



## Academic Senate Business Meeting Minutes

April 10, 2012

12:30-1:20 pm, Room 860

---

Members Present: Dave Angelovich, Amanda Badgett, Glen Bell, Andrea Bewick, Maria del Rosario Biddenback, Stephanie Burns, Shawna Bynum, Dianna Chiabotti, Dan Clemens, Michael Conroy, Emily Cosby, Aaron DiFranco, David Ellingson, Catherine Gillis, Roberto Gonzalez, Ann Gross, Julie Hall, Fain Hancock, Jennifer King, Christy Kling, Barbara Kraig, Karen Larsen, Sherry Lohse, Tia Madison, Kelly McCann, Rob Millay, Rob Miller, Lynda Monger, Bonnie Moore, Christine Palella, Scott Rose, Denise Roselli, Marci Sanchez, Debbie Saunders, Mary Shea, Erik Shearer, Eileene Tejada, Diane Van Deusen, Randy Villa, Jeff Wachsmuth, Nadine Wade-Gravett, Eve-Anne Wilkes, Lisa Yanover, Cliff Zyskowski.

- 1.0 Welcome
- 2.0 Adoption of Agenda
  - Agenda amended: added 6.5 and 7.3 (see below) and times adjusted
  - msp (S. Burns)
- 3.0 Approval of Minutes
  - Minutes not approved. Need to be revised to reflect comments presented at meeting.
  -
- 4.0 General Announcements
  - If you would like to present on Fall Flex Day please contact Cliff.
  - Human Resource committee trainings should be added to Fall Flex Day.
  - Sweeny Todd live theatre starting Friday, 4/13.
  - Thursday is the Faculty Association meeting; Friday – Fair Share Workshop.
- 5.0 Public Comment - none.
- 6.0 Action Items
  - 6.1 Revision to Contract Faculty Evaluation process
    - msp (G. Bell)
  - 6.2 Changes to Faculty Coach Committee
    - msp (D. Clemens)
  - 6.3 Committee Re-assignment
    - 6.3.1 Brian Avila, from Budget Committee to Planning Committee
      - msp (R. Gonzalez)
  - 6.4 Changes to Emeritus application form
    - msp ()
  - 6.5 Approval of Emeritus application for Rick Donohoe
    - msp (B. Moore)



## 7.0 Discussion Items

### 7.1 ASCCC resolutions

- sent preliminary resolutions.
- complete list sent by email last night.
- Need feedback by April 19<sup>th</sup>
- If Early Childhood reforms go through students will not be able to get childcare during school hours. Also, income limits will be further reduced.

### 7.2 LOAC to review the ILO process

- Working with Planning Com. To decide who will review ILOs.

### 7.3 Follow-up to special BOT meeting

- No announcements were made.
- Emergency meeting of AS elected officers was held. Drafting response to clarify misinformation in earlier emails that went to Board members.
- the decline of AS leadership to adequately solicit wide input from the AS faculty membership and provide timely feedback for responses prior to BOT meetings
- the single minded focus by the AS leadership on the performance of the college President to the neglect of other pressing issues which include accreditation efforts

## 8.0 Information Items

### 8.1 Standing Committee Chair Reports

#### 8.1.1 Academic Standards & Practices (submitted in writing)

- Met and discussed the progress made on the drafting of the Course Repetition Policy and regulations as well as the Probation Dismissal regulations.
- Committee was given background information about the Curriculum Committee's vote to change the Pre-requisite, Co-requisite, and Advisory Policy. We will be examining model policies and working on drafting a policy.

#### 8.1.2 Basic Skills Initiative

- none.

#### 8.1.3 Curriculum

- Meeting Friday 4/13
- discussing repeatability policy – changes will impact activity courses.
- Ongoing – catalogue edits.

#### 8.1.4 Faculty Standards & Practices

- Working on draft of hiring policy for part time faculty.

#### 8.1.5 Learning Outcomes Assessment

- Looking at how to assess the assessment process and ILOs.
- Preliminary data: 100% courses have SLOs. 51% of courses have been assessed. 100% of programs have SLOs and 19% of programs have



been assessed. 17% of ILSOs have been assessed. This is fall data only, the spring data will be published in the fall.

8.1.6 Professional Development Committee

-Thank you to those who took survey.

-Spring Flex day will include less administrative presentations and more workshops. Fall Flex day will stay as is.

8.1.7 Student Standards & Practices

-None.

8.2 Shared Governance Reports

8.2.1 Budget Committee

-2012-13 budget cuts potential \$1.9 MM. Planned for \$500,000 cuts, mostly those already published in summer school.

-Tentative budget forum May 17<sup>th</sup> – joint Planning and Budget committees meeting.

8.2.2 Planning Committee

-LOAC brought ILOs to planning.

-Need a timeline to look at reviewing ILOs.

-Joint meeting with Budget committee.

-Formal meeting with Board.

8.3 Officer Reports

8.3.1 President

-As part of increased communication efforts April faculty hour will be an Academic Senate meeting. This meeting will address workload issues and looking at the structure of the Distance Education committee.

-Make sure you have sent your committee requests to Seri.

8.3.2 Vice President - none

8.3.3 2nd Vice President, FCC - none

8.3.4 Secretary - none

8.3.5 Treasurer (submitted in writing) – current balance is \$1,042.50.

9.0 Next Meeting Items

Next meeting will be held on Thursday, April 26, 2012.

9.1 Future Agenda Items

Please email them to Ann or Seri.

10.0 Adjourned 12:20 pm

# **NAPA VALLEY COLLEGE**

## **Contract (Tenure-track) Faculty Evaluation Process**

# **DRAFT**

**Last revised: March 8, 2012**

**Original: January 24, 2006**

<b>PART I - PHILOSOPHY.....</b>	<b>4</b>
NAPA VALLEY COLLEGE PHILOSOPHY - WHAT WE BELIEVE.....	4
PHILOSOPHY OF CONTRACT FACULTY EVALUATION .....	4
<b>PART II – ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PARTICIPANTS.....</b>	<b>5</b>
A.    CONTRACT FACULTY REVIEW TEAM (RT) .....	5
1. <i>Membership</i> .....	5
a.    Makeup of Contract Faculty Review Team .....	5
b.    Appointments to Contract Faculty Review Team.....	5
c.    Changes in Contract Faculty Review Team .....	5
2. <i>Responsibilities of the RT</i> .....	5
a.    RT Chair .....	6
b.    RT Members.....	6
B.    EVALUATEE .....	6
1. <i>Rights</i> .....	6
a.    Information .....	6
b.    Representation .....	7
c.    Appeal.....	7
2. <i>Responsibilities</i> .....	7
C.    ACADEMIC SENATE, SECOND VICE PRESIDENT.....	8
1. <i>Responsibilities</i> .....	8
D.    DISTRICT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES .....	8
1. <i>Responsibilities of Appropriate Vice President (Instruction or Student Services)</i> .....	8
2. <i>District Rights</i> .....	9
<b>PART III – PROCESS.....</b>	<b>10</b>
A.    OVERVIEW - TENURE REVIEW PROCESS .....	10
B.    EVALUATION PROCESS.....	11
1. <i>Contract I</i> .....	11
a.    Definition .....	11
b.    Contract I Process and Components .....	11
i.    Flex Day – Fall.....	11
ii.   Professional Development .....	12
iii.  Peer Observations/Evaluations .....	12
iv.   Student Evaluations .....	14
v.    Self Evaluation.....	14
vi.   Special Circumstances for Alternative Bases of Evaluation .....	15
vii.  Information Originating Outside of Regular Evaluation .....	15
viii.  Administrative Evaluation .....	16

ix.	Final Semester Meeting .....	16
x.	Spring Semester Contract I.....	18
2.	<i>Contract II and Year 1, Contract III</i> .....	18
a.	Definition .....	18
b.	Contract II Process and Components.....	19
i.	Flex Day – Fall.....	19
ii.	Professional Development .....	20
iii.	Peer Observations/Evaluations .....	20
iv.	Student Evaluations .....	22
v.	Self Evaluation.....	22
vi.	Special Circumstances for Alternative Bases of Evaluation.....	23
vii.	Information Originating Outside of Regular Evaluation .....	23
viii.	Administrative Evaluation .....	24
ix.	Final Semester Meeting .....	24
x.	Spring Semester .....	26
2.	<i>Year 2 of Contract III</i> .....	26
a.	Definition .....	26
b.	Contract III Process and Components .....	27
i.	Fall Process and Reports .....	27
ii.	Tenure recommendation Process .....	27

