

# District Proposal – Article 9 – Evaluation

April 13, 2023

## 9.A.4 Evaluation Calendar

---

Managers, evaluators, and evaluatees shall endeavor to meet the following deadlines:

<u>By End of Week 1:</u>	<u>Department chairs confirm lists of faculty scheduled for evaluation</u>
By End of Week <del>1</del> 2:	Evaluation notice is sent to the evaluatee’s District email address. (This may be done during the second half of the preceding semester.)
By End of Week <del>2</del> 3:	Evaluatees indicate evaluation method and if an evaluator from outside the department is desired.
By End of Week <del>4</del> 5:	Names of evaluators are sent to the evaluatee and the names of evaluators not scheduled to do evaluations are sent to the appropriate administrator.
By End of Week 6:	Evaluators are notified.
Weeks 6-10:	Student evaluation is conducted.
By End of Week 10:	Self-evaluation is concluded. Documents are submitted.
By End of Week 11:	Preliminary conferences are completed. First observations are completed.
By End of Week 14:	Second observations are done, if needed.
By End of Week 16:	Evaluation is concluded, signed by evaluatee, and turned in to administration.

## 9.B.1 Timeframes

---

1.2. Faculty shall be notified no later than the end of the ~~first~~ second week of the semester they are to be evaluated in, other than 9.D., below. Faculty may be notified during the second half of the preceding semester that they are to be evaluated during the following semester. Where such notice is not possible because the faculty member is on leave or otherwise unavailable, notice will occur no later than the first

week of the semester in which he/she is to be evaluated. This section does not apply to faculty undergoing management-initiated evaluation (Article 9.D).

## **9.B.2 Evaluation Options (for regular full-time tenured faculty)**

---

2.1.2. The Department Chairperson shall select two or three peer evaluators, ~~in consultation with the~~ with the approval of the supervising Dean. The team shall ordinarily consist of three members but may be reduced to two based on departmental workload. Wherever possible, teams shall represent the diversity of California and be sensitive to affirmative action concerns (Ed. Code §87663(d) and see also Article 4). Where possible, the evaluators shall be from the same or a related department as the evaluatee. The evaluatee may elect to have one of the evaluators be from another discipline or department, with the Department Chair and supervising Dean having final authority ~~in consultation with the Dean~~ to designate the specific evaluator from another discipline or department. The evaluatee shall have the right, within three working days of receipt of the notification, without stating cause, to make up to three (3) disqualifications, in writing, from those originally selected. The evaluators shall not be notified until the ~~challenge disqualification~~ period has passed. The Department Chairperson and supervising Dean shall ~~recommend~~ identify a chair for the evaluating team. The chair of the evaluating team shall have the responsibility of facilitating the evaluation process and obtaining proper signatures, when necessary.

2.1.2.2. Except as provided in this section (9.B.2.1.2.2), the two- (2) member evaluation team shall follow the same evaluation procedures as a three- (3) member team.

In the event that the two- (2) member evaluation team is unable to agree on the overall evaluation rating, the evaluators will endeavor to reach a consensus in consultation with the Department Chairperson and supervising Dean ~~the Dean responsible for faculty evaluation~~. In their attempt to reach consensus, the evaluators may, if time allows, conduct a second classroom or work site visitation(s). Thereafter, if the evaluators are unable to reach a consensus evaluation, the evaluation will be deemed incomplete. The evaluatee will undergo peer evaluation by a three-person team in the following semester, no member of which shall have served on the previous two- (2) member evaluation team.

2.1.6. Consistent with the Evaluation Calendar, Section 9.A.4, above, and at least one (1) week before the first classroom/work site evaluation visit, the evaluators shall confer individually or collectively with the evaluatee, and the evaluators shall also confer individually or collectively with the evaluatee within two (2) weeks after the classroom/work site evaluation has occurred. The evaluators shall decide as a committee whether the conferences shall be with the entire committee or individually.

2.1.7. Within two (2) working days after the formal classroom or work site visitation(s), the evaluatee shall have the option of having the evaluators repeat the classroom or work site visitation(s).

2.1.8. If the evaluators anticipate writing an unsatisfactory evaluation report, the evaluators shall so inform the evaluatee ~~in writing at the post-evaluation conference~~. The evaluators shall repeat the classroom or work site visitation(s) within ten (10) working days after ~~informing the evaluatee the post-evaluation conference~~. If the reason for the unsatisfactory report is not classroom or worksite related, the second visitation is not necessary. If, as a result of the second visitation(s), the evaluation cannot be completed within the Evaluation Calendar, Section 9.A.4, above, such time limits shall be waived.

