Faculty Evaluation and Tenure Review Guidebook

Office of Instruction
Cloud 308
August 2011
Rev. 06-12-17

Table of Contents

Chapter 1. Overview

Faculty evaluation and tenure review are complex processes. Often, questions arise about the mechanics of evaluation – when meetings should be done, how to administer student evaluations, disqualification rights, etc. The intent of this document is to provide a discussion of some of the mechanics of evaluation, discussing both contractual obligations and common practices.

In addition, this document provides some thoughts on conducting faculty evaluation so that it is a meaningful process for everyone involved. When done well, the evaluation process is an opportunity for professional development for evaluators and evaluatees alike.

Several sections of the District/AFT Collective Bargaining Agreement ("AFT Contract") govern faculty evaluation and tenure review: Article 9 (Evaluation), along with Exhibits D (Forms), G (Tenure Review), and K (Early Tenure). None of what is written here is intended to replace or supersede any of that contract language. Relevant sections of the AFT Contract are posted on the Office of Instruction web site[*]. The entire AFT Contract can be found at the Employee Relations web site[†], or at the AFT web site[‡].

---

[*] CCSF Home Page | Employee Services | Office of Instruction

[†] CCSF Home Page | Employee Services | District Business Office | Human Resources | Employee Relations

[‡] http://www.aft2121.org

Chapter 2. Common Elements

City College of San Francisco has two faculty evaluation processes: regular evaluation and tenure review. While there are differences between these processes, they share many common elements. This section discusses those elements that are common to both processes. In addition, there is a discussion about ways to make the evaluation process meaningful for both evaluators and evaluatees alike.

2-1. Components of Meaningful Faculty Evaluation

The approach that evaluators and evaluatees take to the evaluation process has a significant impact on its meaning. The AFT contract speaks to this:

> The purpose of faculty evaluations is to recognize the strengths and special qualities of the evaluatee and to define areas that need improvement.

Meaningful faculty evaluation is *collegial*, in which faculty members engage in a discussion of their profession, giving faculty a framework in which to discuss their craft.

Meaningful faculty evaluation is *formative*, providing an opportunity to discuss professional development, rather than summative, merely ensuring that minimum standards are met.

Meaningful faculty evaluation *acknowledges anxiety*. Since most faculty members spend much of their time working in isolation, allowing a colleague access to observe one's work is, by its nature, allowing someone into what is normally a personal space. Both evaluators and evaluatees should acknowledge that this could produce anxiety.

Meaningful faculty evaluation is *honest*. There are many reasons why evaluators avoid making what can be considered critical remarks – fears of damaging personal relationships, fears of retribution, office politics – but omitting any discussion of improvement takes away the formative nature of the evaluation.

2-2. Evaluation Calendar

Article 9.A.4 of the AFT contract specifies a calendar for evaluation based on the weeks of the semester. The Office of Instruction has established additional timelines that help ensure evaluation processes are completed in a timely manner. While specific deadline dates vary somewhat from semester to semester, the following tables give an approximation of the important deadline dates.

Evaluation Calendar for Regular Evaluations

Item	Deadline
Department chairs confirm list of faculty to be evaluated	Week 1
Evaluatees sent Choice of Evaluation form	End of week 1
Choice of Evaluation form due	End of week 2
Department chair sends names of evaluators to evaluatees so that disqualifications, if any, can be made	End of week 4
Packets of forms and student evaluations sent to evaluators	End of week 6
Student evaluations conducted and forms submitted to Office of Instruction for processing	End of week 10
Faculty who have chosen self-evaluation submit documents to peer reviewers	End of week 10
First observations completed	End of week 11
Second observations (if necessary) completed	End of week 14
Evaluation completed, and signed documents submitted to Office of Instruction	End of week 16

Evaluation Calendar for Tenure Review

Item	Deadline
Department chairs confirm list of Tenure Review Committee members and mentors	End of week 1
Mentors set up meeting schedule	End of week 1
Packets of forms and student evaluations sent to evaluators	End of week 3
Student evaluations conducted and forms submitted to Office of Instruction	End of week 10
First observations completed	End of week 11
Second observations (if necessary) completed	End of week 14
Portfolio submitted to Tenure Review Committee	End of week 14
Evaluation completed, and signed documents submitted to Office of Instruction	End of week 16

Several deadlines bear special mention:

- Student evaluations. Evaluators should submit completed student surveys to the Office of Instruction so that they may be processed and the results used in the overall evaluation.
- Self-evaluation. While most self-evaluations are accepted in their first format, it is possible that the peer evaluators will find problems that may be remedied with revision. The deadline noted in Article 9.A.4 allows time for review and any necessary revision.
- Portfolio submitted. Faculty members in tenure review are to submit their portfolio for review in a timely fashion, so that all Tenure Review Committee members may have a chance to review the portfolio.

The evaluation calendar is based on the presumption that faculty members have a consistent assignment throughout the entire semester. There are times when this is not true. For example, many faculty members now teach short-term classes. The evaluation process can be flexible to accommodate these unusual schedules.

