will be paid at the Special Rate for their time. See Appendix B.
2. The following methods will be used to evaluate adjunct faculty performance against the criteria stated in Section III.
 - a. Faculty Who Teach in the Classroom/Online
 - 1) Classroom/Online Observation
 - 2) Student Questionnaire
 - 3) Faculty Portfolio
 - 4) Mandatory Self-Assessment
 - 5) Division Dean/Responsible Administrator Assessment of Non-Teaching Responsibilities
 - 6) Division Dean/Responsible Administrator Observation (if applicable)
 - b. Counselors, Faculty Coordinators, Librarians, Nurses, and other Student Services Faculty
 - 1) Observation
 - 2) Student Questionnaire
 - 3) Faculty Portfolio
 - 4) Mandatory Self-assessment
 - 5) Division Dean/Responsible Administrator Observation
 - 6) Dean/Responsible Administrator Assessment

c. Observation

- 1) The evaluator shall observe and evaluate as many classes as necessary to cover all teaching modalities represented by the adjunct faculty's assignment. For example, if an adjunct faculty member is teaching online, hybrid, and face-to-face classes, the evaluator shall observe all three. If the adjunct faculty member is teaching only face-to-face or only online classes, the evaluator will observe at least one.
- 2) This assessment may take place in the classroom, at the service site, or through observation of digital recordings of actual classroom presentations, counseling sessions, etc. The evaluator will take into consideration any of the evaluatee's comments regarding the observation, particularly her/his explanation of how the events observed by her/his evaluators relate to the goals and objectives of her/his professional activities before they formulate a written report of her/his individual judgments of the evaluatee's performance.
- 3) In order to enable evaluation of online classes, the evaluator will be given the role of "Non-editing teacher" for the evaluatee's online class(es) through the District-sanctioned online course management system and provided with any necessary passcodes by Week 4 of the spring or fall semester; see timeline below for evaluations conducted during summer session. The evaluator will have access to the evaluatee's online class(es) during Weeks 4-12 of the spring or fall semester, but will be able to evaluate materials for Weeks 1-3 if necessary. If desired by either party, the evaluator may meet with the evaluatee prior to the observation.
- 4) The evaluatee will provide class dates that are inappropriate for observation (e.g., exams, student presentations, field trips, guest speakers, films), on which the evaluator will not visit the class. The evaluator will not participate in class activity.
- 5) The evaluator will make only limited comments immediately after an observation (e.g., "I enjoyed sitting in on your class" or "Thanks for letting me observe") and will wait for all of the observations (if more than one) to be completed before making commendations and possible suggestions for improvement. However, an evaluator may ask the evaluatee to explain or clarify why she/he 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?").
- 6) Within ten days after the observations, the evaluator will meet with the evaluatee to discuss her/his observations before submitting her/his findings to the Dean/Responsible Administrator. The evaluatee may record any unresolved disagreement with the evaluation in the "Evaluatee's Comments" section of the Observation form; this allows the Dean/Responsible Administrator to consider both the evaluator's and evaluatee's points of view.

d. Student Questionnaire

The evaluator shall use the appropriate “Student Questionnaire” (<https://surveys.smccd.edu/n/PETFSurvey.aspx>) in Section IX to gather information from students.

e. Faculty Portfolio

- 1) The faculty member shall supply a well-organized, comprehensible, and succinct faculty portfolio in hard copy or as a PDF to the evaluator, which shall include those items set forth in the appropriate Portfolio Review Form.
- 2) The intent of the Faculty Portfolio is to assist the evaluator in understanding the instructional methodologies being employed in the courses currently taught by the evaluatee.
- 3) The evaluator shall use the Portfolio Review Form to record her/his findings regarding the evaluatee’s portfolio. When the form is completed, the evaluator will forward the form to the appropriate dean (along with any written comments received from the evaluatee as indicated by the Portfolio Review Form).
- 4) The information provided in a portfolio is confidential and may become part of the evaluatee’s personnel file. This portfolio information cannot be used outside the evaluation process without permission of the evaluatee. Only current information (concerning activities of the past three years) will be considered in the evaluation process.

f. Mandatory Self-Assessment

The evaluatee completes the appropriate Mandatory Self-Assessment form set forth in Section IX.

g. Division Dean/Responsible Administrator’s Assessment of Non-Teaching Responsibilities

The Division Dean/Responsible Administrator completes the Division Dean/Responsible Administrator’s Assessment of Non-Teaching Responsibilities form.

h. Division Dean/Responsible Administrator’s Observation (if applicable)

The Division Dean/Responsible Administrator performs a classroom or online observation or performance assessment and completes all related forms if applicable. See VII.C.5 above.

