



Appendix I

ACCREDITATION FOLLOW-UP REPORT – GOVERNANCE REVIEW PROCESS AND TIMELINE

The Accreditation Follow-Up report will follow the general process and timeline outlined below. The Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC) will make a formal recommendation to the College Governance Council (CGC) to approve the report. The CGC will subsequently make a recommendation to the President, based on the input of their constituent groups. The Board of Trustees will formally approve the Follow-Up Report at its October 8th meeting before submission to the ACCJC on or before October 15th.

Committee/Group	Date	Contact
ASSC Governing Council	TBD	Nicole Harris, President, nharris15@my.smccd.edu
Classified Senate	TBD	Alana Utsumi, Classified Senate President, utsumia@smccd.edu
Academic Senate	TBD	Kate Brown, Academic Senate President, brownek@smccd.edu
Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC)	September 22, 2014	Aaron McVean, Dean, PRIE – ALO, mcveana@smccd.edu
College Governance Council (CGC)	September 24, 2014	Regina Stanback Stroud, President, stroudr@smccd.edu
Strategic Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (SPRAC)	September 25, 2014	Aaron McVean, Dean, PRIE – ALO, mcveana@smccd.edu
Board of Trustees (BOT)	October 8, 2014 (October 1 submission deadline)	Regina Stanback Stroud, President, stroudr@smccd.edu
ACCJC	Submit on or before October 15, 2014	Aaron McVean, Dean, PRIE – ALO, mcveana@smccd.edu



Follow Up Report

Submitted by:

Skyline College

San Mateo Community College District

3300 College Dr.

San Bruno, CA 94066

Submitted to:

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges,

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Submitted October 15, 2014

Follow-Up Report

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges,
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Dr. Regina Stanback Stroud

From: _____
(Chief Executive Officer)

Skyline College

(Institution)

3300 College Dr., San Bruno, CA 94066

(Address)

I certify there was broad participation by the campus community and believe this Report accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.

Signatures:

(President, SMCCD Board of Trustees) (Date)

(Chancellor, SMCCD) (Date)

(Regina Stanback Stroud, President, Skyline College) (Date)

(President, Academic Senate) (Date)

(President, Classified Senate) (Date)

(President, Associated Students of Skyline College) (Date)

(Aaron D. McVean, Accreditation Liaison Officer) (Date)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Report Preparation	4
Response to the Commission Action Letter	4
Appendices	5

REPORT PREPARATION

The preparation of the Skyline College Follow Up Report began immediately. At the time of the site visit, the Visiting Team found that one of the five instructional divisions of the college had not been adhering to published policy. This issue was immediately addressed and resolved. The Vice President of Instruction worked with the Division Deans to ensure that all adjunct faculty were placed into a regular schedule of evaluations, published for each Division and assigned as appropriate.

The Follow Up Report outlines the results of these efforts below and provides appropriate evidence. The report itself was vetted through the Skyline College governance process. The report was reviewed by the President's Cabinet, recommended for approval by the Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC), the Strategic Planning and Allocation of Resources Committee (SPARC), and ultimately the College Governance Council (CGC), before being adopted by the Board of Trustees on October 8, 2014.

RESPONSE TO THE COMMISSION ACTION LETTER

From the Commission Action Letter dated February 7, 2014:

College Recommendation 1

In order to meet the Standard and ensure quality instruction, the team recommends that the College adhere to its systematic and regularly scheduled process of performance evaluations for all adjunct faculty members (Standard III.A.1.b).

Response

In accordance with District policy adjunct faculty are evaluated in the first semester of service. Subsequently, adjunct faculty will be evaluated at least once every six (6) semesters and the evaluation will be completed by the end of the semester in which it is begun. The Division Dean facilitates and the Vice President of Instruction Office monitors the adjunct faculty evaluations to assure compliance with the District policy and procedures. The adjunct faculty will receive a peer evaluation by a tenured faculty and an evaluation from the Division Dean. With the peer evaluator, the Division Dean will then forward the joint evaluation recommendation to the Vice President of Instruction. At the beginning of each Fall and Spring semester, the Division Dean will provide an updated "Part-Time Faculty Evaluation Tracking" spreadsheet to the Office of the Vice President of Instruction. The tracking spreadsheet will provide information on which adjunct faculty have completed their evaluation or will be evaluated at the end of each semester. This tracking spreadsheet will assist the Division Deans to be in compliance with the evaluation timelines. (Evidence – 1.1, 1.2)

Immediately following the Fall 2013 visit when the deficiency was noted, Skyline College immediately addressed the issue by making current all adjunct evaluations and putting a procedure in place to ensure a systematic and regularly scheduled process of performance evaluations moving forward. By the end of the fall 2013 semester, the divisions completed the evaluations at the following rates: (The schedules

are attached for your reference). (1) BEPP – 96% (2) LA/LR – 91%; (3) KAD – 100% (4) SMT – 100% and (5) SS/CA – 70% --totaling an average of 91.4% completion of evaluations by the end of the fall 2013 semester as scheduled. Additionally, full compliance was reached by the end of the spring 2014 semester and has been maintained in the subsequent semesters and the process for these evaluations is now part of the Instruction Office operations. (Evidence – 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5)

Conclusion

Skyline College has fully addressed the noted deficiency and meets the Standard III.A.1.b.

APPENDICES

- 1.1 – Part-Time Faculty Evaluation Tracking – EXAMPLES
- 1.2 – Adjunct Faculty Evaluation Process
- 1.3 – Faculty Evaluation Form
- 1.4 – Evaluation Summary Form
- 1.5 – Faculty Evaluation Procedures

APPENDIX A – EVIDENCE

Part-Time Faculty Evaluations Tracking Sheet

Division: Business

Directions: Part-Time faculty are evaluated every 6 semesters per AFT contract. Divisions must submit the tracking sheet to the Vice President of Instruction Office on the first week of every Fall and Spring semester.

