

should be notified no later than December 10th. The faculty member may file an appeal no later than the first workday in January. A written rationale for the appeal must be included, which will be included in the tenure-review record. Such appeal committee shall consist of the Chancellor's designee, the Association President or designee, and the most senior tenured, available member of the faculty member's discipline or closely related discipline not on the evaluation committee.

The appeal committee will determine the scope of the review, which should include, but is not limited to, a review of the complete tenure review record and the written rationale for the appeal. The appeal committee must forward its written recommendation along with any dissenting opinions to the Chancellor no later than February 10th. The Chancellor's recommendation to the Board of Trustees shall include the complete written tenure-review record, the appeal committee's findings, and any dissenting opinions.

- h. Tenure: By the end of the fall semester of the fourth year, by majority vote, the committee shall make a recommendation for tenure to the administration for action as specified under the law. Committee dissenting opinions or differing opinions must be included with the recommendation of the majority. The entire record of tenure review shall be forwarded to the College President. If a recommendation for non-tenure is going to be forwarded to the Chancellor, the faculty member must be notified by December 10th. The faculty member may file an appeal no later than the first work day in January. A written rationale for the appeal must be included, which will be included in the tenure-review record. Such appeal committee shall consist of the Chancellor's designee, the Association President or designee, and the most senior available, tenured member of the faculty member's discipline or closely related discipline not on the tenure review committee.
- i. The appeal committee will determine the scope of the review, which should include, but is not limited to, a review of the complete tenure review record and the written rationale for the appeal. The appeal committee must forward its written recommendation along with any dissenting opinions to the Chancellor no later than February 10th. The Chancellor's recommendation to the Board of Trustees shall include the complete written tenure-review record, the appeal panel's findings, and any dissenting opinions.

2. For Regular Faculty

- a. The area dean shall establish a peer review committee during the spring semester for each regular faculty member undergoing review. The committee shall consist of two (2) faculty members from the regular faculty member's discipline or a closely related discipline and one (1) academic administrator, or in the case of faculty coaches, the Athletic Director, in consultation with the faculty member undergoing review. If the Department Chair is undergoing review, the second member of the committee shall be selected by the Assistant Chair or in the absence of an Assistant

Chair by the most senior member of the faculty member's discipline or department at the College. In most instances, the person undergoing review should not be asked to serve on another improvement of instruction committee. One (1) member shall be selected by the Department Chair and one (1) by the faculty member undergoing review. At least one of the selected members shall be a tenured member of the faculty. The senior faculty member shall chair the committee. Any faculty member who has concerns regarding the administrator designated for the faculty member's evaluation committee may submit a written objection to the President. The President will select a new administrator in consultation with the Academic Senate President and notification to the Association. The faculty member may object only one time and must do so within seven (7) calendar days of notice of the committee composition.

- b. The scope and process of the review shall be determined by the committee in consultation with the faculty member under review. The area dean may request that the committee consider factors identified by the administration that affect the faculty member's performance as a tenured member of the faculty. The review should focus on strengthening the faculty member's instructional skills and professional contributions to the College. Within five (5) working days, the chair will submit a written record of the scope and process to the area dean, the regular faculty member and the other members of the committee.
- c. As mandatory components of the faculty evaluation process, the review committee shall address each of the following:
 - 1) Two classroom visitations by at least two of the peer reviewers. For instructors teaching online, one of the classroom visitations must be an online section;
 - 2) Student surveys of all classes (or alternative instruments for non-teaching faculty);
 - 3) Professional growth goals;
 - 4) Annual institutional service plan;
 - 5) Annual flex obligation;
 - 6) Evidence of subject-matter proficiency and currency;
 - 7) Faculty syllabi; and
 - 8) Faculty Expectations listed in Article XI.B.1.

If agreed upon by the committee, the faculty member undergoing evaluation may be asked to provide examples of teaching and assignment materials to ensure that they adhere to the course outline of record. The review committee may also evaluate professional traits such as time-management, dependability, and respectful collegiality.

While the administrative reviewer does not participate in classroom observations, they may write evaluative reports addressing adherence to deadlines for submission of reports, grades, and assessment; and other areas of institutional service, including

FLEX activities, reassigned time, special assignment, special projects, and coordinator duties.

