
TENURE REVIEW & FACULTY EVALUATION MANUAL

Evaluation Procedures for Tenured Instructional Faculty

For all 10-month, 11-month & 12-month Faculty

The purpose of evaluating tenured faculty is to encourage improvement in teaching and to recognize as well as to promote academic excellence and innovation in other creative and scholarly pursuits.

This process assigns primary evaluation roles to the faculty peer, the students and the responsible Dean (or Program Director as determined by the Dean). The evaluation process should proceed as follows:

Each tenured faculty member will be evaluated once every three years during the spring semester. Evaluations of tenured faculty members shall not occur in summer or intersession.

It is intended that the evaluation process be comprehensive, fair, and humane. At the District's discretion, all aspects of the faculty members assignments such as instructional, non-instructional, and overload assignments may be evaluated. When overload is being evaluated as part of a comprehensive evaluation, proportional weight shall be placed on the primary duties of the unit member's assignment when completing the summary evaluation.

1. The faculty member will provide current course syllabi and sample course materials for each course, in addition to an up-to-date Curriculum Vita (CV) and a Faculty Self-Evaluation Statement. The updated CV and the Faculty Self-Evaluation Statement serve as a self-examination instrument as well as to inform the peers and Dean of any new creative, scholarly or personal pursuits.
2. A tenured peer evaluator will be selected by the faculty member being evaluated from a list of three peers nominated by the Dean in consultation with the Department Chair by the end of the second week of the spring semester. The candidates should be chosen from within the discipline; if these are not available, faculty from within the department of the faculty member may be selected. With the concurrence of the faculty member, a qualified tenured faculty member from a related area outside the department may be selected.
3. The peer evaluator will have an initial meeting with the faculty member being evaluated to receive the updated CV, the course syllabi, the Full-Time Faculty Self-Evaluation Statement, and sample course materials and to inform them of the evaluation process. This process will take place prior to the fourth week of the spring semester.
4. A student evaluation will be conducted using the prescribed form in the Tenure Review & Faculty Evaluation Manual. Only registered students may evaluate instructional faculty. The evaluation will be administered by a student chosen by the faculty member and completed

evaluation questionnaires will be forwarded to the appropriate School/Center office, which will ensure their timely delivery to Human Resources.

5. Student evaluations will be conducted for each unique course prep for the semester of evaluation. If the faculty member has the same prep for two or more assigned sections, then the faculty may choose which of these sections will be evaluated. If the faculty member has only one prep for all sections in the semester of evaluation, two sections of their choosing will be evaluated by students.
6. If requested by the faculty member being evaluated, or the peer, or the Dean, classroom observation(s) will be conducted for a minimum of 50 minutes before the post-evaluation meeting. The person conducting the observation may, but is not required to, announce the day they will visit the class. The person requesting the observation shall designate the visitor(s) and may select the peer, his/her responsible Dean, or both. All observation reports shall be documented on the most appropriate District-approved Faculty Evaluation form and will be included in the evaluation file. If either the Dean or the peer request a classroom observation, then both the Dean and the peer will visit the class.
7. The peer will meet with the faculty member being evaluated to review the updated CV, the course materials, the Faculty Self-Evaluation Statement, the results of the student evaluations, and the classroom observation, if one occurred. The Dean may be included in the review meeting. This process will take place prior to the twelfth week of the spring semester. A critique of each syllabus using the prescribed Course Syllabus Checklist form will be completed by the peer and will be included in the evaluation file.
8. The peer evaluator and the Dean will write the summary evaluation on the Faculty Summary Evaluation form using the self-evaluation, student evaluations, syllabus checklist, classroom observation, if one occurred, and any supplemental materials submitted in the process of evaluation. The summary evaluation report will consist of a summary rating and suggested or required recommendations for professional growth if applicable. The Summary Evaluation will be completed before the end of the spring semester.
9. If a "Needs Improvement" is given, a Needs Improvement Plan will be developed by the Dean, and peer in consultation with the faculty being evaluated. A copy of this plan shall be given to each of the three members previously mentioned, and a copy will be placed in the faculty's personnel file prior to the end of the spring semester.
10. The summary evaluation report will be shared with the faculty member being evaluated by the peer and the Dean and filed in his/her personnel file. All other written material pertinent to the evaluation will be returned to the faculty member being evaluated.

If consensus is not reached regarding the Summary Evaluation rating, an expanded committee including the original peer evaluator, the Dean, plus an additional faculty peer member, will conduct a second evaluation by the end of the subsequent semester to determine a summary recommendation. The additional peer evaluator will be chosen from the original list of proposed peers or the following list of tenured faculty members: the

Department Chair, the Academic Senate President, the Tenure Review Coordinator. In the event that a consensus cannot be reached on the summary rating, separate summary evaluation reports will be forwarded to the responsible Assistant Superintendent/Vice President for resolution.

11. An out-of-sequence evaluation procedure may be initiated by the Superintendent/President only after the following steps have been taken:

- a) All job-related complaints will have been directed to the responsible Dean.
- b) The responsible Dean shall have reviewed the complaints with the faculty member and will have conducted an unbiased investigation to assess the validity of the complaints. This procedure may include, but not be limited to, meetings with students, other Unit members, and/or additional classroom observations.
- c) If the responsible Dean determines that the complaints are valid, he/she will prepare a written report that will be forwarded to the Superintendent/President. A copy will be provided to the evaluatee and the responsible Assistant Superintendent/Vice President.
- d) The Superintendent/President may initiate an out-of-sequence evaluation of an evaluatee after receipt of the report from the Dean recommending such an evaluation.

The evaluatee will be notified in writing the reason for the evaluation. The procedure to be followed shall correspond to the evaluation procedures in the Agreement.

- e) The tenured faculty member may appeal the decision to conduct an out-of-sequence evaluation to the SCEA, who will consult with all parties and make a decision on the matter within 5 days barring unforeseen circumstances.

12. In the event of unusual or unforeseen circumstances that might cause the Dean/Director or tenured faculty member to be unable to adhere to the established evaluation schedule, the Dean/Director and tenured faculty member shall submit a written request to postpone the evaluation cycle by one year. The request will include a rationale from the Dean/Director outlining the reasons for the request and a written response from the tenured faculty member. The request will be submitted to the responsible Assistant Superintendent/Vice President who will respond to the request within five working days stating reasons for either granting or denying the request. A copy of this written response shall be delivered to SCEA who must also approve for a postponement to occur. The SCEA President must provide a written response to the request within five working days stating reasons for either granting or denying the request. A copy of this written response shall be delivered to the respective tenured faculty member and to Human Resources. Upon the postponed evaluation being completed, the three-year evaluation cycle will reset. A decision to deny the postponement may be appealed to a committee composed of two (2) members appointed by the District and two (2) members appointed by the Association. The committee shall be empowered to hear the appeal and, by a majority vote of all members, overrule the decision. The decision of the committee shall be final and binding upon all parties.