ED 420 357   JC 980 306

TITLE   Faculty Evaluation Official Practices.
INSTITUTION   Central Oregon Community Coll., Bend.
PUB DATE   1997-04-28
NOTE   11p.
PUB TYPE   Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Academic Rank (Professional); Administrator Evaluation;
                 Community Colleges; *Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation
                 Methods; Faculty Development; *Faculty Evaluation; *Faculty
                 Promotion; Job Performance; Peer Evaluation; Performance
                 Based Assessment; Professional Development; Student
                 Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Teacher Responsibility;
                 Tenure; Tenured Faculty; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS   Central Oregon Community College

ABSTRACT
         This document provides the official practices for faculty
evaluation at Central Oregon Community College. Presented in outline format,
it begins with the components for evaluation, which are discussed in greater
detail later in the text. It then identifies the categories for evaluation:
performance in primary assignment, professional improvement, service to the
college, and service to the community. The timeline for evaluation is
provided, listing the activities all faculty must perform each year, and the
requirements for the first year, second year, and the year prior to promotion
or tenure review (or every fourth year). Next is a description of components
for evaluation. The following components are described in detail: the
designated evaluator, peer evaluation, administrative evaluation, student
evaluation, and the annual report of activities. Faculty rank is addressed,
including discussions on promotion, eligibility, criteria for promotion, and
descriptions of academic rank, which include instructor, assistant professor,
associate professor, and professor. (Contains a reference regarding the issue
of tenure.) (YKH)

Central Oregon Community College

Faculty Evaluation

Official Practices

Revised April 28, 1997

FACULTY EVALUATION: OFFICIAL PRACTICES

I.   COMPONENTS FOR EVALUATION

    Designated Evaluator
    Peer Evaluation
    Administrative Evaluation
    Student Evaluation
    Annual Report of Activities

II.   CATEGORIES FOR EVALUATION

- Definitions of these criteria can be found under the descriptions of academic rank in Part V.

- For the annual record of the weighting of these categories by the promotion and tenure committees, see Chairmoot minutes on conferencing each spring.

    Performance in Primary Assignment
    Professional Improvement
    Service to the College
    Service to the Community

III.   TIMELINE FOR EVALUATION

A.   EVERY YEAR ALL FACULTY

1.   Student evaluations performed one term in all sections taught.
2.   Faculty member submits Annual Report of Activities to the Vice President via designated evaluator by October 15.
3.   Designated evaluator and faculty member discuss student evaluations, Annual Report of Activities, and review Professional Improvement Plan.

B.   FIRST YEAR

1.   Peer team established.
2.   Designated evaluator meets with faculty member and peer team to establish responsibilities and goals. Faculty member may share his or her goals and request feedback.
3.   Pre-visitation conference between faculty member and evaluator(s).
4.   Class visits and review of class materials.
5.   Post-visitation conference between faculty member and evaluator(s).
6.   Formative feedback submitted to faculty member. (Report not submitted to personnel file.)
7.   Peer team members meet with designated evaluator and faculty member to discuss observations.
8.   Designated evaluator evaluates for rehire.

C.   SECOND YEAR

1.   Designated evaluator meets with faculty member and peer
      team to establish responsibilities and goals. Faculty
      member may share his or her goals and request feedback.
2.   Pre-visitation conference between faculty member and
      evaluator(s).
3.   Class visits and review of class materials.
4.   Post-visitation conference between faculty member and
      evaluator(s).
5.   Peer evaluators' summative reports submitted to faculty
      member.
6.   Designated evaluator provides written evaluation
      including summary of peer evaluation reports. (Reports
      submitted to personnel file.)
7.   Vice President for Instruction class visit (generally in
      the second year).
8.   Vice President for Instruction submits report on visit
      to designated evaluator and faculty member prior to
      submission to personnel file.

