A. INTRODUCTION & PHILOSOPHY

The purpose of the faculty evaluation process is to maintain and improve the quality of instruction, counseling and other educational services offered by the District through periodic evaluation of faculty members (CBA, 4.1: Purpose).

Better teaching/counseling/student services /counseling/student service is something to which every faculty member can aspire. We believe that all faculty can benefit from thoughtful attention to their profession, and deserve help with such efforts. Furthermore, we believe that faculty, as much as possible, should be active participants in the assessment and improvement of their own profession.

The charge of the Academic Senate conforms to Education Code 87633 which mandates the involvement of the Academic Senate in the development of peer review processes. The charge of the Faculty Association conforms to its legal purview to include the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

B. DEVELOPMENT HISTORY

Initial processes for required peer review and self-evaluation were drafted by a joint taskforce of the Academic Senate, the Faculty Association and Administration in Fall 2015. Recommendations amended and approved by the Academic Senate and forwarded to the Faculty Association in March 2016. Peer Review pilot finalized in Negotiations in May 2016. Survey of pilot participants conducted by the Academic Senate to inform suggestions for revision for improvement in February 2017. Taskforce to develop Peer Review Handbook assigned by the Academic Senate in May 2017. Peer Review Handbook developed by the Academic Senate taskforce in cooperation with the Faculty Association and negotiations teams in Fall 2017. Presented to the Academic Senate and Academic Affairs for information and input on December 4, 2017 and approved by the Academic Senate on December 11, 2017.

An itemized timeline can be referenced in the appendices of this document.

C. TIMELINE

This timeline may be adjusted by mutual consent with written confirmation by all parties. Except where otherwise specified, week numbers correspond to the semester in which the faculty member is to be evaluated.

In addition to the following steps, review teams should be committed to on-going, proactive, and informal advisement to occur over the course of the whole peer review process, , including on-going support for tenure-track faculty. During the course of the identified semester, reviewers should be available to assist the reviewee during the course of the process. This assistance may include, but is not limited to, answering questions, making

suggestions, and sharing appropriate resources. Classroom management tips are helpful, as are on- and off-campus resources available to the person whose work is being evaluated.

STEP ONE: Team Selection; Start of the Academic Year

At the beginning of, or previous to, the fall term of any academic year, School deans are to work with Human Resources to identify those faculty scheduled for evaluation, including whether faculty will be reviewed in the fall or spring terms.

1. School deans work with faculty to be reviewed to identify review team membership. In summary, team members are selected according to the following designations:
   a. For contract faculty, reviewers are selected from the interview committee at the time of hire for the entire tenure process;
   b. For tenured faculty, reviewers are selected by the faculty member.
   c. For adjunct faculty, team reviewers are selected from a list of available reviewers.
   d. The selection process is outlined in more detail in Section E of this document.
2. Deans confirm with faculty reviewers that they are available and willing to serve.
3. As soon as possible, deans send a list of team members to the Academic Senate for approval. To be placed on the agenda for the academic senate, requests must be made no later than the morning of the nearest workday which falls 72 hours prior to the senate meeting.

STEP TWO: Pre-Review Conference; Weeks 1-6

1. The dean, faculty reviewers and the reviewee meet to discuss the peer review process, including individual roles, timelines and commitments, as well as to schedule all future meetings, including the days and times for worksite observations.
2. This meeting may be a group meeting or a series of meetings to accommodate multiple schedules. All participants should bring a schedule.

STEP THREE: Self-evaluation; Weeks 4-17

1. Mandatory self-evaluation occurs in years two, three and four of the tenure-track process and during the periodic review of tenured faculty.
2. Self-evaluation is optional, at the reviewee's discretion, for year one tenure-track and adjunct faculty.
3. Faculty should use the most current self-evaluation form.

STEP FOUR: Worksite Observations; Weeks 6-15

1. Worksite observations include classroom visits (face-to-face and online or other approved methods of instruction), counseling sessions, and reference desk sessions.
2. At least one site visit must be completed *before* the mid-semester review.
3. Each member of the team will attend one worksite observation for at least 45 minutes.
4. Observations of counseling appointments require the approval of the student.

STEP FIVE: Student Evaluations; Weeks 6-15

1. *Student Evaluations are to be provided to faculty and distributed to students in collaboration with faculty for course and date selection(s) per the CBA.*
2. Use the forms in the current collective bargaining agreement.
3. At least one classroom student review must be completed prior to the mid-semester meeting.

