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I. PROCEDURE FOR EVALUATION OF PROBATIONARY CONTRACT AND TEMPORARY FACULTY

A. Selection of Committee:

Upon notification from the Area Dean, the department chair or if the evaluatee is the department chair, the dean in consultation with the Academic Senate President, shall form an evaluation committee. Committee composition shall consist of:

1. The evaluatee, as a nonvoting member.
2. The department chair or equivalent (if the evaluatee is department chair, an additional tenured faculty from the evaluatee’s field or a closely related discipline)
3. One tenured faculty peer from the evaluatee’s field or a closely related discipline.
4. One tenured faculty peer from outside the department.
5. Area dean (non-voting) for years one and two of the 4-year probationary evaluation schedule, and at the discretion of the dean or the committee in years three and four.

The three voting members of the evaluation committee shall choose one member (not the evaluatee) to serve as chair.

B. Committee Responsibilities:

1. Plan for Evaluation: Committee members will select a chair and establish a timeline by the sixth week of the semester in which the evaluation takes place. The committee will consider the applicability of the paragraphs below when a faculty member who is not a classroom instructor (i.e., counselor, librarian, campus nurse) is to be evaluated, and unanimously determine which paragraph(s), if any, are not relevant to the specific situation.

2. Review Course Materials: e.g., syllabi, exams, student records, counseling notes, etc.

3. Obtain Written Comments: Obtain written comments from the evaluatee (self-evaluation), evaluatee’s department chair (Faculty Responsibilities Checklist) and dean (Dean’s Comment Form) regarding the individual’s performance of job requirements and fulfillment of departmental and campus responsibilities. The five performance criteria listed in Section 2120 shall be considered: a) expertise in discipline; b) effectiveness in performing job; c) availability to students and colleagues; d) fulfillment of college responsibilities; and e) professional growth. See Performance Criteria Guidelines in Appendix E, Section VI.
4. Review Previous Evaluations: Obtain and review copies of the two most recent previous evaluation reports. In the case of a first or second time evaluation of probationary personnel, the committee shall review the most recent evaluation(s) available (prior evaluation as hourly or temporary contract personnel, for example).

5. Obtain Client Data: Without the evaluatee present, a written client survey will be distributed and collected. For instructors, the survey will be taken covering each section taught by the evaluatee. Surveys shall be conducted in such a way that the quantitative data from each section can be tabulated and qualitative data summarized in a manner that protects the confidentiality of the individual student. Students will be informed that the surveys will be seen by the instructor immediately and those students desiring absolute confidentiality need not complete the written part of the surveys but should communicate concerns to the evaluator in private. To ensure objectivity in client surveys, discussion about the instructor or course shall take place after distributing and collecting the surveys. In the case of non-teaching faculty (e.g., counselors, college nurse, librarian, etc.) the evaluator shall ensure that the procedure for client surveys adopted by that department is carried out.

6. Observe the Evaluatee: Each member of the committee will observe the evaluatee in the performance of his/her duties. For instructors, a committee member will visit each section of the evaluatee's classes for at least one class meeting or a minimum of 50 minutes. For large lecture classes that have multiple labs and/or discussion groups, a minimum total of two lab and two discussion sections will be observed. The specific sections to be observed will be selected by the committee. For non-instructional faculty, the evaluatee shall be observed in the performance of a variety of their duties by each member of the committee for a minimum total of 50 minutes.

7. Prepare Evaluation Report: Members other than the evaluatee will prepare a written report which includes:

   a. The probationary/temporary faculty evaluation checklist
   b. A completed faculty Evaluation Summary form with signatures
   c. A compilation of client survey results, including a transcription summary of qualitative client survey data, presented in such a way as to protect the confidentiality of the individual student's response, and an accurate tabulation of quantitative results.
   d. The department chair's and dean's written reports Faculty Responsibilities Checklist, which includes department chair comments and the Dean's Comment Form
   e. Evaluatee's written self-evaluation
   f. A brief summary of the evaluation which includes conclusions and recommendations and a written statement indicating Satisfactory, Needs Improvement or Substandard performance. 8.—If the evaluatee's performance is satisfactory, this will be stated in the written report.
suggestions to enhance satisfactory performance will may be included to assist the evaluatee to achieve even higher levels of performance. In the case of a Satisfactory evaluation, item 10 below does not apply.

g.e. The cover sheet Faculty Evaluation Summary Form with appropriate signatures

Any committee member, including the evaluatee, who dissents from the majority opinion, may file a minority statement. may append an individual statement to the committee report.

40. 8. Make recommendation: For probationary tenure track faculty, the committee report shall also include a recommendation to:

a. Enter into a contract with the faculty member for the following academic year(s) in accordance with district policy 1700

or

b. Not enter into a contract with faculty member for the following academic year(s), including reasons, in accordance with district policy 1700

or

c. Grant tenure, in the fourth year, to the faculty member in accordance with district policy 1700.

