

Minutes of the
MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE
May 2, 2011

APPROVED

PRESENT: Monika Brannick, Melinda Carrillo, Haydn Davis, Katy French, Erin Hartensveld, Barb Kelber, Teresa Laughlin, Jackie Martin-Klement, Pam McDonough, Linda Morrow, Wendy Nelson, Perry Snyder, Fari Towfiq

ABSENT: Bruce Bishop, Lori Graham, Patrick O'Brien, Diane Studinka

GUESTS: Marlita Donan, Greg Larson, Shayla Sivert

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by the President, Monika Brannick, at 2:00 p.m., in Room SU-30.

Approval of Minutes:

Motion 1 MSC Laughlin, Morrow: Faculty Senate approval of the minutes of April 25, 2011, as amended. The motion carried.

In discussing the April 25 minutes, Senators revisited the issue of subjects of bargaining. Teresa Laughlin distributed copies of a letter from attorney Jeffrey Boxer (Appendix A) which provided additional information on the negotiations process.

Public Comments: There were no public comments.

Announcements: Monika Brannick asked for clarification from Teresa Laughlin regarding her statement last week that all faculty members should avoid formal or informal discussions with administrators regarding negotiations. Brannick referred to an email she sent to Laughlin approximately one week ago with an update on the recommendations of the workgroup put together to discuss the joint/lateral transfer issue. Brannick noted that in that email she expressed her hope that the PFF would consult with the Faculty Senate. In Laughlin's email reply, she indicated that the PFF was not required to consult with the Faculty Senate on the matter. Brannick noted that after some research on her part, most documents she has consulted state that the exclusive bargaining unit should consult with the Faculty Senate on certain issues. She stated that she wished to reiterate that in discussions that affect departments, she hopes the PFF will not only consult with the Faculty Senate, but will receive input from the faculty as well.

Laughlin indicated that writing contract language in the Faculty Senate is not only inappropriate but inadvisable, adding that she will provide general updates as they are available. She noted that members of PFF continually solicit information from faculty, and all PFF meetings are open meetings which faculty are encouraged to attend and in which they are invited to participate. Faculty are encouraged to contact EBoard members (including Senators Laughlin, Jackie Martin-Klement, and Perry Snyder) to offer input. She added that the negotiations table is the appropriate place for writing and negotiating contract language.

Faculty member Judy Wilson left fliers announcing the Palomar Academy for Collaborative Teaching (PACT) Faculty Consortium scheduled for Thursday, May 5, at 3:30 p.m. in MD-157.

This semester, eleven faculty members have been working together to explore issues related to student success. They will be presenting their findings and participating in discussion about the topics on which they have focused. All are invited to attend the first ever Palomar Academy for Collaborative Teaching (PACT) faculty consortium. The three PACT groups will each present for 20 minutes with a short discussion time after each presentation. There will be refreshments served at the end of the meeting.

Committee
Appointments:

Motion 2

MSC Towfiq, Laughlin: Faculty Senate approval of the following committee appointments:

Academic Technology Committee
(11-13) Social and Behavioral Sciences
Michael T. Arguello/History
Kelly Falcone/Physical Education

Basic Skills Committee
(11-14) DRC
Lori Meyers

Bookstore Subcommittee
(10-12) Hope Farquharson/Nursing, MNHS

Faculty Service Area Review Committee
(11-13) Social and Behavioral Sciences
Patti Dixon/American Indian Studies

Instructional Planning Council
(10-12) Student Services
Jose Fernandez/Counseling

(11-13) Career, Technical, and Extended Education
Debi Workman/EME

International Education Advisory Committee
(11-13) One faculty member from Counseling and Matriculation
Karan Huskey/Counseling

Learning Outcomes Council
(11-13) CTEE
Ken Imaizumi/ Design and Consumer Education

Personnel Standards & Practices Committee
(11-13) Nancy Pince/Nursing, MNHS

Student Services Planning Council
(11-13) One DRC faculty member
Ruth Tait-Brown/Disability Resource Center

Tenure & Evaluations Review Board
(11-13) Member-at-large
Perri Brock/Mathematics, MNHS

The motion carried.