2-3. Pre-Conferences

The contract language for both the regular evaluation and tenure review processes envision pre-conferences between evaluators and the evaluatee at least one week prior to the first observation. This pre-conference is a good time to establish a shared set of expectations about the evaluation process. Having a shared set of expectations helps to avoid conflict about the process later.

In addition to having a discussion about the mechanics of the evaluation – dates and times of observations and student evaluations – the pre-conference is a good opportunity to discuss the evaluation criteria itself. Both evaluatees and evaluators can prepare for the pre-conference by considering the following:

- Direct observation is the basis for evaluation. For each criteria included in evaluation, what are the evaluators going to look for? If the roles were reversed, what would the evaluatee look for?
- There are many criteria listed in the evaluation form. Are there specific areas in which the evaluatee wants feedback? For example, a classroom instructor might be trying something new in the class to enhance students' interest in the field. Having evaluators focus on this new technique can be a good way to get feedback from colleagues about the effectiveness of the technique.
- Student surveys are a component of most faculty evaluations, and include both numeric ratings and an opportunity for students to provide written comments. As with the criteria on the evaluation form, are there specific areas in which the evaluatee wants feedback? Are there some questions that are not applicable?

Ideally, pre-conferences are on-campus face-to-face sessions where the entire evaluation committee meets as a group with the evaluatee. A group face-to-face meeting is an ideal way to set those shared expectations. Scheduling group meetings can be difficult. Many faculty find online tools such as Doodle[*] to be an effective way to set up group meetings with a minimal amount of back-and-forth. While face-to-face group pre-conferences are ideal, there are times when scheduling these meetings is impossible. Evaluation committees may find that having individual on-campus meetings, or meetings via phone or email, is the only viable alternative.

2-4. Scope of Evaluation

While most faculty members have a fairly straightforward assignment consisting solely of their primary assignment (classroom teaching, counseling, library services), some faculty members have assignments that are more complicated. For example, there are some faculty members who are primarily classroom teachers that have some non-instructional assignment, such as lab monitoring. Faculty members who are primarily counselors may teach a student success course as a part of their load.

Evaluations should look at *all* of the responsibilities of a faculty member. The evaluation form provides appropriate space for comments:

---

[*] http://www.doodle.com

- Comments about full-time faculty who are performing some non-instructional assignment should be noted under A.2.b (Professional Qualities: Professional Contributions: Serves effectively on…)
- Comments about counselors who are teaching a class should be noted under C.2.g (Non-classroom faculty: Counselors: Communicates ideas…)
- Comments about librarians who are teaching a workshop should be noted under C.1.d (Non-classroom faculty: Librarians: Communicates ideas…) and C.1.e (Non-classroom faculty: Librarians: Presents material…)

While it is important for evaluations to look at all of the responsibilities of a faculty member, it is also important to have balance. If 90% of a faculty member's load is in their primary activity, and 10% is in some other activity, then the preponderance of the evaluation should be about their primary activity. Also, when evaluating a faculty member who is serving as department chair, remember that there is a separate department chair evaluation process under the DCC Contract. See section 3-6 for details.

2-5. Observations

Direct observation is the heart of all peer and peer-management evaluations and tenure review evaluations. Evaluators need to emphasize what they directly observed when writing their consensus evaluation.

Most evaluators who are observing classes find it ideal to observe an entire class session so that they get a sense of the entire flow of a class – announcements; introduction of the day's topic(s); presentation, discussion, and other class activities; answering student questions; end-of-class wrap-up; etc. Observing an entire class session may be prohibitive for an evening or weekend class that meets once a week for three or four hours, but is ideal for most City College classes that meet several times a week for 1-2 hours.

2-6. Student Evaluations

As noted in Article 9.A.3, student evaluations shall be a part of every evaluation of every classroom instructor. There are several different student evaluation forms for different types of classes.

Determining Classes to Survey

As noted in Article 9.A.3, when under regular evaluation not every class of a faculty member need be surveyed, unless the evaluatee or the evaluators so request. Faculty members under regular evaluation receive a Choice of Evaluation form where they can indicate their preference about student evaluations (see section 3-2). Evaluation committees who wish to survey an additional class can contact the Office of Instruction to get additional forms generated.

Faculty members under tenure review do not have the same choice. As noted in Article 9.G.5, *all classes* of a faculty member under tenure review will be surveyed when possible. Tenure Review Committees have some discretion about student evaluations for faculty members in their fourth year of tenure review.

Administration of Student Evaluations

The chair of the evaluation committee will get copies of student evaluation forms, and should distribute the forms to the evaluation committee members for administration of the evaluations. As noted in Article 9.A.3.2, evaluatees shall neither distribute nor collect the student evaluation forms. For classroom faculty, each of the classes to be surveyed will have a different set of forms – be sure to use the correct set of forms with the appropriate class.

Evaluators normally administer the student evaluations at the very beginning or very end of a class session, to minimize the impact on that class session. For multi-hour class sessions where the students take a break, administering student evaluations either before or after the break is also a possibility.