If a probationary faculty member's performance is evaluated as needing improvement, the committee may recommend that the district "not enter into a contract for the following academic year(s)." If the evaluatee's performance is evaluated as Substandard, the committee must recommend that the district "not enter into a contract for the following academic year(s)."

42.9. Submit Evaluation Report: The completed evaluation report, including recommendations, shall be submitted to the division dean by the last day of instruction as designated on the college calendar for the semester in which the evaluation is conducted, end of the 12th week of the semester in which it is due.

10. Develop Plan for Improvement

9. If the a probationary evaluatee's performance is evaluated as needing Improvement or Substandard, the committee (including the evaluatee, the department chair and dean) will develop a plan for improvement stating specific actions to be taken, in accordance with the procedures outlined in Appendix E, Section III. The plan for improvement shall include a statement of areas needing improvement (based on the Performance Criteria Guidelines, Appendix E-VI) and the criteria for determining if improvement has occurred. (Not applicable when faculty member has not been recommended for rehire.)

The evaluatee and the evaluation committee chair will sign this plan for improvement. The evaluatee may submit personal reflections on the plan. A copy of the plan will be submitted with the committee's initial evaluation report by the end of the semester in which the evaluation was conducted.
44. C. Re-evaluation of Probationary Contract Faculty with Performance Designated as Needs Improvement:

1. Timeline: When an evaluatee's probationary faculty member's performance has been judged evaluated as Needs Improvement or Substandard on a prior evaluation, re-evaluation shall occur the following semester.

2. Committee Selection: The department chair, in consultation with the division dean, shall form the re-evaluation committee (Not applicable when faculty member has not been recommended for rehire.) The Committee shall consist of the following:
   a. The evaluatee.
   b. Two faculty members from the original evaluation committee, if possible.
      (If not possible, tenured faculty alternates from the evaluatee's field or a closely related discipline will be added to the committee.)
   c. The department chair (if the evaluatee is department chair, an additional tenured faculty from the evaluatee's field or closely related discipline.)
   d. The division Area appropriate dean (or designee).
   e. One tenured faculty peer from the evaluatee's field or a closely related discipline.
   f. One tenured faculty peer from outside the department.

The department chair (or designee) shall serve as chair of the re-evaluation committee. All members, except the evaluatee and division dean, shall have full voting rights.

The re-evaluation committee will base the evaluation will be based on the plan for improvement formulated by the previous committee, and will prepare A written report will be prepared that addresses the original evaluation committee's plan for improvement in addition to the items outlined above in 7a-e of the Procedure for Evaluation of Probationary and Temporary Contract Faculty.

3. Submission of Re-evaluation Report: The completed report, including recommendations, shall be submitted to the appropriate dean by the last day of instruction as designated on the college calendar for the semester in which the re-evaluation is conducted.

A copy of the plan for improvement will be filed with the committee's evaluation report in the current semester of evaluation and will include:
   a. Definition of areas needing improvement.
   b. Specific goals to be achieved.
   c. Suggested means for improvement (which may include a mentor).
   d. Timeline for plan.
   e. Criteria to be used in determining satisfactory performance at the time of the next evaluation (e.g., course materials, client surveys, etc.).

Approved by Board of Trustees, June 27, 1991
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II. PROCEDURE FOR EVALUATION OF TENURED CONTRACT FACULTY

A. Committee Composition:

1. Area deans shall notify the faculty member when their evaluation is due.

2. The committee shall consist of the evaluatee and at least two other tenured certificated persons who have not served on the evaluatee’s two most recent evaluation committees. (These two persons shall hereinafter be referred to as “evaluators.”) One of the two evaluators shall be in the evaluatee’s discipline or in a closely related discipline. The second of the two evaluators shall be from outside the evaluatee’s discipline.

A. Selection of Committee:

1. The committee will be selected by the evaluatee and approved by his/her department chair (or equivalent). In the case of a department chair, the division dean will approve the committee. Committee composition should consist of at least three regular tenured faculty including:
   a. The evaluatee.
   b. At least one peer from the evaluatee’s field or a closely related discipline.
   c. At least one peer from outside the department.
   d. No person (other than the evaluatee) who has served on the two most recent evaluation committees for the individual being evaluated.

2. In the case of disagreement regarding the composition of the committee, the arbitrators will be the President of the Academic Senate, the division dean, and the Vice President of Academic Affairs or the Vice President of Student Affairs.

B. Committee Selection:

1. The evaluatee shall select the first evaluator from his or her discipline. That evaluator shall select the second evaluator. The evaluatee shall be allowed one veto of the second evaluator. In the case of disagreement regarding committee composition after one veto, the evaluatee’s Dean shall arbitrate, and if necessary make the decision.