Motion 3 MSC Towfiq, French: Faculty Senate acceptance of the results of the ballot for the following committee appointments:

Academic Standards & Practices Committee
(11-13)
Mona Ellis/Mathematics

Basic Skills Committee
(11-14) Faculty at-large
Nimoli Madan/ESL, Languages and Literature

Curriculum Committee
(11-14) Mathematics and the Natural & Health Sciences
Judy Eckhart/Nursing

Matriculation and Transfer Committee
(11-13) Mathematics
Mona Ellis

Workforce and Community Development Advisory Group
(11-13)
Bob Sasse/Child Development, Social and Behavioral Sciences

The motion carried.

Research Award: Several nominations were received for the 2011 Faculty Research Award. Members of the Faculty Senate subgroup reviewed all of the submissions, and Wendy Nelson provided a brief report. After careful consideration, the group is recommending Craig Forney, Associate Professor, Religious Studies, as this year's recipient. She provided more information detailing his impressive accomplishments and successes in research and publication during the past year.

Motion 4 MSC Davis, Morrow: The Faculty Senate designates Craig Forney as the 2011 Faculty Research Award recipient. The motion carried.

Service Award: Monika Brannick announced that this year's Service Award recipient is Teresa Laughlin. Senators congratulated Laughlin and expressed gratitude for her dedication and service on behalf of the faculty.

Emeritus: Monika Brannick indicated that faculty member Lois Galloway of EOPS-CARE, will be retiring in June. She has served Palomar College for 25 years.

Motion 5 MSC Laughlin, Snyder: Faculty Senate affirmation of the Emeritus Status of Lois Galloway. The motion carried.

Curriculum: Monika Brannick reported that the next Curriculum Committee meeting will be held on May 4. She asked Senate members to review the items prior to next Monday's meeting.

Brannick noted that several issues are being discussed at the state level, including repeatability for "Activity Courses." The proposed change in policy would limit repeatability for fine arts courses to 3 or 4, rather than up to 7. She added that several resolutions were also discussed, and some were voted on and approved at the recent Statewide Academic Senate meeting. She noted that one resolution that passed recommended a change to Title 5 to change the category of "Activity," and recommended defining the repeatability for specific courses.

Brannick also stated that the independent oversight agency, The Little Hoover Commission, is reviewing the Master Plan for Higher Education. She also noted that the number of withdrawals will be considered in conjunction with course repeatability/course repetition.

Academic Technology: At last week's meeting Senators confirmed Lillian Payn to the position of Academic Technology Coordinator. Monika Brannick reminded Senators that the position of Academic Technology Coordinator is separate and distinct from the position of chair of the Academic Technology Committee (ATC). The Faculty Constitution requires that the ATC be chaired by a faculty senator. The Senate has encouraged the Academic Technology Coordinator to run for a position as faculty senator and to serve as chair of the ATC. Because Lillian Payn is not a Senator, and because the Faculty Constitution does not allow for a new call for Senators until September, Brannick asked that the Senate discuss the possibility of creating a named position on the Senate for the Academic Technology Coordinator, similar to the position created for the Curriculum Co-chair.

Senators discussed naming an additional position to the membership. Senators agreed that this issue should be reassessed again in the fall, and it was suggested that discussion include the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Coordinator as a possible named position as well.

Motion 6 MSC Towfiq, French: Faculty Senate support of the creation of a named position on the Faculty Senate for the Academic Technology Coordinator, effective for one academic year. The issue will be revisited next year to allow for more discussion. The motion carried.

Policies & Procedures: Senate members reviewed a copy of AP 5055, Enrollment Priorities (Appendix B) on the overhead. Monika Brannick noted the proposed changes and indicated that the procedure will be discussed at the Strategic Planning Council meeting on May 3.