D.   YEAR PRIOR TO PROMOTION OR TENURE REVIEW, OR EVERY FOURTH
      YEAR

1.   Designated evaluator meets with faculty member and peer
      team to establish responsibilities and goals. Faculty
      member may share his or her goals and request feedback.
2.   Pre-visitation conference between faculty member and
      evaluator(s).
3.   Class visits and review of class materials.
4.   Post-visitation conference between faculty member and
      evaluator(s).
5.   Summative report submitted to faculty member.
6.   Designated evaluator provides written evaluation
      including summary of peer evaluation reports. (Reports
      submitted to personnel file.)
7.   When a faculty member approaches consideration for the
      rank of full professor, the faculty member and
      designated evaluator jointly decide whether to conduct
      the review in the fourth year or the year prior to
      promotion.

IV.   DESCRIPTION OF COMPONENTS FOR EVALUATION

A.   DESIGNATED EVALUATOR

1.   The designated evaluator is assumed to be the department
      chair, except when an alternative appointment is made by
      the Vice President for Instruction. The designated
      evaluator for a department chair is the Vice President
      for Instruction.

2.   The designated evaluator serves as an evaluator and as
      coordinator and guide of the evaluation process,
      overseeing the work of peer evaluators and tracking the
      schedule of evaluation procedures and requirements.
      Although the designated evaluator coordinates the
      process, individual faculty members are responsible for
      ensuring that their personnel files are complete.

3. The designated evaluator's evaluation may also include reference to professionalism and commitment to the institution.

4. Designated evaluators will be trained in the use of classroom observation techniques, along with the peer evaluators, and designated evaluators will undergo additional group training, by Chairmoot, with the aim of ensuring consistency in the evaluation process.

5. Classroom observations, and/or equivalent observation of performance in non-teaching duties, are negotiated and mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and the designated evaluator.

6. On the Annual Report of Activities provided by the faculty member, the designated evaluator will provide a brief commentary on the year's performance, noting strengths and any areas for improvement. This document should be reviewed with the faculty member, along with student evaluation responses, and be placed in the personnel file.

7. In addition to these annual comments, the designated evaluator provides a full written evaluation, including summaries of the peer evaluator reports, in the second year for new faculty, and after that only in the year prior to promotion or tenure consideration.

B. PEER EVALUATION

1. During the first year of employment, peer teams will be established for a strictly formative purpose. After the first year, all references to peer evaluation refer to summative evaluation.

2. Schedule of Evaluation: Summative peer evaluation will occur in the second year for new faculty, and after that only in the year prior to promotion or tenure consideration. For full professors with tenure, or for others who do not come up for promotion or tenure, summative peer evaluation should take place every fourth year.

3. To promote consistency in evaluation, annual training will be provided in the Fall (at the Annual Retreat) if possible, through the Faculty Development program to those who are working as peer evaluators in that year and to any other faculty members who wish to attend.

4. Make-up Peer Team

    a. Faculty peer evaluators will be selected through consultation among the faculty member, the designated evaluator, and the potential peer evaluator. Peer teams are approved by the Vice President for Instruction.

b. A peer team will be assembled during the first month of the faculty member's contract period.

c. The peer team will consist of the designated evaluator, one member from the faculty member's department or from a related department, and one member from outside the faculty member's department/division.

d. The designated evaluator is responsible for contacting potential peer-team members and requesting their participation on the peer team.

e. Department chairs should keep track of peer team assignments within their departments to ensure that assignments are made fairly among department members.

5. <u>Initial Meeting of Peer Team</u>:

a. The designated evaluator will call an initial meeting among peer team members and the faculty member to discuss peer team responsibilities and establish deadlines.

b. The faculty member is given the opportunity to share individual goals and requests for feedback from the peer evaluators, and to give peer evaluators the opportunity to ask questions and offer suggestions.

6. <u>Classroom Visitations and Review of Materials</u>

a. The number and nature of classroom visitations should be decided upon by the peer team, the designated evaluator, and the faculty member.

b. Each peer team member and the faculty member should arrange a pre-visitation conference to select class meetings for visitation, to discuss specific learning goals for these classes, as well as to continue the dialogue on the relevant background information introduced at the initial meeting.

c. A post-visitation conference should be held promptly (ideally within 48 hours) between the visiting peer team member and the faculty member to debrief on class observations. Follow up visitations and review of additional course materials may be arranged at this point.

d. Peer team members are encouraged to consider classroom materials (syllabi, handouts, assignments, even the faculty member's critiques of student work) in their evaluation.

e. It is important that the peer team serve a mentoring role during the formative evaluation year offering specific, constructive suggestions as well as introducing the faculty member to the procedures and culture of COCC.