Even with this, the administration of student evaluations disrupts the normal flow of a class session. For this reason, many evaluators find it best to conduct their observation on a day other than the day selected for the administration of student evaluations. However, there are times when the scheduling of student evaluation and observations makes this prohibitive.

Applicability of Questions

There are situations in which not all of the questions asked in a particular student evaluation form are applicable to a particular faculty member or a particular class. For example, question #11 on the credit classroom faculty questionnaire asks about office hours. While many part-time faculty members hold some number of office hours, it is not a contractual requirement.

During the pre-conference, evaluators and evaluatees should discuss the questions asked in the relevant student evaluation form, so that evaluators can give students appropriate instructions about marking certain questions as not applicable.

Written Comments

All of the student evaluation forms allow for students to write additional written comments. Many evaluators and evaluatees find the written comments to be at least as informative, if not more informative, than the statistical results of the survey questions. As such, many evaluators strongly encourage students who are filling out evaluation forms to provide written comments in addition to filling out the numeric ratings.

Additional Directions to Students

Packets of evaluation forms are sent from the Office of Instruction with a cover sheet indicating the number of forms produced and additional directions that the evaluator should give to students completing the form. It is especially important that students take care with the way that they complete the evaluation forms. The scanner used to read the results has limits, and the process of reviewing haphazardly marked forms is painstakingly slow. The Office of Instruction processes close to 10,000 student evaluation forms each semester. Assistance in minimizing the amount of manual work is greatly appreciated.

Timely Completion

As noted in section 2-2, it is important to submit student evaluations to the Office of Instruction in a timely manner so that an analysis of the evaluations can be conducted and returned to the evaluation committee and used as a component of the consensus evaluation document. The summary printout should be attached to the final, signed consensus evaluation document. The original forms should be returned to the evaluatee after final grades for the semester have been posted, as required by Article 9.A.3.4.

Comparisons

The Office of Instruction publishes overall statistics for student evaluations on its web site[*]. Evaluators can use these overall statistics for comparison purposes when reviewing the results of the student evaluations that they have administered.

Use of Student Evaluation Results

Students are an important component of faculty evaluation since, at the point in time when they are surveyed, they have had extensive contact with the faculty member, much more than the amount of time a typical evaluator will spend on an observation. On the other hand, students have a different perception than peer evaluators, and evaluators should take this into account when interpreting the results of student evaluations.

Many evaluation committees find the results of student evaluations to be useful in two ways:

- Confirming something that was noted in an observation. For example, an evaluator typically notes the type of environment established by a classroom instructor. Several of the student evaluation questions also ask about the relationship the instructor establishes with students.
- Providing data on elements that are difficult to observe in a classroom setting. For example, most students are surveyed about how quickly their instructor returns homework and exams. It is difficult for an evaluator to observe this directly.

2-7. Evaluating Distance Education

The process of evaluating faculty teaching distance education courses requires some alterations to usual evaluation practices. There may not be a physical classroom, so the notion of observing the class takes on a different meaning. Still, even if the evaluators themselves do not teach distance education courses, they should not neglect distance education courses as a component of the faculty member's evaluation.

Evaluation teams that are evaluating faculty who are teaching distance education courses will get supplemental information in the evaluation packets that they receive from the Office of Instruction. They will also be contacted by the Educational Technology Department, who can field specific technical questions about student evaluations and observations.

Observations

The Educational Technology Department will set up accounts in Insight, our Learning Management System for distance education courses, for all evaluators of faculty members who are teaching distance education courses. They will send the evaluation team basic directions about accessing the distance education class.

[*] CCSF Home Page | Employee Services | Office of Instruction

Insight classifies different users of the system according to roles. Evaluators of distance education faculty will be given the “reviewer” role, which will allow them to review all online materials, quizzes, homework, etc.

Student Evaluations

The Educational Technology Department sets up online surveys for students enrolled in distance education courses. Evaluators will need to contact the students enrolled in the class to inform them about the survey. The evaluation packet from the Office of Instruction will include a sample notification email evaluators can use. The Educational Technology Department can assist evaluators in the technical details of sending email to the students.

Evaluation Criteria

There are two evaluation criteria that apply specifically to distance education courses, under section B.2. (Job Performance: Course Presentation):

- G. Student-instructor contact is timely and appropriate
- H. Course structure is consistent and easy to navigate

In addition, there is one evaluation criterion that does not apply to distance education courses, also under section B.2:

- F. Uses class time efficiently

2-8. Writing Improvement Plans

Both the regular evaluation and the tenure review processes give evaluators an opportunity to write a plan for improvement for the faculty member being evaluated. The level of detail in improvement plans varies from evaluation to evaluation. In many cases the improvement plan can be stated as a broad set of goals. Evaluators who find themselves scraping the barrel for insignificant mistakes may find it more useful to confer with the evaluatee on areas of professional development they wish to pursue, using that as the basis for the improvement plan instead.

While many situations allow for improvement plans to be somewhat loosely stated, there are times when a detailed improvement plan is warranted. Specifically, when an evaluation team engaged in the regular evaluation process has decided on an overall rating of Satisfactory but Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory, an improvement plan must be written that has specific goals, suggested means of achieving those goals, and timelines for completion. Tenure Review Committees may also find times when a similarly detailed improvement plan is warranted.

