

How to Ensure an Effective Evaluation Process

KCCD CCA Fall 2022

Agenda

- Introductions
- Role of Senate and Union
- Purpose and Requirements
- Getting into Specifics
 - Criteria
 - The Team
 - The Components
 - The Ratings
 - Timeline
- Wrapping Up

Introductions

- Ann Tatum: Professor in English Department
 - KCCD CCA BC Campus Chair and Negotiator
- Pam Boyles: Department Chair, English
 - BC Grievance Officer and KCCD CCA Grievance Chair

Role of the Senate and Union

- Ed Code stipulates that the union consult the Senate on Evaluation Procedures (including Tenure Procedures)
- These procedures will then be negotiated by the union and brought to the membership for voting (dues-paying members only)
- Article 6 (Full-time faculty evaluations) and Article 7 (Part-time faculty evaluations)--This session will focus on Mode A evaluation
- The other role of the union: If contractual processes are not followed, the union must investigate and grievances may result.
- The union protects the contract; it does not determine the accuracy of an evaluation.

What is the purpose of evaluation?

- “To ensure that quality teaching and support services remain the core ingredients in undergraduate education, the faculty evaluation process:
 - 1. Focuses on professional growth, recognition, and improvement by identifying and providing instructional resources for support of individual faculty goals and growth.
 - 2. Promotes faculty service (e.g. community, committee, professional activities).
 - 3. Facilitates the accomplishment of individual faculty objectives linked to departmental, program, and institutional missions and goals.
 - 4. Assesses the performance of the full scope of all assigned duties according to the job assignment and relevant professional standards.
 - 5. Provides the basis for retention and tenure decisions.”

- 1) “Uniform and Consistent” (stay within the parameters of the negotiated process; use tenured faculty)
- 2) “Truthful and Accurate” (no rumors, gossip, or anonymous sources; no recordings)
- 3) “Limited to Contractual Duties”
- 4) “Based on Performance, not Technology” (tech failures cannot affect the evaluation)
- 5) “Timely” (**immediate** formative feedback is required)
- 6) “Content is not Grievable” (**ONLY IF** the content does not violate another part of the contract)
- 7) “Allows for Faculty Response” (faculty have 10 working days to respond to Summary and also 10 working days to respond to additional administrative comments)

Requirements:
Just an
Overview—
See Article
7.B.1-7 for
exceptions and
details



Getting into Specifics

- The “criteria” are intentionally broad to be able to apply to different assignments:
- a) Discipline Knowledge
- b) Creation and Facilitation of the Learning Environment
- c) Individual Professional Responsibility
- d) Participation in Institutional Activities
- e) Effective Teaching Methods

Criteria (Article 7.C.1)

The Team (Articles 6.C.4.a and 6.F.3 have additional details)

- Mode A Evaluation Teams consist of 4 members:
- A department chair, two tenured faculty members (one chosen by department and one chosen by evaluatee), educational administrator
- Possible conflicts of interest must be declared and, if necessary, the member recused.
- The chair or Dean may not decide that the evaluatee's chosen faculty member is too busy to serve and tell them to pick someone else.
- The department chair runs the Pre-Observation and Final Summary meetings.
- ALL MEMBERS ARE EQUAL! No one voice "counts" more than the others.
- The final rating must be made by the majority, not one member.

Components: Overview

- Article 6.C.2
- “The purpose of the multiple components listed below [Evaluation Packet, meetings, observations, student surveys, etc.] is to get data from a variety of perspectives for diverse faculty assignments. Every effort should be made to integrate this data in its entirety in contrast to overemphasizing any individual component.”

- The Evaluation Packet will include the following:
- Goals and Accomplishments (Goals only for year-1)
- Teaching/Service Philosophy
- Syllabi for Classes
- NOTE: The SLO Narrative is no longer required

The Components: Evaluation Packet Contents

- Article 6.C.2.a
- “Demonstrate an on-going commitment to professional growth and development.
- Provide an opportunity to give voice to a teaching and/or service philosophy for Mode A faculty.
- Provide a list of three [measurable and achievable] goals and three achievements of the faculty member. . . .
- Afford the committee a context in which to view scheduled observations.
- Act as the faculty member’s presentation aid for the Pre-Observation meeting.”
- “The evaluation committee reviews the Evaluation Packet during the Pre-Observation Meeting.”