The faculty under evaluation shall provide a self-reflective narrative statement that addresses how the faculty member fulfills institutional service obligations, including support of equitable student access and success. The narrative should also address other non-instructional duties for which the faculty receives reassigned time. Elective and representative duties can only be discussed for non-evaluative purposes. Discussion of duties associated with other reassigned time cannot form the basis for a needs improvement determination. Any other discussion of the report is limited by the scope of the evaluation.

After completion of the formal review process, the committee may review, for informational purposes only, the faculty member's grade distribution, equitable access and success data, and retention statistics. This information shall not be part of the formal review process or report.

- d. At the conclusion of each review, the committee shall prepare a written report that includes a cover sheet where each reviewer shall state whether the faculty member's performance is "satisfactory" or if there is a "need for improvement." The faculty member shall be given a copy of the report and shall sign the report to indicate that they have received it. If the majority of the reviewers determine that the regular faculty member needs improvement, the committee will indicate, as part of the formal report, the specific instructional and/or non-instructional areas to be improved. If the administration or the regular faculty member disagrees with the recommendation, either the College administration or the regular faculty member may request that the matter be reviewed by a three (3) person appeal committee. Such committee shall consist of the College President, the College Academic Senate President, and the Association President, or their designees. If the majority of the appeal committee determines that the faculty member's performance is satisfactory, the appeal committee shall provide a written rationale for its determination. The faculty member shall then be returned to good standing, the results of the appeal shall be included in the formal report, and the faculty member shall return to their original evaluation cycle. If the majority of this appeal committee determines that further review is needed, the matter shall be referred to a second review committee as hereafter set forth. The faculty member being evaluated may file a written disagreement within 15 working days to be included in the formal report.
- e. The second review committee shall be established by the department chair and area dean within 15 working days of the appeal committee's determination. The second review committee shall consist of three (3) tenured faculty members from the evaluatee's discipline (or closely related discipline if no faculty are available in the District) in order of seniority; the Department Chair/ Assistant Chair; and an academic administrator, who will chair the committee. The second review committee shall establish the scope of the review, which shall be reduced to writing

within five (5) working days of the committee meeting. The second review committee may conduct any type of administrative, peer, and/or student evaluation it deems necessary in assessing the faculty member's performance and providing guidance for improving instruction and/or professional performance that was identified as needing improvement by the original Improvement of Instruction review committee. Unless the faculty member requests and the second review committee agrees, the review shall begin in the semester following the semester in which the "need for improvement" rating is received. Faculty members with a "need for improvement" are not considered in good standing.

- f. The second review committee shall prepare a written report which shall provide a determination of "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory." The overall rating shall be by majority vote, but each member of the second review committee shall designate the rating they believe is appropriate. Within 15 working days of the receipt of the written report, the faculty member may file a written disagreement. If a majority of the second review committee determines that the faculty member's performance is "satisfactory," the faculty member shall then be returned to good standing, the results of the review shall be included in the final report, and the faculty member shall return to their original evaluation cycle. If a majority of the second review committee determines that the faculty member's performance is "unsatisfactory," the second review committee has two options:
 - 1) The second review committee may recommend one (1) final review, which shall begin in the following semester. Within fifteen (15) working days, the second review committee, in consultation with the faculty member, shall determine specific objectives and goals for a remediation plan. The purpose of the remediation plan is to help the faculty member remediate and eliminate the areas of deficiency or area(s) in need of improvement specified by the peer reviewers; or
 - 2) Provided the second review committee determines that a final review is not warranted, a written report shall be sent to the President of the College for an administrative determination, and a copy shall be forwarded to the faculty member.
- g. After the final review, if the majority of the second review committee determines that the faculty member's performance is "satisfactory," the faculty member shall then be returned to good standing, the results of the review shall be included in the final report, and the faculty member shall return to their original evaluation cycle.

If the majority of the second review committee determines the objectives and remediation plan have not been met, there shall be no further review. A written report shall be sent to the President of the College for an administrative determination, and a copy shall be forwarded to the faculty member.

3. For Associate Faculty