Definitions

Throughout these procedures a tenured faculty member is defined as a full-time faculty member who has been awarded tenure. A non-tenured faculty member is defined as a full-time faculty member who has not been granted tenure.

Non-tenured status is the status of faculty in the first, second or third year of full-time employment. Non-tenured status may be extended to a fourth year if a faculty member's performance indicates growth but is not yet at the level the college believes warrants tenure, or if a faculty member takes an approved leave of absence that interrupts the evaluation and development procedure.

Premises

Faculty evaluation and development is based on the following premises:

1. The evaluation and development process at the College of Lake County is designed to provide feedback to faculty so that they may reflect upon their performance and make decisions about how that performance can be improved. In addition, the procedure for non-tenured faculty is part of the basis for awarding tenure.

2. All faculty can improve.

3. To garner support for the process and promote respect for the individual, the evaluation and development procedure should not be intimidating.

4. Non-tenured faculty need a fair and frequent evaluation of their performance en route to tenure. This will ensure a process of continuous feedback and continuous improvement.

5. Though the burden of evaluation is best borne by a group of peers, it is recognized that student input, self-evaluation, and Dean/Director input are vital components of a complete evaluation system.

6. Student ratings of instruction should include both quantitative and qualitative information. Any interpretation of statistical summaries of the quantitative information should avoid comparisons.
7. The peer evaluation process will be practiced in all college divisions.

8. The primary responsibility for faculty evaluation should reside with the tenured faculty.

The Peer Committee

A. For Tenured Faculty

The Office of the Provost maintains the evaluation schedule for all tenured faculty and shall inform Deans/Directors which tenured faculty need to be evaluated each year. The Provost shall also provide a list of all tenured faculty being evaluated to the Chair of the Faculty Senate. Each Dean/Director must then ensure that Peer Committees are selected and function each year.

The Peer Committee for tenured faculty shall consist of three to five members, all selected by the person being evaluated. Three members of the Peer Committee shall be tenured faculty with at least one from that same division. Additional committee members can be other tenured faculty, a Dean or other administrator, a college staff member, or an outside consultant. This committee shall function only with 100% quorum.

B. For Non-Tenured Faculty

All non-tenured faculty are evaluated annually until tenure is earned. Each Dean/Director will ensure that Peer Committees are selected and function each year in accordance with the timeline provided by the Office of the Provost.

A Division Peer Committee for non-tenured faculty shall consist of three tenured faculty elected by the division to a term of three years. At least two of the three elected tenured faculty shall be from the non-tenured faculty member’s division. Preferably the terms of the Peer Committee members should be staggered to maintain consistency in the process. If large numbers of non-tenured faculty from one division are being evaluated, multiple peer committees may be elected.

If desired, up to two additional members may be added by the non-tenured faculty member. Appointed members on the committee may include other tenured faculty, a Dean or other administrator, a College staff member, or an outside consultant. A Division Peer Committee shall function only with 100% quorum.
The Student Rating Process for Tenured and Non Tenured Faculty

The same rating format shall be utilized for all classroom instruction delivered by the division whether by full-time or part-time faculty or contractual program staff. Allowance shall be made for departments to modify the form for the understanding of their students. The evaluation instrument will consist of a quantitative part that shall be created by each division and a qualitative part.

The qualitative part shall contain the following three questions in all cases.

1. What did you like about the course, the instructor and the instructional style?
2. What did you dislike?
3. What changes do you think would improve the course?

Questions unique to a division, subject, or mode of instruction may be formally added by majority vote at an official division/department meeting.

The questions in the quantitative portion should be limited to items that a student could respond to using a Likert rating scale with at least four elements. Examples of appropriate items include: items about course organization; timely return of assignments; classroom decorum; adequate and courteous treatment of students’ questions; and prompt beginning and ending of class sessions. Items involving the rating of subject matter competence are not appropriate since the student is not in a position to make such a determination. Students should be mindful of their own commitment to the class, and in order to encourage this, questions should be added to the questionnaire asking students about their attendance, expected grade and class participation.