When writing a detailed improvement plan, it is important to keep in mind how the improvement plan will be used. The intent of writing a more detailed improvement plan is to give the faculty under evaluation measurable objectives and deadlines. As noted in Article 9.F.2.1, faculty members who receive a overall rating of Satisfactory but Needs Improvement need to report on their progress on achieving the goals of their improvement plan, and their department chairs need to determine whether the goals of the plan have been accomplished. Ideally, the question of whether a faculty member is done with the elements of an improvement plan should be as close to a series of yes-or-no questions as possible.

While there is no format for detailed improvement plans specified in the contract, the following format may help in organizing thoughts. The examples below also demonstrate specific goals, suggested means of achieving those goals, and timelines for completion.

Goal	Suggested Means	Timeline
Revise syllabus to ensure conformance with CCSF policies	Review faculty handbook and CCSF policies with department chair.	Beginning of the following semester
Provide better written information to students on course content	Update handouts, working with colleagues and ensuring that all elements of the course outline are covered	End of the following semester
Revise approach to group work in class	Coordinate with discipline coordinator to observe other faculty members teaching similar courses	End of the next academic year
Ensure accurate understanding of student transfer requirements using the IGETC transfer pattern	Attend the annual UC Counselors' Conference. Review the UC IGETC informational website.	End of the next academic year
Revise grading scheme to provide students with clear expectations	Review the course outline to ensure grading scheme conforms to the evaluation section. For subjective items (e.g., class participation), develop language for inclusion in the syllabus about how that will be assessed.	Beginning of the following semester
Align classroom practices with best practices in the discipline.	Coordinate with department chair and observe four class sessions taught by other discipline faculty. After each observation, meet with the department chair to discuss how to implement observed techniques.	End of the following semester
Ensure lectures are organized	Develop written lesson plans and review these plans with the department chair.	Each of the first five weeks of the following semester
Update exams	Review draft exams with lead instructor to ensure questions are clear and conform to the course outline.	End of the following semester

Sample Improvement Plan Elements

Improvement Plan Process

Evaluation committees that are developing detailed improvement plans need to confer with evaluatees and their department chairs. Using the following suggested process will help ensure contractual obligations are met.

1. Write up a draft version of the evaluation summary document and a draft version of the improvement plan. Make sure that the elements of the improvement plan have specific goals, suggested means of achieving those goals, and timelines for completion.
2. Share this draft improvement plan with the Department Chair and get his/her feedback. Evaluation committees may also seek the feedback of the Dean of Instruction or School Dean.
3. Set up a meeting with the evaluatee for a preliminary review of the evaluation and draft improvement plan. During this meeting, discuss in general terms the committee's concerns, the overall rating, and the implications of this overall rating. Do not get signatures on the evaluation at this point.

4. Give the evaluatee a couple of days to read through the draft evaluation and improvement plan. If the evaluatee has ideas on the improvement plan, the committee can choose to accept, modify, or reject those ideas. As with feedback from the department chair, the evaluation committee determines the final version of the evaluation document and the improvement plan.
5. Have a final meeting where the evaluators give the evaluatee the final version of the evaluation and obtain signatures. Submit that paperwork to the Office of Instruction. If the evaluatee wants to submit a rebuttal s/he can do so at that meeting, or can submit one to the Office of Instruction within a week.

2-9. Post-conferences

The contract language for regular evaluation and tenure review envisions post-conferences between the evaluatee and the evaluators. As with pre-conferences, post-conferences are best when they are on-campus group meetings with all evaluators and the evaluatee. There are, however, times when an individual evaluator will want to discuss something that was observed with the evaluatee prior to the development of the evaluators' consensus evaluation. Evaluators should feel free to have an individual post-observation conference with evaluatees.

As noted earlier, the evaluation process can produce anxiety. One of the most uncomfortable elements that many faculty members have experienced is the process of reading one's own evaluation document in front of the evaluators. Evaluatees can feel rushed, and may find themselves reacting based on the anxiety they feel.

To avoid this anxiety, evaluators may wish to provide a copy of the document to the evaluatee a day or two before the final conference. This will allow the evaluatee time to thoroughly read and reflect on the document, and can enhance the level of discussion at the final conference.

2-10. Disqualifying Team Members

Both regular evaluation and tenure review processes make allowances for the disqualification of evaluation team members. The process for the disqualification of team members in the regular evaluation process is in Article 9.B.2.1.2. The process for the disqualification of team members in the tenure review process is in Article 9.G.7.

Faculty members under evaluation who opt to disqualify an evaluator do not need to provide a rationale for their disqualification. There are many conceivable reasons why faculty might choose to disqualify an evaluator. Remaining evaluation team members should not infer any particular reason behind a disqualification.