**PART IV – TIMELINES ..... 28**

A.	OVERVIEW .....	28
B.	SCHEDULE OF DUE DATES .....	29
1.	<i>Contract I – Evaluatee and RT</i> .....	29
2.	<i>Contract II and III – Evaluatee and RT</i> .....	30
3.	<i>Academic Senate Office and Officers</i> .....	31
C.	CHANGES TO TIMELINES .....	31
D.	TIMELINE EXTENSIONS.....	31

- APPENDIX A – CRITERIA AND INTERPRETIVE STATEMENTS FOR INSTRUCTORS
- APPENDIX B – CRITERIA AND INTERPRETIVE STATEMENTS FOR LIBRARIANS
- APPENDIX C – CRITERIA AND INTERPRETIVE STATEMENTS FOR COUNSELORS
- APPENDIX D – ADMINISTRATIVE PERFORMANCE REVIEW FOR CONTRACT INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY
- APPENDIX E - SES
- APPENDIX F - LIST OF FORMS

# **PART I - PHILOSOPHY**

## **Napa Valley College Philosophy - What We Believe**

Education at Napa Valley College is based upon our belief in people-in their worth as individuals and in their capacity to develop to their fullest potential. We believe that people have the ability to direct their own destinies and to participate in directing the affairs of society. We believe in creating an educational environment which supports the learning process, where curiosity, ethical behavior, openness, trust, helpfulness, respect, cooperation and understanding flourish. We believe in cooperation between the college and community. We believe in flexible and innovative approaches to learning that stimulate the aspirations of students, staff and community.

## **Philosophy of Contract Faculty Evaluation**

The purposes of the process are to clarify the performance standards that contract faculty members are responsible for meeting, to provide support for contract faculty members in meeting those standards, and to ensure that the tenure review process is fair and consistent.

For tenure-track positions, the four-year period during which faculty members are reviewed for tenure is best understood as a continuation of the hiring process. We expect that faculty will continue to develop the ability to teach or counsel effectively and to fulfill their professional responsibilities. The Academic Senate makes recommendations on tenure. Contract renewals and, ultimately, the granting of tenure are responsibilities of the Superintendent, President and Board of Trustees. The Academic Senate recommendations are based on the faculty member's demonstrated ability to attain and maintain the standards set forth in this document.

At Napa Valley College, the tenure review period is designed to facilitate formation of a partnership of faculty, colleagues, students, and administration in which the perceptions of each inform the others. Given this partnership, peer professional judgment is paramount, and faculty recommendations will have significant weight when considered by the Vice President of the appropriate area, the Superintendent/President and the Board of Trustees.

## **PART II – ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PARTICIPANTS**

### **A. Contract Faculty Review Team (RT)**

#### **1. Membership**

##### **a. Makeup of Contract Faculty Review Team**

Each nontenured faculty member is evaluated by an Academic Senate RT consisting of the Division Chair of the evaluatee's division, a tenured faculty member from within the division, and one tenured faculty member from outside the division, who is the RT chair. The Academic Senate, Second Vice President oversees the tenure review process.

In cases in which the direct supervisor of a faculty member is an administrator, the administrator and an additional faculty member shall be RT members.

##### **b. Appointments to Contract Faculty Review Team**

The Academic Senate, Second Vice President recommends membership of Contract Faculty Review Teams to the Academic Senate for confirmation.

##### **c. Changes in Contract Faculty Review Team**

If a RT member wishes to be removed from the RT or if an evaluatee requests a change in membership, the person who requests the RT membership change submits that request with rationale to the Academic Senate, Second Vice President, who then decides whether or not to recommend the change to the Academic Senate. All other changes in RT membership would be made for unusual and extreme circumstances only.

#### **2. Responsibilities of the RT**

Napa Valley College's implementation of AB1725 and Title 5, which mandate peer evaluation, allow the Academic Senate, Second Vice President and the Academic Senate President access to information regarding an individual faculty member's evaluation. That fact notwithstanding, the Senate, Second Vice President, Academic Senate President and all evaluation RT members must maintain the confidentiality of the evaluation process and the information obtained during the process.



**a. RT Chair**

- Serve on Faculty Coach Committee (FCC) during all contract years
- Attend RT training on Flex days
- Schedule regular meetings throughout the year with RT and evaluatee
- Schedule peer evaluations
- Gather and keep all evaluation materials
- At the end of each semester, forward all required documents to the Academic Senate, Second Vice President, including any and all Peer Evaluations, Self Evaluation, Student Evaluations, and Current Professional Development Plans
- Lead all RT meetings
- Take minutes
- Oversee the Professional Development Plan

**b. RT Members**

- Attend RT Flex Day trainings
- Attend scheduled meetings throughout the process
- Complete peer evaluations
- Conduct student evaluations
- Assist with Professional Development Plan to include the four areas of Professional Responsibility:
  - Teaches effectively
  - Works responsibly within the program, college, and community
  - Develops professionally
  - Supports students
- Determine an evaluation rating at the end of the fall Semester of each contract year

**B. Evaluatee**

**1. Rights**

**a. Information**

The evaluatee shall be informed of the degree to which he/she is meeting NVC's standards of performance through attending RT meetings, peer evaluations, student evaluations, self evaluation, retention data, Professional Development Plan, and any other evaluation feedback by the RT or Administration.

## **b. Representation**

The evaluatee may contact the Faculty Association President to request that a Faculty Association representative monitor the process. The Association representative may attend RT meetings as an observer.

## **c. Appeal**

If an individual involved in the Contract Faculty Evaluation process believes that the process outlined in these Guidelines has not been followed properly, s/he may appeal within ten (10) instructional days of the alleged impropriety to the Contract Faculty Review Team Chair. If the issue is not resolved adequately, s/he may appeal for resolution to the Academic Senate,, Second Vice President, who meets with the RT and the evaluatee to resolve the issue. The evaluatee may appeal additionally to the Academic Senate Executive Committee. However, *only the process of tenure review is appealable*. The evaluation findings of the RT may not be appealed.

## **2. Responsibilities**

The evaluatee is expected to work collegially with the RT in the collection and review of evaluation materials. At a minimum, the evaluatee must participate in the following activities:

- Attend Flex Day trainings
- Complete Self Evaluation Survey (and Teaching Goals Inventory for Contract II and III)
- Attend all RT meetings
- Schedule peer and student evaluations with team members
- Attend VP OI New Faculty Learning Community meetings
- Participate in Professional Development Plan
- Participate in professional development training including attending meetings, making observations, and other activities as determined by Professional Development Plan.
- Actively participate in Administrative Evaluation process
- Complete Spring Semester Observations (except for Contract III, year 2)

## **C. Academic Senate, Second Vice President**

### **1. Responsibilities**

- Verify accuracy of list of Contract faculty to be evaluated.
- Prepare annual calendar of activities and due dates for RT.
- Work with Academic Senate President, to assign RT members as necessary.
- Monitor progress of all RT's.
- Meet with RT's and evaluatee, as needed.
- Submit timely reports and materials to the Vice President of Instruction.
- Consult with the President of the Academic Senate and the Academic Senate Executive Committee as necessary.
- Review peer and student evaluations, self evaluation, Professional Development Plan, and success & retention data. Verify that the guidelines have been followed and so state in the report to the appropriate Vice President.
- Forward original final evaluation reports indicating the rating received, the summary of raw data, peer observation reports, summary of student comments and self-evaluation, to the Vice President, Instruction or Student Services for forwarding to the Office of Human Resources and for inclusion in the faculty member's personnel file.
- Forward original Student Evaluations to the Office of Human Resources and for inclusion in the faculty member's personnel file.
- Chair the Faculty Coach Committee.
- Work with Professional Development Committee, Staff Development Committee and LLRC Dean on professional development activities.