Evaluation Packet Purpose

- There is a list of acceptable goals on page 34 of the contract: 10 items plus “Other.”
- ANYTHING on that list is acceptable (as long as it is measurable and achievable). First on the list: In-class teaching/counseling/support service.
- The contract does NOT require any of the following:
 - Serving on a committee
 - Presenting for professional development
 - Something “extra impressive” to get tenure
- If it meets the contract, it must be accepted. Extracontractual “requirements” can create problems.

To Keep in
Mind about
the Evaluation
Packet

Components: Observations

- For Mode A, all assignments should be observed. (Article 6.2.c)
- All team members observe assignments.
- There is NO contractual requirement to complete forms in a certain way. (For example, you are not required to write something if you choose “Strongly Agree” or to write at least one “Suggestion.” But remember the goals of evaluation: feedback should be useful).
- Timely feedback IS contractually required. Faculty should know the evaluator’s thoughts prior to the Summary Meeting.

- This is the form the administrator fills out regarding what they see in interactions with the evaluatee as an employee, not as a faculty member.
- Remember: Faculty serving as team members are unlikely to be able to confirm the accuracy of this document.
- If administrators are seeing problematic behavior, that should be addressed via Progressive Corrective Action (Article 14). These issues should not be addressed for the first time via the evaluation process.

Components: Form Q

Components: Student Surveys

- Student Surveys are given to every class.
- There is NO contractually agreed upon acceptable percentage of “Agree,” “Disagree,” etc. responses. Because of this, telling faculty they need to get a certain percentage on surveys is potentially problematic.
- If response rates are low, that should be taken into account.
- Again, no single component should be emphasized, so it is NOT contractual to tell faculty “We weigh student surveys heavier than everything else.”

- Summary is developed “jointly” by the entire team “based on the majority opinion of the group” (Article 6.4.A.3)
- There is NO negotiated/contractual template for the summary.
- If someone disagrees with the majority, they need to be allowed time to submit a minority statement. They should NOT sign the cover sheet until that statement has become part of the packet (Article 6.C.4.a.). There is no special form to complete.

Components: Evaluation Team Summary

The Ratings (Mode A)

- Satisfactory: Faculty member is retained
- Needs to Improve: Retention IF specific recommendations are met. This is NOT the same as “Suggestions for Improvement.” It MUST include a remediation plan that includes a timeline for “remediation, observation, and re-evaluation.” District must offer any needed resources.
- Unsatisfactory: Years 1, 2, and 4: Termination. Year 3: Remediation plan (same requirements as above).

- Pre-Observation Meeting: Weeks 3-5
- Observations: Weeks 5-11
- Student Evaluations: Weeks 7-10
- Report compiled: Week 12 to end of term
- Evaluation Summary: Week 13 to end of term
- Preliminary Tenure Decision (Year 4): December 15
- Materials submitted to Chancellor: February 15

Suggested Timeline
(Mode A, Fall)

- Yes, it is “suggested.” But not following it can lead to two problems:
- From a union perspective, getting too far outside of the schedule can lead to grievances (for instance, requiring faculty to work outside of contracted days, no time to correct problems with reports, etc.)
- From your evaluatee’s perspective, the later they get feedback, the less helpful it typically is and the more stressful it may be as they wait all semester to know how well they did.
- Always remember the purpose of evaluation: it is supposed to be helpful and meaningful, not a burden.

How to Think About
the Suggested
Timeline (Mode A,
Fall)

Wrapping Up

- We are happy to give this presentation to your department or evaluation team.
- If you would like to schedule a presentation or have any other questions, contact your presenters:
 - Ann Tatum: atatum@bakersfieldcollege.edu
 - Pam Boyles: pboyles@bakersfieldcollege.edu
- The contract can be found on our website: kccdcca.com