STEP SIX: Mid-semester Meeting; Weeks 8-10

The purpose of this meeting is for the peer review team to check in with the reviewee to share any initial observations and/or recommendations, as well as to answer questions of the reviewee. This feedback provides an opportunity for the person reviewed to incorporate recommended teaching strategies, classroom management techniques, and other recommendations prior to additional worksite visits.

STEP SEVEN: Review Team Conference, Weeks 13-17

1. The team of reviewers meet to discuss observations, commendations and recommendations.
2. Specific examples should be provided, and recommendations should include suggestions for how the recommended improvement may be achieved, e.g., observe other instructors' classes, review sample syllabi, review course outlines, work with a faculty mentor, work with DSPS on teaching strategies that address specific learning styles, specific professional development activities/strategies, or other recommendations appropriate to the teaching of the faculty's discipline and student success.
3. The faculty evaluation form is completed.

STEP EIGHT: Performance Review Conference, Weeks 15-17

1. The team meets with the person under evaluation.
2. The faculty evaluation form is shared and its contents discussed.

D. FUNCTION OF PERFORMANCE REVIEW:

1. Fundamental to the faculty performance review process are the perspectives of management, students and peers, as each constituency is uniquely positioned to provide quality feedback to the teaching professional.
2. To accomplish the above items, the following items are the goals for faculty performance reviews:
   a. To encourage professional growth (including mastery of discipline and craft of teaching/counseling/student services /counseling/student services);
   b. To establish strong collegial ties across disciplines and the College;
   c. To improve student success;
   d. To provide a meaningful review for the benefit of faculty and students.
3. To better teaching/counseling/student services and learning, any criteria for a performance evaluation must be:
   a. Objective;
   b. Fair;
   c. Standardized while being appropriate for the discipline;
   d. Uniform.

E. COMPOSITION OF PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

Performance Reviews are informed by Peer Review, Student Evaluations, Administrative Review, and a Self-Evaluation. Article 4 of the CBA should be reviewed in full, in addition to the following items.

1. Function of Peer Review
   a. To create opportunities for critique to improve teaching/counseling/student services /counseling/student services and learning;
   b. To identify and share best practices for teaching/counseling/student services /counseling/student services and learning;
   c. To identify suggestions and/or opportunities for professional development.
   d. ADD: best practices for how to conduct a strong peer review.
2. Function of Student Evaluations
   a. The purpose of student evaluations is to provide a snapshot of the student experience in a class. Education Code § 87663 (g) indicates that student evaluations should be considered "to the extent practicable."
   b. While student evaluations play a role in informing the overall performance review, student evaluations should not be the sole determiner, or even the most influential. Instead, student evaluations are additional insights into the classroom experience and are to be viewed as corroborative.
   c. Student evaluations are conducted as negotiated in Article 4.4. of the CBA. Note:
      1) 4.401 of the CBA indicates that, when evaluating faculty members who teach more than one class, the faculty member shall be entitled to select one class for student evaluation and the immediate supervisor(s) shall select one class. A counselor will be

     evaluated by a random number of students who have been counseled by the faculty member.

   2) 4.403 of the CBA indicates that student evaluations shall not become the sole basis for any administrative decision to evaluate, terminate, deny tenure, discipline or transfer a faculty member.

  d. ADD: best practices for how to read student evaluations.

3. Function of Self-Evaluation

  a. For tenure-track faculty, mandatory self-evaluation occurs in years two, three and four of the tenure-track process.

  b. For tenured faculty (as of Spring 2019), mandatory self-evaluation occurs the periodic performance review.

  c. For adjunct faculty, and year-one tenure track faculty, self-evaluation is optional, at the reviewee's discretion. The faculty at his/her option may complete a self-evaluation and submit it to the supervisor in conjunction with the preparation of the evaluation by supervisor as delineated in Instructional and/or Non-Instructional Evaluation areas. The faculty member shall notify the supervisor, in writing, of intent to do a self-evaluation during the first four weeks of the evaluation semester.

  d. Faculty should use the most current self-evaluation form.

  e. To compose a strong self-evaluation, faculty may choose to reference the following list of best practices:

   1. Using the self-evaluation to set goals for the academic year. These goals might also inform who sits as peer evaluators as well as professional development ideas. For example, if I am teaching a course for the first time, my self-evaluation might include a reflection on my own weaknesses in this area, as well as a professional development plan; too, my peer review team might consist of a colleague who has a lot of experience in that course.

