

# District Response – Article 9 – Evaluation

August 22, 2023

## 9.A.3. Student Evaluations

---

3. Student Surveys Evaluations – Student surveys evaluation shall be a part of every evaluation of every classroom instructor except as provided in 9.A.3.7 below. Not every class need needs to be surveyed, unless the evaluatee or the evaluators so request. Student surveys may also be conducted for non-classroom faculty Non-classroom faculty may also be so evaluated, provided that the members of the department determine that student evaluation is appropriate.
  - 3.1. Student surveys questionnaires shall be uniform, to the extent possible, for all classroom faculty.
  - 3.2. Student surveys shall generally be distributed to students through the College's Learning Management System. Departments may elect to use paper surveys for specific classes.
  - 3.23. The distribution and gathering of the student survey evaluation forms shall not be done by the evaluatee.
  - 3.34. Completed student surveys questionnaires and computer printed summaries shall be forwarded to the evaluators who shall prepare appropriate summaries of the results. The summaries shall become part of the evaluation report.
  - 3.45. Completed student surveys questionnaires may be viewed by the evaluatee only after the evaluatee's final grades have been turned in.
  - 3.56. Non-classroom disciplines/departments may develop student survey evaluation forms subject to approval by the Union and the District.
  - 3.7. Student surveys will not be required in certain noncredit ESL and noncredit DSPS courses, where the department determines that they are not appropriate. Where a department makes this determination, it should be consistent for all sections of the given course for the academic year.

## 9.A.4 Evaluation Calendar

---

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

At least a week before the first Flex Day of the Semester:

District provides department chairs with lists of faculty scheduled for evaluation

By End of Week 1:

Department chairs confirm with the Office of Instruction the names lists of faculty who are scheduled for evaluation

- By End of Week ~~12~~: 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 ~~23~~: Evaluatees indicate evaluation method and if an evaluator from outside the department is desired.
- By End of Week ~~45~~: Names of evaluators are sent to the evaluatee ~~and the names of evaluators not scheduled to do evaluations are sent to the appropriate administrator.~~ Faculty undergoing evaluation (other than tenure review evaluation) may make disqualifications within three working days of receipt of notification (see 9.B.2.1.2).
- By End of Week 6: Evaluators are notified.
- Weeks 6-10: Student ~~surveys evaluation are 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 ~~they are 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 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 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 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 evaluatee's immediate supervisor. (The immediate supervisor is usually the department chairperson, but in cases where there is no department chairperson the immediate supervisor may be the lowest-level director, manager, or supervising dean responsible.) the Dean responsible for faculty evaluation. If the immediate supervisor is on the committee, the supervising dean shall serve in this role. In their attempt to reach consensus, the evaluators may, if time allows, conduct a second classroom or work site visitation observation(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 observation~~, 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 visit observation~~ 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 observation~~(s), the evaluatee shall have the option of having the evaluators repeat the classroom or work site ~~visitation observation~~(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 observation~~(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 observation~~ is not necessary. If, as a result of the second ~~visitation observation~~(s), the evaluation cannot be completed within the Evaluation Calendar, Section 9.A.4, above, such time limits shall be waived.

2.1.9. ~~The evaluators, as a whole committee, shall also conduct a post-evaluation conference with the evaluatee if they conclude that the final overall rating is unsatisfactory or satisfactory but needs improvement.~~

2.1.910 The evaluatee, upon receiving the evaluation report form, shall sign or initial the report indicating ~~he/she has they have~~ received it. If the evaluatee refuses to sign the report, the chairperson of the evaluation committee shall so indicate and sign ~~his/her their~~ own name.

### **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 shall so inform the evaluatee at a final evaluation conference. -consult with the evaluatee to determine whether a follow up Peer Evaluation is appropriate.~~

~~The team may then 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 surveys~~ (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 ~~they have 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. The self-evaluation, supporting documents, and reports of the evaluating committee shall be ~~sent to the Office of Instruction and~~ retained in the employee's Personnel File in the manner that all evaluations are kept.

## **9.D. Faculty Undergoing Management-Initiated Evaluation**

---

1.3 If the appropriate Vice-Chancellor determines an evaluation is to occur, ~~he/she they~~ shall inform the faculty member including a succinct statement of the areas of concern.