Effective Fall 2015 all student ratings of instruction will be administered through an online, web-based system. For non-tenured faculty, the student rating forms shall be made available to every student in every section of every class every semester. For tenured faculty, the student rating forms shall be made available to every section of every class in either the Fall or Spring semester. During the Summer semester student ratings are conducted for non-tenured faculty (and adjuncts). The forms shall be made available to students during weeks 12 through the last week of instruction of the semester for 16-week classes and prorated appropriately for classes of different lengths. The Director of IEPR (Institutional Effectiveness, Planning, and Research) is responsible for administering ratings electronically. Reminders should sent until the form is completed in case students delete the e-mail containing the survey link. The forms shall be statistically tabulated outside the division by IEPR. Deans will be provided a set from each class section. By the first week of the next semester, the forms will be sent electronically to the faculty member for storage or disposal. Such a method of administration is needed to ensure that students do not perceive that their rating may negatively impact their course grade.
Faculty who have significant responsibilities outside of classroom instruction (Counselors, Librarians, Instructional Developers) may solicit evaluative feedback in alternative forms such as surveys or questionnaires distributed to students, faculty, administrators, staff members, members of the community. The method of feedback shall be approved by the peer committee. IEPR can assist in developing surveys and rating instruments.

The Deans/Directors and Peer Committee shall have access (via password) to the student ratings of instruction and alternative evaluation forms upon completion of the tabulation by IEPR. Without such access, anecdotal statements from students cannot be examined in the light of overall comments. Division staff identified by the Dean to assist in this process shall be given their own password.

**Faculty Evaluation Process for Tenured Faculty**

Once every five years a tenured faculty member shall be evaluated by a Peer Committee. This evaluation can occur in either the Spring or Fall semester. The following procedures and recommendations shall govern the conduct of the Committee:

1. Upon notification that the faculty member is due for evaluation, the faculty member shall select a Peer Committee and notify the Dean/Director of the committee membership.

2. The faculty member shall submit to the Peer Committee a self-evaluation including details of recent course improvements and other evidence of professional growth. The self-evaluation should respond to and be organized around the following topics:
   - Teaching/Educational Philosophy
   - Instructional Performance
   - Student Relationships
   - Professional and Personal Development
   - Institutional, Professional and Community Service
   - Counseling Services Performance

3. The Peer Committee shall gather additional information and may choose from such sources as:
   - Other faculty
   - Classroom visitations with advance permission of the instructor
   - Student meeting observations with advance permission of the faculty member
   - Videotaping a faculty member’s class with advance permission from the faculty member and pursuant to state privacy laws
   - Informal talks with students
   - Dean
   - Other members of the college or community as appropriate.
4. The Peer Committee shall assist the faculty member in interpreting student evaluations. The shared experience of the Committee will enable it to sort the useful and meaningful comments from the spurious, and to judge whether the frequency of certain comments is usual or exceptional.

5. The task of the Peer Committee is to make constructive recommendations regarding instructional or organizational habits in need of critical examination. Above all, the spirit of this endeavor must be kept in clear focus: this is an opportunity to share experiences and be of service to one's colleagues. The object is continuous improvement.

6. The Peer Committee shall take this opportunity to inquire whether obstacles to effective instruction exist within the institutional structure itself, such as college facilities, support services, college policies, and personnel. Any information of this nature should be collected, grouped together, and reported to the instructional area in such a way as to maintain the anonymity of individual complainants.

7. The Peer Committee shall provide a written report containing constructive recommendations to the faculty member. The faculty member may choose to keep this report or dispose of it. No overall hierarchical judgments ("average," "above average," or the like) shall be rendered.

8. At the conclusion of the peer process, the membership of the Peer Committee shall provide the Dean/Director with the following signed statement: "The Peer Evaluation of (faculty name) has been completed as of: (date)"

9. The Peer Committee shall be available to assist the faculty member in efforts to implement committee suggestions. The intention is that faculty members will take the advice of their peers, resulting in progressive upgrading of instruction.

**Faculty Evaluation Process for Non-Tenured Faculty**

1. The Dean/Director shall explain the evaluation process to the new faculty member within the first month of their initial semester.