KEY	
	Taught this Semester
	To be evaluated this Semester
	Evaluation Review Complete
	Did not teach this semester

Part-Time Faculty	Hire Date	Next Scheduled Evaluation Date	Scheduled Evaluation Complete? Y/N	Last Evaluation Date											Comments
					Fall 10	Sp 11	Fall 11	Sp 12	Fall 12	Sp 13	Fall 13	Sp 14	Fall 14		
Department: Accounting															
Bruening, William	Fall 1979	Spring 17	Yes	Spring 14											
Claire, Richard	Fall 2011	Spring 17	Yes	Spring 14											
Miller, John	Spring 2008	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13											
Steinberg, Marvin	Fall 1981	Spring 15	Yes	Spring 12											
Zhang, Hellen	Spring 2005	Full-Time Tenured	Yes	Fall 13										Full-Time Tenured	Status changed to
Department: Automotive															
Behraves, Kalon	Spring 2012	Spring 15	Yes	Spring 12											
Childress, Craig	Spring 1998	Spring 16	Yes	Spring 13											
Cresta, James	Spring 2011	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13											
Dair, Perry	Fall 1993	Fall 15	Yes	Fall 12											
Dhaliwal, Hari	Fall 1989	Fall 15	Yes	Fall 12											
Enriquez, Emmanuel	Spring 1999	Fall 15	Yes	Fall 12											
Gleyzer, Filipp	Fall 2013	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13											
Hill, David	Fall 1983	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13											
Naderpour, Shahbal	Fall 2006	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13											
Salazar, Jerry	Fall 2001	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13											Course ended in O
Young, Richard	Fall 2011	Spring 16	Yes	Spring 13											
Department: Business Computer Systems and Management															
Corzonkoff, Barbara	Fall 1996	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13											
Weeks, Janice	Spring 2008	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13											
Cervantes, Alma	Fall 2000	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13											
Department: Business															
Alcalde, Sharon	Fall 1976	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13											
Broxholm, Valerie	Spring 2000	Spring 16	Yes	Spring 13											

Part-Time Faculty Evaluations Tracking Sheet

Division: Business

Directions: Part-Time faculty are evaluated every 6 semesters per AFT contract. Divisions must submit the tracking sheet to the Vice President of Instruction Office on the first week of every Fall and Spring semester.

KEY	
	Taught this Semester
	To be evaluated this Semester
	Evaluation Review Complete
	Did not teach this semester

Part-Time Faculty	Hire Date	Next Scheduled Evaluation Date	Scheduled Evaluation Complete? Y/N	Last Evaluation Date	Fall 10	Sp 11	Fall 11	Sp 12	Fall 12	Sp 13	Fall 13	Sp 14	Fall 14	Comments
Canfield, Celia	Spring 2013	Fall 17	Yes	Spring 14										
Dai, Andrew	Fall 2013	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13										
Damonte, Beth	Spring 2013	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13										
Guadamuz-Cabral, Fatima	Fall 2008	Spring 16	Yes	Spring 13										
Kilmartin, Jack	Fall 1991	Spring 16	Yes	Spring 13										
Lewis, Alpha	Fall 2013	Fall 13	Yes	Fall 13										
McCarthy, Soledad	Fall 2012	Spring 16	Yes	Spring 13										
Neuendorff, Michael	Fall 2011	Fall 16	Yes	Spring 13										
Thomas, Ed	Fall 2013	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13										
Weinberger, Jeff	Spring 2014	Spring 17	Yes	Spring 14										Didn't teach in Spr
Tan, Paul	Fall 2012	Fall 15	Yes	Fall 12										
Zabaneh, Rachel	Fall 2013	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13										
Department: Cooperative Education														
Prater-Slack, Dietra	Fall 1992	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13										
Zanassi, Lavinia	Fall 1986	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13										
Department: Cosmetology														
Smith, Evelyn	Spring 2000	Spring 16	Yes	Spring 13										
Hemstreet, Linsey	Fall 2014	Spring 17		Fall 14										
Nielsen, Karen	Fall 2011	No longer employed with SMCCD	Yes	Spring 13										No longer employ
Department: Early Childhood Education														
Adams, James	Fall 2013	Spring 17	Yes	Fall 13										
Ansari, Soudabeh	Fall 2004	Fall 15	Yes	Fall 12										
Blair, Penelope	Spring 2003	Spring 16	Yes	Spring 13										
Floor, Penelope	Spring 2006	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13										
Ford, Sylvia	Spring 1997	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13										

Part-Time Faculty Evaluations Tracking Sheet

Division: Business

Directions: Part-Time faculty are evaluated every 6 semesters per AFT contract. Divisions must submit the tracking sheet to the Vice President of Instruction Office on the first week of every Fall and Spring semester.

KEY	
	Taught this Semester
	To be evaluated this Semester
	Evaluation Review Complete
	Did not teach this semester

Part-Time Faculty	Hire Date	Next Scheduled Evaluation Date	Scheduled Evaluation Complete? Y/N	Last Evaluation Date											Comments
					Fall 10	Sp 11	Fall 11	Sp 12	Fall 12	Sp 13	Fall 13	Sp 14	Fall 14		
Francisco, Elaine	Spring 2006	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Blue	Yellow	Yellow		
Genevro, Robert	Fall 1998	Spring 16	Yes	Spring 13	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Blue	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow		
Genevro, Robert	Fall 1998	Spring 16	Yes	Spring 13	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Blue	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow		
McClain-Rocha	Fall 2010	Fall 17		Fall 14	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Blue	Yellow	Yellow		
McGinn, Paula	Fall 2013	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Blue	Yellow	Yellow		
Proett, Paul	Spring 2010	Fall 14	Yes	Fall 13	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	Blue	Yellow	Course ended in N	
Ratkewicz, Vivian	Fall 2013	Spring 17	Yes	Spring 14	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Blue	Yellow		
Watts, Tina	Fall 2010			Fall 14	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Yellow	Blue	Yellow		
Wiggins-Dowler, Karen	Summer 08	Spring 17	Yes	Spring 14	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Blue	Yellow		
Whitney, Shawna	Fall 2006	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Blue	Yellow		
Yung, Mary	Spring 2010	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	Blue	Yellow	Hybrid Course; Lec	
Department: Education															
DeJosia, Nicholas	Spring 2014	Spring 16	Yes	Spring 13	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Blue	Yellow		
Department: Fashion Merchandising															
Nuschy, Allison	Spring 2002	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Blue	Yellow	Yellow		
Department: Interior Design															
Dye, Jennifer	Fall 2007	No longer employed with SMCCD	Yes	Fall 13	Yellow	Grey	Yellow	Grey	Yellow	Grey	Blue	Grey	Yellow	No longer employ	
Department: Real Estate															
Nuttall, Allan	Fall 2000	Fall 16	Yes	Fall 13	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Blue	Yellow	Yellow		
Department: Wellness															
Aldridge, Linda	Fall 2011	No longer employed with SMCCD	Yes	Spring 12	Grey	Grey	Yellow	Blue	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	No longer employ	
Brown, Richard	Fall 2011	Spring 15	Yes	Spring 12	Grey	Grey	Yellow	Blue	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow		
Frederick, Mark	Fall 2012	Fall 15	Yes	Fall 12	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Blue	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	No longer employ	

Part-Time Faculty Evaluations Tracking Sheet

Division: Business

Directions: Part-Time faculty are evaluated every 6 semesters per AFT contract. Divisions must submit the tracking sheet to the Vice President of Instruction Office on the first week of every Fall and Spring semester.

