

## Article 14 A&B: Comparison of Previous with 2012-13 Pilot

June 6, 2012

#	Item	Previous Article 14A/B	2012-13 Pilot Evaluations
1	Organization of the articles	There was only one article for regular and adjunct faculty; often this required some guesswork as to how the article applied to adjunct faculty members.	There are separate articles for contract and adjunct faculty. Most of the language is exactly the same, except when there are good reasons for differences. A Table of Contents is included. A timeline is included near the beginning. The provisions are arranged chronologically to be easier to navigate. Specialized information and exceptions are at the end.
2	Timeline	Timelines were <b>different</b> for adjunct and regular faculty. Adjunct evaluations were semester or summer based; regular evaluations stretched over an entire academic year and were not final until May. The SA may not discover until May that the evaluation was not done or was incomplete.	Timelines are identical for adjunct and contract faculty. Both are semester based. The Chair will assign contract faculty to either a fall or spring evaluation. If an evaluation is not completed in a timely way, the chair and SA will become aware of that sooner.
3	Evaluee is uncooperative	The previous contract was not always clear on what to do if an evaluee uncooperative, which sometimes delayed the process.	The pilot is clear that the process continues even without evaluee cooperation. If the evaluee fails to submit paperwork, fails to find a mutually agreeable observation time, or refuses to sign the forms, the process still continues.
4	Adjunct probationary evaluations	Adjunct probationary evaluations were in semesters 1 or 2, and then 5. The Chair performed the first probationary evaluation (or identifies a department peer), but after that, the department peer was chosen from the rotation list. In choosing from the rotation list, it was possible that the peer would not have content expertise.	Adjunct probationary evaluations are in semesters 1 or 2, then 3 or 4, <b>and then 5, if necessary. Semester 6 begins to establish "like load."</b> The probationary team consists of a discipline expert, chair, and SA. <b>The chair has the right to observe, and the SA may request to observe.</b> The disciplinary expert assures that content knowledge is evaluated during probation (for example, to evaluate a new adjunct instructor in ceramics, a ceramics instructor could be assigned).
5	Continuing Evaluation Team	The continuing evaluation team consisted of the department chair and departmental peer. SA participated only if requested to do so by evaluee. The evaluee could request an additional faculty peer. Regular evaluations had the option of non-departmental peer, but adjunct faculty members did not. Dean served as both chair and supervising administrator in	The continuing Evaluation Team consists of the departmental peer, department chair, and supervising administrator. There is no option for an additional peer. Regular evaluations have the option of a non-departmental peer but adjunct faculty members do not. Each member of the team performs only one role. Directors in Public Safety, Health Sciences, <b>and Work Experience</b> perform

#	Item	Previous Article 14A/B	2012-13 Pilot Evaluations
		Public Safety, Health Sciences, and Child Development.	the chair role. (DTREC will discuss any others.)
6	Rotation List	Rotation list included adjunct faculty, if the department agrees. Adjunct could evaluate if compensation is pre-approved.	Adjunct faculty will <u>not</u> be included on the rotation list (and compensation is not available). Rotation list may be constructed by department or by discipline.
7	Self-assessment	Self-assessment was required for regular faculty and optional for adjunct faculty.	Regular evaluations require self-assessment, including reflection on SLOs. Adjunct evaluations do <b>not</b> require self-assessment (not an option).
8	"Informal" student evaluations	Regular faculty evaluations required "informal" student feedback, but this was optional for adjunct faculty.	"Informal" student evaluation eliminated.
9	Observation	The peer and the chair had the right to observe. (Note: Due to an inconsistency in the previous contract, a DTREC interpretation said only the peer had the right, not the chair.) Each observer met with evaluatee. Supervising administrator participated only through "Direct Knowledge Report" and could not observe.	The peer and the chair have the right to observe. <b>The SA may request to observe.</b> Each observer meets or <b>confers</b> with evaluatee. Both the chair and the dean can bring to bear knowledge of verified student complaints by participating in the evaluation process.
10	Categories that are evaluated	Regular faculty evaluations included ratings for Student Contact, College Service, and Professional Development. Adjunct evaluations ratings include only Student Contact.	Regular faculty evaluations include four categories – the new one is "other required duties." Adjunct evaluations include only student contact and "other required duties." Other required duties include such things as keeping office hours, regularly checking email, submitting census rosters, and submitting grade rosters in a timely way.
11	Evaluation Ratings	Ratings were "commendable," "satisfactory," and "improvement needed." "Improvement needed" triggered a follow up evaluation.	<b>The rating "commendable" has been eliminated. There are now only three ratings: 1) Satisfactory, 2) Satisfactory with Minor Improvement needed, and 3) Improvement needed.</b>
12	Coordination of evaluation process	Department chair coordinated the process and retains the evaluation file until it is complete.	<b>The Department Chair coordinates evaluations and retains file until it is complete. If a "needs improvement" rating is assigned, the file is passed along to the supervising administrator who meets with evaluatee.</b>
13	Final Report	The <i>Final Report</i> includes ratings in <b>three</b> categories. A narrative is required.	The <i>Final Report</i> includes ratings in four categories. A narrative is <u>not</u> required unless an "improvement needed"

#	Item	Previous Article 14A/B	2012-13 Pilot Evaluations
		The chair rates the evaluatee on College Service and Professional Development.	rating is given in any category. The Chair and the SA agree upon ratings in College Service, Professional Development, and “other required duties,” with disagreement resolved by the team. <b>The chair meets or confers with the evaluatee if all ratings are “satisfactory” or “satisfactory with minor improvement needed.”</b>
14	Final Meeting with Evaluatee	Typically, the department peer is the only observer, and he/she meets with the adjunct or regular faculty member.	The department peer meets <b>or confers</b> with evaluatee if all ratings are satisfactory or better. The Supervising administrator meets with evaluatee if any rating is “needs improvement.”
15	Out-of-cycle evaluation	Additional evaluation triggered by department chair, in consultation with SA.	Out-of-cycle evaluation triggered by mutual agreement of the chair and SA.
16	Follow up evaluation	Follow-up evaluation mirrors the full process.	Follow-up evaluations focus only the category that needs improvement.
17	Team member does not perform their obligation	Currently, if a team member does not perform their obligation, the evaluation is then incomplete.	If a team member does not perform their obligation, he/she could be replaced, and the process should be completed the following semester.
18	Retiree Evaluations	No mention of how this works.	<b>Retiree cycle described in section 14.21, special provisions.</b>

SA = Supervising Administrator

Chair = Elected Department Chair

Disciplinary expert = an evaluator chosen for their expertise; for example a choral instructor could be identified for probationary evaluation of adjunct choral instructors and a Jazz instructor chosen for probationary evaluation of adjunct jazz instructors

Department peer = peer chosen from rotation list

Non-Departmental peer = a peer chosen by lottery from the group of regular faculty who have chosen the non-departmental peer option