



## Academic Senate Business Meeting Minutes

April 24, 2012

12:30-1:20 pm, Room 860

---

Members Present: Dave Angelovich, Bryan Avila, Amanda Badgett, Andrea Bewick, Maria Biddenback, Stephanie Burns, Dianna Chiabotti, Dan Clemens, Michael Conroy, Emily Cosby, Aaron DiFranco, Steve Fawl, Sheryl Fernandez, Catherine Gillis, Stephanie Grohs, Ann Gross, Alejandro Guerrero, Julie Hall, Fain Hancock, Betty Hopperstad, Jose Hurtado, Jennifer King, Christy Kling, Barbara Kraig, Karen Larsen, John Liscano, Tia Madison, Rob Miller, Lynda Monger, Christine Palella, Denise Roselli, Mary Salceda-Nuñez, Marci Sanchez, Debbie Saunders, Mary Shea, Erik Shearer, Eileene Tejada, Diane Van Deusen, Maria Villagomez, Jeff Wachsmuth, Nadine Wade-Gravett, Eve-Anne Wilkes, Lisa Yanover.

- 1.0 Welcome
- 2.0 Adoption of Agenda
  - Agenda amended: added 8.1 and changed 8.1 to 8.2 (see below) and times adjusted
  - msp (S. Grohs)
- 3.0 Approval of Minutes
  - Minutes from March 13 amended to include 2 additional paragraphs. Msp (L. Monger)
  - Amendment to strike second paragraph not passed.
  - Minutes from April 10 passed with typo correction. Msp (L. Monger)
- 4.0 General Announcements
  - Come to Faculty Appreciation on Friday at 3:30 at the winery.
- 5.0 Public Comment - none.
- 6.0 Action Items
  - 6.1 Changes to Faculty Coach Committee – second reading
    - msp (E. Shearer)
  - 6.2 Changes to Tenured Faculty Evaluation Process – first reading
    - Discussion covered role of Professional Development Committee in Faculty Evaluation process and Professional Development activities resulting from the process.
    - What is the criteria for unsatisfactory finding?
    - Discussion also addressed issue of whether Coach must be from the same division/department or not. Since divisions/departments are college-specific, and this is addressed in spirit, but not requirement, in Ed. Code, this requirement it is not included in the new process.
    - Forms discussion – they will be circulated ahead of second reading.
    - Documents sent to HR could include Student Evaluations.
    - msp as proposed, subject to second reading and clarifications ( )



## 7.0 Information Items

### 7.1 President

- State AS Plenary Session resolutions will be circulated in a few days.
- Exploring how to bring groups together.
- Timeline draft for updating Master Plan.
- Second Accreditation workshop clarified many issues.
- Unit plan for AS is posted on web site; focused on getting full time AS secretary.

## 8.0 Discussion Items

### 8.1 Ideas for filling interim/permanent College President position

- Brainstorming produced the following ideas to be brought forward to the BOT:

#### Interim Hire:

- STRS rules changed for bringing in an interim President.
- Use this time for reflection on what happened with previous president;
- Don't rush to fill position; take 6 months to 1 year
- Choose carefully if using an internal candidate
- Use in house interim President will save \$
- Consider external candidates as well as internal candidates
- Listen to constituent groups re: external candidate

#### Permanent Hire:

- Someone – Senate and Union reps – should perform site visit
- Review minutes of past Senate and Board meetings
- Take time to reflect on what happened
- Require that candidate have demonstrated working knowledge of CA law and Ed. Code
- Look at the process and what we really use
- Don't rush
- Don't act in fear
- Maintain transparency

### 8.2 Workload issues

- Brainstorming produced the following ideas:

- Suspending committees that are not vital.
- Prioritize committees
- Collapse committees
- Review assessment models – faculty release time
- Make better use of Flex Days (working component)
- Review secretaries positions, and what they can be doing for faculty
  - TrakDat, other duties



- Make secretaries permanent
- More Flex Days
- Everyone do their work on committees
- Revisit compressed calendar
- Reduce # of faculty members on committees
- Hire more full time faculty
- Release time for chairs/co-chairs

9.0 Next Meeting Items

Next meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 8, 2012.

9.1 Future Agenda Items

Please email them to Ann or Seri.