KEY	
	Taught this Semester
	To be evaluated this Semester
	Evaluation Review Complete
	Did not teach this semester

Part-Time Faculty	Hire Date	Next Scheduled Evaluation Date	Scheduled Evaluation Complete? Y/N	Last Evaluation Date	Fall 10	Sp 11	Fall 11	Sp 12	Fall 12	Sp 13	Fall 13	Sp 14	Fall 14	Comments
Leary, Mary	Fall 2010	Spring 16	Yes	Spring 13										

Part-Time Faculty Evaluations Tracking Sheet

Division: Social Sciences/Creative Art

Directions: Part-Time faculty are evaluated every 6 semesters per AFT contract. Divisions must submit the tracking sheet to the Vice President of Instruction Office on the first week of every Fall and Spring semester.

KEY	
	Taught this Semester
	To be evaluated this Semester
	Evaluation Review Complete
	Did not teach this semester

Part-Time Faculty	Hire Date	Next Scheduled Evaluation Date	Scheduled Evaluation Complete? Y/N	Last Evaluation Date	Fall 10	Sp 11	Fall 11	Sp 12	Fall 12	Sp 13	Fall 13	Sp 14
					Department: Administrative Justice							
Gottuso, Nicholas	Sp 12			Fall 2009								
MacLaren, Peter	Sp 10	Fall 2016	Y									
Phipps, Kevin	Sp 14	Spring 2017	Y	Spring 2014								
Department: Anthropology												
Cecil, Chuck	Fall 07	Fall 2016	Y									
Lance, David	Fall 13	No Rehire	Y	Fall 2013								
Schaefers, Katherine	Fall 13	Fall 2013	N	Fall 2013								
Department: Art/Photo												
Artola, Aya	Su 01	Fall 2016	Y									
Crispi, Ilana	Fall 08	Fall 2013	N	Fall 2008								
David, Eileen	Sp 07	Fall 2016	Y									
Keane, Jody	Sp 87		N									
Lowenstein, Ellen	Sp 87	Fall 2016	Y	Fall 1994								
Pauker, Michael	Sp 06	Spring 2016	Y	Fall 2012					student Evals Only			
Ryan, Michael	Sp 09	Fall 2016	Y	Spring 2009								
Venning, Laura	Sp 87			Spring 1994								
Department: Art/Photo												

Part-Time Faculty Evaluations Tracking Sheet

Division: Social Sciences/Creative Art

Directions: Part-Time faculty are evaluated every 6 semesters per AFT contract. Divisions must submit the tracking sheet to the Vice President of Instruction Office on the first week of every Fall and Spring semester.

KEY	
	Taught this Semester
	To be evaluated this Semester
	Evaluation Review Complete
	Did not teach this semester

Part-Time Faculty	Hire Date	Next Scheduled Evaluation Date	Scheduled Evaluation Complete? Y/N	Last Evaluation Date	Fall 10	Sp 11	Fall 11	Sp 12	Fall 12	Sp 13	Fall 13	Sp 14
Jones, Dianne	Sp 09	Spring 2016	Y	Spring 2009					student Evals Only			
Department: Drama												
Ceccarelli, Alan	Sp 11		Y	Spring 2011								
Department: Economics												
Kress, Shirley	Sp 87		N	Spring 1997								
Nelson, Kevin	Sp 09		N									
Sanford, Dorothy	Sp 00	Spring 2016	Y									
Speight, Lonnie	Sp 00	Fall 2016	Y									
Department: Film												
Uyehara, Sean	Fall 07	Fall 2016	Y	Student Evals Only								
Department: Geography												
Hansell, Christine	Sp 09	Spring 2016	Y									
Department: History												
Bolick, Paul	Sp 08	Fall 2016	Y	Spring 2008 Student Evals Only								
Collins, Christopher	Fall 13		N									
Elia, John	Sp 98	Spring 2016	Y									
Erion, Greg	Sp 07			Spring 2007 Student Evals Only								

Part-Time Faculty Evaluations Tracking Sheet
Division: Social Sciences/Creative Art

Directions: Part-Time faculty are evaluated every 6 semesters per AFT contract. Divisions must submit the tracking sheet to the Vice President of Instruction Office on the first week of every Fall and Spring semester.

KEY	
	Taught this Semester
	To be evaluated this Semester
	Evaluation Review Complete
	Did not teach this semester

Part-Time Faculty	Hire Date	Next Scheduled Evaluation Date	Scheduled Evaluation Complete? Y/N	Last Evaluation Date									
					Fall 10	Sp 11	Fall 11	Sp 12	Fall 12	Sp 13	Fall 13	Sp 14	
Rose, Murielle	Fall 96			Fall 1996									
Shusterman, Alice	Fall 96												
Department: Sociology													
Murajda, Tricia	Sp 07	Fall 2015	Y	Fall 2012									

Part-Time Faculty Evaluations Tracking Sheet
Division: Language Arts

Directions: Part-Time faculty are evaluated every 6 semesters per AFT contract. Divisions must submit the tracking sheet to the Vice President of Instruction Office on the first week of every Fall and Spring semester.