## **D. District Rights and Responsibilities**

### **1. Responsibilities of Appropriate Vice President (Instruction or Student Services)**

The VP receives summary of raw data, all typed student comments, peer observation reports, self-evaluation and the Final Evaluation Report from the Academic Senate, Second Vice President.

The VP forwards the Final Evaluation Report and other evaluation materials specified above to the Office of Human Resources for inclusion in the evaluatee's personnel file.

As needed, the VP may request in writing copies of raw data and other materials contained in the RT's evaluation file from the Academic Senate, Second Vice President.

The VP may make copies of any and all materials received for submission to the President/Superintendent, Board of Trustees and/or legal counsel.

The VPI conducts a simultaneous Administrative Evaluation during fall semester of Contract Year I and Contract Year II, as needed. Nothing precludes the VPI from subsequent Administrative Evaluations in cases in which the evaluatee is believed not to be fulfilling his/her professional responsibilities.

The VPI develops and coordinates the New Faculty Learning Community.

## **2. District Rights**

Nothing in this article shall be construed to limit in any way the district's right to investigate allegations against unit members when authorized or required by law or to initiate discipline procedures as authorized by applicable provisions of Education Code.

## **PART III – PROCESS**

### **A. Overview - Tenure Review Process**

Tenure review is a four-year process that follows a coaching model of collegial peer support, in which the faculty members are expected to work together to promote the contract faculty member's professional development as a member of the college community. Additionally, the RT has the responsibility of assessing the degree to which the contract faculty member is meeting the professional expectations put forth by the college. Thus, by December 1 of each year, the RT must determine whether the instructor's performance:

Meets or Exceeds the Evaluation Performance Standards, OR

Needs Improvement to Address Specific Areas, OR

Does Not Meet the Performance Standards for NVC

The evaluation must clearly reference the expected duties as specified in the position announcement as well as in the performance criteria referenced in the Appendices to this document.

At the conclusion of the Contract III, year two evaluation, the RT makes a final recommendation to grant or deny tenure which is approved by the Academic Senate prior to being forwarded to the Vice President of Instruction and the Superintendent/President. The final decision regarding tenure is made by the Board of Trustees at their February meeting,

The tenure review process is confidential and must be treated as such by all persons involved. Additionally, while the timelines are important to the overall process, they are not intended to hinder evaluatees or RT members, nor to be technicalities by which the entire process can be invalidated. Non-prejudicial procedural errors shall not serve to invalidate the recommendation of the RT.

Tenure is not granted in less than four years. However, upon receipt of a "Does not meet NVC standards" evaluation by the RT, the District may decide not to renew the contract of the non-tenured instructor. This process also does not preclude the District from pursuing disciplinary action, independent of this Tenure Review process, which may result in non-renewal of contract or to not re-elect the contract of a Contract Year I faculty member. In these circumstances the tenure review process would be concluded in fewer than four years.

## **B. Evaluation Process**

### **1. Contract I**

#### **a. Definition**

A faculty member enters the process with Contract I status. If the instructor completes at least 75 percent of a full-year assignment during her/his first year of employment and the District renews the instructor's contract, the instructor advances to Contract II status. In the event that the Contract I instructor completes less than 75 percent of a full-year and his/her contract is renewed, the instructor must continue at Contract I status for an additional year during which at least 75 percent of a full-year assignment is completed (Ed Code 87605).

#### **b. Contract I Process and Components**

##### **i. Flex Day – Fall**

The evaluatee participates in an overview of the Contract I process during the two fall Flex Days. During the first fall Flex day, the evaluatee is given a complete overview of the process including expectations, responsibilities, mandatory professional development trainings, specific timelines and the Self-Evaluation Survey (SES) and/or other measures as identified. The evaluatee is expected to complete the SES by the second Flex day.

The evaluatee's RT attends a separate training on the first day of fall Flex day. Curriculum for the training includes an overview of the process, along with roles, responsibilities and evaluation standards and procedures.

The evaluatee and the RT attend a workshop on the second day of Flex day together. During this workshop, the evaluatee will:

- (a) Distribute his/her course syllabi to all members of the RT
- (b) Review SES with the RT
- (c) Work with the RT to develop a schedule of activities for the year (using information from the course syllabi and the SES)

The schedule of activities outlines the activities in which the evaluatee must participate for each semester. The schedule of activities includes:

- Dates times for subsequent RT meetings
- Dates and times for RT peer observations/evaluations
- Dates and times for New Faculty Learning Community meetings
- As needed, goals and objectives for non-teaching responsibilities
- Dates and times that student evaluations will be collected
- Profession development activities reflecting the needs of the evaluatee after review of the SES
- Dates and times of the Academic Senate Business meetings
- Dates and times of assigned committee meetings, as available
- (d) Complete first meeting form
- (e) Review Administrative Evaluation process

**ii. Professional Development**

**(1) Self Evaluation Survey**

The evaluatee completes a Self-Evaluation Survey (SES), and/or other measures as identified, each fall semester. The SES is a tool to assist the evaluatee to analyze his/her performance and to identify strengths and development needs. The information from the SES is utilized to determine specific professional development opportunities that meet the needs of evaluatee and the institution.

**(2) New Faculty Learning Community**

The evaluatee also becomes a member of the New Faculty Learning Community (NFLC) directed by the Vice President of Instruction. The NFLC meets throughout the first year.

**(3) Mandatory trainings in TLC**

**(4) Other activities as identified by evaluatee or RT**

**iii. Peer Observations/Evaluations**

Peer evaluations follow a coaching model designed to promote performance goals in a collegial and supportive manner. Peer evaluations are based on the responsibilities identified in the position announcement and the performance standards in the four areas of professional responsibility (teaches effectively, works responsibly within the program, college and community, develops professionally and supports students) appended to this document.

Each RT member conducts one peer observation. These observations will be completed by week 5 in the fall semester to permit any recommendations for improvement to be implemented. The RT may require additional observations as needed.

For teaching faculty, RT members also evaluate course syllabi, samples of assessments, assignments and other materials that are pertinent to the evaluation.

In the case of counselors, peer evaluations are based on counseling session observations and must adhere to student confidentiality guidelines. In that case, each RT member evaluates a different counseling session, which may be taped with prior permission of the RT and students. Counselors who have an additional teaching assignment as part of their regular teaching load also have their teaching responsibilities evaluated.

In the case of librarians, peer evaluations are based on workstation observations and library orientation sessions. The remarks of the peer evaluators are not limited to classroom observations and may include other observations relevant to the performance of the evaluatee's professional duties.

In the case of non-teaching responsibilities such as coordinator or articulation work, the evaluatee submits goals and objectives to the RT for review by week 5 of the semester. The RT uses the goals and objectives to clarify additional appropriate evaluations and professional development needs. Proposed alternative basis of evaluation will be forwarded to the Academic Senate, Second Vice President for approval prior to collecting alternative evaluations.

In the case of classroom observation, the Observation Form for Academic Personnel or other rubric reflecting criteria of the evaluation process may be used to guide the observation. When observation reports are made of non-classroom assignments such as librarian, counselor or coordinator assignments, the evaluator submits a narrative on the Observation Form for Non-Teaching.

The results of the observations are shared with the evaluatee and other RT committee members. A meeting will be held to discuss the Peer Evaluations and the extent to which the evaluatee is meeting the requirements and/or goals of the position no later than week 7 of the fall semester.



**iv. Student Evaluations**

Members of the RT administer and collect written, anonymous evaluations of evaluatee performance by current students. For teaching faculty, student evaluations are to be collected from over half of the sections taught. For Counselors and Librarians, 60 student evaluations will be collected. Student evaluations are collected by the ninth week of the fall semester.

The evaluatee may not remain in the classroom while the student evaluations are completed and collected. Student responses are collected on Student Evaluation Forms. Written comments are collected on a separate form, and are typed before being shared with the evaluatee to protect student anonymity.