E. Overall Evaluation

1. An adjunct faculty member receiving an overall evaluation of “Unsatisfactory” in their first semester of service will not be renewed for employment.
2. An adjunct faculty member receiving an overall evaluation of “Needs Improvement” or “Unsatisfactory” after a previous “Exceeds Expectations” or “Meets Expectations” rating will be given a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) to follow for the next academic semester in which

they have an assignment. Upon the request of the evaluatee or an AFT representative, a new evaluator may be chosen to conduct the follow-up evaluation(s).

3. Most recent evaluation materials will be made available to evaluators responsible for performing follow-up evaluations triggered by a PIP.
4. A second evaluation will be conducted in the next academic semester and, if a second “Needs Improvement” results, the adjunct faculty member will be given one more opportunity for evaluation.
5. If a third evaluation results in a “Needs Improvement” or an “Unsatisfactory,” the adjunct faculty member will not be renewed for employment.

F. Right to Grievance

An adjunct faculty member has the right to file a grievance, but such grievance may only be based solely on a claim that the District violated, misinterpreted, or misapplied the procedural aspects this policy.

G. Timeline for Adjunct and Grant-Funded Faculty Evaluations (Fall/Spring)

1. Weeks 1-4:
 - a. An evaluation orientation is held for all evaluators and evaluatees during Weeks 1 and 2.
 - b. The evaluator meets with the evaluatee to discuss the process format, objectives, and expectations.
 - c. In order to enable evaluation of online classes, the evaluator will be given the role of “Non-editing teacher” for the evaluatee’s online class(es) through the District-sanctioned online course management system and provided with any necessary passcodes by Week 4. The evaluator will have access to the evaluatee’s online class(es) during Weeks 4-12, but will be able to evaluate materials for Weeks 1-3 if necessary. If desired by either party, the evaluator may meet with the evaluatee prior to the observation.
2. Weeks 5-12:
 - a. The evaluator begins her/his observation(s) as early as Week 5 and completes them by Week 12. The evaluator observes and reports on her/his observations. If the observation results in a rating of “Unsatisfactory,” the evaluator reports to the Division Dean/Responsible Administrator and requests her/him or a full-time tenured faculty member as her/his designee to conduct an additional observation.
 - b. Prior to the observation, the evaluatee shall provide the evaluator with materials and/or documents necessary to provide a context for the class observation.
 - c. Student questionnaires are administered by Week 10.
 - d. The evaluatee completes her/his portfolio and the Mandatory Self-Assessment form and submits them to the evaluatee’s division office by Week 11.
 - f. The evaluator discusses her/his classroom observation and the evaluatee’s portfolio and Mandatory Self-Assessment and provides an overview of the Student Questionnaires to the evaluatee no later than Week 12. The tabulated Student Questionnaires will be made available to the evaluatee after grades are posted.
3. Weeks 13-17:
 - a. The Dean/Responsible Administrator completes the Dean/Responsible Administrator’s Assessment of Non-Teaching Responsibilities by Week 13.
 - b. The evaluator meets with the evaluatee to inform her/him of her/his recommendations and, if the evaluatee receives an overall rating of “Needs Improvement” on the evaluation summary, develops with the evaluatee a Performance Improvement Plan.

- c. The evaluator submits her/his recommendation to the Division Dean/Responsible Administrator, and subsequently to the Vice President of Instruction and the College President by Week 17 of the academic year.
- d. If the evaluator's observation triggers an additional observation by the Division Dean/Responsible Administrator, and there is disagreement over the outcomes of their respective observations, the matter is referred to the Evaluation Guidance Committee.

H. Timeline for Adjunct and Grant-Funded Faculty Evaluations (For those with ONLY Summer Session assignments)

- 1. Week 1-2:
 - a. The evaluator meets with the evaluatee to discuss the process format, objectives, and expectations.
 - b. In order to enable evaluation of online classes, the evaluator will be given the role of "Non-editing teacher" for the evaluatee's online class(es) through the District-sanctioned online course management system and provided with any necessary passcodes by Week 2. The evaluator will have access to the evaluatee's online class(es) during Weeks 2-6, but will be able to evaluate materials for Week 1 if necessary. If desired by either party, the evaluator may meet with the evaluatee prior to the observation.
- 2. Weeks 3-5:
 - a. The evaluator begins her/his observation(s) as early as Week 3 and completes them by Week 5. The evaluator observes and reports on her/his observations. If the observation results in a rating of "Unsatisfactory," the evaluator reports to the Division Dean/Responsible Administrator and requests her/him or a full-time tenured faculty member as her/his designee to conduct an additional observation the following summer session.
 - b. Prior to the observation, the evaluatee shall provide the evaluator with materials and/or documents necessary to provide a context for the class observation
 - c. Student questionnaires are administered by Week 4.
 - d. The evaluatee completes her/his portfolio and the Mandatory Self-Assessment form and submits them to the evaluatee's division office by Week 5.
 - e. The evaluator discusses her/his classroom observation and the evaluatee's portfolio and Mandatory Self-Assessment and provides an overview of the Student Questionnaires to the evaluatee no later than Week 5. The tabulated Student Questionnaires will be made available to the evaluatee after grades are posted.
- 3. Week 6:
 - a. The Dean/Responsible Administrator completes the Dean/Responsible Administrator's Assessment of Non-Teaching Responsibilities by Week 6.
 - b. The evaluator meets with the evaluatee to inform her/him of her/his recommendations and, if the evaluatee receives an overall rating of "Needs Improvement" (or "Unsatisfactory" if the evaluatee has a previous "Exceeds" or "Meets Expectations" rating) on the evaluation summary, develops with the evaluatee a Performance Improvement Plan.
 - c. The evaluator submits her/his recommendation to the Division Dean/Responsible Administrator, and subsequently to the Vice President of Instruction and the College President by Week 6 of the summer session.
 - d. If the evaluator's observation triggers an additional observation by the Division Dean/Responsible Administrator, and there is disagreement over the outcomes of their respective observations, the matter is referred to the Evaluation Guidance Committee.