KEY	
	Taught this Semester
	To be evaluated this Semester
	Evaluation Review Complete
	Did not teach this semester

Part-Time Faculty	Hire Date	Next Scheduled Evaluation Date	Scheduled Evaluation Complete? Y/N	Last Evaluation Date	Fall 10	Sp 11	Fall 11	Sp 12	Fall 12	Sp 13	Fall 13
Department: Biology											
Allen, Andrew	Spring 2005	Spring 15		Spring 13							
Aquino, Yancy	Spring 2013	Spring 16		Spring 13							
Barbier, Janelle	Fall 2014	Fall 2014									
Bhagwat, Vashali	Summer 2014	Fall 2014									
Davis, Kevin	Fall 2008	Spring 16		Fall 12							
Del Mundo, Genievive	Fall 2009	Spring 16		Spring 13							
Folsom, Jing	Fall 2013	Fall 16		Fall 13							
Gearhart, Anne	Spring 2009	Fall 14		Fall 11							
Kanaaneh, Jamil	Fall 2007	Spring 15		Spring 12							
Kimpo, Rhea	Summer 2014	Fall 2014									
Lilla, Jennifer	Fall 2007	Spring 16		Fall 12							
McDaniel, John	Fall 2007	Fall 14		Fall 11							
Okonek, Bonnie	Spring 1987	Fall 15		Spring 12							
Su, Richard	Fall 2007	Fall 14		Fall 11							
Timpe, Leslie	Spring 2006	Spring 14		Fall 13							
Wenck-Reilly, Brennan	Fall 2013	Fall 16		Fall 13							
Department: Chemistry											
Appleton, Anthony	Spring 2014	NA	Y	Spring 14							
Chang, Terrance	Summer 2014	Fall 2014									
Ghanma, Mousa	Fall 2004	Fall 14		Fall 11							
Martinovic, Valeria	Fall 2009	Spring 15		Spring 13							

Part-Time Faculty Evaluations Tracking Sheet
Division: Language Arts

Directions: Part-Time faculty are evaluated every 6 semesters per AFT contract. Divisions must submit the tracking sheet to the Vice President of Instruction Office on the first week of every Fall and Spring semester.

KEY	
	Taught this Semester
	To be evaluated this Semester
	Evaluation Review Complete
	Did not teach this semester

Part-Time Faculty	Hire Date	Next Scheduled Evaluation Date	Scheduled Evaluation Complete? Y/N	Last Evaluation Date								
					Fall 10	Sp 11	Fall 11	Sp 12	Fall 12	Sp 13	Fall 13	
McKay, Pat	Spring 1998	Spring 15		Spring 12								
McOmber, Janice	Fall 2002	Spring 15		Spring 12								
Mossman, Craig	Spring 2010	NA		Spring 13							Resigned	
Parast, Camran	Spring 2007	NA		Spring 13							Terminated	
Ruis, Nancy	Spring 2003	Fall 14		Fall 11								
Somma, Maria	Spring 2014		Y	Spring 14								
Vo, Van Thi	Summer 2014	Fall 2014										
Young, Brian	Fall 2013	Fall 16	Y	Fall 13								
Department: Computer Science												
Obrien, Kathleen	Fall 2008	Fall 15		Spring 12								
Department: Earth Science												
Cook, John	Fall 2008	Fall 14		Fall 11								
Department: EMC												
Crawford, Judith	Fall 2004	Fall 15		Fall 12								
Miller, Rick	Spring 2004	Spring 15		Spring 12								
Philips, Matt	Fall 2007	Spring 15		Spring 12								
Department: ESTM												
Faust, Douglas	Fall 2011	Fall 14		Fall 11								
Greenstein, Bruce	Fall 2011	Fall 14		Fall 11								Full time
Thompson, Omer	Fall 2009	Spring 15		Spring 12								
Wilcher, Aaron	Fall 2011	Fall 14		Fall 11								
Department: HSCI												

Part-Time Faculty Evaluations Tracking Sheet
Division: Language Arts

Directions: Part-Time faculty are evaluated every 6 semesters per AFT contract. Divisions must submit the tracking sheet to the Vice President of Instruction Office on the first week of every Fall and Spring semester.

KEY	
	Taught this Semester
	To be evaluated this Semester
	Evaluation Review Complete
	Did not teach this semester

Part-Time Faculty	Hire Date	Next Scheduled Evaluation Date	Scheduled Evaluation Complete? Y/N	Last Evaluation Date								
					Fall 10	Sp 11	Fall 11	Sp 12	Fall 12	Sp 13	Fall 13	
Momeni, Kayvan	Spring 2012	Spring 15		Spring 12								
Nguyen, Sean	Spring 2011	Spring 17	Y	Spring 14								
Reuterdahl, Tom	Spring 1981	Fall 14		Fall 11								
Wang, Li	Fall 1997	Spring 15		Spring 12								
Wang, Miranda	Spring 2012	Spring 15		Spring 12								
Department: MEDA												
Brown-Kelly, Paige	Fall 2014	Fall 2014										
Holland, Cristi		Fall 2014			See BUS for last evaluation							
Newland, Bernadette		Fall 2014			See BUS for last evaluation							
Department: Physics												
Hein, Emilie	Fall 2014	Fall 2014										
Grist, Greg	Fall 2006	Fall 14		Fall 11								
Langhoff, Nick	Fall 2009	Spring 17	Y	Spring 14								
Prochter, Gabriel	Spring 2013	Spring 16		Spring 13								
Reil, Kevin	Spring 2007	Fall 14		Fall 11								
Yadak, Polin	Fall 2012	Fall 2015		Fall 2012								
Department: Respiratory Therapy												
Esparza, Heather	Fall 2013	Fall 16		Fall 13								
Kawamura, Scott	Fall 2013	Fall 16		Fall 13								
Department: Surgical Tech.												
Breadmont, Linda	Fall 2011	Fall 14		Fall 11								
Wasilewski, Michael	Spring 2007	Fall 14		Fall 11								

Part-Time Faculty Evaluations Tracking Sheet
Division: Language Arts

Directions: Part-Time faculty are evaluated every 6 semesters per AFT contract. Divisions must submit the tracking sheet to the Vice President of Instruction Office on the first week of every Fall and Spring semester.

KEY	
	Taught this Semester
	To be evaluated this Semester
	Evaluation Review Complete
	Did not teach this semester

Part-Time Faculty	Hire Date	Next Scheduled Evaluation Date	Scheduled Evaluation Complete? Y/N	Last Evaluation Date	Language Arts						
					Fall 10	Sp 11	Fall 11	Sp 12	Fall 12	Sp 13	Fall 13
Department: Telecommunications											
Allen, Rus	Fall 2008	Spring 15		Spring 12							
Hanley, Walter	Spring 2013	Fall 2014		Fall 2014							
Perino, Pete	Fall 1990	Fall 14		Fall 11							
Petromilli, Jim	Sping 2010	Spring 15		Spring 12							
Scurries, Dean	Fall 1997	Spring 15		Spring 12							
Lohmann, Roger (Eric)	Sping 2000	Fall 15		Fall 12							
Cortes, Quintin	Sping 2001	Spring 16		Spring 13							
Frank, John	Sping 1983	Spring 16		Spring 13							

Skyline College
Office of Instruction
Part Time Faculty Evaluation Process

Part Time Faculty Evaluation at Skyline College follows the Board of Trustee procedures and the AFT contract. The AFT contract section pertaining to part time faculty evaluation follows at the end of this document. The relevant Board of Trustee procedure is below.