   2. Using the self-evaluation as critical exploration: here, I might reconsider the lens through which I view my teaching. I might explore biases inadvertently encased in my teaching, such as equity, or I might invite new factors into my teaching, such as composition serving the needs of CTE faculty.

   3. Using the self-evaluation tool to take steps into new areas of professional interest, such as new committee work, or a research project.

4. Function of Dean's Review

  a. Direct contact between newly hired faculty and academic deans through independent observation and consultation is strongly encouraged.

  b. The roles of administration (e.g. deans) in the observation process should be informed by concerns appropriate to management and should therefore be distinct from the role(s) of faculty peer reviewers.

  c. Examples of management concerns include:

1) Student Learning Outcome Assessments;
2) Professional Obligations;
3) Follow-up on any concerns identified through peer review and/or student evaluations.
   d. ADD: best practices for the review of faculty by an administrator.

F. PEER REVIEW TEAM COMPOSITION, SELECTION and PROCESS
Peer Review Committees should be composed of full-time, tenured faculty within the discipline where possible. If not possible (e.g. due to the size of the department), full-time, tenured faculty in a related discipline are recommended.

1. Tenure-Track Faculty
   a. Peer Review Committees for tenure-track faculty should be determined by the hiring committee prior to hiring:
      1. Two full-time tenured faculty (or tenure-track should tenured faculty not be eligible) should be selected to serve as reviewers;
      2. Reviewers should have served on the hiring committee, whenever possible and should be identified during the hiring process prior to the second interview process.
   b. Peer Review Committees should remain intact for the full four years of the tenure process.
      1. Where a reviewer is no longer able to perform her/his duties, it is the responsibility of the hiring committee to determine a replacement, in consultation with the appropriate academic dean.
      2. After the first two years, the tenure-track faculty member may petition the replacement of one of the reviewers providing the faculty member can demonstrate just cause for the change.
      3. Add: definition and examples of just cause and corresponding process.
   c. For the tenure-review process, assessments of the candidate for tenure advancement by the peer review committee for tenure should:
      1. be an influential consideration in the decision to renew contract and/or to recommend tenure;
      2. be completed by the end of fall terms to precede March 15th;
      3. include narrative;
      4. include a classroom observation process;
      5. include active mentoring and participation on the part of the reviewers;
      6. include professional development in the form of a professional development plan developed in consultation with the reviewee to reflect department goals/priorities;
      7. include committee and/or College-wide service as part of a plan for progressive responsibilities.

2. Tenured Faculty

a. Unlike tenure review, it is not the intent of the tenured peer review process to inform evaluations of the reviewee.

b. However, at their own discretion, tenured faculty may request aspects of this review process to be included in her/his employment files.

c. Tenured faculty members may identify two faculty members to serve as reviewers, with consideration of the following allowances:

1. Where possible, at least one faculty member from the same discipline, or a closely related discipline if not possible;

2. Where possible, faculty members who teach in multiple disciplines will have reviewers from the separate disciplines which correspond to the faculty member's assignment;

3. While it is preferable to select full-time tenured faculty members, adjunct faculty members may be selected based on:

   a. the size of the department;

   b. an insufficient number of full-time faculty in that department;

   c. expertise in a particular field of study;

   d. request by the reviewee.

4. Small departments may develop a mechanism for petitioning to invite faculty from other institutions;

5. Instructors teaching/counseling/student services online should request a member of the DE Committee or other successful online instructor as one peer reviewer.

6. Faculty may prefer off-site experts (e.g. for CTE faculty, an industry expert); approval would be at the discretion of the academic senate.

7. Any reviewer should not also be in her/his evaluation cycle.

3. Adjunct Faculty:

a. The process for selecting peer reviewers for adjunct faculty will reflect the College's recognition of the professionalism/expertise of adjunct faculty, including that adjunct faculty are experts within their fields, and, in some cases, the only experts employed by the College.

b. Peer reviewer selection:

1. Adjunct faculty will be assigned a tenured faculty member or otherwise qualified expert, as her/his peer evaluator;

2. The assigned faculty member shall be from the same discipline, where possible, or, if not, a related discipline;

3. Adjunct faculty may review a list of available reviewers, and, although not guaranteed, every effort will be made to adhere to the request of the reviewee requests.