## **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, and supervising dean, develop an improvement plan with specific goals, suggested means of achieving those goals and timelines for completion. 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.2.1.5. If the faculty member fails to submit a report in accordance with 9.F.2.1.1, the Department Chairperson may, after conferring with the faculty member, write a letter to be included in the personnel file documenting the failure to submit a report. The faculty member may rebut the letter but may not appeal placement of the letter in ~~his/her~~ their file. Failure to submit a report shall be reported to the appropriate Vice Chancellor/Associate Vice Chancellor so that a determination may be made if follow-up evaluation in accordance with 9.D.2 is warranted. The Dean shall receive a copy of the foregoing documentation.

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. If a faculty member under tenure review is the department chairperson, a department chairperson from a related department shall fill the department chairperson role, 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.

2.2.4. If a new supervisor assumes authority, they he/she shall take the supervisor's position on all Tenure Review Committees. Whenever a member of the Tenure Review Committee resigns, or retires, or takes a leave of absence of more than one year, the supervisor will appoint a replacement according to the original appointment procedures. Whenever a member of the Tenure Review Committee takes a leave for one year or less, the



supervisor will appoint a replacement for the duration of the leave according to the original appointment procedures.

### **9.G.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.

3.3.3. Subject to the provisions of Section 9.G.3.3.1 (above), the committee member may make a second visitation at his/her their discretion. For each committee member visitations should be limited to twice a semester.

3.3.4. Each time a committee member makes a visitation, he/she they must complete the Peer-Management Evaluation Form for Contract Employees Under Tenure Review as a working document Exhibit J. These working documents shall be retained by the Committee chair until such time as the employee acquires tenure, at which time they shall be destroyed. The documents shall be made available to the Board of Trustees under conditions described in Section 9.G.6.10, below, and to the employee and all relevant parties under conditions described in Article 22.F.6.2.

3.4.4. The evaluatee shall have the opportunity to see and comment upon his/her their evaluation.

3.4.4.1. The evaluatee, upon receiving the evaluation report form, shall sign or initial the report indicating he/she has they have received it. If the evaluatee refuses to sign the report, the chairperson of the evaluation committee shall so indicate and sign his/her their own name.

### **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~~ **their** 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.

### **9.G.7. Due Process and Tenure Review Grievances**

---

9.G.7.3.1. The immediate supervisor will appoint a new Tenure Review Committee, including ~~himself/herself~~ **themselves** and the chair of the previous committee. Other members would be new. Ethnic and gender **identity** non-uniformity would be maintained. The new Committee would have five members in all cases. The new Committee will elect its chair from among the faculty members on the Committee. The chair may or may not be the chair of the previous Committee. If tenure review has been done by a committee-of-the-whole, the new members of the Committee will be chosen from the related disciplines as described in Section 9.G.2.2.1.

9.G.7.3.1.2. The employee will be invited to recast ~~his/her~~ **their** Tenure Portfolio. The Committee will review all of the documents from the old Committee. If the employee is currently employed by the District, the Committee for reconsideration will carry out a one-semester evaluation including a complete visitation and student evaluation process. Compensation shall be in accordance with Section 9.G.4.

### **9.G.9. Tenure Service Requirement**

---

9.G.9.2.2. The District determines that the faculty member has demonstrated sufficient progress in ~~his/her~~ **their** ability to perform the assigned duties and professional responsibilities of a tenured, full-time faculty member despite ~~his/her~~ **their** absence from work.

## Exhibits D, G, H, K

The parties acknowledge that Title 5 Section 53602 requires that “The evaluation of district employees must include consideration of an employee's demonstrated, or progress toward, proficiency in diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility DEIA-related competencies that enable work with diverse communities”. The parties agree to meet promptly following ratification of this agreement and AFT’s consultation with the Academic Senate, as required by Ed Code sections 87663 and 87610.1, to consider updates to the evaluation processes forms in Exhibits D, G, H, and K as needed to implement this Title 5 regulation.