2-11. Rebuttals

Both the regular evaluation and tenure review processes allow for evaluatees to file a rebuttal. Evaluatees intending to file a rebuttal indicate their intent to do so when they sign the evaluation form. While it is possible for the evaluatee to have a rebuttal handy at the time when signatures are obtained, it is much more common for the faculty member to indicate their intent to file a rebuttal within one week. Evaluatees filing a rebuttal should submit them directly to the Office of Instruction, Cloud 308.

When a rebuttal is filed, it is attached to the evaluation and both the evaluation and the rebuttal are sent to Human Resources for filing in the faculty member's employee file. The faculty member does not need to share the rebuttal with the evaluation committee. The evaluation committee does not have an opportunity to rebut the rebuttal.

Chapter 3. Specifics of Regular Evaluation

3-1. Overview of the Process

At the beginning of every semester, the Office of Instruction sends lists to department chairs so that they can confirm the faculty to be evaluated in the coming semester.

Once this list is returned, the Office of Instruction sends Choice of Evaluation forms to those faculty members who are being evaluated. This form is used to collect the faculty member's choice of evaluation type and other evaluation options. Department chairs are encouraged to remind those faculty members who are being evaluated, especially part-time faculty, that they should return this form in a timely manner.

By the third week of the semester, the Office of Instruction sends lists to department chairs that they use to indicate the composition of evaluation committees. In addition, department chairs are given forms to use to inform faculty of their evaluators so that any disqualifications can be made. Evaluatees choosing to disqualify an evaluator should inform the Dean of Instruction directly. Department chairs should take care *not* to inform potential evaluators until *after* the disqualification period has passed.

Once the membership of evaluation committees has been returned to the Office of Instruction, packets of evaluation forms and student surveys are sent to the evaluation committee chairs. Committees conduct pre-conferences, observations, student evaluations, and post-conferences, develop a consensus evaluation, and review this evaluation with the faculty being evaluated, using the calendar noted in section 2-2. The completed, signed consensus evaluation is submitted to the Office of Instruction by the end of the sixteenth week of the semester, which is about ten days before the beginning of the final exam period.

The entire evaluation process involves quite a bit of paperwork flowing back and forth between the Office of Instruction, department chairs, evaluation committees, and faculty under evaluation. It is imperative that deadlines for submission be met so that the process can go smoothly.

3-2. Choice of Evaluation Form

Early in the semester, faculty members being evaluated receive a Choice of Evaluation Form from the Office of Instruction. This form allows the evaluatee to select different options for the evaluation process, as noted in Articles 9.B.1.3 and 9.B.1.4.

Type of Evaluation – Peer, Peer-Management, or Self

Nearly all evaluations that are performed are <u>Peer Evaluations</u>, where the evaluation team is a group of fellow faculty members.

<u>Peer-Management Evaluation</u> is similar to Peer Evaluation, but in Peer-Management, the faculty member being evaluated is requesting that their department chair be on their evaluation committee.

In <u>Self Evaluation</u>, the faculty member being evaluated writes up his/her own assessment of performance. There is still a team of peer reviewers, who administer student evaluations (as appropriate) and review the self-assessment. Self evaluation is an option for full-time faculty once every six years, and for part-time faculty only after two satisfactory evaluations, and then once every 12 semesters.

Other Options

If the faculty member wishes to allow, *but not require*, that the department chair serve as an evaluator, they should *not* choose Peer-Management Evaluation. Rather, they should choose Peer Evaluation, and check the secondary box that allows the department chair to serve as a peer evaluator.

The Choice of Evaluation form allows faculty members to indicate their desire to have a member of the evaluation committee come from another department. Classroom faculty also have an opportunity to indicate which classes they would prefer to have student evaluations administered. As noted in Article 9.A.3, student evaluations need not be conducted in all classes, unless the evaluatee or evaluators request.

Finally, faculty members can opt to have evaluators view a videotape in lieu of an in-person observation. However, faculty members opting for videotape need to make the arrangements for videotaping themselves. Contact Broadcast Media Services at 239-3694.

3-3. Observations

Direct observation is the cornerstone of the peer and peer-management evaluation processes. As noted in section 2-4, evaluators are free to observe the entire range of activities in which the evaluatee is engaged. In particular, evaluators of classroom faculty are *not* constrained to observations of only the classes that the evaluatee identified for student evaluations on their Choice of Evaluation form.

Often, classroom faculty members teach more class sections than there are members of the evaluation committee. While it is conceivable that the members will conduct observations of each class section being taught, it is not necessary. Evaluators in this situation should endeavor to conduct observations so that they observe the range of courses being taught.

Evaluatees may request that evaluators repeat their observation. This request must be made within two working days after the initial observation. See Article 9.B.2.1.7 for details.

A second round of observations is *required* if the evaluators anticipate writing an unfavorable or unsatisfactory evaluation report. See Article 9.B.2.1.8 for details.

3-4. Self-Evaluation

Faculty members chosen to serve as peer reviewers for a faculty member who has selected self-evaluation often have questions about the scope of their responsibilities. While the burden of self-evaluation falls largely on the faculty member who is writing his/her self-evaluation document, the faculty members chosen as peer reviewers still have some responsibilities: the administration of student evaluations (as appropriate), and the review and approval of the self-evaluation document.