Board of Trustees Administrative Procedure 2.09.1 Categories of Employment: Evaluation
https://sharepoint.smccd.edu/SiteDirectory/portal/Procedures/2_09.1.pdf

1. All District employees are evaluated systematically and at stated intervals. Written criteria are established for evaluating employees. Evaluation processes are designed to assess effectiveness of employees and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely and documented.

2. Detailed evaluation procedures for various categories of employment can be accessed as follows:

a. Faculty:

See Procedure 3.20, Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Tenure:

https://sharepoint.smccd.edu/SiteDirectory/portal/Procedures/3_20.pdf

The process for the collecting and tracking the information will be as follows:

- 1) At the beginning of each semester, Instructional Deans and Counseling Dean fill out PT Faculty tracking spreadsheet (standard format for all divisions).
- 2) Deans forward their completed tracking spreadsheets to the Instruction Office SharePoint site and upload into appropriate folders by the **end of the second week** of each semester. The spreadsheet indicates faculty start dates, when evaluations are due, and when each is completed.
- 3) At the end of each academic year, the VPI will prepare a summary report to the College President.
- 4) College President will send update to the District HR Department.

Instruction Office SharePoint Site:

https://smccd.sharepoint.com/sites/sky/InstructionalOps/_layouts/15/start.aspx#/

Adjunct Faculty Evaluation Policy

General Considerations

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

I. Purpose

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

The specific purposes of adjunct faculty evaluation are as follows:

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

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

II. Evaluation Criteria for Adjunct Faculty

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

A. Student Relations

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

1. responds to the educational needs of students by (a) answering questions clearly and following through to maximize student understanding; and (b) giving equal access and treatment to students regardless of ethnicity, cultural background, age, gender, and lifestyle, and by avoiding

stereotypes;

2. demonstrates respect for the right of the student to hold and to express divergent opinions and demonstrates sensitivity to concerns of students; and
3. shows concern for student educational welfare by being available during office hours and answering questions with courtesy

B. Professional Responsibilities

The adjunct faculty member:

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

C. Performance Criteria

1. Performance by Classroom Faculty

The adjunct faculty member:

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

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

The adjunct faculty member:

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

III. Evaluation Procedures and Methods

Adjunct faculty will be evaluated in the first year of employment. In the SMCCCD, adjunct faculty will be evaluated in the first semester of service. Thereafter adjunct faculty shall be evaluated at least once every six (6) regular semesters. In accordance with District policy, the evaluation will be completed by the end of the semester in which it is begun.

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

Section II.

Required:

1. Student questionnaire

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

2. Adjunct faculty portfolio

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

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

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

3. Performance assessment by peer evaluator

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

Optional:

1. Adjunct faculty self-assessment

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

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

IV. Role and Responsibility of Tenured Peer and Division Dean

Role of Peer Evaluator

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

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

Responsibilities of Peer Evaluator

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

Role of Division Dean

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

Responsibilities of Division Dean

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

V. Right to Grievance

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

OBSERVATION FORM

CLASSROOM FACULTY

NOTE TO OBSERVER: Review the instructor's syllabus, the catalog description, and the course outline of record, which can be found on the Curriculum Committee website or in the Division Office, PRIOR to your observation. Evaluate the instructor's performance and contact with students using specific, detailed examples.

OVERALL OBJECTIVE: To determine whether the instructor demonstrates mastery of subject matter and proficiency in teaching.

RATING KEY:

A. Exceeds Expectations B. Meets Expectations C. Needs Improvement D. Unsatisfactory E. Not Enough Information/Not Applicable

Instructor: _____ Evaluator: _____

Class/Section: _____ Date _____ Scheduled Time: _____

Number of Students Attending: _____ Time Class Began: _____

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

Subject Matter Covered (e.g., the primary subject matter focused upon during the session):

RATING KEY:

A. Exceeds Expectations B. Meets Expectations C. Needs Improvement D. Unsatisfactory E. Not Enough
Information/Not Applicable

Rated section	A B C D E	Comments or examples of behavior
<p>1. Methods of Instruction a. Please identify the methods of instruction used during the session in the Comments section (e.g., lecture, discussion, tutorial, group work, demonstration, laboratory exercise, or a combination of methods). b. The instructor uses the instructional method(s) effectively (e.g., the method employed was interesting, used creatively, and enabled students to engage with the material).</p>		
<p>2. Instructional Aids and Classroom Technology a. The instructor makes use of educational equipment and facilities, such as the white board or seating arrangements, visual or audio aids, or other forms of technology. b. Instructional aids are current. c. Instructional aids support the lesson.</p>		
<p>3. Instructional Materials The instructor provides the materials necessary for the lesson to be completed.</p>		
<p>4. Instructional Delivery a. The instructor speaks clearly and modulates the pace of his or her speech, showing enthusiasm for the subject matter and the students. b. The instructor's handwriting on the white/chalk board is legible, grammatically correct, and organized.</p>		

Rated section	A B C D E	Comments or examples of behavior
<p>5. Knowledge of Subject Matter</p> <p>a. The instructor demonstrates knowledge of the subject matter through a command of information, an ability to interpret that information, and an ability to answer questions and reformulate explanations.</p> <p>b. The instructor shows awareness of recent/current developments, methods, and research in the field. Provide an example.</p> <p>c. The instructor shows a sufficient understanding of the technical aspects of the field. Provide an example.</p>		
<p>6. Subject Matter</p> <p>The subject matter presented contributes to the course objectives in the course outline of record (COR) and the instructor's syllabus and relates to the description in the college catalog and schedule of classes.</p>		