## Exhibit D – Student Evaluations Surveys

### 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?~~
4. Does the instructor respect your efforts and opinions as an individual?
5. Does the instructor try to interest you in the subject and encourage you to learn more about it?
6. Were your responsibilities in the course (exams, term papers, attendance regulations, etc.) clearly stated and explained?
7. Is the grading system fair?
8. Does the instructor follow his/her their stated grading system?
9. Are the methods of testing (examinations, papers, etc.) a valid evaluation of the knowledge and or skills you have gained from this course?
- ~~10. Is the instructor sufficiently available to you during regularly scheduled office hours or by appointment? Does the instructor respond to student inquiries in a timely manner?~~
10. Are assignments relevant and helpful in understanding the subject area?
11. Is the instructor receptive to questions from students either during or outside class?
12. Is the instructor enthusiastic about teaching this course?
13. Does the instructor meet and dismiss scheduled class sessions on time at the scheduled time?
14. Does the instructor return assignments and exams and homework promptly with meaningful feedback?
- ~~15. Does the instructor speak clearly and understandably?~~
15. Does the instructor show respect for all racial, sexual, religious, and political groups seem to be free of racial, sexual, religious, and political prejudices?
16. What is your overall evaluation of this instructor?
17. If you wish to add any comments concerning your instructor, please write them below.

Questions 1-15 are on a “Always-Sometimes-Never” 5-point scale, with an “I don’t know” option. Question 16 is on an “Excellent-Unsatisfactory” 5-point scale. Question 17 is for open comments.

## Credit Online Classes

### Noncredit Classes

1. The instructor explains the goals of the course.
2. The instructor prepares for class.
3. The instructor knows ~~his/her~~ their 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.~~
12. The instructor starts and ends the class on time.
13. The instructor respects your individual efforts and opinions.
14. The instructor answers your questions and those of other students in the class.
15. The instructor ~~shows respect for all racial, sexual, religious, and political groups seems to be free of racial, sexual, religious, and political prejudices.~~
- ~~16. Would you recommend this instructor to other students?~~
16. What is your overall evaluation of this instructor?
17. If you wish to add any comments about your instructor, please write them below.

Questions 1-15 are on a “Always-Sometimes-Never” 5-point scale, with an “I don’t know” option. Question 16 is on an “Excellent-Unsatisfactory” 5-point scale. Question 17 is for open comments.

## Lower-Level Credit ESL Classes

1. The teacher explains English well.
2. The teacher respects the students.
3. The lessons ~~are is~~ organized.
4. The ~~books and instructional~~ 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. The teacher gives clear instructions.~~
9. The teacher returns my work quickly.
10. The grading system is clear and understandable.
11. The teacher starts and ends the class on time.
12. ~~The teacher ends the class on time.~~
13. ~~The teacher uses class time well.~~
12. The teacher likes to teach.
13. ~~The teacher speaks clearly.~~
13. The teacher is available and helpful in office hours or at other times.
14. What else would you like to say about the teacher? Please write your comments below.

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.

This survey is intended to be used for lower-level credit ESL classes. Higher level credit ESL classes use the Credit survey. The ESL department shall make the determination of the applicability of this survey. Use of the survey should be consistent for all sections of the applicable courses for the academic year.

## Noncredit ESL Classes

1. The teacher explains English well.
2. The teacher respects the students.
3. The lessons ~~are is~~ organized.
4. The ~~books and teaching~~ 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 ~~and ends~~ the class on time.
- ~~10. The teacher ends the class on time.~~
- ~~11. The teacher uses class time well.~~
10. The teacher likes to teach.
11. The teacher helps me learn English.
12. ~~If you want, please~~ You can write more about your teacher here.

Questions 1-11 are on a “Always-Sometimes-Never” 5-point scale, with an “I don’t know” option.  
Question 12 is for open comments.

## Noncredit DSPS Classes

1. The teacher explains the purpose of the class well.
2. The teacher respects the students.
3. The lessons ~~are 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 ~~and ends~~ the class on time.
- ~~10. The teacher ends the class on time.~~
- ~~11. The teacher uses class time well.~~
10. The teacher likes to teach.
11. You can write more about your teacher here.

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

## 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?~~
- ~~4. Is the instructor receptive to questions from students? Did the library instructor try to answer questions from students during or after the workshop?~~
5. Did the library instructor show interest and enthusiasm in teaching the class?
- ~~6. Did the library instructor show respect for all racial, sexual, religious, and political groups seems to be free of racial, sexual, religious, and political prejudices?~~
- ~~7. Was this workshop useful and relevant to your academic needs?~~
7. Do you now feel more confident about using the library resources taught in this class?
8. What is your overall evaluation of this library instructor?
9. If you wish to add any comments about your instructor, please write them below.

Questions 1-7 are on a “Always-Sometimes-Never” 5-point scale, with an “I don’t know” option. Question 8 is on an “Excellent-Unsatisfactory” 5-point scale. Question 9 is for open comments.