Peer reviewers of faculty who have chosen self-evaluation will be given copies of the student evaluations and should administer them by the end of week 10 of the semester. Once administered, the forms should be returned to the Office of Instruction for analysis.

Week 10 of the semester is also the deadline for the faculty member who has chosen self-evaluation to submit their self-evaluation document to the peer evaluators. Once submitted, peer reviewers should review the document to ensure it fully addresses the appropriate evaluation criteria, and that the results of any student evaluation support the conclusions drawn in the self-evaluation document.

Peer evaluators have several choices, as noted in Article 9.B.2.3 of the District/ AFT Collective Bargaining Agreement:

- They can determine that the self-evaluation is acceptable, notifying the faculty member and signing the self-evaluation document.
- They can determine that the self-evaluation could be acceptable pending some revision. They shall notify the faculty member and give them two weeks for revision. If, after the revision, the self-evaluation is deemed acceptable, the faculty member shall be notified and the peer evaluators will sign the document.
- They can determine that the self-evaluation is unacceptable, and recommend re-evaluation. They shall notify the faculty member of their decision and take all actions as noted in Article 9.B.2.3.5 of the District/AFT Collective Bargaining Agreement.

3-5. Implications of the Overall Evaluation Ratings

In Peer and Peer-Management evaluation, the evaluation committee must choose from one of three overall ratings. It is important to understand the implications of each of the three ratings.

- An overall rating of <u>Satisfactory</u> means that the evaluatee will be scheduled for another evaluation in three years.
- An overall rating of <u>Satisfactory but Needs Improvement</u> also means that the evaluatee will be scheduled for another evaluation in three years. However, the evaluation committee will need to create an improvement plan, with specific goals, suggested means of achieving those goals and timeliness for completion. Each semester following the evaluation the evaluatee will need to submit a report to the department chair (or designee) detailing their progress towards achieving the goals set forth in the improvement plan.
- An overall rating of <u>Unsatisfactory</u> also requires the creation of an improvement plan (just like Satisfactory but Needs Improvement). However, in choosing Unsatisfactory the evaluation committee is recommending follow-up evaluation. This follow-up evaluation is normally conducted in the following semester.

Please review section 2-8 for details and suggestions about improvement plans.

3-6. Evaluating Part-time Faculty

The evaluation process and criteria for part-time faculty mirrors that of full-time faculty. There are some differences, as noted in Article 9.E of the AFT Contract. Among the differences:

- Every part-time faculty member shall be evaluated within his or her first year of service. After the initial evaluation, part-time faculty should be evaluated once every six semesters.
- There are some evaluation criteria that apply to full-time faculty that do not apply to part-time faculty, as noted on the various evaluation forms.
- Evaluation committees are normally comprised of two peers, instead of three.
- As noted in section 3-4, self-evaluation is only available after two satisfactory peer or peer-management evaluations, and then is limited to once every 12 semesters.

3-7. Evaluating Department Chairs

All tenured faculty members are evaluated once every three years, including those faculty members serving as department chairs. Faculty members chosen to serve as committee members of a regular evaluation of their department chair often have questions about the scope of the evaluation process.

It is important to remember that there is a separate evaluation process outlined in the Department Chairperson Council contract that is used to evaluate the performance of faculty serving as department chairs. When department chairs are due for evaluation under the AFT Contract, they are to be evaluated for their performance *as faculty members in the department*. Nearly all department chairs have some of their load in a regular assignment in their department, whether it is teaching, counseling or a librarian assignment. It is important that the regular evaluation process include an assessment of their work in this assignment.

There is some room in the regular evaluation process for mention of a department chair's work as chair. Specifically, section A.2. of the evaluation document asks about the faculty member's professional contributions, asking about contributions to the department, service on special assignments, and bearing an appropriate share of faculty responsibilities.

3-8. Categorically-Funded Faculty and Long-Term Substitutes

Evaluation of categoricallyi funded faculty falls under Article 9.E of the AFT Contract. Evaluation of faculty employed as longi term substitutes falls under Article 9.E. Contact the Dean of Instruction for details.

3-9. Management-Initiated Evaluation

Article 9.D of the AFT Contract delineates the processes for managementi initiated evaluation. Contact the Dean of Instruction for details.

Chapter 4. Specifics of Tenure Review

4-1. Overview of the Process

The tenure review process is an extended, typically four-year, time of evaluations of new probationary (tenure-track) faculty. Tenure Review Committees make recommendations throughout the process about contract renewal of faculty under tenure review, and ultimately make a recommendation for or against the conferral of tenure. These recommendations are brought to the Board of Trustees, which makes the final decision.

4-2. Composition of the Committee

Tenure Review Committees are composed of tenured faculty, and are formed by the supervisor (i.e., department chair) in consultation with the chair of the hiring committee. Tenure Review Committees have 3-5 members total, including a committee chair, the supervisor, and 1-3 other committee members.

Departments that have eight or fewer tenured faculty may choose to form committees of as few as three faculty total, or may choose to act as a committee-of-the-whole, provided that there are at least three members on the committee. In addition, large departments that would otherwise not meet the threshold above but that have a large number of faculty members under tenure review or other workload issues may elect to have smaller Tenure Review Committees.