### **9.B.2.3 Self-evaluation with Peer Review**

---

2.3.4. If the peer evaluators determine the self-evaluation and other materials are acceptable, the evaluatee shall be so notified, and the self-evaluation shall be signed off on by the chairperson of the evaluation committee ~~and then forwarded to the appropriate Department Chairperson and Dean~~.

2.3.4.1. If the Peer evaluators identify problems in the self-evaluation which might be remedied by revising the document, the evaluatee shall be notified as soon as possible and given two weeks to submit a revision. If the revision is acceptable, the evaluatee shall be so notified, and the self-evaluation shall be turned in to the appropriate Vice Chancellor/Associate Vice Chancellor with indication of approval. If the revision is deemed unacceptable, ~~the evaluating team may recommend re-evaluation under Section 9.D by turning in to the Associate Vice Chancellor the evaluation report with written rationale for recommending re-evaluation. the Department Chair shall consult with the Dean, the evaluatee and the team to determine whether a follow-up Peer Evaluation in the following semester is appropriate.~~

2.3.5. After reviewing the self-evaluation, student evaluations (if used), and supporting documents (if used), the evaluating team may recommend re-evaluation under Section 9.D by turning in to the Associate Vice Chancellor the evaluation report with written rationale for recommending re-evaluation. The peer committee evaluators shall use an official form to notify the evaluatee of its recommendation to the Chancellor. The

evaluatee must sign the form to indicate he/she has received notice of the committee's decision and its written criticism of the self-evaluation. This signed recognition does not imply acceptance of the recommendation of the committee. The evaluatee may submit written objections to the conclusion of the peers. If the Administration decides to proceed with re-evaluation, the evaluation must take place not later than the subsequent semester according to the provisions of 9.D.

2.3.8. [Completed evaluation documents will be forwarded to the appropriate Department Chairperson and Dean for review and appropriate follow-up action.](#)

The self-evaluation, supporting documents, and reports of the evaluating committee shall be retained in the employee's Personnel File in the manner that all evaluations are kept.

### **9.E. Evaluation of Temporary Employees (Includes Part-Time, Categorical Full- and Part- Time, and Long-Term Substitutes (LTS))**

---

1. The evaluation of temporary faculty shall follow the same procedures, use the same form and the same criteria as the evaluation of tenured faculty in the same department, except as follows:

...

1.3 Every temporary faculty member must be evaluated within the first year of service. [A Department Chair or supervisor may serve as a peer evaluator in this first evaluation.](#) Thereafter, evaluation shall be at least once every six (6) regular semesters.

### **9.F. Evaluation Outcomes (For All Faculty Except Those Undergoing Tenure Review)**

---

9.F.2. Satisfactory but Needs Improvement: If the overall evaluation report rating is Satisfactory but Needs Improvement, the evaluators shall, in consultation with the evaluatee and the department chair, develop an improvement plan with specific goals, suggested means of achieving those goals and timelines for completion. [The improvement plan shall be approved by the supervising Dean before being the improvement plan will be](#) presented to the evaluatee at the final conference. The faculty member will be scheduled for another evaluation in three years, in accordance with 9.B.1. [The Dean shall receive a copy of the improvement plan.](#)

9.F.3. Unsatisfactory: If the overall evaluation report rating is Unsatisfactory, the evaluators shall, in consultation with the evaluatee and the Department Chairperson, develop an improvement plan with specific goals, suggested means of achieving those goals, and timelines for completion. The improvement plan shall be [approved by the supervising submitted to the Dean for approval, and approved,](#) before being presented to the evaluatee at the final conference.