2. The evaluatee may elect to have up to two additional faculty as committee members, beyond the required minimum. Additional members shall be by unanimous choice of the existing committee.

3. Once the committee has been selected, the evaluatee shall inform the department chair (or when the evaluatee is a department chair, the division dean) of the committee membership.

C. Committee Responsibilities:

1. Plan for Evaluation: Prior to the sixth week of the semester in which the evaluation is taking place, a chair will be selected and a timeline established. The committee will consider the applicability of the paragraphs below when a faculty member who is not a classroom instructor (e.g., counselor, librarian, campus nurse) is to be evaluated, and unanimously determine which paragraphs, if any, are not relevant to the specific situation.

2. Review Course Materials, e.g., syllabi, exams, student records, counseling notes, etc.
3. Obtain Written Comments: Obtain written comments from the evaluatee (self evaluation), and invite written comments from the evaluatee’s department chair and the appropriate dean regarding the individual’s performance of job requirements and fulfillment of departmental and campus responsibilities. The five performance criteria listed in Section 2120 shall be considered: a) expertise in discipline; b) effectiveness in performing job; c) availability to students and colleagues; d) fulfillment of college responsibilities; and e) professional growth.

4. Review Previous Evaluations: Obtain and review copies of the two most recent evaluation reports.

5. Obtain Client Data: Without the evaluatee present, a written client survey will be distributed and collected. For instructors, the survey will be taken in each section taught by the evaluatee. Surveys will be conducted in such a way that the quantitative data from each section can be tabulated. Students will be informed that the surveys will be seen by the instructor immediately and those students desiring absolute confidentiality need not complete the written part of the surveys but should communicate concerns to the evaluator in private.

6. Observe the Evaluatee: Each member of the committee will observe the evaluatee in the performance of his/her duties. For instructors, each committee member will visit the evaluatee’s classes for at least a total of 50 minutes. At least one section of each course taught shall be observed by a committee member. For large lecture classes that have multiple labs and/or discussion groups, at least one lab and one discussion section will be observed in addition to the lecture.

1. Selection of Committee Chair – The evaluation committee shall select a committee member other than the evaluatee to be the chair by the end of the sixth week of the semester in which the evaluation is being conducted. The committee chair shall then be responsible for seeing that the evaluation is carried out in accordance with the procedures stated here (Appendix E-II) and that the final report is forwarded to the department chair (or when the evaluatee is a department chair, the division dean) by the last day of instruction as designated on the college calendar for the semester in which the evaluation is being conducted.

2. Establish Timeline – The committee shall review the mandatory activities listed below in items 3a - 3h and set up a timeline for carrying them out consistent with the two deadlines stated in item C1 above.

3. Conduct Evaluation - The evaluation committee must perform the following activities in conducting the evaluation:

   a. Review the evaluatee’s most recent Faculty Evaluation Report before setting up the timeline for other activities.

   b. Review performance of faculty responsibilities. The committee chair shall request from the evaluatee’s department chair (or in the case of a department chair, the division dean) and present to the committee a completed Faculty Responsibilities Checklist. The committee chair shall also request from the evaluatee’s dean and present to the committee a completed Dean’s Comment Form.
c. Review the evaluatee’s written self-evaluation.

d. Observe the evaluatee – For instructional faculty, each evaluator shall observe the evaluatee in the performance of her/his duties for a minimum of 50 minutes of instruction. For non-instructional faculty, each evaluator shall observe the evaluatee in any number of roles involving direct student contact for a combined total of a minimum of 50 minutes.

e. Conduct a Client Survey – In the case of instructional faculty, ensure that anonymous, written client surveys on the form approved by the evaluatee’s department are conducted in each section of each course (except co-requisite laboratory courses) currently being taught by the evaluatee. The surveys shall be conducted by the evaluators without the evaluatee present. To ensure objectivity in the client surveys, discussion with the class about the instructor or the course shall take place after distributing and collecting the surveys. In the case of non-teaching faculty (e.g., counselors, college nurse, librarians, etc.), the evaluator shall ensure that the procedure for client surveys adopted by the evaluatee’s department is carried out.

