Response to Recommendation - Year Three Evaluation

Recommendation #1 – Year Three Evaluation Report

It is recommended that the institution align policies and practices to ensure all faculty are evaluated in a regular, systematic, substantive way, and collegial manner at least once every five-year period of service. The evaluation process must specify the timeline and criteria by which faculty are evaluated; utilize multiple indices of effectiveness, each of which is directly related to the faculty member’s roles and responsibilities, including evidence of teaching effectiveness for faculty with teaching responsibilities; contain a provision to address concerns that may emerge between regularly scheduled evaluations; and provide for administrative access to all primary evaluation data (Standard 2.B.6)

Executive Summary

The following paragraphs describe Chemeketa Community College’s response to Recommendation #1 from the Year Three Evaluation Report regarding Criterion B.2.6 from Standard Two. Responding to the recommendation provided an excellent opportunity for Chemeketa faculty and administrators to review and improve the entire faculty evaluation process, thus reflecting Chemeketa’s commitment to innovation and continuous learning within the organization. The findings of a college-wide task force and its proposal for process improvements is outlined below.

Response to the Recommendation

Background

In Chemeketa’s response to criterion 2.B.6 in its Year Three Self-Evaluation Report (p. 54), it was noted that faculty were evaluated consistent with the faculty collective bargaining agreement (See Appendix A – Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement). The goals of this agreement include: (a) identification of specific strengths and areas of improvement; (b) provision for growth and professional development; and (c) verification for pay and/or continuation of employment. The report further noted:

- **Frequency of evaluations**: Specific evaluation timeframes and tools did exist and were used, but distinctions existed in the frequency of evaluations and specificity of timeframes, depending upon the type of faculty position (full vs. part time) and status level (probationary vs. regular).
- **Evaluation tools**: Multiple indices of evaluation were identified for all faculty and evaluation tools were readily available to faculty online through the Opportunity Center for Teaching and Learning.
- **Criteria**: Upon hire, all faculty received a written job description and access to guidelines for evaluation, along with a Faculty Handbook.
- **Timelines**: The Faculty Bargaining Agreement contained specific deadlines for evaluations for full time faculty.
- **Faculty Improvement Plans**: This option existed for supervisor and faculty to jointly develop a continuous improvement plan, the terms of which needed to be met within 60 days.
Redesign Process

In addressing the recommendation cited in the Three Year Self Evaluation Report, the College took the opportunity to examine the entire faculty evaluation process, identify its strengths, challenges, and gaps, and develop guiding principles and a plan for system improvement. The overall goal was to create a process that was efficient, effective, and meaningful. Thus, the College chose to address both the content and procedural steps of the faculty evaluation process.

Early Data Collection

The process to respond to the recommendation began in Summer 2012. Discussions regarding required changes in the faculty evaluation were discussed with the faculty in contract management. Chemeketa’s Director of Assessment collected data from the College’s deans through an electronic survey regarding their experiences and perspectives on the existing faculty evaluation process. Research on best practices and evaluation instruments was conducted and compiled. This initial data collection provided valuable information about use and effectiveness of that process. Human Resource personnel gave input into the strengths and challenges of Chemeketa’s system particularly with regard to collecting evaluations during a three-year cycle, determining faculty evaluation timelines, and updating supervisor lists.

Convening of Task Force

In the fall of 2012, Dr. Susan Murray, Executive Dean for Academic Advancement, invited faculty and deans from across the four divisions as well as Human Resources representatives to join a task force to examine the faculty evaluation process. This broad representation allowed for the presentation of multiple perspectives and information from a variety of sources regarding the existing system. The members of the Faculty Evaluation Task Force (listed in Appendix B) began their work in Fall 2012.

Task force goals

The College saw the need to develop a response to the recommendation as an opportunity to examine the entire faculty evaluation process, identify its strengths, challenges, and gaps, and develop guiding principles and a plan for improvement. The overall goal was to develop a system that was efficient, effective, and meaningful.