Student evaluations also are required for non-teaching faculty. In the case of counselors, the Division Chair collects student evaluations and forwards them to the RT. Every effort should be made to collect at least sixty (60) student evaluations for full-time counseling faculty using the Student Evaluation Form (Counselor). In cases where an adequate number of student evaluations cannot be collected, as in the case of counseling faculty whose assigned responsibilities result in decreased student contact, additional peer evaluations are collected as judged reasonable by the RT. Student evaluations also are collected for librarians. Every effort should be made to collect a minimum of sixty (60) student evaluations using the Student Evaluation Form (Librarian).

By week 12 of the semester the RT meets with the evaluatee to discuss the results of the student evaluations using computer-summarized results and typed comments to protect student anonymity. If necessary, the schedule of activities is adjusted to support the evaluatee in making improvements as needed.

Evaluatees are not permitted access to actual student evaluation forms. The Human Resources Department keeps the original student evaluations until the Tenure Review Process has been completed and there is a decision to grant or deny tenure.

**v. Self Evaluation**

The evaluatee completes a self evaluation by the end of the thirteenth week of each fall semester, addressing the ways that s/he has incorporated, learned, or identified areas for growth based on the performance criteria attached. The self-evaluation should

acknowledge peer and student feedback as well as addressing the four areas of professional responsibility (see Appendices).

**vi. Special Circumstances for Alternative Bases of Evaluation**

For contract faculty with significant job duties falling outside the traditional teaching/counseling/librarian areas, the RT may determine alternatives to peer or student evaluation formats, following the best source principle of collecting information from those in the best position to assess the faculty member's performance. Proposed alternative basis of evaluation will be forwarded to the Academic Senate, Second Vice President for approval prior to collecting alternative evaluations.

**vii. Information Originating Outside of Regular Evaluation**

Student complaints are addressed through the Student Complaints and Grievances policy. Should the complaint not be resolved at the lowest level (i.e., by the contract faculty member), and should the division chair or other direct supervisor determine that the complaint was merited, the division chair or supervisor notifies the RT in writing of the complaint and the outcome. The RT includes this information in making their final performance rating for the evaluation period in which the complaint was made, (or for the following fall evaluation if the information was generated outside the fall evaluation period).

Negative information, concerns or complaints from all other sources, including administration, can be forwarded to the RT. All information, concerns, or complaints reported must include the names of the complainant and/or the person submitting the information to the RT and specific details about the issue. The RT reviews the information and researches the validity of the complaint. The RT documents the research and determines whether the information, complaint or concern is substantiated or not substantiated. Substantiated issues are included in the evaluation summary and/or work plan. If the RT determines that the issue is not within their purview, then the RT forwards the issue to the Vice President of Instruction for further assessment and/or Administrative Review.

When a Contract faculty member has been disciplined by the District and the disciplinary action is final, the RT receives a copy of the disciplinary action. The RT may consider any disciplinary action in their final evaluation.

**viii. Administrative Evaluation**

An administrative evaluation is conducted simultaneously with the RT evaluation during the fall semester. The administrative process includes evaluation of contractual obligations. The contractual components are reviewed with the evaluatee during the fall Flex day training. An administrator will meet individually with the evaluatee to discuss the results of the fall semester administrative evaluation. If evaluatee does not receive a Meets or Exceeds the Evaluation Performance Standards, then an additional administrative evaluation will be conducted in the spring semester. The administrator may meet with the evaluatee to discuss the results of the subsequent administrative evaluation. The results of each administrative evaluation will be shared with the RT.

**ix. Final Semester Meeting**

By the 14th week the RT will meet with the evaluatee to discuss the evaluatee's self evaluation, his/her professional development activities and what s/he has learned/incorporated or identified as areas for growth.

The RT considers all methods of evaluation (peer observations/evaluations, student evaluations, administrative evaluation, self evaluation, professional development progress (as well as information originating outside the standard evaluation process) in making its determination as to whether the evaluatee's performance:

Meets or Exceeds the Evaluation Performance Standards, OR

Needs Improvement to Address Specific Areas, OR

Does Not Meet the Performance Standards for NVC

**(1) Definitions and General Standards of Evaluation Reports**

**Meets or exceeds the Evaluation Performance Standards** denotes that overall the evaluatee has met or exceeded the performance standards appended to this document. The RT may note some areas for continued improvement and still choose this rating as long as the evaluatee's pattern of performance is satisfactory in the four areas of professional responsibility and in reference to the position announcement, and there are no areas of significant concern.

**Needs Improvement** designates that the evaluatee has not met the performance standards outlined in one or more of the criteria appended to this document and/or

in regard to the position announcement. This rating either denotes a pattern of performance that does not adequately meet NVC performance standards or is assigned when some area(s) shows significant weakness. In this case, the RT works with the evaluatee to develop a work plan for implementation the following semester that directly addresses the areas of concern (see section iii, Work Plans, below).

**Does Not Meet NVC Standards** denotes that the evaluatee has significantly failed to meet the performance standards outlined in one or more of the criteria appended to this document or the position announcement and/or has not made satisfactory progress in the areas outlined in the work plan.

## **(2) Work Plans**

In the event that the evaluatee receives a “Needs Improvement” final evaluation rating, the RT works with the evaluatee before the end of that fall semester to develop and implement a work plan to address the areas of concern. The work plan identifies specific improvements needed and includes a timeline for implementing changes and assessing improvement over the following semester. The RT works with the evaluatee and the Teaching and Learning Center to locate relevant professional development resources. A copy of the work plan is forwarded to the Academic Senate, Second Vice President by the end of the fall semester in which the “Needs Improvement” rating was given.

The evaluatee is expected to work cooperatively with the RT and meet all deadlines in addressing the issues listed in the work plan over the following spring semester. The outcomes of the work plan are included as part of the following fall semester evaluation materials.

## **(3) Decision-Making Process**

Optimally, all decisions of the RT are reached by consensus. However, if consensus is not possible then the Academic Senate, Second VP may be consulted for input. The Academic Senate, Second VP may bring the issue to the FCC for additional consideration. At that point, if necessary, decisions are made by majority vote of the RT members. The evaluatee is not a voting member of the committee.

The RT completes the Evaluation Review Form and submits it (along with the workplan if applicable) to the Academic Senate, Second Vice President by December 1.

**x. Spring Semester Contract I**

During the Spring semester, the evaluatee observes at least three other faculty or staff members in the performance of their duties (e.g., teaching, counseling) in order to gain additional exposure to a range of techniques and styles and to develop networks within the college. The evaluatee consults RT members in selecting whom to observe, and the final choice must be approved by the RT. The evaluatee keeps a record of each observation, including the date, person being observed and any noted insights or outcomes, for discussion with the RT at the first team meeting of the following fall evaluation period. The evaluatee retains a list of observations until the tenure review process has been completed.

The evaluatee continues to attend professional development activities established in the schedule of activities.

If the evaluatee received a work plan during the fall semester, s/he addresses the area identified in the plan, and documents his/her progress.

**2. Contract II and Year 1, Contract III**

**a. Definition**

If a faculty member completes at least 75 percent of a full-year assignment during her/his first year of employment and the District renews the instructor's contract, the instructor advances to Contract II status. If a faculty member completes at least 75 percent of a full-year assignment during her/his second year of employment and the District renews the instructor's contract, the instructor advances to Contract III status. (Ed Code 87605)

Faculty in non-tenure track, grant funded positions will be evaluated during each subsequent year of employment according to the guidelines of the Contract II process. It should be noted, however, that if a non-tenure track contract instructor is subsequently hired for a tenure-track position, only the Contract I evaluation will be included in the tenure review process. In that case, the faculty member begins the tenure-review process as a Contract II faculty member.

## **b. Contract II Process and Components**

### **i. Flex Day – Fall**

The evaluatee participates in an overview of the Contract II process during the two fall Flex Days. During the first fall Flex day, the evaluatee is given a complete overview of the process including expectations, responsibilities, mandatory professional development trainings, specific timelines and the Self-Evaluation Survey (SES) and the Teaching Goals Inventory (TGI) and/or other measures as identified. The evaluatee is instructed to complete the SES and the TGI by the second Flex day.

The evaluatee's RT attends a separate training on the first day of fall Flex day. Curriculum for the training includes an overview of the process, along with roles, responsibilities and evaluation standards and procedures.

