

FACULTY EVALUATION PLAN (FEP)

<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Introduction	
General Goals	1
Assumptions	1
Faculty Accountability	1
Brief Description of the FEP	2-3
FEP Quick Guide	4-5
FEP Summary	6
Endorsement sheet	7
Appendices to assist you	
A. Examples of data collection for Required Areas	A1-A2
B. Examples of criteria reviewed in Elective and Related Areas	B1-B4
C. Suggested data collection procedures	C1-C3
D. Student questionnaire information	D1-D20

The members of the Faculty Association's FEP Subcommittee are:

<u>MEMBER</u>	<u>COLLEGE</u>	<u>PHONE NUMBER</u>
Pam Harrison	MCC	(480)461-7157
Paul Petrequin	CGCC	(480)857-5256
Rachel Smith	EMCC	(623)935-8397
Mike Mitchell	FA President-Elect	(602)787-7289
Sasha Radisich	GCC	(623)845-4765
Peter Zawicki	GWCC	(602)286-8476
Salina Bednarek	FA Past President	(602)532-8601
John Schampel	PC	(602)285-7875
Jon Storslee	PVCC	(602)787-6734
Jennifer Shantz	RIO	(480)517-8221
Ramona Goth	SCC	(480)423-6419
Dolores Urbietta	SMCC	(602)305-5833
Robert Soza	FA President	(480)461-7607

FACULTY EVALUATION PLAN

Introduction

GENERAL GOALS

As a result of changes in faculty instructional roles, responsibilities and delivery systems, a District Faculty Association Evaluation Committee was formed to examine the evaluation process used by the Maricopa College faculty since 1986. As they designed a Faculty Evaluation Plan (FEP), the committee adopted assumptions that were distributed to faculty. They also conducted two surveys, as well as possible data, who collects it, and the form in which the data is presented from which a new evaluation plan was created. In 2005-2006, the Faculty Evaluation Plan was updated in the Meet and Confer process (RFP 3.5.). The FEP Subcommittee developed the updated *Required, Elected, and Related* areas to be assessed.

The committee's goal regarding the FEP is to move away from "traditional" means of faculty evaluation. Instead, they have concentrated on a process to assist faculty in their common mission to meet student needs. The committee recognized that most faculty continually seek to improve their effectiveness and this proposed system should support that effort. The FEP is also aligned with the MCCCDD vision and mission.

ASSUMPTIONS

Faculty Commitment to Improvement

- As faculty members, we are committed to improving our instructional and service effectiveness.
- Faculty acknowledge our accountability for our professional performance.
- While most faculty members are committed to continuous improvement through their own effort, they perceive that performance is also enhanced through support and guidance from colleagues (Maricopa Community Colleges Faculty Evaluation Survey, Fall 1994).

Goals of the Faculty Evaluation Plan

- The FEP concentrates on assessment for improved performance. The research evidence that exists indicates that traditional evaluation methods do not consistently lead to improved instruction. (Centra, 1993, p. 11) The FEP is an evaluation system that expands beyond that traditional model.
- The new FEP identifies and acknowledges not only effective teaching but also other faculty service beyond the classroom.
- Administrative review of faculty for retention/dismissal (per Residential Faculty Policy 6.6.) remains separate from the FEP.

FACULTY ACCOUNTABILITY

Each faculty member doing an FEP remains accountable to the department/ division chair and the college Vice President Academic Affairs for satisfactory completion of the FEP. Faculty members may implement their Plan option as often as they wish, but must complete a Plan every third year when appointive, as currently required by the RFP. The faculty member to be evaluated and members of the evaluation team who assist with an FEP sign an "endorsement sheet" verifying that the process has been completed.

Brief Description of the FEP

The main goal of this proposed plan is to refocus the current RFP mandated faculty evaluation system toward emphasizing the recognition and encouragement of improved performance and not just gathering evaluation data for personnel decisions.

While keeping some parts of the previous, more traditional method of faculty evaluation, the proposed FEP plan recognizes an expanded image of the role of Maricopa faculty that goes beyond classroom instruction, for example, faculty serving in non-teaching roles (librarians, counselors, program managers, etc.) and other professional faculty involvement such as advising and mentoring students, participating on college/district committees, departmental interaction with colleagues, etc.