Task force analysis

Task force members reviewed the recommendation and information was shared about the existing evaluation process in order to build a common knowledge base. These conversations focused on identifying procedures and content that worked well, as well as problems or challenges. Identified strengths in the faculty evaluation process are listed on page 1 of this document and also include the self-evaluation component, the opportunity for congenial discussions between faculty and supervisors regarding goals and measures, and the link between faculty evaluation and professional development support through Chemeketa’s Opportunity Center for Teaching and Learning.
With regard to challenges, the task force noted that, although the existing faculty evaluation process contained guiding principles and goals, it lacked clarity and consistency regarding frequency and specificity of evaluations across all faculty groups. As noted in the Commission evaluation report, it was also neither systematic nor consistent in the availability of multiple indices for evaluation across the faculty groups. The option of two different evaluation processes with different timelines proved confusing for faculty and supervisors when filing final evaluation results. For example, under the existing three-year cycle for full time faculty evaluations, documentation was often filed at the end of the cycle rather than at several points throughout the three years.

Simultaneous to the group’s analysis, several task force members identified promising practices at other institutions. Information compiled from internal surveys and research on systems was reviewed and informed the design of the new system. The results comprise the essential components of an improved process that has been renamed Faculty Evaluation and Development (FED).

**Recommendations**

The task force recommended redesigning the faculty evaluation process and developed the broad outline and essential components of an improved process. The basic principles, essential elements, and overall proposed process are outlined below.

**Basic principles of revised process**

In building on the strengths of the existing system, the task force agreed that the improved process should:

- be learning-centered;
- promote meaningful feedback;
- use multiple indices of teaching and work effectiveness, including student evaluations;
- create continuous communication amongst faculty/colleagues/supervisor;
- support the growth and future development of the faculty and administration;
- operate within a clear framework, supported by training at all levels;
- be systematic and consistent across all faculty groups; and
- define and specify roles and responsibilities.

In order to incorporate these principles, the task force agreed that the following elements were to be components of the improved process:

- A four-year evaluation cycle for every full time and part time faculty member
- Multiple indices of teaching and work effectiveness available throughout the performance period, including the use of student feedback
- Multiple opportunities for self-assessment
- The setting of identified goals, based on discussions with supervisor, to enhance learning
- Collected and documented evidence of evaluation information, recorded yearly
• A procedure for identifying problem areas during off-cycle evaluation periods and for a supervisor and faculty to develop a plan for improvement
• A clear process for individual faculty members as well as their supervisors to access computerized evaluation data.
• A structured yearly evaluation cycle for the first three years for probationary faculty with class observation, student feedback and syllabi/materials review required.
• Professional development opportunities to support growth in teaching and learning, in the achievement of degree or certification qualifications, and in areas identified as important to the College’s mission and core values

Task force members agreed that three additional quality control elements were to be included as part of the faculty evaluation process: (a) training for faculty and administrators regarding the enhanced process and its appropriate use, (b) an oversight advisory committee, comprised of faculty, administration, and Human Resources representatives to oversee the implementation and use of the improved process, and (c) an evaluation component to regularly ensure that the process is achieving its objectives and addressing the needs involved in faculty evaluation.

**Characteristics of revised process**

The revised faculty evaluation process outlines a four-year cycle for both full time and part time faculty. A key characteristic of the revised process is that evaluation and professional development are major components throughout the process, but are addressed separately. A single framework will be used to evaluate the two major faculty responsibilities of teaching (or instructional support for nonteaching faculty) and professional responsibilities. The framework will be modified at several key points to tailor the evaluation to the particular individual’s roles and responsibilities. Choices regarding key points, including status level, evaluation year, evaluation tools chosen, etc., will be available through drop-down menus. The framework includes an option for a faculty improvement plan to be jointly developed by the faculty member and the supervisor. The framework outline will be available and completed online. Completed frameworks and evaluation instruments will be available online to individual faculty and his or her respective supervisor. Guidelines and examples (such as evaluation tools) will be available in a separate online document and in the Faculty Handbook. An outline of the revised faculty evaluation process and suggested feedback measures are presented in Appendices C and D.