The evaluatee and the RT attend a workshop on the second day of Flex day together. During this workshop, the evaluatee will:

- (a) Share what s/he gained from his/her spring faculty/staff observations
- (b) Distribute his/her course syllabi to all members of the RT
- (c) Review SES and the TGI with the RT
- (d) Work with the RT to develop a schedule of activities for the semester (using information from the course syllabi, the SES and the TGI).

The schedule of activities outlines the activities in which the evaluatee must participate for each semester. The schedule of activities includes:

- Dates times for subsequent RT meetings
- Dates and times for RT peer observations/evaluations (although additional observations may be unannounced for evaluatees who received a "Needs Improvement" final evaluation in the previous year)
- As needed, goals and objectives for non-teaching responsibilities
- Dates and times that student evaluations will be collected
- Profession development activities reflecting the needs of the evaluatee after review of the SES and TGI
- Dates and times of the Academic Senate Business meetings

- Dates and times of assigned committee meetings, as available

(e) Complete first meeting form

(f) Review Administrative Evaluation process (Contract II only)

## **ii. Professional Development**

### **(1) Self Evaluation Survey and TGI**

The evaluatee completes a Self-Evaluation Survey (SES), and a Teaching Goals Inventory (TGI) and/or other measures as identified, each fall semester. The SES is a tool to assist the evaluatee to analyze his/her performance and to identify strengths and development needs. The information from the SES is utilized to determine specific professional development opportunities that meet the needs of evaluatee and the institution.

The Teaching Goals Inventory (TGI) is a self assessment tool to assist with identifying and measuring instructional goals. It assists faculty with, 1) identifying what they want students to learn in individual classes, 2) identifying Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATS) to measure their teaching and learning goals and outcomes, and 3) adjusting teaching techniques to assure student learning.

### **(2) New Faculty Learning Community**

The evaluatee also becomes a member of the New Faculty Learning Community (NFLC) directed by the Vice President of Instruction. The NFLC meets throughout the first year.

### **(3) Mandatory trainings in TLC**

### **(4) Other activities as identified by evaluatee or RT**

## **iii. Peer Observations/Evaluations**

Peer evaluations continue to follow a coaching model designed to promote performance goals in a collegial and supportive manner. Peer evaluations are based on the responsibilities identified in the position announcement and the performance standards in the four areas of professional responsibility (teaches effectively, works responsibly within the program, college and community, develops professionally and supports students) appended to this document.

Each RT member conducts one peer observation. These observations will be completed by week 5 in the fall semester to permit any recommendations for improvement to be implemented. The RT may require additional observations as needed.

For teaching faculty, RT members also evaluate course syllabi, samples of assessments, assignments and other materials that are pertinent to the evaluation.

In the case of counselors, peer evaluations are based on counseling session observations and must adhere to student confidentiality guidelines. In that case, each RT member evaluates a different counseling session, which may be taped with prior permission of the RT and students. Counselors who have an additional teaching assignment as part of their regular teaching load also have their teaching responsibilities evaluated.

In the case of librarians, peer evaluations are based on workstation observations and library orientation sessions. The remarks of the peer evaluators are not limited to classroom observations and may include other observations relevant to the performance of the evaluatee's professional duties.

In the case of non-teaching responsibilities such as coordinator or articulation work, the evaluatee submits goals and objectives to the RT for review by week 5 of the semester. The RT uses the goals and objectives to clarify additional appropriate evaluations and professional development needs. Proposed alternative basis of evaluation will be forwarded to the Academic Senate, Second Vice President for approval prior to collecting alternative evaluations.

In the case of classroom observation, the Observation Form for Academic Personnel or other rubric reflecting criteria of the evaluation process may be used to guide the observation. When observation reports are made of non-classroom assignments such as librarian, counselor or coordinator assignments, the evaluator submits a narrative on the Observation Form for Non-Teaching.

The results of the observations are shared with the evaluatee and other RT committee members. A meeting will be held to discuss the Peer Evaluations and the extent to which the evaluatee is meeting the requirements and/or goals of the position no later than week 7 of the fall semester.



#### **iv. Student Evaluations**

Members of the RT administer and collect written, anonymous evaluations of evaluatee performance by current students. For teaching faculty, student evaluations are to be collected from over half of the sections taught. For Counselors and Librarians, 60 student evaluations will be collected. Student evaluations are collected by the ninth week of the fall semester.

The evaluatee may not remain in the classroom while the student evaluations are completed and collected. Student responses are collected on the Student Evaluation Forms. Written comments are collected on a separate form, and are typed before being shared with the evaluatee to protect student anonymity.

Student evaluations also are required for non-teaching faculty. In the case of counselors, the Division Chair collects student evaluations and forwards them to the RT. Every effort should be made to collect at least sixty (60) student evaluations for full-time counseling faculty using the Student Evaluation Form (Counselor). In cases where an adequate number of student evaluations cannot be collected, as in the case of counseling faculty whose assigned responsibilities result in decreased student contact, additional peer evaluations are collected as judged reasonable by the RT. Student evaluations also are collected for librarians. Every effort should be made to collect a minimum of sixty (60) student evaluations using Student Evaluation Form (Librarian).

By week 12 of the semester the RT meets with the evaluatee to discuss the results of the student evaluations using computer-summarized results and typed comments to protect student anonymity. If necessary, the schedule of activities is adjusted to support the evaluatee in making improvements as needed.

Evaluatees are not permitted access to actual student evaluation forms. The RT Chair keeps the original student evaluations until the Tenure Review Process has been completed and there is a decision to grant or deny tenure.

#### **v. Self Evaluation**

The evaluatee completes a self-evaluation by the end of the thirteenth week of each fall semester, addressing the ways that s/he has incorporated, learned, or identified areas for growth based on the performance criteria attached. The self-evaluation

should acknowledge peer and student feedback as well as addressing the four areas of professional responsibility (see Appendices).

**vi. Special Circumstances for Alternative Bases of Evaluation**

For contract faculty with significant job duties falling outside the traditional teaching/counseling/librarian areas, the RT may determine alternatives to peer or student evaluation formats, following the best source principle of collecting information from those in the best position to assess the faculty member's performance. Proposed alternative basis of evaluation will be forwarded to the Academic Senate, Second Vice President for approval prior to collecting alternative evaluations.

**vii. Information Originating Outside of Regular Evaluation**

When any member of the college community receives material of potentially substantive impact from any individual regarding a contract faculty member, s/he must follow the standard campus complaint policy. Student complaints are addressed through the Student Complaints and Grievances policy. Should the complaint not be resolved at the lowest level (i.e., by the contract faculty member), and should the division chair or other direct supervisor determine that the complaint was merited, the division chair or supervisor notifies the RT in writing of the complaint and the outcome. The RT includes this information in making their final performance rating for the evaluation period in which the complaint was made, (or for the following fall evaluation if the information was generated outside the fall evaluation period).

Negative information, concerns or complaints from all other sources, including administration, can be forwarded to the RT. All information, concerns, or complaints reported must include the names of the complainant and/or the person submitting the information to the RT and specific details about the issue. The RT reviews the information and researches the validity of the complaint. The RT documents the research and determines whether the information, complaint or concern is substantiated or not substantiated. Substantiated issues are included in the evaluation summary and/or work plan. If the RT determines that the issue is not within their purview, then the RT forwards the issue to the Vice President of Instruction for further assessment and/or Administrative Review.

When a Contract faculty member has been disciplined by the District and the disciplinary action is final, the RT receives a copy of the disciplinary action. The RT may consider any disciplinary action in their final evaluation.

**viii. Administrative Evaluation**

An administrative evaluation is conducted simultaneously with the RT evaluation during the fall semester of Contract year II. There is no administrative evaluation in subsequent years unless the previous administrative evaluation has determined that the evaluatee does not Meet or Exceed the Evaluation Performance Standards. The administrative process includes evaluation of contractual obligations. The contractual components are reviewed with the evaluatee during the fall Flex day training. An administrator may meet individually with the evaluatee to discuss the results of the fall semester administrative evaluation. If evaluatee does not receive a Meet or Exceed the Evaluation Performance Standards, then an additional administrative evaluation will be conducted in the spring semester. The administrator may meet with the evaluatee to discuss the results of the administrative evaluation. The results of each administrative evaluation will be shared with the RT.

