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Introduction

Chemeketa Community College is a public institution in Oregon’s Mid-Willamette Valley with two campuses and multiple centers serving nearly 50,000 students each year. The four broad areas of study at the College are career and technical education, college transfer courses, lifelong learning, and developmental skill building classes.

College Mission: “Chemeketa Community College values access and diversity which is affirmed by how we care, collaborate, and innovate with each other and the community. We promise to actively support student learning from precollege to transfer or to the workplace and lifelong learning by focusing on student success, quality, and sustainability in all of our practices and by being responsible stewards of our resources.”


Assessment of the Self-Evaluation Report

Chemeketa Community College provided electronic and printed copies of the Self-Evaluation Report, a printed copy of the 2012-2013 Catalog, and a printed copy of the 2013 Winter Class Schedule according to the prescribed schedule. The Self-Evaluation Report was written and organized in a manner that facilitated review by the Evaluator. A set of six appendices provided an element of concise detail that was very helpful. Overall, the material was sufficiently clear and provided a good sense of progress made over the past year regarding Recommendation 1 of the Spring 2012 Year Three Peer-Evaluation Report.
Recommendation 1 of the Spring 2012 Year Three Peer-Evaluation Report

Recommendation 1, Spring 2012: It is recommended that the institution align policies and practices to ensure all faculty are evaluated in a regular, systematic, substantive, and collegial manner at least once within 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)

Faculty at Chemeketa are evaluated in accordance with provisions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between Chemeketa Community College and the Chemeketa Community College Faculty Association (Appendix A of the Self-Evaluation Report). The broad purposes of faculty evaluation outlined in the current CBA are to: (1) identify specific strengths and provide for formalized recognition of staff accomplishments; (2) provide faculty a means for identifying their growth and professional development; (3) identify weaknesses in faculty performance, and eliminate such weakness; (4) identify special circumstances which impede effective instruction; (5) help identify individual and in-service training requirements; and (6) provide continuing documentation for pay and promotional actions or to determine whether a faculty member’s employment should be continued.

In keeping with a spirit of innovation and continuous learning, responding to Recommendation 1 from Spring 2012 has been viewed by the College as an opportunity to review and improve the faculty evaluation process. Initial steps were taken in Summer 2012, including discussions with faculty regarding required changes, surveys of deans regarding their experiences and perspectives, research on best practices and evaluation instruments, and input from human resources staff regarding strengths and challenges. Subsequently, a 17-member college-wide Faculty Evaluation Process Task Force (Appendix B of the Self-Evaluation Report) comprised of deans, faculty, and staff was convened in Fall 2012 to assess the existing process and recommend improvements.

While several overarching principles and goals of the existing faculty evaluation process were deemed by the Task Force to be strengths, the group also noted that some aspects are not clear, consistent, or systematic (e.g., frequency and specificity of evaluations across faculty groups, availability of multiple indices across faculty groups, and different processes with different timelines). These findings, coupled with identification of best practices at other institutions, led the Task Force to recommend revising the College’s faculty evaluation process. Principles, characteristics, timelines, and responsibilities for an improved Faculty Evaluation and Development (FED) system are described in pages 3-5 and appendices C (process and cycle), D
(examples of feedback measures), E (implementation timeline), and F (responsibilities) of the Self-Evaluation Report. Key characteristics include a common cycle for full- and part-time faculty, evaluation and professional development as major components, a single framework for evaluating teaching (or instructional support for nonteaching faculty) and professional responsibilities, a framework that can be adapted to a faculty member’s particular roles and responsibilities, a faculty improvement plan option to be developed jointly by a faculty member and supervisor, and online availability and use.

Development of the FED system began in Winter 2013 and is scheduled to be completed in Summer 2013, with a pilot to commence in Fall 2013. Training, use, and refinement will continue through 2013 and 2014, and the new process will be fully implemented by 2015 in response to Recommendation 1 from Spring 2012. According to the Self-Evaluation Report (page 5), “During the final development and pilot phase, the college will maintain its current faculty evaluation process as the new FED is phased in.”

Concern 1: Except for the sentence quoted directly above, further information was not presented in the Self-Evaluation Report that details the status of faculty evaluation at the College under the current process while a new system is developed and implemented.

Summary

Chemeketa Community College is engaged in developing and implementing a revised faculty evaluation process with the overall goal of achieving a system that is efficient, effective, and meaningful. The new Faculty Evaluation and Development (FED) system is being developed in a collaborative fashion by key stakeholders. The revised process establishes a four-year evaluation cycle for all non-probationary full-time and post-step 5 part-time faculty, with all probationary full-time and pre-step 5 part-time faculty to be evaluated annually for three years prior to non-probationary standing. Parties responsible for various aspects of the FED system have been identified, and there will be an emphasis on training to promote understanding, consistency, and collegiality. Multiple feedback measures are being developed that can be configured to a given faculty member’s roles and responsibilities. The revised process provides for development of faculty improvement plans, when needed, and there will be electronic access to evaluation tools and data. Finally, it is anticipated the new process will be fully implemented by 2015 in response to Recommendation 1 from Spring 2012.
Commendation and Recommendation

Commendation 1: The College is commended for its commitment to improvement and invention as demonstrated by the thoughtful and far-reaching manner in which it is conducting the review and revision of its faculty evaluation process.

Recommendation 1: It is recommended the College complete revisions and fully implement a process that provides for regular, systematic, substantive, and collegial evaluation of all faculty at least once within every five-year period of service; specifies the timeline and criteria by which faculty are evaluated; utilizes 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; contains a provision to address concerns that may emerge between regularly scheduled evaluations; provides for administrative access to all primary evaluation data; and, where areas for improvement are identified, works with the faculty member to develop and implement a plan to address identified areas of concern. (Standard 2.B.6)