2. Each year the non-tenured faculty member shall submit to the Peer Committee and the Dean/Director a self-evaluation including details of recent improvements and other evidence of professional growth. The self-evaluation should respond to and be organized around the following topics:
   - Teaching/Educational Philosophy
   - Instructional Performance
   - Student Relationships
   - Professional and Personal Development
   - Institutional, Professional and Community Service
   - Counseling Services Performance
3. Non-tenured faculty members shall have their student ratings made available to the Peer Committee and the Dean/Director. The student evaluations shall be shared by the Peer Committee with the non-tenured faculty member at the beginning of the following semester and before the final meeting of the Peer Committee. Non-tenured faculty may request copies of student evaluations of instruction from the Dean before the electronic forms are returned to them. This will allow for the information to be used more timely in course improvement the subsequent semester. If this request is made the copies shall be given to the non-tenured faculty member only after they have turned in grades.

4. The Peer Committee and Dean/Director shall assist the non-tenured faculty member in interpreting student evaluations. The shared experience of the committee will enable it to sort the useful and meaningful comments from the spurious, and to judge whether the frequency of certain comments is usual or exceptional.

5. The task of the Peer Committee is to make constructive recommendations to the non-tenured faculty member and to the Dean/Director that can alert them both to instructional or organizational habits in need of critical examination.

6. The Dean/Director and the Peer Committee shall utilize classroom visitation and student evaluation to provide an indication of instructor performance, but may employ information from other sources as may be desirable, or as requested by the non-tenured faculty. The Dean/Director and the Peer Committees of counseling faculty will also utilize observations of the primary services provided by counseling faculty to individual students. To minimize disruption to classroom and individual meetings, the visits shall be coordinated with the non-tenured faculty member. All Peer Committee Members shall conduct classroom observations and provide timely feedback. For counseling faculty the peer committee will determine which members will complete classroom observations and student meeting observations. The Dean/Director shall make at least two classroom observations and shall meet with the non-tenured faculty member after each classroom observation. Evaluators shall stay for the entire class, except for a 150-minute class when they shall stay until the first break.

7. The Peer Committee shall take this opportunity to inquire whether obstacles to effective instruction/services exist within the institutional structure itself, such as college facilities, support services, college policies, and personnel. Any information of this nature should be collected, grouped together, and reported to the instructional area in such a way as to maintain the anonymity of individual complainants.

8. The Peer Committee shall develop a preliminary written report, including strengths, weaknesses and constructive recommendations for improvement. No overall hierarchical judgments (average, above average, or the like) shall be rendered. The Peer Committee shall meet with the faculty member to review the preliminary report. A copy of the Peer Committee's final report shall be given to the faculty member and the Dean/Director. The committee shall also retain a copy of the report. If a non-tenured faculty member's performance is found to be significantly deficient, then the Peer Committee shall state specific recommendations to improve performance.
9. The Dean/Director and the non-tenured faculty member shall meet for a formal evaluation conference. The results of the various elements of the evaluation process shall be discussed. After the meeting, the Dean/Director shall write a summary of the evaluation conference including suggested ways and means for improvement. A confidential copy of the evaluation summary shall be given to the non-tenured faculty member. The Dean/Director is responsible for making reemployment and tenure recommendations. The Peer Committee's report shall be a major consideration in the reemployment and tenure recommendations.

10. In the third year of employment for a non-tenured faculty member, the student evaluation, self-evaluation and Peer Committee recommendation shall accompany the Dean/Director's evaluation and recommendation to the Provost. If reemployment or tenure is not recommended, the non-tenured faculty member may attach a statement with supporting exhibits contesting the validity of the recommendation. The probationary period may be extended for an additional year. If granted, such extension must state in writing to the non-tenured faculty member the corrective actions that must be taken to satisfactorily complete requirements for tenure. The specific reasons for the one-year extension shall be held in confidence.

11. The Peer Committee and the Dean/Director shall make themselves available to assist the non-tenured faculty member in the implementation of the Peer Committee and Dean/Director's recommendations for improvement.

12. All evaluations performed in the fall semester are to be completed by the end of January of the spring semester. Reemployment or tenure decisions shall be determined by the Board of Trustees by March 1.

13. Upon receiving tenure, the faculty member will participate in the evaluation and development procedure every five years with no further participation within two years of retirement.