## 9.G.2 Tenure Review Committees

---

2.2. The Tenure Review Committees shall ordinarily consist of four faculty members, ~~the department chairperson, and the supervising Dean, and the immediate supervisor of the contract employee.~~ ~~The immediate supervisor is the lowest level non-bargaining unit member who has supervision over the employee. A Dean may serve on the Committee when he or she is the immediate supervisor, where the immediate supervisor is out sick or on other leave status, where enough faculty are not otherwise available, as the replacement for an immediate supervisor who has been disqualified pursuant to Section 9.G.7.1, or where the Dean is the only available faculty member with subject matter expertise or is needed for diversity purposes.~~ A department of eight tenured faculty members or fewer may choose to use only two faculty members, ~~the department chairperson, and the supervising Dean and the immediate supervisor of the contract employee,~~ or it may choose to function as a committee-of-the-whole, provided that the committee-of-the-whole has at least three ~~faculty~~ members, including the ~~department chairperson supervisor.~~ Departments having a significant number of faculty under tenure review, or significant workload additional to tenure review, may opt to have Tenure Review Committees that consist of either two or three faculty members, ~~the department chairperson, and the supervising Dean and the immediate supervisor of the contract employee.~~ All faculty members of the Tenure Review Committees must be tenured.

2.2.1. The immediate supervisor shall select the faculty members in consultation with ~~the Dean and~~ the chairperson of the Hiring Committee which interviewed the contract employee ~~with the approval of the supervising Dean.~~ If the chairperson of the Hiring Committee is not available, the supervisor will consult with one or more members of the Hiring Committee. Service on the committee shall be voluntary. If the ~~department chairperson supervisor~~ is unable to recruit the required number of faculty members from volunteers within the department, ~~they he/she~~ shall endeavor to remedy the situation by seeking a committee member(s) from a related discipline. If the ~~department chairperson supervisor~~ cannot find a faculty member(s) in a related discipline, ~~they he/she~~ shall inform the appropriate Vice Chancellor/Assistant Vice Chancellor, who shall have the authority to select a volunteer(s), district-wide, to achieve the required number.

2.2.2. Subject to Article 4.B., The ~~department chairperson supervisor~~ shall endeavor to represent the diversity of California in ~~their his/her~~ appointments. No Tenure Review committee shall consist of ~~people all of the same gender identity or same ethnicity all men or all women or be all of the same ethnicity.~~ If the ~~department chairperson supervisor~~ cannot achieve this balance from volunteers within the department, ~~they he/she~~ shall endeavor to remedy the situation by seeking a committee member(s) from a related

discipline. If the ~~department chairperson supervisor~~ cannot find a faculty member(s) in a related discipline, ~~they he/she~~ shall inform the appropriate Vice Chancellor/Associate Vice Chancellor, who shall have the authority to select a volunteer(s), district-wide, to achieve the proper ethnic or gender ~~identity~~ balance.

2.2.3. The ~~department chairperson supervisor~~ shall supply the appropriate Vice Chancellor/Associate Vice Chancellor with the names of all members on Tenure Review committees.

### 3. Tenure Review Committee Procedures

3.1. Each Tenure Review Committee will elect a faculty member as its chair. Ordinarily, a faculty member should chair no more than one Committee. If the supervisor is the only tenured member of a department, ~~they he/she~~ shall have the option of being the chair of the committee.

3.2. All faculty members of the Tenure Review Committee shall make direct visitations of the contract employee. However, the supervisor shall not be obligated to make classroom visitations in the case of classroom instructors, though ~~they he/she~~ is encouraged to do so.

## **9.G.6. The Recommendation/Decision Process and Timelines for Tenure Review Candidates**

---

9.G.6.2 In the following paragraphs, “first semester” means the first fall semester of employment; “second semester” means the subsequent spring semester; “third semester” means the second fall semester of employment, and so on.

6.2.1. Where the first year contract employee has served as a full-time temporary academic employee (LTS), or a full-time grant/ categorical employee for the complete academic year prior to his/her appointment as a contract employee, the previous year’s employment shall be deemed a year of contract employment in accord with Education Code §§ 87478 and 87470. For purposes of tenure review, the two semesters of temporary or grant/categorical full-time employment shall ~~be deemed the “first semester” and “second semester” of employment~~ counted in lieu of the fifth and sixth semesters of tenure review.

6.2.2. Where a full-time contract employee is appointed in the spring semester and serves in the previous semester as a full-time temporary or grant/categorical full-time employee, this academic year constitutes ~~the first~~ a year of contract employment, counted in lieu of the fifth and sixth semesters of tenure review.

**Note: California Ed Code 87478 is as follows:**

Except as provided in Sections 87481 and 87482, governing boards of community college districts shall classify faculty employed to fill positions of regularly employed persons absent from service as temporary employees.

After September 1 of any school year, the governing board of a community college district may employ, for the remainder of the school year, in temporary status any otherwise qualified person who consents to be so employed in a position for which no regular employee is available, including persons retired for service under the State Teachers' Retirement System. Inability to acquire the services of a qualified regular employee shall be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the board of governors.