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

Supervisors should be familiar with the provisions of Article 9.D.3.2 when composing Tenure Review Committees. The Office of Instruction sends forms that supervisors use to indicate committee composition. Returning these forms in a timely manner is essential to the smooth start of the tenure review processes that semester.

4-3. Evaluation Components

Evaluation of faculty under tenure review is based on the following components, as articulated in Article 9.G.3.4:

- Teaching effectiveness or performance of duties, as noted via direct observations
- Tenure Portfolio
- Student Evaluations
- Professional Activities

4-4. Student Evaluations

Article 9.G.5 discusses student evaluations, noting that *all classes* of a tenurei track faculty member should be surveyed when possible, at least in the first three years of tenure review.

4-5. Tenure Portfolio

Exhibit G discusses the composition of the tenure portfolio, including components that are required and tips for portfolio construction. While all of this guidance is important, faculty under tenure review, their mentors, and Tenure Review Committees should particularly bear in mind the tip that quantity is not a substitute for quality. The tenure portfolio and its documentation of professional activities is an important component of the overall evaluation, providing the reader with a clear idea of the faculty member's professional development. A portfolio that is disorganized, unfocused, and/or so large as to dissuade thorough review does not serve the interests of the faculty member under tenure review or their committee.

While many faculty members who create online resources include references to those resources in their portfolio, it's best for portfolios to have a physical manifestation, and not be an entity that exists solely online.

4-6. Recommendation/Decision Process

Tenure Review Committees conduct formal evaluations in each of the four fall semesters of the tenure period, and make recommendations in three of those four semesters:

- First year (semester #1): recommendation for or against a one-year contract extension
- Second year (semester #3): recommendation for or against a two-year contract extension
- Third year (semester #5): no recommendation necessary (since the faculty member is in the middle of the two-year contract)
- Fourth year (semester #7): final recommendation for or against the conferral of tenure

Tenure Review Committees may elect to conduct evaluations in any of the spring semesters of the first three years of the tenure period. If they choose to conduct an evaluation in the spring semester of the first or second year, the recommendation they make is dependent on the recommendation that was made in the previous fall semester:

- If the fall semester recommendation was for a contract extension, the committee can only confirm this prior recommendation
- If the fall semester recommendation was against a contract extension, the committee can confirm this prior (negative) recommendation, or elect to reverse its prior recommendation and now recommend for a contract extension.

Article 9.G.6 spells out the recommendation/decision process in great detail, including thresholds that must be met when the committee is not unanimous in their recommendations.

4-7. Mentoring

In the first year of tenure review, new tenure-track faculty members are assigned a mentor by their department chair. Exhibit G has specific guidance and instructions about mentoring, including the following:

- Mentors are full-time, tenured faculty
- No faculty shall mentor more than one tenure-track faculty.
- New tenure-track faculty members who have been part-time for two years may elect to forgo having a mentor assigned. However, nearly all of new tenure-track faculty members who have this option choose to have a mentor.

As noted in Exhibit G, faculty cannot simultaneously serve as a mentor and on the Tenure Review Committee of a new tenure-track faculty member. It is important to the mentoring process that a new tenure-track faculty member be comfortable with their mentor. As such, members of the Tenure Review Committee should not discuss elements of the tenure process or the evaluations with the mentor directly, nor should the mentor discuss the new faculty member with the Tenure Review Committee. For example,

- At the end of the evaluation process in the fall semester, the Tenure Review Committee may have a list of suggested topics for the new faculty member to review with their mentor. Rather than conveying those recommendations to the mentor, they should be made to the faculty member, so that they can decide which items to bring to the mentor.
- A mentor preparing for the spring semester might be curious to see what was written in the fall semester evaluation. They should ask the new faculty member for a copy of the evaluation, and not the Tenure Review Committee directly, so that the new faculty member is in control of this information.

The Office of Instruction web site has a list of suggested discussion topics for mentors and new faculty members to discuss, from the very basics (e.g., where can I get lunch?) to the more complicated (e.g., how do I deal with plagiarism?). In addition to suggested topics, this document has links to online resources that can help answer questions.

4-8. Compensation and Orientation Requirements

Article 9.G.4 discusses compensation for Tenure Review Committee members (including department chairs), Tenure Review Committee chairpersons, and Mentors.

In order for Tenure Review Committee members and Mentors to receive compensation, they must have attended an orientation session within the last four years. Orientation sessions are put on by the Office of Instruction and occur throughout the beginning of the Fall semester. Information about orientation sessions is sent to new Tenure Review Committees. Contact the Dean of Instruction for details.

4-9. Changes to the Tenure Review Committee

Every year, there are some faculty members serving on Tenure Review Committees that either go on leave or retire. Article 9.D.3.2.4 discusses changes in the composition of the Tenure Review Committee, and states the following:

- If a Tenure Review Committee member takes leave for *one year or less*, the supervisor (i.e., department chair) assigns a replacement for the duration of the absence.
- If a Tenure Review Committee member takes leave for *more than one year*, retires, or resigns, the supervisor will assign a permanent replacement.
- If a new supervisor assumes authority, s/he takes the department chair spot on all Tenure Review Committees in the department.