VIII. Evaluation Procedures for Coordinators, Nurses, and Healthcare Providers

- A. Evaluations of Coordinators will follow the general procedures for tenured, tenure-track, and adjunct faculty as appropriate, with two exceptions:

1. Deans/Responsible Administrators will evaluate Coordinators. If the Dean/Responsible Administrator's evaluation results in an overall rating of "Unsatisfactory" or "Needs Improvement," a full-time faculty member will be identified to perform a follow-up evaluation.

If the Dean/Responsible Administrator's evaluation triggers an additional evaluation by a full-time faculty member, and there is disagreement over the outcomes of their respective evaluations, the matter is referred to the Evaluation Guidance Committee for resolution.

2. Faculty who both teach and coordinate will be evaluated on both aspects of their assignment utilizing the appropriate forms and corresponding procedures.

- B. Evaluations of Nurses and Healthcare Providers will follow the general procedures for tenured, tenure-track, and adjunct faculty as appropriate, with one exception: the Health Services Director will observe Nurses and Healthcare Providers. If the Health Services Director's observation results in an overall rating of "Unsatisfactory" or "Needs Improvement," a full-time faculty member from the Nursing program will be identified to perform a follow-up observation.

If the Health Services Director's observation triggers an additional observation by a full-time faculty member from the Nursing program, and there is disagreement over the outcomes of their respective observations, the matter is referred to the appropriate Vice President for resolution.

IX. Evaluation Forms

Forms and instructions are split into sections and can be downloaded as fillable PDF documents from the Human Resources SharePoint site. Clicking on the links below will take you directly to the relevant document.

- A. [Tenured, Tenure-Track, and Adjunct Faculty](#)
 - 1. Classroom Observation Form
 - 2. Online Class Observation Form
 - 3. Instructions for Administering Student Questionnaire (Classroom)
 - 4. Instructions for Administering Student Questionnaire (Online)
 - 5. Student Questionnaire (Classroom/Online)
 - 6. Portfolio Review Form
 - 7. Mandatory Self-Assessment Form
 - 8. Dean/Responsible Administrator's Assessment of Non-Teaching Responsibilities

- B. [Faculty Coordinator](#)
 - 1. Evaluation Form
 - 2. Portfolio Review Form
 - 3. Mandatory Self-Assessment Form.

- C. [Counselor](#)
 - 1. Observation Form
 - 2. Student Questionnaire (Academic Counselor)
 - 3. Student Questionnaire (Psychological Services Counselor)
 - 4. Portfolio Review Form
 - 5. Mandatory Self-Assessment Form
 - 6. Dean/Responsible Administrator's Assessment of Professional Responsibilities

- D. [Evaluation Forms—Librarian](#)
 - 1. Faculty Questionnaire—Instruction
 - 2. Observation Form—Reference or Other Public Service
 - 3. Student Questionnaire—Reference Librarian
 - 4. Student Questionnaire—Library Instruction
 - 5. Portfolio Review Form.
 - 6. Mandatory Self-Assessment Form
 - 7. Dean/Responsible Administrator's Assessment of Professional Responsibilities

- E. [Evaluation Forms—Nurse or Other Healthcare Provider](#)
 - 1. Observation Form
 - 2. Student Questionnaire
 - 3. Portfolio Review Form.
 - 4. Mandatory Self-Assessment

- F. [Evaluation Summary Forms](#)
 - 1. Evaluation Summary for Tenured Faculty
 - 2. Evaluation Summary for Tenure-Track Faculty
 - 3. Evaluation Summary for Adjunct and Grant-Funded Faculty

- G. [Performance Improvement Plan \(PIP\) Form](#)

- H. [Faculty Evaluation Committee Orientation Document](#)