The use of one framework reflects LEAN process goals of simplification, clarity, and reduction of duplication. The concept of using one framework also reinforces the concept of evaluation for all faculty in a systematic, clearly presented process.

**Timeline for implementation**

The revised process will be implemented during 2013 and 2014 and will be in use by 2015 in full response to Recommendation #1. Prior to its implementation, focus groups of faculty and administrators will conduct a quality review of the draft process and their feedback will be incorporated into the final version of the revised process. The timeline for implementation of the revised process is
presented more specifically in Appendix E. During the final development and pilot phase, the college will maintain its current faculty evaluation process as the new FED is phased in.

Conclusion

The development of the revised process and the process itself reflects the Chemeketa value of innovation through reflection, analysis, and creativity. Innovation is necessary for organizations to be able to respond appropriately to those they serve and to adapt to the outside environment. It is accomplished through the capacity of an organization’s members for continuous learning. Senge defined a learning organization as “a place where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire...where people are continually learning to act together” (Senge, 1990, p. 3). Watkins and Marsick noted six action imperatives for learning organizations; these included continuous learning opportunities, inquiry and dialogue, and the establishment of systems to capture and share learning (Watkins & Marsick, 1993). The proposed revised process incorporates these imperatives.

The proposed revised Chemeketa faculty evaluation process specifically addresses the elements of Recommendation #1. The revised process is systematic in that all faculty will be evaluated according to a regular schedule with specific timelines and criteria; both faculty and administrators will be trained in its use and in the expectation that it be consistently used. Responsibilities across the college for the process are illustrated in Appendix F. The process has been developed in a collegial manner, through open discussions and exchange of ideas between faculty representatives and administrators. A key expectation in the training for faculty and administrators on the use of the process will be that it be conducted in a collegial manner and will include opportunities for collegial input. All faculty be evaluated; the frequency will depend on their status and length of service, but will occur at least once every four years. The framework used for each evaluation will be modified to specifically address the individual’s roles and responsibilities. The process contains a provision to address concerns that may emerge between regularly scheduled evaluations. Finally, the revised process, because it will be utilized online, will provide administrative access to primary evaluation data.
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Appendix A

Excerpt from the Collective Bargaining Agreement between Chemeketa Community College and Chemeketa Community College Faculty Association.

ARTICLE 10—FACULTY MEMBER EVALUATION

A. PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

Both the College and the Association agree that the purpose of evaluation at Chemeketa Community College will be the improvement of instruction and:

1. To identify specific strengths and provide for formalized recognition of staff accomplishments;
2. To provide faculty a means for identifying their growth and professional development;
3. To identify weaknesses in faculty performance, and eliminate such weakness;
4. To identify special circumstances which impede effective instruction;
5. To help identify individual and in-service training requirements;
6. To provide continuing documentation for pay and promotional actions or to determine whether a faculty member’s employment should be continued.

B. EVALUATION METHODS FOR FULL-TIME FACULTY

Nothing in this Section shall be construed to limit the evaluative methods that may be used, or to prevent individual departments from developing independent methods so long as they are consistent with the purposes defined in Section A of this Article. All full-time faculty shall be given written notice setting forth which methods are to be used prior to the time data for evaluation purposes is gathered. Video cameras used for public safety shall not be used for performance-related evaluations.

C. DEADLINE FOR RECOMMENDATIONS OF FULL-TIME FACULTY

Recommendations for continuing employment, salary placement, or promotional action, any or all of which may include an evaluation, as specified in Article 23, shall be in writing and shall be completed in accordance with the provisions of Article 23.

D. STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION

To assist faculty in identifying their professional strengths and weaknesses, students and peers will be encouraged to evaluate faculty. These evaluations may be used as a means of identifying strengths or weaknesses in performance and to trigger further evaluation and corrective action.
when appropriate, but shall not be used in any proceeding which involves disciplinary action, termination, or non-renewal of full-time faculty. Copies of these evaluations shall be made available to the faculty member.

E. RESPONSE TO EVALUATION

The faculty member shall be provided a written copy of every official evaluation, and shall be afforded the opportunity to respond in writing to any evaluations made. If the faculty member chooses to respond, then the response will be attached to the evaluation and placed in the personnel file.

F. PROBATIONARY FULL-TIME FACULTY EVALUATION

1. The probationary faculty member shall be provided a written job description, and access to guidelines for his/her evaluations and a fulltime faculty handbook as early as possible during the first term of his/her employment.

2. The faculty member shall be evaluated at least once during each of the three years of probation. A faculty member can request up to two (2) additional evaluations during the first probationary period. In cases where probation is extended, there shall be one (1) additional evaluation during the additional three (3) terms.

3. Evaluations shall be in writing, identifying areas in which the immediate administrator notes that improvement is required, specifying performance objectives in such areas. The performance objectives to be improved are noted on the evaluation form.

G. REGULAR STATUS FULL-TIME FACULTY EVALUATION

1. A regular status faculty member may be evaluated when the College determines to do so. These evaluations will be done in accordance with accreditation guidelines. If the College determines not to evaluate a regular status faculty member for any reason, the lack of a formal evaluation shall not be used to justify denial of an increment or to support disciplinary action, termination, or nonrenewal.

2. An early warning notice of performance concern(s) shall be given orally or in writing to a faculty member when it comes to the attention of the faculty member’s immediate supervisor.

H. IMPROVEMENT PLAN—FULL-TIME FACULTY

A regular or grant status full-time faculty member receiving a “Need for Improvement” rating on an evaluation shall be offered an opportunity to become more effective through an Improvement Plan. The association will also be sent a copy of any Improvement Plan to help assist the faculty member. Further, the faculty member shall have the right to representation, upon request, at any and all meetings called by the College concerning an Improvement Plan. The faculty member shall arrange for representation so that meetings regarding the plan shall not be unreasonably delayed.
1. The faculty member’s immediate supervisor shall hold a conference at which time the faculty member will be given a written improvement plan and will be allowed an opportunity to review the plan with the supervisor. The following applies to the improvement plan:

   a. Each area in which a “Need for Improvement” is identified on the performance rating will be considered in developing the Improvement Plan. A timeline will also be included.

   b. The following are some methods which may be utilized in implementing the Improvement Plan. This list is not intended to be exclusive.

      i. Consultation with colleagues for purposes of assistance in problem areas.

      ii. Reassignment of duties to facilitate improvement.

      iii. Additional training or course work.

      iv. Personal counseling.

      v. Support and direction by immediate supervisors.

      vi. Consultation with the Opportunity Center.

   c. The faculty member’s right to confidentiality shall be maintained.

   d. Improvement plans shall include at least the five sections below with each section containing clearly stated item(s).

      i. Standard(s) and/or deficiency(ies).

      ii. Expectation(s) for each standard.

      iii. How satisfactory achievement of each standard will be determined.

      iv. Suggestion(s) for achieving each standard.

      v. Monitoring, assistance, and feedback to be provided by the supervisor.

2. The faculty member will be given sixty (60) calendar days to meet the expected level of performance. This period may be extended by mutual consent in thirty (30) day increments to a maximum of one hundred twenty (120) calendar days extension, for a total maximum of one hundred eighty (180) calendar days. The March 15 date for “Notice of Employment” or nonrenewal shall be extended until the end of the plan.