**ix. Final Semester Meeting**

By the 14th week the RT will meet with the evaluatee to discuss the evaluatee's self evaluation, his/her professional development activities and what s/he has learned/incorporated or identified as areas for growth.

The RT considers all methods of evaluation (peer observations/evaluations, student evaluations, administrative evaluation, self evaluation, professional development progress (as well as information originating outside the standard evaluation process) in making its determination as to whether the evaluatee's performance:

Meets or Exceeds the Evaluation Performance Standards, OR

Needs Improvement to Address Specific Areas, OR

Does Not Meet the Performance Standards for NVC

**(1) Definitions and General Standards of Evaluation Reports**

**Meets or exceeds the Evaluation Performance Standards** denotes that overall the evaluatee has met or exceeded the performance standards appended to this

document. The RT may note some areas for continued improvement and still choose this rating as long as the evaluatee's pattern of performance is satisfactory in the four areas of professional responsibility and in reference to the position announcement, and there are no areas of significant concern.

**Needs Improvement** designates that the evaluatee has not met the performance standards outlined in one or more of the criteria appended to this document and/or in regard to the position announcement. This rating either denotes a pattern of performance that does not adequately meet NVC performance standards or is assigned when some area(s) shows significant weakness. In this case, the RT works with the evaluatee to develop a work plan for implementation the following semester that directly addresses the areas of concern (see section iii, Work Plans, below).

**Does Not Meet NVC Standards** denotes that the evaluatee has significantly failed to meet the performance standards outlined in one or more of the criteria appended to this document or the position announcement and/or has not made satisfactory progress in the areas outlined in the work plan.

## **(2) Work Plans**

In the event that the evaluatee receives a "Needs Improvement" final evaluation rating, the RT works with the evaluatee before the end of that fall semester to develop and implement a work plan to address the areas of concern. The work plan identifies specific improvements needed and includes a timeline for implementing changes and assessing improvement over the following semester. The RT works with the evaluatee and the Teaching and Learning Center to locate relevant professional development resources. A copy of the work plan is forwarded to the Academic Senate, Second Vice President by the end of the fall semester in which the "Needs Improvement" rating was given.

The evaluatee is expected to work cooperatively with the RT and meet all deadlines in addressing the issues listed in the work plan over the following spring semester. The outcomes of the work plan are included as part of the following fall semester evaluation materials.

### **(3) Decision-Making Process**

Optimally, all decisions of the RT are reached by consensus. However, if consensus is not possible then the Academic Senate VP for Evaluation may be consulted for input. The Academic Senate VP for Evaluation may bring the issue(s) to the FCC for additional consideration. At that point, if necessary, decisions are made by majority vote of the RT members. The evaluatee is not a voting member of the committee.

The RT completes the Evaluation Review Form and submits it (along with the workplan if applicable) to the Academic Senate, Second Vice President by December 1.

#### **x. Spring Semester**

During the spring semester, the evaluatee observes at least three other faculty or staff members in the performance of their duties (e.g., teaching, counseling) in order to gain additional exposure to a range of techniques and styles and to develop networks within the college. The evaluatee consults RT members in selecting whom to observe, and the final choice must be approved by the RT. The evaluatee keeps a record of each observation, including the date, person being observed and any noted insights or outcomes, for discussion with the RT at the first team meeting of the following fall evaluation period. The evaluatee retains a list of observations until the tenure review process has been completed.

The evaluatee continues to attend professional development activities established in the schedule of activities.

If the evaluatee received a work plan during the fall semester, s/he addresses the areas identified in the plan, and documents his/her progress.

## **2. Year 2 of Contract III**

### **a. Definition**

Usually an instructor who is beginning her/his fourth year of teaching is Year 2 Contract III status unless the person has not completed 75 percent of a full-year assignment. In these cases, status is determined by Ed Code (see above).

**b. Contract III Process and Components**

**i. Fall Process and Reports**

Refer to Year 1, Contract III section for fall process and reports.

**ii. Tenure recommendation Process**

At the conclusion of the Contract III, year two evaluation, the RT makes a final recommendation to grant or deny tenure which is approved by the Academic Senate prior to being forwarded to the Vice President of Instruction and the Superintendent/President. The final decision regarding tenure is made by the Board of Trustees at their February meeting,

## **PART IV – TIMELINES**

### **A. Overview**

No later than December 1 of each year, the Tenure Review Form and all evaluation materials are completed by the RT and forwarded to the Academic Senate, Second Vice President. The Academic Senate, Second Vice President forwards the original tenure review form, the summary of raw data, peer evaluation reports and the self-evaluation to the Vice President, Instruction for inclusion in the faculty member's personnel file. In all cases, materials must be available for inclusion on the February Board of Trustees' agenda.

It is the intent that all teams adhere to the deadlines set forth each academic year by the Academic Senate, Second Vice President, which reflect the deadlines set forth in this document. However, as referenced herein, non-prejudicial procedural errors shall not serve to invalidate the recommendation of the RT.

**B. Schedule of Due Dates**

**1. Contract I – Evaluatee and RT**

Day/date (fall semester)	Who	Action
First Fall Flex Day	Evaluatee and RT	Evaluatee and RT members have trainings to discuss the evaluation process and criteria, according to Part III.
2nd Fall Flex Day	Evaluatee and RT	The RT meets with the evaluatee to discuss syllabi and the SES. They create the Schedule of Activities and fill out the First Meeting Form.
Week 5	RT chair	Peer observations are completed.
Week 7	Evaluatee and RT	RT meets with the evaluatee to discuss the peer evaluations.
Week 9	RT chair	Student feedback is collected and sent to the Academic Senate Secretary for processing.
Week 12	Evaluatee and RT	RT meets with the evaluatee to discuss the student feedback.
Week 13	AS office	The results of the administrative review are delivered to the RT members.
Week 13	Evaluatee	Self-Evaluation delivered to RT chair.
Week 14	Evaluatee and RT	RT meets with the evaluatee to discuss the professional development progress and other evaluation materials. They will complete the Final Report Form. If a “Needs Improvement” rating is given, the RT will meet the following week to discuss and develop a work plan for implementation during the spring semester.
Week 15	Evaluatee and RT	If necessary, the RT meets with the evaluatee to develop a work plan for the spring semester.
December 1	RT chair	The Final Report Form, SES, Peer Observations, Summary of Student Feedback, Administrative Evaluation and Work Plan (if created) sent to the AS, Second VP.



## 2. Contract II and III – Evaluatee and RT

Day/date (fall semester)	Who	Action
First Fall Flex Day	Evaluatee and RT	Evaluatee and RT members have trainings to discuss the evaluation process and criteria, according to Part III.
2nd Fall Flex Day	Evaluatee and RT	The RT meets with the evaluatee to discuss previous semester's observations of faculty or staff, syllabi, the SES and the TGI. They create the Schedule of Activities and fill out the First Meeting Form.
Week 5	RT chair	Peer observations are completed.
Week 7	Evaluatee and RT	RT meets with the evaluatee to discuss the peer evaluations.
Week 9	RT chair	Student feedback is collected and sent to the Academic Senate Secretary for processing.
Week 12	Evaluatee and RT	RT meets with the evaluatee to discuss the student feedback.
Week 13	AS office	The results of the administrative review are delivered to the RT members.
Week 13	Evaluatee	Self-Evaluation delivered to RT chair
Week 14	Evaluatee and RT	RT meets with the evaluatee to discuss the professional development progress and other evaluation materials. They will complete the Final Report Form. If a "Needs Improvement" rating is given, the RT will meet the following week to discuss and develop a work plan for implementation during the spring semester.
Week 15	Evaluatee and RT	If necessary, the RT meets with the evaluatee to develop a work plan for the spring semester.
December 1	RT chair	The Final Report Form, SES, TGI, Peer Observations, Summary of Student Feedback, Administrative Evaluation and Work Plan (if created) sent to the AS, Second VP.