Any person employed for one complete school year as a temporary employee shall, if reemployed for the following school year in a faculty position, be classified by the governing board as a contract employee and the previous year's employment as a temporary employee shall be deemed a year of employment as a contract employee for purposes of acquiring regular status.

## **Exhibit D – Student Evaluations**

---

Include updates to questionnaires which were negotiated in 2012 and have been subsequently implemented but are not reflected in the 2018-2021 CBA.

Document usage of different forms.

### **Credit In-Person Classes**

1. Does the instructor organize the material well?
2. Is the instructor’s presentation of material clear and understandable?
3. Does the instructor seem to have adequate knowledge of the subject area of this course?
4. When possible does the instructor relate subject matter to other fields and situations?
5. Does the instructor respect your efforts and opinions as an individual?
6. Does the instructor try to interest you in the subject and encourage you to learn more about it?
7. Were your responsibilities in the course (exams, term papers, attendance regulations, etc.) clearly stated and explained?
8. Is the grading system fair?
9. Does the instructor follow his/her stated grading system?
10. Are the methods of testing (examinations, papers, etc.) a valid evaluation of the knowledge and or skills you have gained from this course?
11. Is the instructor sufficiently available to you during regularly scheduled office hours or by appointment?
12. Are assignments relevant and helpful in understanding the subject area?
13. Is the instructor receptive to questions from students either during or outside class?
14. Is the instructor enthusiastic about teaching this course?
15. Does the instructor meet and dismiss class at the scheduled time?
16. Does the instructor return exams and homework promptly?
17. Does the instructor speak clearly and understandably?
18. Does the instructor show respect for all racial, sexual, religious, and political groups?
19. What is your overall evaluation of this instructor?
20. If you wish to add any comments concerning your instructor, please write them below.

Questions 1-18 are on a “Always-Sometimes-Never” 5-point scale, with an “I don’t know” option. Question 19 is on an “Excellent-Unsatisfactory” 5-point scale. Question 20 is for open comments.



## Credit Online Classes

1. Does the instructor organize the material well?
2. Is the instructor's presentation of material clear and understandable?
3. Does the instructor seem to have adequate knowledge of the subject area of this course?
4. When possible does the instructor relate subject matter to other fields and situations?
5. Does the instructor respect your efforts and opinions as an individual?
6. Does the instructor try to interest you in the subject and encourage you to learn more about it?
7. Were your responsibilities in the course (exams, term papers, participation requirements, etc.) clearly stated and explained?
8. Is the grading system fair?
9. Does the instructor follow his/her stated grading system?
10. Are the methods of testing (examinations, papers, etc.) a valid evaluation of the knowledge and or skills you have gained from this course?
11. Is the instructor sufficiently available to you during the semester?
12. Are assignments relevant and helpful in understanding the subject area?
13. Is the instructor receptive to questions from students?
14. Is the instructor enthusiastic about teaching this course?
15. Does the instructor respond to student inquiries in a timely manner?
16. Does the instructor make your exam and assignment results available promptly?
17. Does the instructor communicate clearly and understandably?
18. Does the instructor show respect for all racial, sexual, religious, and political groups?
19. What is your overall evaluation of this instructor?
20. If you wish to add any comments concerning your instructor, please write them below.

Questions 1-18 are on a "Always-Sometimes-Never" 5-point scale, with an "I don't know" option. Question 19 is on an "Excellent-Unsatisfactory" 5-point scale. Question 20 is for open comments.

## Noncredit Classes

1. The instructor explains the goals of the course.
2. The instructor prepares for class.
3. The instructor knows his/her subject.
4. The instructor presents material clearly.
5. The instructor returns assignments promptly.
6. The instructor makes the class interesting.
7. The instructor allows time for questions and discussions.
8. The instructor makes you feel comfortable in the classroom.
9. The instructor appears enthusiastic about teaching.
10. The instructor shows courtesy and respect to all students.
11. The instructor shows interest in your progress.
12. The instructor keeps sufficient order in the classroom.
13. The instructor starts and ends the class on time.
14. The instructor respects your individual efforts and opinions.
15. The instructor answers your questions and those of other students in the class.
16. The instructor shows respect for all racial, sexual, religious, and political groups.
17. What is your overall evaluation of this instructor?
18. If you wish to add any comments about your instructor, please write them below.