It has been designed to avoid the traditional “cookie cutter” approach to faculty evaluation requiring the same procedure for all. The goal of the proposed FEP is to allow more flexibility to reflect more accurately the diverse faculty roles and the uniqueness of different teaching styles and teaching in different disciplines. This includes the opportunity to customize the FEP, allowing a faculty member to obtain more useful and applicable information while assessing their performance as they strive to improve instruction or the effectiveness of other professional services.

In searching the literature on faculty evaluation, the Faculty Evaluation Committee which developed the FEP has come to support strongly this observation: “Improved performance only occurs when faculty: (1) learn something new about their performance, (2) value the information and have confidence in its source, (3) know how to make changes based on it, (4) are motivated to make the changes” (Centra, 1993, p. 9). The team of individuals that assist a faculty member in developing and implementing an FEP should be guided by these values.

Key Elements of the FEP

1. Recognizing the movement toward broadening the definition of instruction-time beyond the traditional semester, the proposed FEP can begin at any time within the **fiscal year** but must be completed by June 30th of the same fiscal year. The college Vice President Academic Affairs, through the appropriate department/division chair, will be responsible for notifying a faculty member to begin the FEP.
2. It is recommended that each college Faculty Senate appoint a “**RESOURCE PERSON**” who is familiar with the FEP to help facilitate the process. The college Faculty/Staff Development Specialist is a suggested candidate for this position. (According to Centra [1993, p. 11] “A trained faculty development instructional specialist has the potential to help instructors significantly change their teaching and should be involved in the process.”)
3. Faculty must complete (or review and update) a plan every third year (or more often if desired) when “appointive.” This process should also include part-time faculty--although the FEP would be modified by/for these faculty members in order to accommodate differences in their roles. (The existing process to evaluate adjunct faculty will remain in place)
4. To complete an FEP each faculty member **must** engage in a self-examination of “**THREE REQUIRED AREAS**”:
 - **TEACHING (OR OTHER PRIMARY DUTIES)**. For example, instructional or service delivery, content expertise, classroom or program management, instruction/program design.
 - **COURSE OR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT/REVISION**. For example, a review of syllabi, tests, and course or program content, including competencies and objectives.
 - **GOVERNANCE AND/OR COMMITTEE PARTICIPATION AT THE COLLEGE AND/OR DISTRICT LEVELS**

In addition to an assessment of these “**3 REQUIRED AREAS**” (RFP Section 3.5.3.1.), “**AT LEAST TWO ELECTED AREAS**” (RFP Section 3.5.3.2.), and other “**RELATED AREAS**” (REP Section 3.5.3.3.) may also be selected by the faculty member to review, in order to bring into better focus their full professional involvements at the college or within the District. Examples include program coordination, research projects, department/division chair responsibilities, student activities-advising/mentoring, professional involvement in the community, professional growth, involvement/projects, professional interaction with colleagues, etc.

See (Appendix B) for details.

