

Policy 4.1 Faculty Evaluation

As stated in Standard Four, the effectiveness and quality of an institution's total educational program depend upon the presence of a competent faculty. Further, it is the institution's obligation, in consultation with the faculty, to evaluate the performance of its faculty members and to provide for their development on a continuing basis.

Standard Four also calls for faculty members to be safeguarded in their exercise of academic freedom. The protection of academic freedom does not lessen the need for performance evaluation of temporary or permanent members of the faculty to ensure, on a continuing basis, the effectiveness and quality of those individuals responsible for the academic program. This ongoing evaluation may take several forms, in accordance with the size, complexity, and mission of the institution, including, for example, annual merit salary evaluations of a significant nature, promotions, and/or tenure reviews, periodic post-tenure reviews, or reviews conducted in response to some institutional need. The requirement of this policy is that the accredited institution shall conduct a comprehensive evaluation of each faculty member in a regular and systematic manner at least once within each five-year

4.1.A -- Institutions develop collegially and implement internal plans and procedures that specify the process and criteria by which faculty members are evaluated on a continuing basis.

The internal evaluation plans and procedures for TMCC's full-time faculty were developed during negotiations between the college's bargaining unit – the NFA – the Faculty Senate, and the college administration. The most recent negotiations were finalized in the spring of 2003, and the evaluation procedure is outlined in Article 7 of that contract (Appendix ?). The plans and procedures for the evaluation of part-time faculty were a part of this negotiation process as well. In addition, non-instructional faculty in counseling and the TMCC libraries participated in the creation of modified performance criteria for their areas.

4.1.B -- Collegial participation in faculty performance evaluation is critical in order to bring subject matter and pedagogical knowledge substantively into the assessment process. Nonetheless, it is the obligation of the administration to ensure quality and effectiveness of the educational program through the evaluation of faculty performance. At a minimum, an institution's evaluation plans must include administrative access to all primary or raw evaluation data.

The primary evaluation data – student evaluations and administrative evaluations of teaching – are delivered directly to the faculty member's immediate supervisor. In the case of part-time faculty, all evaluation data is collected by the Part-time Faculty Support Center and delivered directly to the instructor's direct supervisor.

4.1.C -- Multiple indices are utilized by the administration and faculty in the continuing evaluation of faculty performance. Each of these data sources is to be related to the role of the faculty member in carrying out the mission of the institution. Some examples include: 1) The evaluation of teaching through student, peer, and administrative assessment. 2) The evaluation of the quality of scholarly performance and/or research

productivity as reflected in peer judgments about publication and success in securing external funding. 3) The evaluation of service to the profession, school, and community.

Teaching and learning are at the center of TMCC's mission, and academic excellence is its first strategic goal. The faculty evaluation criteria menu includes items S.1, S.2, and S.9 that require faculty members to meet classes and to receive "satisfactory" student evaluations and administrative classroom/lab observations. Multiple indices are used as follows:

- Student evaluations of instruction are distributed and collected in every TMCC course section. Beginning in fall 2003, department chairs began to observe full-time faculty as well as part-time faculty in the classroom. Because department chairs are faculty members and not administrators, this added an element of peer assessment to the evaluation process. The evaluation process stipulates that deans are the final evaluating authority. In this process, student, peer, and administrative evaluations of instruction take place on a yearly basis.
- The production of research/scholarship/art is not part of TMCC's mission, and the evaluation process does not place this at its center; however, research and scholarly activity are often an important element of ongoing faculty development, and as such are considered professional development activities in annual plans and annual evaluations. For example, faculty evaluation criteria E.12 allows a faculty member to achieve the rank of excellent in the professional growth area through the publication of professional materials.
- Elements of service are incorporated into the annual plan and are measured during the annual evaluation. Faculty members may earn credit toward a commendable or excellent evaluation by belonging to and serving in professional organizations. This type of service is a choice and not required. The annual plan requires service on one faculty senate committee and at least one screening committee (as needed) in order to achieve a satisfactory evaluation. Other types of service – e. g. service on faculty senate or a probationary committee – count toward a commendable ranking. The form requires that faculty members "actively" participate in college service activities. Community service is factored into the menu as well, and service in this area can help a faculty member achieve a ranking of commendable or excellent.
- Untenured faculty members compile a tenure binder that tracks and documents their performance in the areas of teaching, professional development and service. Based on the requirements outlined in the Board of Regents Handbook (citation), the tenure guidelines require narrative summaries and collections of evidence that demonstrate competence in the areas of teaching effectiveness, service to the TMCC community and the public, ability to work with colleagues, and personal integrity (<http://www.tmcc.edu/vp/aa/pdf/TenureFiling.pdf>).
- Professional counseling faculty members are evaluated using substitute indices of performance. In addition to student evaluations and observations by the counseling director, measurable performance standards (completion of note screens and participation toward a 75% direct student contact goal) are included in the counseling faculty evaluation criteria.

4.1.D -- Where areas for improvement in a faculty member's performance are identified, the institution works with the faculty member to develop and implement a plan to address identified areas of concern.

Section 9.2 of the NFA contract (Appendix ?) details the process for dealing with an unsatisfactory evaluation for a tenured faculty member. In short, upon receiving an unsatisfactory evaluation, the faculty member is instructed to form a committee – a Faculty Support Committee – to guide the faculty member to an improved performance. That committee forms a plan with the faculty member. After approval by the evaluator, the committee works to assist the faculty member with that plan. This committee submits a report to the faculty member's evaluator at the end of the academic year that details his/her progress.

When a faculty member's performance needs improvement but falls short of an unsatisfactory evaluation, it is the responsibility of the immediate supervisor to identify these areas and to require that a plan of improvement be created and followed. The yearly evaluation is the tool through which these identifications are expressed to the faculty member. In combination with the annual plan, the supervisor and faculty member can agree on a specific plan for improvement if necessary. For example, faculty evaluation criterion S.2 requires faculty members to use student evaluations “as a means to grow and change.”

The process for non-tenured faculty is considerably more intensive. Non-tenured faculty members meet twice yearly with their tenure committee to ensure that progress is being made toward the standards of tenure, and a member of this committee observes the faculty member in the classroom every semester. In addition, a department chair or dean observes the faculty member in the classroom once yearly before tenure. If the faculty member's performance is not satisfactory and does not improve with coaching from the tenure committee and/or the supervisor, the faculty member may be given a terminal contract.