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Purpose of Tenure Review

• Improve educational programs
• Assure compliance with district policies and procedures
• Recognize excellence
• Enhance performance and assist with improvement
Evaluation Process

- Team Composition
- Frequency
- Criteria
- Components
- Review of materials
- Conferences
- Results
Team Composition

• Evaluatee

• Administrator
  – Area Dean
  – Director Library/Instructional Services
  – VP Student Services

• Peer
  – appointed by the Academic Senate
  – From discipline or reasonably related discipline
Frequency

- Probationary faculty
- Undergo evaluation process at least once during each year of probation
Criteria—“shall be evaluated”

- Professional Competence
- Professional Conduct
Professional Competence

• Teaching practice and techniques
• Knowledge of the field
• Effective preparation and planning
Professional Conduct

• Adherence to course outline of record
• Observance of district policies
• Collegiality
• Willingness to grow
Criteria—“may be included”

- Additional areas of Professional Competence
- Professional Growth
- Professional Activities

Typically seen at increasing levels in years 2-4
Additional areas of Professional Competence

EXAMPLES

• Curriculum development/revision

• Development/revision of classroom materials

• Timely return of exams and papers
Professional Growth

**EXAMPLES**

- Research in field or in pedagogy
- Publication, editing professional journals, reviewing textbooks
- Participating in professional organizations
Professional Activities

**EXAMPLES**

- Department and college committees
- Academic Senate committees
- Recruitment activities
- Student club advisement
- Community service
Components

• Reports and class materials by evaluatee
  – By October 15

• Worksite Observations
  – By November 15
  – Three classes each by administrator and peer

• Student appraisals
  – By November 15
  – Every class
Review of materials

• Administrator and peer review materials
  – Reports by evaluatee
  – Worksite observation reports
  – Instructional materials
  – Student appraisals
Conferences

• Pre-evaluation conference
• Conference with peer
  – At least twice a semester
• Conference with administrator
  – At least once a semester
• Peer and administrator meet
  – By Dec. 1
• Post evaluation conference
  – By Dec. 10
Results

• Summary Evaluation Report
  – Overall performance rating
    • Years 1-3: Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory
    • Year 4: Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory

  – Recommendation to Tenure Review Committee
    • Renewal or nonrenewal
    • No recommendation given year 3
Results

• If “Needs Improvement” rating given
  – Team must prepare a remediation plan
  – Submitted to Tenure Review Committee
  – Reviewed by Tenure Review Committee
Assistance

• Constructive Criticism
  – Expected

• Counsel and advice for improvement

• Remediation Plan
  – Formal process

• Can be at Evaluation Team level or Tenure Review Committee level or both
Tenure Review Committee

- Composition
- Review Process
- Recommendation Process
Composition

• Vice President for Instruction
• Vice President for Student Services
• Academic Senate President
• Academic Senate Vice President

Or designee
Review Process

• All members read entire packet for each evaluatee
  – All years reviewed
  – Each candidate reviewed

• Complete review for each evaluatee
  – High level of scrutiny
  – Evidence of criteria
Review Process

• Meet and discuss findings
  – Thorough discussions

• Develop recommendations and write recommendation summaries
  – Documentation of findings
Recommendation Process

—Recommendation to Board of Trustees

• Enter into next contract or not

• No recommendation given year 3

Why not in year 3?
Recall...

• At end of first year
  – Renewal of appointment for year 2
• At end of second year
  – Renewal of appointment for years 3 and 4
• At end of third year
  – No Board of Trustee action
  – Appointment in effect for years 3 and 4
• At end of fourth year
  – Decision to grant tenure or not
Recommendation Process

• For evaluatees in years 1 or 2
  – Enter into next contract
  – Do not enter into next contract
  – May recommend tenure at end of year 2
Recommendation Process

• For evaluatees in year 3
  – No recommendation
Recommendation Process

• For evaluatees in year 4
  – Employ as tenured faculty for all subsequent years
  – Do not enter into next contract
Recommendation Process

• TRC Recommendations forwarded to President

• President recommends to the Board of Trustees
Prior to March 15th

- Board action
- District contacts to report status
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