**3. Academic Senate Office and Officers**

Day/date	Who	Action
December 1	AS, Second VP	AS, Second VP verifies that the guidelines have been followed and so states in the report to the Vice President, Instruction or Student Services; and forwards tenure recommendations to Academic Senate office for vote at business meeting.
December	AS, Second VP	AS, Second VP presents tenure recommendations to Academic Senate during December Business Meeting
December 15	AS, Second VP	AS, Second VP forwards tenure recommendations to BOT for approval at January meeting
February 1	AS, Second VP /AS office	AS, Second VP forwards the evaluation materials and report forms to the VP of Instruction or Student Services for review and employment recommendation prior to February BOT meeting. Original Student Evaluations are sent to the Office of Human Resources to be filed until the final decision to grant or deny tenure has been made. If tenure is granted original student comments will be destroyed; in cases in which tenure is denied, original students comments will be retained until any appeals have been settled.
Following February BOT mtg	VPI or VPSS	The VP of Instruction or Student Services forwards the evaluation materials to the Office of HR for inclusion in the evaluatee's personnel file.
By April 15th	AS, Second VP	The AS, Second VP verifies the list of faculty to be evaluated from the Office of Instruction is accurate.

**C. Changes to Timelines**

The Academic Senate, Second Vice President, may adjust actual dates on the final calendar to accommodate holidays or college calendar changes.

**D. Timeline Extensions**

In extenuating circumstances, a RT may determine that it is necessary to deviate from the timelines outlined in these guidelines. In such cases a written request from the RT is submitted to the Academic Senate, Second Vice President, specifying the deviation which the RT requests and the reasons for the request. The Academic Senate Vice President shall determine whether to grant or deny the request within five instructional days of receipt.

Contract Faculty Review Teams are encouraged to meet more frequently than the guidelines

provide if they feel it is necessary or advisable. Nonetheless, the RT must comply with legally mandated guidelines and deadlines, which means that all decisions must be completed and available for placement on the February meeting agenda of the Board of Trustees.

### **SECTION 9: FACULTY COACH COMMITTEE**

The Faculty Coach Committee shall be concerned with the Contract Faculty Evaluation Process. Members are expected to train on the components of the evaluation and support each other through the process as they work with the contract review team and individual evaluatees to identify and address specific goals following the areas of professional responsibility developed by the Napa Valley College faculty as a whole.

Membership: The committee will be chaired by the 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice President of the Academic Senate. The Committee will consist of Academic Senate members currently serving as head coaches for the tenured-contract faculty evaluation process. ~~Every attempt shall be made to ensure that members of this committee are not themselves being evaluated in the same academic year as serving on the committee.~~

The Faculty Coach Committee shall:

1. Inform the Professional Development Committee of training needs.
2. Discuss methods for evaluating faculty and processing information
3. Work with the TLC Director to ensure appropriate professional development activities are available
4. Consult collegially when concerns arise in an evaluation process for a faculty member



## 2012-2013 Application for Emeritus Status

### Applicant Information

Full Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Last First M.I.

Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
Street Address Apartment

\_\_\_\_\_ City State ZIP Code

Home Phone: ( ) \_\_\_\_\_ E-mail \_\_\_\_\_

Preferred Academic Title \_\_\_\_\_

### Eligibility Information

Retirement Status:  Retired  
 Not Retired

Name of school from which you retired: \_\_\_\_\_

Years served as full- time instructor/professor at Napa Valley College: \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_

### Emeritus Benefits

*Please indicate which of the Emeritus privileges you would like (check all that apply):*

- Official document certifying emeritus status endorsed by the President of the Academic Senate.
- A business card (and, if appropriate, identification card) which indicates emeritus status.
- Listing with the faculty in all appropriate directories\*
- Listing with the faculty in the college catalogue\*
- Courtesy campus parking with a faculty sticker
- A faculty library card allowing full use of Library & Learning Resource Center
- Complimentary or reduced price admission to NVC performances and events, on the same basis as that provided to other faculty.
- The opportunity to visit classes, subject to the consent of the professor.
- Use of recreational and social facilities of the college, on the same basis as that provided to other faculty.

**\*Four (4) year limit, must reapply to continue**

*I hereby authorize the Senate and its appointed committee on Emeritus Status to verify the above statements as it deems necessary and useful for its determinations, and gather information as it deems needful and useful. I am acquainted with the rules and regulations governing the granting and holding of Emeritus Status at Napa Valley College.*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**FOR COMMITTEE USE ONLY**

**Name of Applicant:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Disposition:**                      **Granted**                      **Not Granted**                      **Modified**

**If granted:**

**Academic Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Effective as of** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of application:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Years served:** \_\_\_\_\_

**As of:** \_\_\_\_\_

**If not granted or modified:**

**Reasons:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

Chair, Faculty Standards and Practices Committee

## **Resolutions approved at Area B, 3/30/2012, Chabot College**

### **Early Childhood Education**

Whereas, The governor's proposed 2012-13 budget calls for saving \$517 million through the curtailment of early childhood education (ECE) by slashing program eligibility, lowering family income levels, and removing the enrollment in a course of study in higher education as a reason to be eligible for services, and recommendations for 2012-2014 include moving all except a fraction of ECE from the State Department of Education to the State Department of Social Services;

Whereas, These cuts and changes will disproportionately affect poor women and children seeking to raise themselves out of poverty, including those enrolling in campus-based child development centers and lab schools, resulting in the end of education for thousands of low-income women, and a continuation of the cycle of poverty for them and their children;

Whereas, These cuts will prevent early childhood/child development students, as well as psychology, nursing, and other related majors, from participating in essential lower division major preparation laboratory courses similar to chemistry, auto technology, biology, and multimedia laboratories; and

Whereas, While it is estimated that between 62,000 and 80,000 child care and ECE slots will be cut throughout the state, the number is likely to be far higher as most agencies will not be able to absorb another 10% cut in the reimbursement rate causing them to close;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support legislation and policy directives that protect California's investment in ECE teacher education, and preserve California's half-century investment in college programs that prepare the early care and education workforce;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support ECE policy reform that occurs thoughtfully and deliberately, not solely within the budget process but through careful planning by all those impacted, and that identifying inefficiencies within state-funded programs should be done without threat to the integrity of California's quality early care and education system; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support legislation and policy directives that preserve families' access to child care and education that aims to

- Preserve current eligibility for all low-income families, whether working or in higher education,
- Consider reforms to the delivery system that do not result in closure of programs providing quality child care and education, such as community college teacher preparation programs and early education centers and lab schools, and
- Preserve the practice that child development and early education funds remain in the Department of Education so that they can better provide optimal learning environments for California's youngest learners.

Contact: Terry Shell, Santa Rosa Junior College

### **Emeritus Status for Ian Walton**

Whereas, The Bylaws of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges include procedures and criteria for conferring the status of senator emeritus on individuals;

Whereas, Ian Walton has satisfied those requirements as a retired faculty member of the California Community College System who has completed well more than the required five (5) years of significant service to the Academic Senate:

- Executive Committee member of the State Academic Senate from 1998 to 2007;
- Treasurer, Vice President, and President of the Academic Senate;
- Chair of numerous Senate committees including Educational Policies, Occupational Education, Technology and Relations with Local Senates;
- Significant leadership in groups such as the Education Roundtable, Distance Education Technology Advisory Committee, the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), and Consultation Council;
- Significant leadership in facilitating raising community college degree standards and establishing the CCC Basic Skills Initiative as a means to ensure student success within the context of the higher standards;
- Colleague who by example personifies collegiality, dedication, and integrity at his college and statewide, while maintaining the occasional sublime irreverence with introspective wit, melodious and depressing Celtic ballads and many late evenings spent pondering the good nature of single-malt whiskey and dark chocolate; and

Whereas, Ian Walton has contributed to countless papers and resolutions and provided wise counsel, founded on years of experience at Mission College and as a member of Area B, and has consistently demonstrated leadership with intelligence and unfailing grace, all presented with a delightfully sexy Scottish brogue;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recognize Ian Walton's extraordinary and distinguished service by awarding him the status of senator emeritus with all rights and privileges thereof; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges convey to Ian Walton its heartfelt congratulations upon his retirement and wish him and his family every happiness in the many years to come.