10.0 Adjourned 12:20 pm

-msp (S. Burns)

# **NAPA VALLEY COLLEGE**

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

**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.

# **REGULAR (TENURED) FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

Adopted by Academic Senate, May 8, 2012

## **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 Tenured Faculty Evaluations**

In accordance with Napa Valley College's philosophy, the role of faculty in evaluation of their tenured peers is one of collegial collaboration in order to facilitate professional growth. The evaluation process is based on a coaching model, in which all members of the coaching team can benefit from the process while focusing on the specific strengths and areas for growth of the evaluatee.

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

### **Expectations of Faculty**

Tenured faculty members are expected to demonstrate competence and currency within their discipline to advance student learning. They see the value of becoming well-versed in counseling, learning, and assessment theory, in order to effectively address learning differences inside and outside of the classroom. Faculty will utilize various teaching and counseling methodologies to ensure student success and will use varied forms of assessment as a means for providing feedback to students and to faculty. They are seen as leaders and experts within their discipline, and they take the initiative to work with other professionals across disciplines. They are able to work as a team and actively collaborate with faculty, staff, and administration. This evaluation process is designed to allow faculty the time to periodically focus on how well they are fulfilling their professional responsibilities and to identify areas for growth. Faculty members are expected to follow the process and timelines related to evaluation and to work collegially with their respective coach(es). In addition, evaluatees are expected to be prepared for meetings with their coaches and have necessary documents ready for discussions.

### **Expectations of Coaches**

The Tenured Faculty Evaluation process is based on a coaching model, in which faculty members meet to support their colleagues' professional growth. One faculty coach is expected to work with each evaluatee over the course of the evaluation process to identify and address specific goals. Following the areas of professional responsibility developed by the Napa Valley College faculty as a whole, coaches will meet with evaluatees to discuss areas of strength and goals for the evaluation cycle, identify areas on which to focus, collect feedback from students and peer observations, and identify training resources to address specific areas of interest.

Coaches are expected to attend a training on flex day at the start of the academic year for which he/she will be a coach. It is the responsibility of each coach to make sure that the process and timelines are followed and any necessary forms are returned to the Academic Senate Second Vice-President on/by the date due. (All forms are available through the Academic Senate secretary and on the Academic Senate webpage.)

If, at any point in the evaluation process, the coaches and/or evaluatees are not meeting the timelines, the appropriate Division Chair/Dean of that faculty member will be notified by the Academic Senate Second Vice-President to encourage completion of the process in a timely fashion. Further, if any problems arise during the course of the evaluation process, coaches and evaluatees are directed to consult with the Academic Senate Second Vice-President. As necessary, the Second Vice-President will alert the Vice-President of Instruction or Vice-President of Student Services of any significant issues.

Coaches will be trained on topics, including but not limited to: the evaluation process, confidentiality, assessing syllabi, effective techniques for observing faculty in teaching, counseling, and library settings, giving constructive feedback, various teaching pedagogy, the faculty handbooks, and other issues as they arise.

The Academic Senate Second Vice-President and the Director of the TLC will coordinate workshops and other professional development options for coaches and evaluatees.

### **Expectations of District**

Alongside the peer review process is a simultaneous administrative evaluation that focuses on information related to the faculty member's completion of his/her contractual obligations, including office hours and other professional responsibilities.

The District will work collaboratively with the faculty to design and offer professional development opportunities for faculty members based on needs identified through the evaluation process.

While the District supports the peer coaching model, nothing in these guidelines 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. Further, the district may initiate an Administrative Performance Review if faculty members do not meet expectations as determined by their peers, fail to complete the evaluation process, or fail to meet their contractual obligations.

## **PART III – PROCESS AND TIMELINES**

- A. In accordance with Ed Code Section 87663, tenured faculty members will be evaluated every three years. The Academic Senate Second Vice-President will notify those faculty members to be evaluated the semester preceding their evaluation year.
- B. The faculty member to be evaluated will work with a tenured faculty coach during the evaluation year. Upon request of the evaluatee, the Academic Senate Second Vice-President will assign a second coach. All coaches are assigned by the Academic Senate Second Vice-President, although an evaluatee may suggest a specific coach in writing by

the end of the semester prior to being evaluated. The Academic Senate Second Vice-President will honor these requests whenever possible. No evaluatee will be consecutively evaluated by the same coach(es).