Each non-instructional department of the college shall develop a form for surveying clients appropriate to that department’s special function to be used by all faculty members in that department. It is recommended that each department’s (both instructional and non-instructional) client survey form be reviewed by the Academic Policies Committee prior to first-time use by the department.

f. Summarize Client Survey Data - Ensure that quantitative results of the written client surveys are tabulated accurately and that qualitative results are transcribed and presented in such a way as to protect the confidentiality of individual student responses.

g. Additional Components – The evaluatee or the evaluation committee may request additional components to the evaluation, beyond the minimum required in sections 3a - 3f above. Optional activities that might be included are:

- Review of course syllabi, assignments, exams or other materials used by the evaluatee
- Additional observation of the evaluatee in the performance of her/his duties
- Long-term follow-up on clients
- Review of videotaped class sessions conducted by the evaluatee
- Review of feedback from other faculty served by the evaluatee
- Participation by the Dean and/or department chair

h. Complete the Faculty Evaluation Summary Form basing findings on the District Performance Criteria listed in Section 2120 (demonstrates expertise in academic discipline and/or area of assignment; effectiveness in teaching and/or performance of job; availability to students and colleagues; responsibilities to the college community and SBCC’s goals and policies; professional growth). See Appendix E-VI for Performance Criteria Guidelines. Each committee member shall review all evaluation materials before the Faculty Evaluation Summary Form is completed.
The committee shall determine the evaluatee's performance to be "Satisfactory," "Needs Improvement," or "Substandard." If the finding is "Needs Improvement" or "Substandard," the re-evaluation process outlined in Appendix E-III, "Needs Improvement" or Appendix E-IV "Substandard" shall be followed. If there is an impasse, the Academic Senate President (or designee) shall be added to the committee to serve as tie-breaking person.

i. Sign and forward the complete evaluation report (see subsection D below) to the department chair who shall sign in acknowledgment that the evaluation has been completed and forward the report to the appropriate dean. The dean shall then sign in acknowledgment that the evaluation has been completed and forward the report to the Vice-President, who shall be responsible for ensuring that the report is filed with the Office of Human Resources.

D. Submission of Evaluation Report:

The completed evaluation report shall be submitted to the Division Dean not later than the last day of instruction, for the semester in which the evaluation is done.

When the evaluatee's performance is determined to be satisfactory, the Evaluation Report shall consist of the Faculty Evaluation Summary, summaries of the client surveys, the Faculty Responsibilities Checklist, and (at the discretion of the evaluatee) the written self-evaluation and/or the Dean's Comment Form. If the performance of the evaluatee is evaluated as Needs Improvement or Substandard, the written self-evaluation and the Dean's Comment Form shall be included with the final report. No alterations or additions shall be made to the committee's final evaluation report once it has been signed by the committee. The two most recent evaluations shall be kept on file in the Office of Human Resources.

7. Prepare Report: Members other than the evaluatee will prepare a written report which includes:
   a. The tenured contract faculty checklist
   b. Completed faculty evaluation form
   c. A summary of client survey data
   d. The evaluatee's self evaluation
   e. Written comments from the department chair and/or dean (if provided)
   f. The cover sheet with appropriate signatures
   g. Observations that reflect review of the two prior evaluation reports
   h. A brief summary of the evaluation which includes conclusions and recommendations

Any member of the committee, including the evaluatee, may append an individual statement to the committee report.

8. If the evaluatee's performance is satisfactory, this will be stated in the written report. Suggestions to enhance satisfactory performance will be included to assist the evaluatee to achieve even higher levels of performance.

9. If the committee finds a need for substantial improvement, the re-evaluation process outlined in the "Substandard Evaluation" section will be followed. If the committee is unable to reach consensus, it will forward to the Academic Policies Committee for resolution of its report as described in 7 above, along with an explanation of the points of disagreement within the committee.
10. Submission of Report: By the end of the 14th week of the semester in which the evaluation occurs, the signed report will be forwarded to the evaluatee's department chair and dean for signature in acknowledgment that procedure has been followed. Any request for alteration or addition to the committee's report must be submitted to the committee and is subject to their approval. No alterations or additions will be made to the committee's final report after the evaluatee has signed it.

Board of Trustees, October 28, 1982
Revisions Approved by Board of Trustees August 16, 1990; September 1, 1992
III. PROCEDURE FOR RE-EVALUATION OF TENURED CONTRACT FACULTY WITH PERFORMANCE DESIGNATED AS NEEDS IMPROVEMENT

A. Overview:

If the report of the evaluation committee indicates that the faculty member's performance needs improvement, a review of the faculty's progress toward improvement will be completed within two semesters following the initial committee recommendation. Department chairs are responsible for ensuring that the review process is completed on schedule.

B. Development of Plan for Improvement

1. The original evaluation committee, including the evaluatee, in consultation with the department chair (or equivalent) and the dean, will develop a plan for improvement. The evaluatee and the evaluation committee chair will sign this plan for improvement. The evaluatee may submit personal reflections on the plan. A copy of the plan will be submitted with the committee's initial evaluation report by the end of the semester in which the evaluation was conducted. The plan for improvement shall include a statement of areas needing improvement (based on the Performance Criteria Guidelines, Appendix E—VI) and the criteria to be used to determine if improvement has occurred.