Contact: Area B Approved by Acclamation

### **Making Resolution Authorship Visible**

Cousin Bob Grill, College of Alameda

Whereas, The attribution of the author in resolutions is an essential feature of resolutions allowing the field to know who is responsible for creating the resolution and who to hold accountable for the ideas contained in the resolution;

Whereas, Having just contact persons for resolutions or giving a resolution for someone else to put his or her name on (whether as contact or author) is deceptive in the sense that it hides from view the person or persons who were responsible for coming up with the idea for the resolution and thus hiding from the field who to hold accountable (positive or negative) for the ideas contained therein; and



Whereas, Changing the resolution source from “author” to “contact” person is a significant enough change to a core function of the resolution process that it should be decided by the senate body rather than only by the executive committee;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges revert back to the practice of putting authors’ names at the top of resolutions; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges committees discontinue the practice of putting persons’ names on resolutions other than the name of one of the resolution’s true authors.

### **Priority Registration for MESA Students**

Whereas, The State of California is experiencing a significant shortage in the number of qualified engineers and scientists matriculating through its post secondary institutions compared to needs in the economy;

Whereas, The student membership of the Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement (MESA) Community College Program consists of educationally and financially disadvantaged students pursuing degrees in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) fields whose goal is to transfer to a four-year college or university;

Whereas, Impacted math and science courses impede the timely transfer of MESA community college students; and

Whereas, The inability of MESA community college students to enroll in sequential math and science courses, required for their high unit majors, unnecessarily delays the transfer of these students and postpones their eventual matriculation from the four-year institutions;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that community colleges afford MESA students in good standing priority registration similar to students participating in existing mandated priority registration programs; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommends amendment of Education Code 66025.9 to require each community college district, that administers a priority enrollment system and maintains an existing MESA Program, to grant priority registration to California Community College MESA Students.

Contact: Mission College Academic Senate

### **Student Success Infrastructure Act of 2012**

Whereas, AB 1741 (Fong, as of March 30, 12), the Student Success Infrastructure Act of 2012, would set up a fund, subject to the Budget Act, to enhance the following infrastructure in the community colleges:

- 1) Increase the counselor to student ratio;
- 2) Restore critical student support services;

- 3) Increase the ratio of full- to part-time faculty; and
- 4) Professionalize part-time faculty beginning with expansion of paid office hours;

Whereas, These infrastructure components listed above directly correlate to increased student success, since they result in direct student contact and services that help identify and respond directly to student needs;

Whereas, Successful implementation of the Student Success Act of 2012 (SB 1456 Lowenthal, as of March 30, 2012) would depend upon a funding stream being identified, since this bill does not specify such a funding stream, especially for counseling and advising services; and

Whereas, The Consultation Council did not act upon a 2/06/2012 digest jointly signed by the Presidents of five statewide faculty groups (FACCC, CCA/CTA, CCC/CFT, ASCCC, CCCI) which proposes the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Consultation Council to convene a funding task force to "develop a full cost scenario for implementing the Student Success Task Force" recommendations;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strongly support AB 1741 (Fong, as of March 30, 2012) Student Success Infrastructure Act of 2012.

Contact: Karen Chow, De Anza College

### **Resolution on Arbitrary Targeting of Athletics by the Legislative Analyst's Office**

Whereas The LAO has recently recommended\* defunding Community College athletic programs, by prohibiting colleges from counting intercollegiate athletics program courses' FTES for apportionment in a desire to "protect the CCC system's highest-priority missions";

Whereas, The LAO's specific identification of athletics' FTES apportionment is an isolated targeted recommendation that is not put into the context of an extensive analysis of fiscal responsibility, productivity, and other measures of student success in Athletics;

Whereas, The student athlete cohort consistently attains higher GPAs than the rest of the Community College student body (Female athletes 2.7 vs. 2.46 and Male athletes 2.54 to 2.3), transfers at a higher rate than the rest of the student body (Female athletes 16% vs. 6% and Male athletes 9% vs. 6%); and

Whereas, Athletes are required to have an education plan in place their first term, earlier than what is proposed by the Student Success Task Force for all students and must be enrolled in and successfully complete 12 academic units each term with a GPA of 2.0, thereby ensuring responsible use of state funds;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges disagrees with the recent LAO recommendation which goes beyond its long established scope of examining the costs of legislative proposals and projecting state revenue; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges consider this recommendation as the LAO overstepping its self-stated function as "California's nonpartisan fiscal and policy advisor,"

\*LAO document “Eliminate state funding for CCC intercollegiate athletics, for savings of about \$55 million in 2012-13” February 10, 2012

Contact: Paul Setziol, De Anza College

### **Opposition to Additional Academic Requirements for Recipients of BOG Fee Waivers**

Whereas, SB1456 (as of March 30, 2012 or March 30, 2012) proposes imposing additional academic requirements upon students as a condition for receiving BOG fee waivers, to wit: that the student must identify one of a limited list of goals upon enrollment and that the Board of Governors will define academic and progress standards (including a maximum unit cap) beyond what is required from students who are paying fees; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges took a position with Resolution 07.03 Fall, 2011 against BOG fee waiver rules that establish different academic policies for students based on differing ability to pay;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adamantly oppose any provision(s) of SB1456 (as of March 30, 2012) that would:

- require students receiving BOG fee waivers to declare goals earlier than students who can afford to pay fees;
- require students receiving BOG fee waivers to meet additional academic and progress standards that are not required for students who are paying fees; and
- deny BOG fee waivers to students who declare goals that are acceptable for students who can afford to pay fees.

Contact: Karen Saginor City College of San Francisco

### **Tiered Fees in the California Community Colleges**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges opposes “recommendations that establish different academic policies for students based on their differing abilities to pay” (Resolution 7.03, adopted Fall 2011), and also strongly opposes “any attempt to abridge the mission of California community colleges, reduce their affordability, or remove their control from the communities they serve.” (Resolution 7.02, adopted Fall 2011)

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urges “the Board of Governors to not adopt any regulations that would diminish the California community colleges’ ability to:

- provide instruction and educational support services to all who desire them reaching out to those of underserved communities that encounter barriers to education;
- develop sustainable campuses and sites to better serve students and neighborhoods;
- diversify and improve programs and services for the benefit of the entire community;
- build partnerships with public, private, and community-based agencies to respond with agility and efficiency to educational, economic, environmental, and societal needs;
- foster the participation of our students and employees in community life;
- enhance the availability of educational opportunities for all; and

- support the acquisition of knowledge and skills by all, including the critical thinking skills and career skills that are essential to full participation in society.” (Resolution 7.02, adopted Fall 2011)

Whereas, Santa Monica College’s recent announcement to establish a two-tiered system of fees for regular course offerings, including courses in English, math, and sciences, is an unprecedented action in violation of the California Community College Mission and **may be in violation of Title 5**, and would force students seeking enrollment in impacted courses to pay \$180 per semester unit, an amount nearly three times higher than the state-established community college fees of \$46 per semester unit thereby creating a slippery slope towards possible consequences that would take state resources away from regular course offerings; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has previously opposed “Assembly Bill (AB) 515 (Brownley, February 15, 2011) and any initiative that would further shift the use of human, physical, technology, or fiscal resources to a fee-based system that provides access only to those who can afford higher fees.” (Resolution 6.06, adopted Spring 2011);

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strongly opposes any attempt, such as that undertaken by Santa Monica College, to establish extension courses that would create a two-tiered system of fees and would deny access to in-state students **who do not have the ability to pay**; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges reaffirm its opposition to any bill that attempts to establish a two-tiered system, including the current Senate Bill 1550 (Wright, as of 30 March 2012).

Contact: Karen Chow, De Anza College

### **CTE Program Review**

Whereas, In addition to completing the local program review cycle, Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs must complete additional program reviews every 2 years;

Whereas, Many CTE programs have minimal or no full time faculty and thus have severe time constraint issues; and

Whereas, Many CTE programs are subject to external reviews and discipline specific accreditation reviews;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges write a paper on methods and best practices for streamlining the program review processes for CTE programs.

Contact: Dianna Chiabotti, Executive Committee