3. Normally, plan(s) would be extended to coincide with the end of a regular academic term. Whenever four (4) or more areas of performance needing improvement, the college may prioritize the plan into two sequential parts. Satisfactory progress, or completion, of part one will then lead to part two. In this case, each part will have its own timelines subject to section
10.H.2. Both parts of the plan must be satisfactorily completed. Unsatisfactory progress or completion of part one will lead to section 10.H.5.

4. If, at the conclusion of the improvement plan, the faculty member has met or exceeded the level of performance outlined in Section 10.H.1, the immediate supervisor will notify the faculty member and the plan of improvement shall be discontinued.

5. Faculty members who fail to meet the expected level of performance may be terminated or non-renewed as provided in Article 12.A.10.

I. GRANT STATUS FULL-TIME FACULTY EVALUATION

1. During the first three years of employment in a grant funded program, a grant status faculty member shall be evaluated on the same basis as a probationary faculty member.

2. In subsequent years such a faculty member shall be evaluated when the College determines to do so. These evaluations will be done in accordance with accreditation guidelines.

J. PART-TIME FACULTY EVALUATION

1. A part-time faculty member may be evaluated when the College determines to do so. These evaluations will be done in accordance with accreditation guidelines. If evaluated, the faculty member will be provided an opportunity to respond. Both the evaluation and the response will be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file. The College agrees not to place an evaluation in a faculty member’s personnel file without providing him/her an opportunity to review and sign the evaluation.

2. To assist faculty in identifying their professional strengths and weaknesses, students and peers will be encouraged to evaluate faculty. Copies of these evaluations shall be made available to the faculty member.

3. Video cameras used for public safety shall not be used for performance related evaluations.

4. To assist experienced part-time faculty in evaluating and improving their instructional performance and to assist such faculty in assessing their qualifications for potential full-time faculty positions, the College agrees to the following procedures.

   a. Upon written request to his/her immediate supervisor, a faculty member in good standing who is currently on Step 5 or above on the salary schedule shall be formally observed and evaluated annually.

   b. In a timely manner following the evaluation, the immediate supervisor shall meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her performance and if requested, discuss the faculty member’s qualifications and prospects for potential employment as full-time faculty.

5. Part-time faculty on Step 4 will be evaluated, and must receive a satisfactory or higher rating, prior to the College moving them to Step 5. (NOTE: All other criteria for step movement will
Student evaluations may be used as a part of the part-time faculty evaluation. A part-time faculty member who receives a less than satisfactory evaluation may have the opportunity to advance to Step 5 in the following year if a satisfactory or higher evaluation is received.

6. If the College determines to not evaluate a part time faculty member for any reason, the lack of a formal evaluation shall not be used as the sole reason to deny a salary increment or to support disciplinary action. Conversely, the lack of a formal evaluation shall not nullify or restrict the College’s right to take disciplinary action.

7. Part-time Faculty Performing Below Expectations

Faculty members who do not perform up to the College’s expectation will be notified in writing and given a chance to improve before termination. The following procedure will be followed to provide an opportunity for the faculty member to improve their performance:

i. supervisor will meet with the faculty member;

ii. expectations will be outlined in that meeting;

iii. a timeframe shall be given for improvement;

iv. a notice of outcome shall be given at the end of the timeframe.

A faculty member may grieve only the misapplication of this procedure. Faculty members who do not improve sufficiently may be terminated. (See Article 12.B.)
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Faculty Evaluation Process Task Force Members

1. Dr. Susan Murray, Executive Dean of Academic Advancement
2. David Hallett, Executive Dean of General Education and Transfer Studies
3. Johnny Mack, Executive Dean of Career and Technical Education
4. Kellie Schellenberg, Dean of Distance Education and Academic Technology
5. Don Brase, Dean of Humanities and Communication
6. Deborah Sipe, Dean of Teaching and Learning
7. Dr. Dorothy Moore, Director of Assessment
8. Alice Sprague, Assistant Director of Human Resources
9. Patricia Antoine, faculty member Social Sciences
10. Lori Clark, faculty member Health and PE
11. Michele Burke, faculty member –librarian
12. Robin Gilley-Post Secondary Remedial faculty
13. Paula Lisoff, Executive Assistant to the Dean-Academic Advancement
14. Myra Adams-Part time Faculty
15. Bran Branalather Bond Part time Faculty
16. Karl Meiner- Early College Faculty
17. Gregg Lander, CTE Instructor
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Full Time and Part Time (Post Step 5) Faculty Evaluation & Development (FED)