2. The committee, evaluatee, department chair and dean will determine:
   • appropriate follow-up, based upon the nature of the improvement recommended,
   • the nature of evidence of improvement,
   • whether a full re-evaluation at the end of the year is necessary.

   For example, if improvement was needed in classroom presentation, student surveys and observation may be required; if improvement was in syllabi or test composition, committee review may be sufficient; for improvement in committee/college participation, statements of improvement from department chair or committee chair may be sufficient.

C. Implementation of the Plan

Not more than two semesters shall be allowed for implementation of the plan, with re-evaluation taking place during the second half of the second semester. The evaluatee or the committee has the option of choosing a mentor faculty member to provide feedback and serve as a resource to the evaluatee during the period of review. If this option is selected, the evaluatee, the committee and the department chair must agree on the mentor.

D. Selection of Committee for Review of Improvement

1. At the beginning of the second semester after the recommendation of Needs Improvement, the department chair (or in the case of the department chair, the Dean) will form the re-evaluation committee. The committee will consist of the following:
   • The evaluatee
   • The two faculty members from the original evaluation committee, if possible,
   • The department chair
   • The appropriate dean (votes only to break a tie)

2. The department chair shall serve as chair of the review committee.
E. Committee Responsibilities

1. Plan for Re-evaluation--At its first meeting, the committee will review the evaluation report from the previous evaluation, the plan for improvement and establish a timeline for re-evaluation. The evaluatee will present a written report to the committee describing progress toward goals outlined in the plan for improvement.

2. Conduct the Re-evaluation--Re-evaluation shall be conducted consistent with procedures outlined in Appendix E-II. At the discretion of the committee, re-evaluation may consist of review of all or selected aspects of the evaluatee's performance.

3. Prepare Report--Members of the committee, other than the evaluatee, will prepare a written report that addresses item B.2 above. All members of the committee will sign the report. Any member of the committee may append an individual statement to the committee report.

4. Make Recommendation--
   a. If improvement has been satisfactory, recommend returning the faculty evaluatee to the regular Faculty Evaluation schedule; the period of Needs Improvement constitutes the first year of the three-year cycle;
   b. If satisfactory progress has been made, but further improvement is still needed, the Needs Improvement time period may be extended one time, for a maximum of one additional year;
   c. If reasonable effort at improvement has not been made, the evaluatee is referred to the Procedure for Re-evaluation of Tenured Contract Faculty who Demonstrate Substandard Performance (Appendix E-IV), where dismissal may be the ultimate recommendation.

5. Submit Report--Report shall be submitted to the faculty member's Vice President by the last day of instruction as designated on the college calendar for the semester in which the re-evaluation is completed.
III.IV PROCEDURE FOR RE-EVALUATION OF TENURED CONTRACT FACULTY REQUIRING SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT WHO DEMONSTRATE SUBSTANDARD PERFORMANCE

A. Overview:
If the report of the evaluation committee indicates that the faculty member's performance is Substandard, states a need for substantial improvement, a re-evaluation will be completed within one year by the end of the following semester. The re-evaluation process will use peer review and be based on a written plan for improvement. Division deans are responsible for ensuring that the re-evaluation process is completed on schedule.

B. Development of Plan for Improvement:
The original evaluation committee, including the evaluatee, in consultation with the department chair (or the equivalent) and dean, will develop a plan for improvement, stating specific actions to be taken. All parties will sign this plan for improvement. The evaluatee may submit his/her reflections on the plan. The committee will file a copy of the plan with the committee's evaluation report by the end of the semester in which the initial evaluation was conducted. The plan for improvement shall include:
1. Definition Identification of areas needing improvement
2. Specific goals to be achieved
3. Suggested means for improvement
4. Timeline for plan
5. Criteria to be used in determining satisfactory performance at the time of re-evaluation (e.g., course materials, client surveys, etc.)

C. Implementation of the Plan:
One-half semester shall be allowed for implementation of the plan by the evaluatee. No formal evaluation will take place during this semester. Re-evaluation shall be completed by the end of that semester. A mentor, mutually agreed upon by the evaluatee and the department chair, will be selected to serve as a resource to the evaluatee. The mentor will provide feedback to the evaluatee but will not participate in formal evaluation procedures.

D. Selection of Committee for Re-Evaluation:
1. At the beginning of the second semester following the evaluation that identified identification of need for substantial improvement Substandard performance, the department chair (or equivalent) in consultation with the dean will form a new evaluation committee. The committee will consist of the following:
   a. The evaluatee (as a non-voting member)
   b. The department chair (if the evaluatee is department chair, an additional faculty member from the evaluatee's field or a closely related discipline)
   c. Two regular tenured faculty members, mutually agreed upon by the evaluatee and the department chair (in the case of a department chair, the dean).
   d. The chair of the Academic Policies Committee (or designee), as a non-voting observer.
   e. The appropriate dean (as a non-voting member)

2. In the case of disagreement regarding the composition of the committee, the arbitrators will be the President of the Academic Senate, the division dean, and the Vice President of Academic Affairs or Vice President of Student Affairs.