6

7. Final Reports:

    a. Formative: Individual feedback should be submitted to the faculty member. Peer teams should meet with the faculty member and designated evaluator to discuss their final observations. At that time, possible concerns for future summative evaluation should be raised. No written report will be submitted to the faculty member's personnel file.

    b. Summative: Peer evaluators should be prepared to write complete, detailed reports to offer positive feedback, to provide guidance for further growth (perhaps by identifying goals for the development of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness), and to document perceived problems.

8. The "Peer Evaluation Guidelines" provides guidelines for peer team meetings, classroom peer evaluation, review of classroom materials, and review of unique teaching situations.

C. ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION

1. The Vice President for Instruction will go through the same training and follow the same methodology as the other evaluators. Vice President or designate reviews all evaluation documents, and under unusual circumstances may conduct an extraordinary evaluation. The Vice President will give reports of his or her class visits, generally made in the second year, to the designated evaluator and the faculty member for review, prior to inclusion in the personnel file.

D. STUDENT EVALUATION

1. Written student evaluations, using a campus-wide standard questionnaire, are to be conducted for every faculty member once every year, including every section being taught by the instructor that term. The Vice President of Instruction has set a benchmark of 80% or better of students in the class, as per the fourth week roster, completing evaluations. Therefore, faculty are urged to distribute evaluations on a day when strong attendance is expected. The instructor has the option of attaching to the summary report alternate "number enrolled" figures with an explanation.

2. The following standard procedures will be used for administering student evaluations:

    a. the instructor leaves the room.
    b. a student volunteer reads a standard statement of explanation and instruction to the class.
    c. forms are sealed in the presence of the class and taken to the department secretary or to a secure place by the student volunteer. (NOTE: only evaluations which are contained in that envelope when the secretary receives it will be processed.)

d. results are not reviewed by anyone, other than the typist who compiles the responses, until after final grades are turned in.

3. The summary sheet will show ratings and student comments and will indicate the percentage of enrolled students completing the questionnaire. The summary sheet is distributed to the Vice President for Instruction (this copy will be forwarded to the personnel file), the Designated Evaluator, and the faculty member.

4. Faculty members and Designated Evaluators should meet annually (perhaps when the Annual Report is discussed and signed) to review and discuss the student evaluation results, including identification of faculty strengths and weaknesses.

E. ANNUAL REPORT OF ACTIVITIES

1. The faculty member has the option of attaching a one-page self-evaluation essay to the annual report, perhaps addressing individual goals achieved during the year, or any weaknesses noted in the file.

2. Such documentation as the faculty member has to support the annual report should be kept by the faculty member until requested by the designated evaluator or the promotion or tenure committees.

3. The faculty member and the designated evaluator should review the Professional Improvement Plan as they review the annual report.

4. The annual report is completed by October 15.

V. **FACULTY RANK**

A. PROMOTION

Central Oregon Community College has used a system of academic rank throughout its history as a means of recognizing the quality of a faculty member's contribution to the College. Considerable effort is undertaken to employ faculty members who are fully qualified in the disciplines, who have the potential for significant personal and professional growth, and who are committed to the goals and philosophy of Central Oregon Community College. Thus, it is expected that faculty members employed at Central Oregon Community College, whatever rank they initially occupy and whatever qualifications they possess on initial employment, will mature as professionals and progress through the ranks to become outstanding faculty members.

B. ELIGIBILITY

Eligibility for promotion should adhere to the following time limits, unless exceptional conditions warrant otherwise:

Instructor: Entry Level

Assistant Professor: A faculty member should be in his/her
third year of service at the rank of instructor at the time
he/she is first eligible for consideration to be promoted to
assistant professor.

Associate Professor: A faculty member should be in his/her
fourth year of service at the rank of assistant professor at
the time he/she is first eligible for consideration to be
promoted to associate professor.

Professor: A faculty member should be in his/her sixth year
of service at the rank of associate professor at the time
he/she is first eligible for consideration to be promoted to
professor.