Process and Cycle: Final Draft

Fall --Evaluation Year 1

Step 1 Self-Assessment:
- Reflect on teaching/professional effectiveness areas
- Reflect on contributions to the department, college and student community
- Identify targets for professional development
- Review assessment indicators/indices to measure outcomes (must include syllabus, materials review, student evaluations and class observation for probationary faculty)

Step 2 Meeting with Supervisor:
- Discuss areas of teaching/professional effectiveness, targets and measures
- Determine methods of evaluation (must include multiple indices)
- Complete form on line as to outcomes, agreements, evaluation tools and timelines
- Evaluation Tools will be available on line in a drop down menu with the ability to attach narrative elements, add specific information to customize the evaluation agreements and provide narrative space.

Step 3 Complete Agreed Upon Evaluation Activities
- Discuss outcomes and feedback from data collection
- Identify next step goals for professional development
- Develop an improvement plan if needed
- Develop next year cycle teaching and professional effectiveness goals/methods and assessments
- Complete activities
- Spring-File Year 1 Report

Year 2 & 3 Fall --Revise teaching effectiveness and professional effectiveness goals/measures and assessments if necessary and note on report
- Document progress on identified goals, professional contributions, teaching effectives.
- Discuss with supervisor
- File interim reports

Year 4 Fall --Meet with supervisor to review four year report

File final evaluation
- Begin new cycle
- Self-assessment
- Goal, measures, methods
• Discussion with supervisor
• Complete activities
• File interim report in spring, yr 2 & 3

**Probationary Faculty and pre-step 5 Part Time Faculty**

- Will be evaluated one time per year in the first three years of employment prior to transitioning to non-probationary faculty status
- Evaluation will include a review of syllabi and instructional materials, student evaluation information and at least one class observation
- Feedback from colleagues will be encouraged

Evaluation tools will be the same as used by full time non-probationary faculty and the process will include:

**Step 1  Self-Assessment:**
- Reflect on teaching/professional effectiveness areas
- Reflect on contributions to the department, college and student community
- Identify targets for professional development
- Review assessment indicators/indices to measure outcomes (must include syllabus, materials review, student evaluations and class observation)

**Step 2  Meeting with Supervisor:**
- Discuss areas of teaching/professional effectiveness, targets and measures
- Determine methods of evaluation (must include multiple indices)
- Complete form on line as to outcomes, agreements, evaluation tools and timelines
- Evaluation Tools will be available on line in a drop down menu with the ability to attach narrative elements, add specific information to customize the evaluation agreements and provide narrative space.

**Step 3  Complete Agreed Upon Evaluation Activities**
- Discuss outcomes and feedback from data collection
- Identify next step goals for professional development
- Develop an improvement plan if needed
- Develop next year cycle teaching and professional effectiveness goals/methods and assessments
- Complete activities
- Spring-File Year 1 Report
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Examples of Feedback Measures---Draft

**Full-time Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Effectiveness</th>
<th>Service to the College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class observation</td>
<td>Committee and task force work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student feedback</td>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague feedback</td>
<td>Special department or college assignment completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videotape analysis</td>
<td>Presentation at conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test measures</td>
<td>Letters of commendation from community work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program assessment outcomes</td>
<td>Academic advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus and materials review</td>
<td>Participation on advisory groups or state wide committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training effectiveness feedback (nonteaching faculty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional service activities outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(nonteaching faculty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relevant measures:</td>
<td>Other relevant measures:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professional Development to enhance instructional skill and content area expertise**

| Education and training                          | Other areas of contribution                                                            |
| Other relevant measures:                        |                                                                                        |