5. As a means of designing an FEP that is flexible enough to respect the broad diversity of the faculty role, a faculty member developing and implementing the plan should select ways of examining his/her performance that will most effectively describe his/her: current performance, future goals and actions needed to achieve them, accomplishments in the professional areas to be examined, etc. These may include different means of assessment for each of the **“REQUIRED,”** **“ELECTIVE,”** and **“RELATED”** areas that are evaluated. Examples of different means include checklists, observations, student evaluation instruments (which can be customized), student skill inventories, video assessments, portfolios, written summaries, conferences, etc.
See (Appendix C) for details.
6. The team will consist of:
- THE FACULTY MEMBER TO BE ASSESSED will be the director of, and active participant in, the designing and implementation of their FEP plan. He/she will carry the major responsibility for gathering the information about and completing the plan to the best of the person’s ability.
 - A FACULTY PEER (to be chosen by the faculty member) may be outside the faculty member’s discipline, department, or college.
 - A THIRD PERSON WILL BE SELECTED BY THE EVALUEE FROM AMONG THE FOLLOWING: Department/Division chair, appropriate other professional, another faculty member, administrator, staff developer, advisory committee, alumni, college committee members.
 - STUDENTS (or other service area recipients) **will always provide** input regarding teaching or service area performance via a customizable questionnaire or other appropriate measurement instrument.
See (Appendix D) for details.
7. At the conclusion of the process, the individual team members will review the documents submitted by the faculty member to indicate his/her performance and goals in the areas outlined in the FEP and discuss them with the faculty member. It will be signed by the individual team members and also by the Department/Division Chair and appropriate College Vice President, or designee, to verify the work and indicate compliance with the process. A copy of the **“FEP SUMMARY ENDORSEMENT SHEET”** will be filed with the appropriate VP or designee. **See page 6-7.**
- * Centra, John H. Reflective Faculty Evaluation: Enhancing Teaching and Determining Faculty Effectiveness. San Francisco: Josse Basse, 1993.
- ** Maricopa College District Faculty Evaluation Committee (1994). Summary of the first survey, Fall 1994.

FACULTY EVALUATION PLAN QUICK GUIDE

The Faculty Evaluation Plan is flexible enough to meet your unique circumstances/needs while maintaining a structure to help you plan your approach and provide for District-wide consistency.

To complete the plan, follow these three steps:

I. Areas to Examine

A. Required Areas that **must** be examined

1. Teaching, Learning, and/or Service
2. Course Assessment and/or Program Development/Revision
3. Governance and/or Committee Participation at the College and/or District levels

B. Elective Areas of which at least two must be examined

1. Professional Development
2. Acquisition of New Skills
3. Enhancement of Diversity
4. College Level Assessment of Learning Outcomes
5. Service to the Community

C. Related Areas that **may** be examined

1. Program coordination
2. Department/division chair responsibilities
3. Advisement/mentoring or other student activity involvement
4. Professional interaction
5. Other roles (as identified)

II. Persons involved in the process:

1. Individual Faculty Member
2. A peer selected by the evaluatee
3. A third person selected by the evaluatee from among the following:
 - Department/Division chair
 - Appropriate other professional
 - Another faculty member
 - Administrator
 - Staff developer
 - Advisory committee
 - Alumni
 - College committee members
4. Students or other service recipients

NOTE: The FEP requires a faculty member to gather written evaluations or assessments from students or other service recipients. They will then be reviewed by the FEP team and discussed with the faculty member.

III. Methods examining performance:

- A. Checklists
- B. Observations (classroom visit or video)
- C. Questionnaires (including student evaluation)
- D. Pre-post evaluations
- E. Student skills inventories
- F. Portfolios or written summaries
- G. Conferences

FEP Summary

Faculty member's name _____

Department _____

Date _____

1. Brief description of my roles and responsibilities as a faculty member:
2. Focus of the FEP and brief statement of rationale and purpose:
3. Summary of accomplishments and outcomes:
4. Brief statement of plans to integrate or apply this learning into my work as a faculty member:
5. What method and class was used for the student/service recipient evaluation?
6. Goals for next evaluation:

Please send the FEP Summary and Faculty Evaluation Plan Endorsement Sheet to the Employee Records Center at the District office, keep a copy for the Faculty member's college file and send a copy to the Faculty member.

FACULTY EVALUATION PLAN
ENDORSEMENT SHEET

Faculty member: _____,

completed a Faculty Evaluation Plan on _____.

We have assisted with the above member's Faculty Evaluation Plan and agree that the FEP documents comply with the evaluation requirements in the RFP.

Signature	Title	Date
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

As Division/Department Chair, I acknowledge receipt of this Summary/Endorsement sheet.

_____ Date _____
Signature

As College Vice President Academic Affairs or designee, I acknowledge receipt of this Summary/Endorsement sheet. (Sign, send to District, and forward copy to faculty member within 10 working days.)

_____ Date _____
Signature

Please send the FEP Summary and Faculty Evaluation Plan Endorsement Sheet to the Employee Records Center at the District office, keep a copy for the Faculty member's college file and send a copy to the Faculty member.