3. The department chair shall serve as committee chair.
E. Committee Responsibilities:

1. Initial Meeting—The re-evaluation committee chair will convene the committee not later than the fourth week of the semester following a Substandard recommendation. At its first meeting, the committee will review the summary evaluation report from the previous evaluation and the plan for improvement. It will also establish a timeline for the re-evaluation process, which must be completed by the last day of instruction for that semester. The evaluatee will present a written report to the committee describing progress toward goals outlined in the plan.

2. Review of Materials—The re-evaluation will be conducted using the process described in the Policy and Procedure for Evaluation of Tenured Contract Faculty. (Appendix E-II) In addition, the committee should determine ways to evaluate progress in the areas outlined in the plan for improvement. Development and implementation of the plan for improvement shall be consistent with items B and C above.

3. Preparation of Report—Members of the committee other than the evaluatee will prepare a written report that addresses each of the general evaluation criteria, five performance criteria that were Substandard, with particular emphasis on the specific goals outlined in the evaluatee’s individual plan for improvement. Within the report will be a statement that indicates whether the evaluatee has demonstrated successful performance in all appropriate areas identified in the criteria for evaluation (e.g., expertise in academic discipline, teaching effectiveness/performance of duties, college responsibilities, professional growth, and availability to clients). Any member of the committee may append an individual statement to the committee report.

4. Submission of Report—By the end of the last day of instruction as designated on the college calendar for that semester, 12th week of the semester the committee will submit the completed report to the appropriate dean. A majority of the committee may recommend:
   a. returning the faculty member to the regular rotation for faculty evaluation;
   b. moving the faculty member to the Needs Improvement evaluation procedure;
   c. continuing for a maximum of one additional semester with the Substandard procedure;
   d. dismissal.

If the evaluation is satisfactory, no additional follow-up will be required until the next regularly scheduled evaluation (two years from the re-evaluation). If the evaluation committee determines that substantial improvement has not occurred, a report of Substandard performance will be forwarded to the appropriate vice president for review and action. If b, c, or d above is selected by the committee, the report will be forwarded to the appropriate vice president for administrative review and action. If the committee cannot agree on a conclusion, its report including indications of all points of disagreement will be forwarded to the appropriate vice president for review and action.

Board of Trustees: July 12, 1972
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First revision: March 10, 1977
Second revision: July 13, 1978
Third revision: January 10, 1980
Fourth revision: May 8, 1980
Fifth revision: Approved by Board of Trustees August 16, 1990
IV-V. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION OF HOURLY FACULTY

A. Policy Statement

In Accordance with the provisions of the Education Code Section #87664, which requires the Board in consultation with the faculty to set forth "reasonable but specific standards which it expects its certificated employees to meet in accordance with their duties," the following general professional criteria shall serve as a basis for evaluating all certificated hourly faculty:

1. Expertise in academic discipline and/or area of assignment.
2. Teaching effectiveness and/or performance job
3. Ability to communicate effectively with Availability to students and colleagues, and supervisors

B. Procedures

1. All new hourly faculty shall be observed by the department chairperson or his/her designee (a tenure track faculty member) during the first and second semester of employment.

All continuing hourly faculty shall be observed by the department chairperson or his/her designee (a tenure track faculty member) at least once every four semesters or two years, whichever occurs first.

2. The evaluator shall administer a department approved student survey without the evaluatee present. To ensure objectivity in the client surveys, any discussion with the class about the instructor or the course shall take place after distributing and collecting the surveys. In the case of non teaching faculty (counselors, librarians, the college nurse, etc.), the evaluator shall ensure that the procedure for client surveys adopted by the evaluatee’s department is carried out, and inform the students that the surveys will be seen by the instructor. Those students desiring confidentiality should be advised that they may communicate concerns to the evaluator in private.

3. After the observation, a written summary of the evaluation shall be given to the hourly faculty member. This written evaluation shall reflect:
   a. Results from the student surveys tabulated and transcribed in a manner that protects the confidentiality of the individual student.
   b. Adherence to Criteria 1, 2, and 3 of the Performance Criteria Guidelines (Appendix E-VI). The evaluation report shall be in narrative form; however, if the hourly faculty member has had satisfactory evaluations for the past four years, the Hourly Instructor Evaluation Form may be used in lieu of a narrative report.