Rated section	A B C D E	Comments or examples of behavior
<p>7. Student Centeredness</p> <p>a. The activities completed during the observed class period were commensurate with students' varying abilities and the objectives of the course. That is, the activities (which may include lecture) seem to meet the majority of the students where they are and guide them to the next level.</p> <p>b. The instructor presents the subject matter in a way that allows for student engagement. Give an example.</p> <p>c. Students are given the opportunity to provide feedback during the lesson to help them determine what they do and do not understand.</p> <p>d. The instructor assesses whether students are assimilating the information and offers help when needed.</p> <p>e. The instructor gives safety reminders/suggestions, if relevant.</p> <p>f. (For Kinesiology classes) The instructor demonstrates progression/regression of movement.</p> <p>g. (For Kinesiology classes) If a new movement is presented, the instructor demonstrates and explains the movement.</p>		
<p>8. Content Logic</p> <p>a. Describe how the class period is organized.</p> <p>b. The class follows an observable logic and leads to clear objectives.</p> <p>c. (For Kinesiology classes) Class format is appropriate for activity.</p>		

Rated section	A B C D E	Comments or examples of behavior
<p>9. Communication with 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, the instructor:</p>		
a. Listens to the students.		
b. Answers questions clearly.		
c. Pursues discussion to ensure students' understanding.		
d. Encourages all students to participate in discussion or activity.		
e. Allows students to express divergent viewpoints.		
f. Treats all students respectfully.		
g. Fosters a climate of respect.		

Rated section	A B C D E	Comments or examples of behavior
<p>10. Critical Thinking Skills The instructor stimulates critical thinking. Ways to promote critical thinking include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Presenting material inductively * Asking open-ended questions * Encouraging metacognition * Inviting inference and interpretation * Promoting independent thinking and the evaluation of ideas or principles <p>Give examples.</p>		

OVERALL PERFORMANCE RATING

- A. Exceeds expectations.
- B. Meets expectations.
- C. Needs improvement. (Improvement plan required. See Improvement Plan form.)
- D. Is unsatisfactory. (Improvement plan required. See Improvement Plan form.)

EVALUATOR COMMENTS:

I have met with the evaluatee and discussed the evaluatee's classroom observation.

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Evaluator

EVALUEE COMMENTS:

I have met with the evaluator and discussed my classroom observation.

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Evaluatee

OBSERVATION FORM
ONLINE FACULTY

NOTE TO OBSERVER: Review the instructor's syllabus, the catalog description, and the course outline of record, which can be found on the Curriculum Committee website or in the Division Office, PRIOR to your observation. Evaluate the instructor's performance and virtual contact with students using specific, detailed examples.

OVERALL OBJECTIVE: To determine whether the instructor demonstrates mastery of subject matter and proficiency in teaching.

RATING KEY:

A. Exceeds Expectations B. Meets Expectations C. Needs Improvement D. Unsatisfactory
E. Not Enough Information/Not Applicable

Instructor: _____ Evaluator:

Class/Section: _____ Date: _____

Number of Students Enrolled: _____

Number of Students Logging in Regularly: _____

Instructor uses the District-designated course management system. Please check one: Yes ___ No ___

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

Subject Matter Covered (e.g., the primary subject matter focused upon during the session):

Rated section	A B C D E	Comments or examples of behavior
<p>1. Organization and Accessibility (Presentation Logic)</p> <p>a. Course navigation is clear.</p> <p>b. The logic and progression of the course are efficient, consistent, and user-friendly.</p> <p>c. Components and structure of the course are easy to comprehend.</p> <p>d. The technologies that the instructor uses are functioning, readily accessible, and user-friendly including for students with disabilities.</p> <p>e. The course points students to academic and student support services and resources.</p> <p>f. The means through which to contact the instructor and/or seek technical assistance are clear.</p> <p>g. The syllabus is easily accessible.</p>		
<p>2. Syllabus</p> <p>a. The course syllabus identifies and clearly delineates the role that technology and the online environment will play in the course as a whole.</p> <p>b. The course syllabus addresses all the requirements in the course outline.</p> <p>c. All course policies, including assignment load and grading, are clearly stated.</p> <p>d. The technical requirements for the course are stated.</p> <p>e. Course objectives, expectations, and materials are clear.</p>		

Rated section	A B C D E	Comments or examples of behavior
<p>3. Learning Objectives</p> <p>a. Learning objectives are clearly identified and measurable and consistent with the course outline of record.</p> <p>b. Activities clearly support learning objectives.</p>		
<p>4. Knowledge of Subject Matter</p> <p>a. The instructor demonstrates knowledge of the subject matter through a command of information, an ability to interpret that information, and an ability to answer questions and reformulate explanations.</p> <p>b. The instructor shows awareness of recent developments and research in the field? Give an example.</p> <p>c. The instructor shows a sufficient understanding of the technical aspects of the field? Give an example.</p>		
<p>5. Subject Matter and Content Logic</p> <p>a. Subject matter presented contributes to the course objectives in the course outline of record (COR) and the instructor's syllabus and relates to the course description in the college catalog and schedule of classes.</p> <p>b. Lessons follow an observable logic and lead to clear objectives.</p> <p>c. Students are given the opportunity to provide feedback before the completion of each lesson to help them determine what they do and do not understand.</p> <p>d. (For Kinesiology classes) Class format is appropriate for activity.</p>		

Rated section	A B C D E	Comments or examples of behavior
<p>6. Student Centeredness</p> <p>a. The activities assigned are commensurate with students' varying abilities and the objectives of the course. That is, the activities (which may include recorded lectures) seem to meet the majority of the students' learning capabilities and guide them to the next level.</p> <p>b. The instructor assesses whether students are assimilating the information and offers help when needed.</p> <p>c. The instructor gives safety reminders/suggestions, if relevant.</p> <p>d. (For Kinesiology classes) The instructor demonstrates progression/regression of movement.</p> <p>e. (For Kinesiology classes) If a new movement is presented, the instructor demonstrates and explains the movement.</p>		
<p>7. Instructional Design and Delivery (Use of technology)</p> <p>a. The course uses a variety of technology tools to facilitate communication and learning.</p> <p>b. The course uses a variety of multimedia elements and/or activities to accommodate different learning styles.</p> <p>c. Teaching methods and aids are current, innovative, and support the lesson.</p>		