C. **Must be completed in FALL SEMESTER**

(The first week of the semester is the week in which the first class for that term starts)

1. On fall flex day, tenured faculty members being evaluated and their coaches will participate in an orientation to the evaluation process and review the evaluation process and timelines.

At this orientation, evaluatees will receive the following:

- a. information on the process and timelines
- b. the Self-Evaluation Survey (SES)
- c. program/class data

Evaluatees should bring their syllabi for fall semester to the orientation.

Evaluatees and their coaches will also schedule meetings for the remainder of the semester at this orientation.

2. **By the end of the fifth week**, the evaluatee will meet with his/her coach(es) to:
  - a. review the evaluatee's completed Self Evaluation Survey and identify training needs.
  - b. review, discuss, and revise, if necessary, syllabi, goals, instructional design, assignments, and assessments for each course
  - c. identify courses for which student evaluations will be collected and select dates for student evaluations.
  - d. discuss any other areas of interest or concern

If the evaluatee has significant job duties falling outside the traditional teaching/ counseling/ librarian areas, the coach(es) and evaluatee will identify alternatives to peer and/or student evaluations. In such cases, the coach(es) will submit a request for alternative evaluation measures to the Academic Senate Second Vice-President for approval prior to collecting the alternative evaluation material. This request will outline the alternative evaluation measures, as well as a justification for these alternatives.

3. **By the end of the sixth week**, the coach(es) will submit the Initial Meeting Form to the Academic Senate Second Vice-President.
4. **By the end of the twelfth week**, student evaluations will be collected. (See section IV.A. for process of collecting student evaluations.)
5. **By the end of the first week in December**, each coach will meet with the evaluatee to:
  - a. review student evaluations and give appropriate feedback
  - b. identify additional training needs (the coach will submit the list to the Academic Senate Second Vice President)
  - c. discuss other issues related to the evaluation
  - d. discuss other issues related to assessment of learning outcomes

6. **By the end of the eighteenth week**, the TLC Director, and the Academic Senate Second Vice-President will develop a training schedule for professional development activities.

D. **Must be completed during SPRING SEMESTER**

(The first week of the semester is the week in which the first class for that term starts)

1. **By the end of the third week**, coaches will meet with evaluatees to:
  - a. revise professional development options as needed
  - b. review syllabi, particularly if there were problems in the fall term
  - c. check on other issues
  - d. finalize training needs
2. **By the end of the tenth week**, evaluatees participate in professional development, which includes:
  - a. One peer observation by the coach; and
  - b. Two additional professional development options from the following:
    - Observe another faculty member's course
    - Additional peer observation(s)
    - Trainings
    - Workshops
    - Additional student evaluations
    - Other options as approved by Academic Senate Second Vice President.
3. **No later than April 1, or as adjusted**, coaches and evaluatees meet to:
  - a. review peer observation report(s)
  - b. discuss professional development options in which evaluatee participated
  - c. discuss assessment of learning outcomes
  - d. complete Final Evaluation Report (FER)
4. **No later than April 15**, the Final Evaluation Report must be submitted to the Academic Senate Second Vice-President.
5. **No later than May 1**, the Academic Senate Second Vice-President will submit the Final Evaluation Reports to the appropriate vice-president.

Note: Based on program need/design or extenuating circumstances, requests for timeline adjustments, including justifications, may be made in writing to the Academic Senate Second Vice-President who, along with the appropriate vice-president, will determine whether or not to grant the request within five instructional days of receipt. The Academic Senate Second Vice-President may need to adjust the April due dates in consideration of spring break.

## **PART IV – COLLECTING FEEDBACK**

### A. Student Feedback

**By the end of the tenth week of the fall semester**, student evaluations will be collected from at least three class sections that the faculty member is teaching. If the faculty member is teaching fewer than three sections, evaluations for all sections will be collected. For counselors and librarians, at least 60 student evaluations will be collected. If these faculty

members are also teaching as part of their regular assignment, student evaluations will be collected from both classes and individual appointments/contacts.

Standardized evaluation questionnaires will be used to solicit information from students; the questionnaires allow for written comments. The Academic Senate Secretary will prepare the student evaluation materials and distribute them to the faculty members being evaluated. The faculty member will ask for a student volunteer from each class to administer the questionnaires and return them in a sealed envelope to the Academic Senate Office immediately after the class session. Student evaluations for distance education courses are collected on-line.