4. A copy of the evaluation shall also be submitted to the department chair for review and forwarded to the appropriate dean by the last day of instruction as designated on the college calendar for the semester in which the evaluation is conducted.

C. These evaluation procedures are intended as minimum requirements. A department may impose additional requirements as part of its hourly evaluation procedure.

Approved by the
Academic Senate,
September 21, 1994
Approved by the Board of Trustees, November 10, 1994
VI. PERFORMANCE CRITERIA GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEES:

The following guidelines give a profile of some of the qualities a faculty member ought to demonstrate who falls into one of the three rating categories (Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, Substandard). The guidelines are not all-inclusive - they are meant to provide some examples on which to base committee findings. Interpretation and application of these criterion are within the judgment of the committee, based upon student evaluations, input from observations, and/or review of optional feedback from the area dean or department chair, or other supplemental materials.

Criterion 1: Demonstrates Expertise in Academic Discipline and/or Area of Assignment

Satisfactory: The faculty member consistently:
- Imparts current and accurate discipline-specific knowledge and information to students and colleagues; Communicates information to students, faculty and staff clearly and accurately;
- Maintains currency and depth of knowledge in discipline by participating in professional organizations, conferences, workshops, reading professional journals and engaging in informal discussions with colleagues;
- Develops and maintains an awareness of community/societal applications of knowledge of his/her discipline.

Needs Improvement: Inconsistently meets standards such that a plan for improvement is required.

Substandard: Fails to meet the above standards in such a way that student learning is impaired or the performance of non-teaching duties negatively affects students and dismissal from classroom teaching or job assignment is strongly indicated.

Criterion 2: Effectiveness in Teaching and/or Performance of Job

Satisfactory: The faculty member consistently:
- Prepares course syllabi and other materials for distribution; maintains a lesson plan;
- Has clear course objectives and requirements consistent with department standards; administers and evaluates examinations in a manner consistent with department standards for the course;
- Presents material at appropriate student level of understanding; demonstrates interest in student understanding and mastery of information presented; exams, materials and assignments consistent with the Course of Study Outline.
- Incorporates effective teaching techniques;
- Works to stimulate a spirit of inquiry in students; encourages students to be independent in their learning; shows a positive attitude and respect for student opinions; engages students in the subject matter through sound pedagogy and enthusiasm; encourages student effort;
- Demonstrates fairness in the discussion and evaluation of student work.
- In the case of non-teaching faculty (e.g.: counselors, librarians, DSPS, EOPS, FRC, LSS) additional criteria for evaluating performance of job may be developed by the faculty's department based upon state competencies and Ed. Code regulations appropriate to the discipline.

Needs Improvement: Inconsistently meets standards such that a plan for improvement is required.

Substandard: Fails to meet the above standards in such a way that student learning is impaired or the performance of non-teaching duties negatively affects students and dismissal from classroom teaching or job assignment is strongly indicated.
Criterion 3: Availability to Students and Colleagues:

Satisfactory: The faculty member consistently:
- Establishes and maintains office hours or appointments at reasonable times and within requirements of college policy;
- Makes him/herself available for regularly scheduled committee, division and department meetings that do not conflict with teaching or work assignment;
- Seeks to maintain a collegial atmosphere with staff and other faculty;
- Is receptive and respectful of the needs of individual students and tries to accommodate special circumstances;
- Responds in a timely manner to communication from faculty and staff;

Needs Improvement: Inconsistently meets standards such that a plan for improvement is required.

Substandard: Fails to meet the above standards in such a way that student learning is impaired or the performance of non-teaching duties negatively affects students and dismissal from classroom teaching or job assignment is strongly indicated.

Criterion 4: Responsibilities to the College Community and SBCC’s Goals and Policies:

Satisfactory: The faculty member consistently:
- Meets college deadlines for turning in grades, textbook orders, etc.;
- Demonstrates integrity and respects professional ethics of his/her field; does not use his/her position for private advantage;
- Honors confidential information received in the course of professional duties unless otherwise required by law;
- Responsibly represents the profession or the institution in public discussions; distinguishes between private views and official positions of the college or the department;
- Supports and contributes to the college’s overall mission and goals; participates in department and college planning activities;
- Demonstrates an awareness of and compliance with district policies and procedures;
- Demonstrates an awareness of and sensitivity to the needs of a culturally diverse college community;
- Attends required college activities, e.g.: flex days, in-service days, graduation;
- Makes required reports, e.g.: absences, etc.

Needs Improvement: Inconsistently meets standards such that a plan for improvement is required.

Substandard: Fails to meet the above standards in such a way that student learning is impaired or the performance of non-teaching duties negatively affects students and dismissal from classroom teaching or job assignment is strongly indicated.