4-10. Tenure-Track Faculty and Extended Leave

Occasionally, faculty members who are under tenure review have situations arise where they need to take extended leave. Illness and maternity leave are two common examples. Article 9.D.9 discusses the tenure service requirement, and establishes 75% less 10 days as the threshold for an academic year counting towards tenure review. For a typical 175-day academic calendar, this threshold translates into a maximum of 54 days off during the year.

Article 9.D.9 also provides circumstances under which a faculty member that has service below this threshold may still apply that year towards tenure review. Faculty under tenure review, Tenure Review Committees, and department chairs are strongly encouraged to discuss extended leaves with the Dean of Instruction. This is especially important if meeting the minimum service threshold is in question.

4-11. Early Tenure

Qualifying for Early Tenure

Faculty who are working in a tenure-track position may be eligible for consideration for early tenure if they meet one of three sets of criteria:

1. They were a senior, tenured, faculty member at another community college or other institution of higher learning.
2. They have reputational qualities in a discipline worthy of state/national/international recognition.
3. Prior to their tenure-track position they were a long-time part-time instructor, meeting the following criteria:
    - They have eight years of service at City College.
    - In the eight years prior to their tenure-track position they have averaged a 50% workload.
    - There is documented evidence of performance at an exceptional level, with an emphasis on their academic services.

- There is documented evidence of significant, high quality, sustained involvement in college service. This should include college-wide as well as departmental service.

Applying for Consideration for Early Tenure

A tenure-track faculty member who wishes to be considered for early tenure starts the process by completing Form 1 from Exhibit K ("Request for Early Tenure Review"). This form is submitted to the Tenure Review Committee by the end of the fourth week of the fall semester. The process normally starts in the first year of tenure review – see below for situations where the process could start in the second year.

The Tenure Review Committee weighs the faculty member's application and completes Form 2 from Exhibit K ("Early Tenure Review Request Application"). The committee sends both Forms 1 and 2 to the Dean of Instruction by the end of the sixteenth week of the fall semester.

If the Tenure Review Committee unanimously (or within one vote of being unanimous) agrees that the tenure-track faculty member is worthy of early tenure candidacy, they sign Form 3 from Exhibit K ("Recommendation for Early Tenure Review"). This form is also submitted to the Dean of Instruction by the end of the sixteenth week of the fall semester.

The Dean of Instruction reviews the applications with the Chancellor, who has the sole discretion on whether or not to advance tenure-track faculty to early tenure candidacy. If the Chancellor decides to go against a Tenure Review Committee's positive recommendation, he or she will meet with the committee first. The Chancellor will sign Form 4 from Exhibit K ("Approval of Early Tenure Review") for those faculty members advanced to early tenure candidacy, and inform the Tenure Review Committees by the end of the first week of the spring semester.

During this entire application process the Tenure Review Committee continues with their regular fall semester tenure review evaluation, and makes a recommendation about renewing the faculty member's contract.

Modified Recommendation/Decision Process

Once a faculty member has been advanced to early tenure candidacy, the Tenure Review Committee performs at least one more evaluation in the spring semester. This evaluation uses Form 5 from Exhibit K, a slightly modified version of the standard tenure review evaluation form. When this evaluation is complete the Tenure Review Committee has two options:

- They can recommend that early tenure be conferred effective the subsequent fall semester.
- They can recommend that the faculty member be re-assessed for early tenure in their third semester.

If the Tenure Review Committee decides to re-assess in the second year, they will perform an evaluation in the fall semester, again using Form 5 from Exhibit K. At the end of the fall semester they have the three options:

- They can recommend that early tenure be conferred effective the subsequent fall semester.

- They can recommend that the faculty member's contract be renewed for a period of two years, and that they be re-assessed for early tenure in fourth semester of tenure review.
- They can recommend against contract renewal.

If the Tenure Review Committee decides to evaluate in the fourth semester, they have three options for a recommendation:

- They can recommend that early tenure be conferred effective the subsequent fall semester.
- They can confirm their recommendation that the faculty member's contract be renewed (effectively putting the faculty member back into the standard four-year tenure process).
- They can confirm a prior recommendation against renewing the faculty member's contract.

First Year or Second Year?

Under most circumstances, faculty members who wish to be considered for early tenure should start the process in their first year of tenure review. There are two instances in which this process would start in the second year:

- Tenure-track faculty who were long-term substitutes for an entire year immediately prior to their tenure-track appointment start their tenure process as if they were in their second year.
- In some instances, faculty who failed to apply for consideration in their first year of tenure review have applied in their second year and been advanced to early tenure candidacy.

If either of these cases apply, then the Tenure Review Committee will evaluate the committee member the following spring, but does not have the opportunity to recommend re-assessing readiness for early tenure in the following year – they must decide to either recommend early tenure, or recommend that the standard tenure process be followed.