Note: Persons with significant service of an outstanding nature
at other institutions of higher education, or who display
extraordinary service at Central Oregon Community College, may
be recommended by the President for early advancement to any of
the ranks noted above.

C.   CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

    1.   Performance in Primary Assignment
    2.   Professional Improvement
    3.   Service to the College
    4.   Service to the Community

D.   DESCRIPTION OF ACADEMIC RANK

    Although each rank has specific criteria to be examined
    during promotions deliberations, there are fundamental
    assumptions (most of them obvious) which pertain to all
    faculty and are not grounds for promotion. These are:

    1.   The faculty member satisfactorily performs his/her
          assignment.
    2.   The faculty member is competent is his/her field.
          Competency implies that one keeps current in one's
          field.
    3.   The faculty member acts professionally and ethically.
    4.   The faculty member shares in the extra-teaching
          responsibilities of the College.
    5.   The faculty member shows a willingness to undertake
          appropriate new efforts on behalf of the College and
          his/her professional associates.

INSTRUCTOR

    This rank, the rank at which many faculty are hired, carries
    with it the expectation that points one through five, above,
    are valid.

    In addition to these characteristics common to all faculty
    members, the following criteria are considered necessary to
    the ranks beyond instructor:

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

1. Performance in Primary Assignment: Evidence of above average teaching ability or, in the case of non-teaching faculty, evidence of above average performance in one's assignment. The individual shows regular, significant improvement in the quality of teaching or performance in non teaching assignment. The individual contributes to maintenance and development in his/her curricular or program area.

2. Professional Improvement: The individual steadily pursues a current professional improvement plan. Commitments are being met or exceeded. The individual remains current in the discipline and is progressing toward significantly greater competence.

3. Service to the College: The individual is increasingly involved in college affairs and is an active participant in affairs of the department or division.

4. Service to the Community: The individual demonstrates willingness or promise of meaningful service to the community. Advisory boards, consulting with industry or school districts on curricular matters, and public service in a professional or personal capacity are some examples of such service.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

1. Performance in Primary Assignment: The individual clearly shows continued improvement and refinement of teaching ability or of performance in the primary assignment. The individual has contributed significantly to maintaining and developing the existing curriculum or program area.

2. Professional Improvement: The individual has initiated and actively pursued an approved professional improvement plan. The activities pursued and accomplished are demanding and clearly contribute to the individual's competence and to the goals of the College.

3. Service to the College: The individual is an active participant at the department or division level and frequently makes contributions outside the department.

4. Service to the Community: The individual has demonstrated willingness to provide service to the community especially in the areas of one's professional competence.

PROFESSOR

1. Performance in Primary Assignment: The individual continues to demonstrate regular and significant improvement and refinement of teaching ability or of performance in the primary assignment. The individual

has demonstrated leadership in curricular or program development.

2. <u>Professional Improvement</u>: The individual has a long term record of broad commitment to professional growth. The individual has an exemplary and current plan for professional improvement. The activities are challenging, actively pursued, and clearly contribute to the individual's competence and to the goals of the College.

3. <u>Service to the College</u>: The individual consistently seeks opportunities to be involved in leadership on the campus.

4. <u>Service to the Community</u>: The individual will demonstrate a consistent meaningful service to the community, especially as an expert resource.

VI **Tenure**: Candidates and Chairs are encouraged to refer to the Tenure Committee's Report on Procedures and Practices.

College Affairs 4-28-97

ERIC®

JC 980306

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title:

FACULTY EVALUATION OFFICIAL PRACTICES

Author(s):   Central Oregon Community College committees

Corporate Source:	Publication Date:
Central Oregon Community College	April 28, 1997

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ↑ [X]	Level 2A ↑ [ ]	Level 2B ↑ [ ]
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

Sign here,→ please

Signature: *[signature]*	Printed Name/Position/Title: Louis B. Queary, Vice President Instruction
Organization/Address: Central Oregon Community College 2600 NW College Way, Bend, OR 97701	Telephone: (541) 383-7206 FAX: (541) 317-3071 E-Mail Address: bqueary@cocc.edu Date: July 28, 1998

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

ERIC

088 (Rev. 9/97)
PREVIOUS VERSIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.