Once the Academic Senate Secretary processes the student evaluations, which includes transcribing student comments to ensure anonymity, the summary report and type-written student comments will be sent to the coach(es) and appropriate vice-president. Original student evaluation comments will be shredded once the evaluation process is complete.

#### B. Peer Observations

The coach(es) will observe at least one class session or one individual counseling session and will prepare a written summary of his/her observations. The coach(es) will discuss the peer observation with the evaluatee and will give appropriate feedback for improvement.

### **PART V – SELF-EVALUATION SURVEY AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

The Self-Evaluation Survey – The SES is a tool the faculty evaluatee will utilize as part of the evaluation process. It is a dynamic document that can be modified during the process. The SES affords the evaluatee the opportunity to critically analyze his/her performance and to identify professional development needs. The SES is retained by the evaluatee.

Professional Development – Coaches will work closely with evaluatees to identify and select professional development opportunities that best meet the needs of the faculty members. The Academic Senate 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice President will work collaboratively with the Director of the TLC to ensure that appropriate training opportunities are provided for faculty.

### **PART VI – DOCUMENT RETENTION**

Final Evaluation Report -- Upon completion of the evaluation, the Academic Senate Second Vice-President forwards the Final Evaluation Reports to the appropriate vice-president for review. Final Evaluation Reports are then forwarded to faculty members' personnel files. The evaluatee may choose to have copies of the Self Evaluation Survey, the student survey summary(ies) and/or peer observation(s) included in his/her personnel file.

Student Evaluation Materials -- The original student questionnaires and comments are destroyed once the evaluation process is complete, unless the evaluation is continued for an additional year. The Student Evaluation Summary Form and type-written student comments are forwarded to the appropriate vice-president who shall retain these materials for the three academic years following the evaluation year.



## **PART VII – INCOMPLETE EVALUATIONS**

If the evaluation is incomplete the FCC will make a final recommendation, which could be either a repeated evaluation or a referral for an Administrative Performance Review.

If the evaluation is incomplete after the second cycle, the Academic Senate Second Vice-President will notify the appropriate vice-president that the evaluation has not been completed for two evaluation cycles. This will complete the faculty peer review process. Action after two incomplete faculty evaluations is within the purview of the District.

# TENURED FACULTY EVALUATION

## 1<sup>st</sup> Formal Meeting Form

---

**Evaluatee:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Division:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Discipline:** \_\_\_\_\_

The first meeting of the tenured faculty evaluation team should occur by the end of the fifth week of the fall semester. The purpose of this meeting is to:

- Review the evaluatee's completed Self Evaluation Survey
- Identify training needs
- Review, discuss, and revise, if necessary, syllabi, goals, instructional design
- Review and discuss assignments and assessment for each course
- Identify courses for which student evaluations will be collected and select dates for student evaluations
- Discuss any other areas of interest or concern.

**Peer Evaluation** to be performed by: \_\_\_\_\_ no later than February 28<sup>th</sup>.  
*Name*

Three **Student Evaluations** should be administered as follows (or 60 evaluations for Librarians and Counseling Faculty). The AS secretary will send student evaluation packets to the evaluatee via campus mail. Student evaluations should be completed by the end of the twelfth week of the fall semester. The scheduled dates are:

Class	Date	Time	# Students
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

**We have completed the first meeting discussion described above.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Evaluatee
Date
Coach
Date

**PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE 2<sup>ND</sup> VICE PRESIDENT BY THE END OF THE SIXTH WEEK OF THE FALL SEMESTER**



# TENURED FACULTY Final Evaluation Report

---

Evaluatee: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Division: \_\_\_\_\_ Discipline: \_\_\_\_\_

The final meeting of the tenured faculty evaluation team should occur by April 1<sup>st</sup>, or as adjusted by the Academic Senate 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice president to accommodate Spring Break. The purpose of this meeting is to:

- Review peer observation report(s)
- Discuss professional development in which evaluatee participated
- Discuss assessment of learning outcomes
- Confirm that all steps of the process were completed

<b><u>Review of:</u></b>	<b><u>Discussed with evaluatee</u></b>	<b><u>Incomplete</u></b>
1. Instruction/Counseling Comments:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Support of Students Comments:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Support of College Comments:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Assessment of Learning Outcomes Comments:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Professional Development Comments:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>





## **Tenured Faculty**