Rated section	A B C D E	Comments or examples of behavior
<p>8. Learner Interaction and Engagement</p> <p>a. There is/are a mean(s) through which the students and instructor can introduce themselves.</p> <p>b. The requirements for student interaction are clearly stated.</p> <p>c. Course materials and assignments create active learners and encourage student engagement.</p> <p>d. The instructor presents the subject matter in a way that allows for student engagement and lesson assimilation. Give an example.</p> <p>e. Course offers ample opportunities for interaction and communication student to student, student to instructor, and student to content.</p>		
<p>9. Assessment and Evaluation of Student Learning</p> <p>a. Students can easily and quickly access their grades for both individual assignments and for the course as a whole.</p> <p>b. The types of assessments measure the stated learning objectives for the course.</p> <p>c. Grading standards are clear.</p> <p>d. The course provides continuous and timely assessment and feedback.</p> <p>e. The course provides students the opportunity for self and peer assessment and instructor feedback.</p>		
<p>10. Critical Thinking Skills Activities help students develop critical thinking and problem-solving skills.</p>		

Rated section	A B C D E	Comments or examples of behavior
11. Communication with 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, the instructor:		
a. Replies promptly to student communications and inquiries.		
b. Answers questions clearly.		
c. Pursues discussion to ensure students' understanding.		
d. Encourages all students to participate in discussion or activity.		
e. Allows students to express divergent viewpoints.		
f. Treats all students respectfully.		
g. Fosters a climate of respect.		

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRES

CLASSROOM FACULTY

To faculty member being evaluated:

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

To person conducting the questionnaire:

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

All faculty are evaluated periodically, and your instructor is being evaluated this semester. 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 your teacher's performance.

Because student feedback is an important part of your instructor's evaluation, we ask that you take time to answer each question thoughtfully and candidly. Please note that your answers should be for this instructor and this class only.

Please do not put your name anywhere on the form. The questionnaire is anonymous; your responses will be processed before they are shared with your instructor after the semester has ended.

Before responding to the prompts on the evaluation form, please write the instructor's name, the course number, the CRN, and today's date at the top of the form. Then respond to Questions 1, 2, and 3 in the spaces provided. After you have answered Questions 1-3, respond to the remaining prompts by indicating STRONGLY AGREE (4), AGREE (3), DISAGREE (2), STRONGLY DISAGREE (1), or NOT APPLICABLE (0), or EXCELLENT (4), GOOD (3), SATISFACTORY (2), POOR (1), or NOT APPLICABLE (0).

Thank you for your participation.

2) Before students leave, please try to ensure they have completed all the questions on the survey, especially the written responses to Questions 1, 2, and 3.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRES

ONLINE FACULTY

****THIS PAGE SHOULD ACT AS A “COVER SHEET” FOR THE ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE****

To students:

The survey will take you approximately 15 minutes to complete and must be completed within 5 days of receipt.

All faculty are evaluated periodically, and your instructor is being evaluated this semester. 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 your teacher's performance.

Because student feedback is an important part of your instructor's evaluation, we ask that you take time to answer each question thoughtfully and candidly. Please note that your answers should be for this instructor and this class only.

Please do not put your name or G number anywhere on the form. The questionnaire is anonymous; your responses will be processed before they are shared with your instructor.

Before responding to the prompts on the evaluation form, please select the instructor's name, the course number, and the CRN from the drop-down menu. Then respond to Questions 1, 2, and 3 in the spaces provided. After you have answered Questions 1-3, respond to the remaining prompts by indicating STRONGLY AGREE (4), AGREE (3), DISAGREE (2), STRONGLY DISAGREE (1), or NOT APPLICABLE (0), or EXCELLENT (4), GOOD (3), SATISFACTORY (2), POOR (1), or NOT APPLICABLE (0).

Thank you for your participation.

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
CLASSROOM/ONLINE FACULTY

<https://surveys.smccd.edu/n/PETFSurvey.aspx>

PORTFOLIO REVIEW FORM

CLASSROOM/ONLINE FACULTY

College: _____ Division: _____
Academic year of evaluation _____ Semester: _____
Name of evaluatee: _____
Name of evaluator: _____

Please note that portfolios may be submitted in hard copy or as a PDF in a well-organized, comprehensible, and succinct manner and should include materials from both onsite and online classes.

The portfolio contains the following items:

- ___ course syllabi, including description of grading policy, texts (title, author, publisher, and date), student learning outcomes, and supplemental materials, such as computer software used in lab or student guides.
- ___ sample quizzes, midterm(s), and examinations.
- ___ key information handouts.
- ___ representative assignments and key projects.
- ___ evidence of professional development activities.
- ___ statement of teaching philosophy. (Optional)
- ___ other information the evaluatee feels should be included to adequately describe the instructional strategies employed in his or her courses. (Optional)

OVERALL PORTFOLIO RATING

- ___ A. Exceeds expectations.
- ___ B. Meets expectations.
- ___ C. Needs improvement. (Improvement plan required. See Improvement Plan form.)
- ___ D. Is unsatisfactory. (Improvement plan required. See Improvement Plan form.)

EVALUATOR COMMENTS:

I have met with the evaluatee and discussed the evaluatee's portfolio.

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Evaluator

EVALUEE COMMENTS:

I have met with the evaluator and discussed my portfolio.

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Evaluatee

MANDATORY SELF-ASSESSMENT FORM

CLASSROOM/ONLINE FACULTY

College: _____ Division: _____
Academic year of evaluation _____ Semester: _____
Name of evaluatee: _____

Provide the requested information since your last evaluation.

1. Describe or list ways you have participated in Department and/or Division activities.
2. Describe or list ways you have participated in College and/or District activities.
3. Describe or list how you have engaged in professional development related to discipline expertise and/or teaching techniques.
4. Identify any publications, presentations, and/or job-related community activities in which you have been engaged.
5. Describe or list ways you have participated in the development and assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). SLO assessment may include but is not limited to faculty-faculty dialogue, working in professional organizations or groups, working with an institutional researcher, curriculum mapping as part of a retreat, reviewing curriculum for external organizations, addressing student equity questions, using student input through surveys, exams, exam analysis, and registering changes as a consequence.
6. Identify any awards, honors, and/or external evaluations you have received.
7. Provide information not addressed above.

DEAN/RESPONSIBLE ADMINISTRATOR'S ASSESSMENT OF
NON-TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES FORM

CLASSROOM/ONLINE FACULTY

College: _____ Division: _____
Academic year of evaluation _____ Semester: _____
Name of evaluatee: _____
Name of evaluator: _____

1. Evaluatee participates constructively in Division and Department meetings and other activities related to area of responsibility. (Optional for adjunct faculty.)
2. Evaluatee participates constructively on College-wide committees. (Optional for adjunct faculty.)
3. Evaluatee submits grades and other information in a complete, accurate, and timely manner.
4. Evaluatee collaborates well with and is respected by faculty, staff, and students.
5. Evaluatee fulfills professional responsibilities.
6. Evaluatee participates in professional growth activities.