Criterion 5: Professional Growth:

Satisfactory: The faculty member consistently:
- Takes advantage, when possible, of educational opportunities such as seminars, workshops, professional conferences, and college-sponsored resources, flex day activities, in-service;
- Evaluates his/her performance on an on-going basis and seeks ways to improve effectiveness;
- Establishes relationships with individuals, businesses, community organizations and educational institutions, as appropriate;
- Participates in curriculum/program modification or development, classroom research and appropriate community activities.

Needs Improvement: Inconsistently meets standards such that a plan for improvement is required.

Substandard: Fails to meet the above standards in such a way that student learning is impaired or the performance of non-teaching duties negatively affects students and dismissal from classroom teaching or job assignment is strongly indicated.
VII. FORMS FOR USE BY EVALUATION COMMITTEES

- Faculty Responsibilities Checklist (Contract Faculty)

- Dean's Comment Form (Contract Faculty)

- Faculty Evaluation Summary Form

- Hourly Faculty Evaluation Form (Attached but not changed)
### SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
### FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES CHECKLIST (CONTRACT FACULTY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Substandard</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. **Responsibilities to Students or Clients:**
   a. Meets class or appointments as scheduled
   b. Keeps posted office hours
   c. Gives final exams as scheduled

2. **Responsibilities to Department**
   a. Participates in usual and reasonable department duties
   b. Attends department/division meetings
   c. Returns text orders on time
   d. Participates in recruitment, selection and orientation of new faculty and staff

3. **Responsibilities to the College:**
   a. Reports personal absences
   b. Serves on college committees
   d. Attends In-Service
   e. Demonstrates awareness of and compliance with district policies and procedures
   f. Participates in evaluation of faculty and/or staff by serving on evaluation committees

4. **To Admissions Department:**
   a. Returns drop and census rosters on time
   b. Returns final grades on time

**DEPARTMENT CHAIR COMMENTS** (optional): Use space below or attach another sheet)
SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE

DEAN’S COMMENT FORM
(for Contract Faculty Evaluation)

Evaluatee: ___________________________  Due Date: ________________

____  No Comments

____  Comments

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

Dean Signature: ___________________________  Due Date: ________________

Reviewed by Committee:  ___________________  Date
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FACULTY EVALUATION SUMMARY (CONTRACT FACULTY)

Evaluatee: ___________________________ Department: ___________________________

Semester/Year: ______  Status: ____ Probationary  ____ Tenured  ____ Temporary

___ Satisfactory with Regard to District Performance Criteria: 1) Expertise in discipline; 2) Effectiveness of Teaching/Performance; 3) Availability to students/colleagues; 4) Responsibilities to SBCC; 5) Professional growth. (Policy #2120, Appendix E–VI)

___ Needs Improvement: Include Plan for Improvement as required by the Procedure for Re-evaluation of Tenured Contract Faculty with Performance Designated as Needs Improvement (Appendix E–III) or Re-evaluation of Probationary Contract Faculty with Performance Designated as Needs Improvement (Appendix E–I–C)

___ Substandard: Include Plan for Improvement as required by the Procedure for Re-evaluation of Tenured Contract Faculty who Demonstrate Substandard Performance (Appendix E–IV)

COMMITTEE:

Evaluatee: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Evaluator: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
(Comm. Chair) Name, Title, Department

Evaluator: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Name, Title, Department

Evaluator: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Name, Title, Department

Received & Forwarded: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Department Chair

Received: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Dean

Received: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Vice President

Received: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Human Resources

Next Evaluation Due: ___________________________
**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE**

**Hourly Instructor Evaluation Form**

Name of Instructor Evaluated ____________________________________________

Department __________________________ Date __________________________

Course(s) Evaluated __________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Consistently 5</th>
<th>Most of the time 4</th>
<th>Usually 3</th>
<th>Some of the time 2</th>
<th>Never 1</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Defines course objectives and requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Distributes current course outlines or syllabi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Defines grading policy at start of course and abides by it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Plans course content on a weekly basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Adheres to teaching plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is punctual in starting class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Conducts class for full class period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Demonstrates knowledge of subject.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Presents material at students' level of understanding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Demonstrates interest in student mastery of course content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Speaks clearly, communicates effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Encourages student participation and questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Demonstrates respect for students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Is available to students during posted office hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Administers tests that are consistent with course objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Returns graded materials promptly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Maintains accurate records of students' grades and attendance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Meets college deadlines (e.g., Admissions Office, Bookstore).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Maintains open communication with dept. chair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks: Positive comments and/or suggestions for improvement (continue on reverse side if necessary).

Signature - Instructor __________________________ Date __________________________

Signature - Department Chair __________________________ Date __________________________

Original: Department File
Copies: 1) Instructor
        2) Division Dean

Signature - Div. Dean, Academic Affairs __________________________ Date __________________________