4. in absence of any eligible faculty, the Division Coordinator or other designee shall be considered;

5. This process will be in consultation with the dean and School coordinator.

6. Faculty may prefer off-site experts (e.g. for CTE faculty, an industry expert); approval would be at the discretion of the academic senate.
7. Whenever possible, the same peer reviewer should participate in the first two evaluations of a newly-hired adjunct instructor (to occur within the first two semesters of employment, per Article 4.)

c. Peer review will be connected to an active mentor role with the goal of more fully connecting our part-time colleagues to their departments and the College.

d. For the adjunct peer-review process, assessments of adjunct faculty should:
   1) be an influential consideration in the decision to renew contract;
   2) include narrative;
   3) include a classroom/session observation process;
   4) include active mentoring and participation on the part of the reviewers;
   5) include the consideration of (but not obligate) professional development, including priority for faculty development funds;
   6) include the consideration of (but not obligate) committee and/or College-wide service.

G. Qualities of a Strong Performance Review

If a faculty evaluation process is to be effective, then faculty must see the process as meaningful and useful rather than as an obligation or a threat:

1. The process must be perceived as honest and fair;
2. To the greatest degree possible, all input and discussion involved with the evaluation should be presented in a positive manner;
3. Suggestions for improvement should not be perceived as insults or attacks, but rather should be included and welcomed in all evaluations;
   a. Even the best faculty member can continue to learn and grow;
   b. A process that allows faculty to feel validated and appreciated might be perceived as more positive and thus may promote more enthusiastic and involved participation;
4. No matter how positively and productively a faculty evaluation process is constructed,
   a. Evaluators will sometimes have the duty of reviewing unacceptably weak or substandard performance;
   b. Faculty evaluators must not shy away from their responsibilities to acknowledge significant problems if such problems exist and to recommend serious corrective actions when necessary;
5. Only if all participants fulfill their roles conscientiously and honestly will the faculty and the institution be able to see the process as meaningful.

H. Professional Development

1. Professional development for peer evaluators should be provided on a regular basis by the College.
2. Professional Development should be a priority of the peer review process and could inform peer review goals at the onset of the process or could be mutually identified by the reviewer(s) and reviewee as part of the observation process.
3. Faculty in peer review shall have priority for Professional Development funds.

Appendices

Appendix A: Article 4 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (to include)

Appendix B: Timeline

- 5.5.2014: SCC Academic Senate and Office of the Superintendent-President define the taskforce but work is delayed due to negotiations impasse.
- 10.6.2014: SCC Academic Senate and SCC Faculty Association discuss peer review in an open meeting of the SCC Academic Senate.
- 10.15.2015: SCC Academic Senate, Faculty Association, Academic Affairs and Human Resources agree to reconstitute the 5.5.2014 taskforce with the following charge: to develop and vet proposed language for peer review as a recommendation to the senate and negotiations teams.
- 10.30.2015, 11.6.2015, 11.20.2015, 12.4.2015: Series of working meetings wherein taskforce members reviewed state-wide best practices and solicited campus-wide input to develop recommendations to present during Spring 2016 flex.
- 1.11.2016: Recommendations shared at Spring 2016 flex. Faculty input identified two primary areas of concern:
  - **The evaluation process**, including the proper training of evaluators, the amount of input evaluated faculty have in the process, the role of the Dean, the distinction between procedures for adjunct vs. full-time faculty, and the procedure for evaluation for faculty that teach distance education and online classes;
  - **The impact of peer review**, including tenure, the environment/climate of peer evaluation, and any potential aftermath of peer evaluation, ranging from "next step" concerns to permanent records and access to personal information.
- 1.22.2016: Final meeting of the taskforce to plan for the completion of formal recommendations to present to the SCC Academic Senate.
- 3.21.2016: Recommendations presented to the SCC Academic Senate.
- 4.18.2016: Recommendations with edits approved by the SCC Academic Senate and forwarded to the Faculty Association and Bargaining Teams.
- Spring 2016: Peer Review Pilot implemented as part of negotiations, to include beginning peer review process for tenure-track and adjunct faculty in AY 2016-2017.
- AY 2016-2017 and 2017-2018: Pilot initiated only for tenure-track faculty (not adjunct).
- 2.24.2017: Survey of participants administered by the Academic Senate to inform revision process.

- Fall 2017: Peer Review Handbook drafted to capture current procedures in a single document, including recommended revisions.
- Fall 2017: Peer Review handbook vetted and refined in negotiations.
- 12.4.2017: Peer Review Handbook presented to the Senate, Faculty Association and Academic Affairs for information and input.
- 12.11.2017: Peer Review Handbook approved by the Academic Senate.