**Part-time Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Effectiveness</th>
<th>Other Areas of Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus and materials review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videotape analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program assessment outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus and materials review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional service activities outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(nonteaching faculty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Faculty Evaluation and Development System Implementation Timeline--Draft

Summer 2012
- Research and review promising practices
- Conduct survey and gather feedback from instructional supervisory personnel
- Review HR system, supervisory lists and current reporting practices
- Review accessibility of tools, reports

Fall 2012
- Convene Task Force comprised of a broad base of faculty, supervisors and HR staff
- Analyze the current systems and determine strengths and weaknesses
- Determine the desired outcomes, guiding principles and goals that could be applied to all faculty groups including probationary faculty, part time faculty pre step 5, full time faculty and part time faculty from multiple locations and with varied teaching assignments and non-teaching faculty
- Collect and share additional promising practices from other institutions and review research and survey information
- Identify gaps in Chemeketa’s system

Winter 2013
- Began redesign work in sub groups
- Research and review options for collecting student course evaluation data to provide quarterly summaries to supervisors and faculty
- Redesign timelines, process to ensure faculty will be evaluated on a four-year cycle
- Revise evaluation tools to reflect Chemeketa’s LEAN process goals of simplification, clarity and reduction of duplication including the Self Assessment, Class Observation forms and add a tool specifically for evaluation of non-teaching faculty
- Work with HR on redesigning supervisory lists, collection of initial evaluation agreements, yearly updates, and final reports in an electronic format accessible to supervisors and faculty
- Work with Instructional Technology department in facilitating faculty evaluation systems in HR
- Obtain budget support for FED system implementation

Spring 2013
- Continue Task Force sub-committee work
- Share Task Force work with focus groups campus wide
- Design trainings for administration and faculty
- Finalize work for implementation of the pilot Fall 2013
- Hire a consultant to redesign student evaluation questions to ensure instrument validity
Summer 2013
• Complete sub-committee redesign work
• Conduct trainings for administration on supervisory expectations, tools and process
• Prepare for new faculty trainings
• Update new forms on the Opportunity Center website

Fall 2013
• Conduct faculty trainings during college in-service
• Begin new process for probationary faculty, part time faculty pre step 5, faculty who completed their evaluation cycle from the previous year
• Convene the FED oversight group
• Begin training cycles for new part time faculty
• Implement electronic student evaluation system

Winter and Spring 2014
• Survey administration and faculty who have used the new FED system
• Review feedback and make system improvements
• Continue cycle of training for new faculty and administration

Academic Year 2014-15
• Continue process of system review
• Review feedback and make system improvements
• Continue cycle of training for new faculty and administration
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Draft

Human Resource System Responsibilities: Faculty Evaluation and Development
Human resources will send notification to supervisors regarding the following information within the faculty evaluation cycles will provide reports accessible to faculty and evaluators within the Chemeketa electronic system:

- Faculty status: Probationary full time, Non-probationary full time; Pre step 5 part time
- Updated supervisor information including multiple supervisor information for faculty teaching at multiple locations
- Evaluation Cycle status of a full or part time faculty member
- Dropdown faculty Evaluation tools to be updated throughout the four year cycle
- Documentation of Final reports in the FED cycle
- Provide student course evaluation data

Opportunity Center for Teaching and Learning Responsibilities: Faculty Evaluation and Development

- Provide training for faculty on the faculty evaluation process, tools and cycle
- Provide professional development opportunities
- Provide syllabus and materials review assistance
- Schedule FED system review and convene the oversight committee for system improvement
- Provide professional development feedback: The GIFT/Colleague review

Administrative Team: Faculty Evaluation

- Provide training on supervisory skills, use of the FED system, classroom evaluation and customizing evaluation tools and accessing report cycle/supervisory information
- Participate on the FED system oversight committee