DEAN/RESPONSIBLE ADMINISTRATOR'S COMMENTS:

I have met with the evaluatee and discussed the evaluatee's classroom observation.

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Evaluator

EVALUEE COMMENTS:

I have met with the evaluator and discussed my classroom observation.

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Evaluate

EVALUATION SUMMARY

TENURED FACULTY

College: _____ Division: _____

Academic year of evaluation _____ Semester: _____

Name of evaluatee: _____

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

PART I: (to be completed by the Evaluation Committee/Evaluator(s))

The Evaluation Committee/Evaluator(s) for the _____ Division has reviewed all evaluation materials and, after careful consideration, rates the professional performance of the evaluatee as:

- ___ A. Exceeds expectations.
- ___ B. Meets expectations.
- ___ C. Needs improvement. (Performance improvement plan required. See performance improvement plan form.)
- ___ D. Is unsatisfactory. (Performance improvement plan required. See performance improvement plan form.)

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

I/we have met with the evaluatee and discussed the contents of the evaluatee's classroom observation, student evaluations, portfolio review, self-assessment, and Dean/Responsible Administrator's assessment of non-teaching responsibilities reports (Comprehensive) OR student evaluations, self-assessment, and Dean/Responsible Administrator's assessment of non-teaching responsibilities reports (Standard).

Signature _____ Date _____
Evaluator(s)

Signature _____ Date _____
Evaluator(s)

PART II: (to be completed by the Evaluatee)

COMMENTS: (attach additional sheets if necessary)

I have met with the evaluator and discussed the contents of my classroom observation, student evaluations, portfolio review, self-assessment, and Dean/Responsible Administrator's assessment of non-teaching responsibilities reports (Comprehensive) OR student evaluations, self-assessment, and Dean/Responsible Administrator's assessment of non-teaching responsibilities reports (Standard).

Signature: _____ Date: _____
Evaluatee

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

This Evaluation Summary has been received and reviewed for completeness. Copies have been forwarded to the evaluatee and Responsible Administrator. The original has been forwarded to the Vice Chancellor - Human Resources & Employee Relations for placement in the evaluatee's personnel file.

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

Signature: _____ Date: _____
Vice President

EVALUATION SUMMARY

TENURE-TRACK ONLINE, CLASSROOM,
AND NON-CLASSROOM FACULTY

College: _____ Division: _____
Academic year of evaluation _____ Semester: _____
Name of evaluatee: _____

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

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

Classroom/Online Faculty:	Non-Classroom Faculty
_____ Classroom/Online Observation	_____ Observation
_____ Student Questionnaire	_____ Faculty Portfolio
_____ Faculty Portfolio	_____ Mandatory Self-assessment
_____ Mandatory Self-Assessment	_____ Dean/Responsible Administrator Assessment
_____ Division Dean/Responsible Administrator Assessment	

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

- ___ A. Exceeds Expectations
 - ___ Recommended for Contract II
 - ___ Recommended for Contract III
 - ___ Recommended for Tenure
- ___ B. Meets Expectations
 - ___ Recommended for Contract II
 - ___ Recommended for Contract III
 - ___ Recommended for Tenure
- ___ C. Needs Improvement (Performance improvement plan required. See performance improvement plan form.)
 - ___ Recommended for Contract II
 - ___ Recommended for Contract III
 - ___ Recommended for Tenure
- ___ D. Unsatisfactory (See attached reasons for this recommendation.)
 - ___ Recommended for non-rehiring

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

We have met with the evaluatee and discussed the contents of the evaluatee's classroom observation, student evaluations, portfolio review, self-assessment, and Dean/Responsible Administrator's assessment of non-teaching responsibilities reports.

_____	(Chair)	Date _____
_____		Date _____
_____		Date _____
_____		Date _____

_____ Date _____

PART II: (to be completed by the Evaluatee):

COMMENTS: (attach additional sheets if necessary)

I have met with the Tenure Review Committee and discussed the contents of my classroom observation, student evaluations, portfolio review, self-assessment, and Dean/Responsible Administrator's assessment of non-teaching responsibilities reports.

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.

(Evaluatee)

(Date)

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

This Evaluation Summary has been received and reviewed for completeness. Copies have been forwarded to the evaluatee and Responsible Administrator.

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

Signature: _____ Date: _____
Vice President

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

EVALUATION SUMMARY
ADJUNCT FACULTY

College: _____ Division: _____
Academic year of evaluation _____ Semester: _____
Name of evaluatee: _____

PART I: (to be completed by the Evaluator(s))

Overall performance rating

- A. Exceeds expectations.
 B. Meets expectations.
 C. Needs improvement. (Improvement plan required. See Improvement Plan form.)
 D. Is unsatisfactory.

EVALUATOR COMMENTS:

I have met with the evaluatee and discussed the contents of the evaluatee's classroom observation, student evaluations, portfolio review, self-assessment, and Dean/Responsible Administrator's assessment of non-teaching responsibilities reports.

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Evaluator

PART II: (to be completed by the Evaluatee):

EVALUEE COMMENTS:

I have met with the evaluator and discussed the contents of my classroom observation, student evaluations, portfolio review, self-assessment, and Dean/Responsible Administrator's assessment of non-teaching responsibilities reports.

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Evaluatee

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

A. Tenure Evaluation Committee:

1. Each Tenure Evaluation Committee shall be division-based and comprised of four tenured faculty members and one Division Dean/Responsible Administrator, and shall elect its own Chair from among the four 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. Committee members shall be chosen from within the division, if possible, and at least one of the four 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 Evaluation Committee 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. Two tenured faculty members shall rotate onto the Committee 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 three-year term for Years 1-3; (E) tenured faculty member serving a two-year term for Years 1-2.

Year 3:

(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 three-year term for Years 1-3; (F) new tenured faculty member serving a two-year term for Years 3-4.

Year 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) tenured faculty member serving a two-year term for Years 3-4; (E) new tenured faculty member serving a one-year term for Year 4.

4. Evaluation committees 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 Evaluation 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/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](#)