Questions 1-16 are on a "Always-Sometimes-Never" 5-point scale, with an "I don't know" option. Question 17 is on an "Excellent-Unsatisfactory" 5-point scale. Question 18 is for open comments.

## Lower-Level Credit ESL Classes

1. The teacher explains English well.
2. The teacher respects the students.
3. The lesson is organized.
4. The books and materials help me learn English.
5. The teacher helps me understand my mistakes.
6. The teacher encourages students to ask questions.
7. The teacher gives time for questions.
8. The teacher answers questions well.
9. The directions for assignments are clear.
10. The teacher returns my work quickly.
11. The grading system is clear and understandable.
12. The teacher starts the class on time.
13. The teacher ends the class on time.
14. The teacher uses class time well.
15. The teacher likes to teach.
16. The teacher speaks clearly.
17. The teacher is available and helpful in office hours or at other times.
18. What else would you like to say about the teacher? Please write your comments below.

Questions 1-17 are on a “Always-Sometimes-Never” 5-point scale, with an “I don’t know” option. Question 18 is for open comments.

This questionnaire is used for the following credit ESL classes. Other credit ESL classes use the Credit questionnaire.

<b>Course</b>	<b>Title</b>
ESL 49	Pronunciation
ESL 75	Intermediate Editing and Grammar Review
ESL 75A	Intermediate Editing and Grammar Review A
ESL 75B	Intermediate Editing and Grammar Review B
ESL 75C	Intermediate Editing and Grammar Review C
ESL 182	Intermediate Academic ESL

## Noncredit ESL Classes

1. The teacher explains English well.
2. The teacher respects the students.
3. The lesson is organized.
4. The books and materials help me learn English.
5. The teacher helps me understand my mistakes.
6. The teacher gives time for questions.
7. The teacher answers questions well.
8. The teacher checks my work.
9. The teacher starts the class on time.
10. The teacher ends the class on time.
11. The teacher uses class time well.
12. The teacher likes to teach.
13. The teacher helps me learn English.
14. If you want, please write more about your teacher here.

Questions 1-13 are on a “Always-Sometimes-Never” 5-point scale, with an “I don’t know” option. Question 14 is for open comments.

Questionnaires are not used for the following noncredit ESL classes:

<b>Course</b>	<b>Title</b>
ESLF 3020	ESL Skills Computer Lab
ESLF 3128	Reading – Beginning Low
ESLF 3129	Writing – Beginning Low
ESLF 3144	Pronunciation – Beginning
ESLF 4127	Beginning Low Conversation
ESLN 3010	ESL Literacy: Comprehensive
ESLN 3015	ESL Literacy
ESLN 3100	Beginning Low 1
ESLN 3105	Beginning Low 1 Abridged
ESLN 4015	ESL Literacy Abridged
ESLV 4842	ESL for Work - Beginning

## **Noncredit DSPS Classes**

1. The teacher explains the purpose of the class well.
2. The teacher respects the students.
3. The lesson is organized.
4. The teacher gives me clear instructions
5. The teacher helps me understand my mistakes.
6. The teacher gives time for questions.
7. The teacher answers questions well.
8. The teacher helps me to improve.
9. The teacher starts the class on time.
10. The teacher ends the class on time.
11. The teacher uses class time well.
12. The teacher likes to teach.
13. You can write more about your teacher here.

This form is used for all noncredit DSPS classes, except for DSPS 4305 (High School Level Learning Strategies). Students in DSPS 4305 would use the same form used in other noncredit courses.

Credit DSPS courses use the credit course form.

## **Librarians**

1. Was the presentation well organized?
2. Did the Library instructor seem to have adequate knowledge of research skills?
3. Did the library instructor use examples and illustrations effectively?
4. Did the library instructor speak clearly and understandably?
5. Did the library instructor try to answer questions from students during or after the workshop?
6. Did the library instructor show interest and enthusiasm in teaching the class?
7. Did the library instructor seem to be free of racial, sexual, religious and political prejudices?
8. Was this workshop useful and relevant to your academic needs?
9. Do you now feel more confident about using the library resources taught in this class?
10. What is your overall evaluation of this library instructor?
11. If you wish to add any comments about your instructor, please write them below.

Questions 1-9 are on a “Always-Sometimes-Never” 5-point scale, with an “I don’t know” option. Question 10 is on an “Excellent-Unsatisfactory” 5-point scale. Question 11 is for open comments.