Discussion followed on the document. Senators asked several questions, noting that because not all campuses are offering summer school this year, there will be a huge demand for courses. The Enrollment Priorities policy may have significant consequences, as students from other schools who have filled out applications will have priority over current Palomar students if these categories are met.

TERB: Two weeks ago, members of the Senate reviewed and made recommendations for changes to the following Tenure & Evaluations documents: Article 17, Evaluation Procedure (Appendix C), Part-time Faculty Evaluation Report (Appendix D), and Evaluation Report Guidelines (Appendix E).

Kelber indicated that she took the ideas proposed by the Faculty Senate to members of the Tenure & Evaluations Review Board (TERB) last week. She provided an update on those recommendations in light of the review and discussion with TERB members. She stated that in the Part-time Faculty Evaluation Report, the signature line for the dean's signature has been put back into the document, so it mimics what is on the Peer Review form. Brief discussion followed as the document was viewed on the overhead.

Motion 7 MSC Towfiq, Morrow: Faculty Senate support of the revised Part-time Faculty Evaluation Report form, as recommended by the Tenure & Evaluations Review Board. The motion carried.

Senate members also viewed the Evaluation Report Guidelines, and Kelber indicated that TERB members had agreed with the changes suggested by the Senate, and showed them how they will be written in the document.

Motion 8 MSC Snyder, Martin-Klement: Faculty Senate support of the revised Evaluation Report Guidelines, as recommended by the Tenure & Evaluations Review Board. The motion carried.

Kelber also stated that in reference to Article 17, Evaluation Procedure, members of TERB will persist in their recommendation of the addition of language relating to extending the circle of confidentiality for multi-discipline departments and will take this recommendation to the PFF and the District as a next step.

Statewide Academic Senate:

Monika Brannick attended the Statewide Academic Senate Spring Session meeting at the end of April and still has several items on which to report. Because of the time constraints in the Senate meetings, she will put together a newsletter on the issues discussed and forward it to all Senators sometime next week.

Apprenticeship Instructors Submitting Grades:

Fari Towfiq indicated that several weeks ago she attended a meeting with several individuals from Human Resources, as well as Molly Smith, Director of Occupational and Non- Credit Services, and Herman Lee, Director of Enrollment Services. The discussion focused on the issue of apprenticeship instructors submitting grades. Although apprenticeship instructors have gone through the Equivalency process, they are not employees of Palomar College and do not have access to PeopleSoft to submit grades. Because Title 5 requires the instructor to input their grades, the group suggested that those instructors utilize paper rosters and submit them to Herman Lee's office for input into the system. The group also suggested that the information could be entered into the system through Molly Smith's office. Towfiq told the group that she would report this matter to the Faculty Senate and ask for input.

Discussion followed as to whether it was appropriate for an administrator's office to have access to a faculty member's grade roster because grading clearly falls within the purview of faculty. There was also a question raised about what name would be listed on

the roster if the document was entered into the PeopleSoft system by a staff member rather than by the faculty member who issued the grade. More information is needed in order for the Senate to understand how the process would work from start to finish, and to clarify the procedures that would be followed in the event of a grade dispute. This issue will be brought back for further discussion at a later date.

CAST/AA/Classified
Staff Walking in
Commencement:

Monika Brannick reported that PFF Co-president Shayla Sivert initially approached Vice President Mark Vernoy with the request that the district discuss the possibility of CAST, AA, and Classified staff members walking in commencement. Vernoy indicated that because it was an Academic and Professional Matter, it should be discussed by the Faculty Senate. Sivert then requested that the item be brought to the Senate for further discussion.

Sivert reported to the Senate that it wouldn't cost the district additional money, and with the upcoming challenges that will be facing all the campus groups, it would provide an opportunity for all employees to celebrate student success. In response to the question of whether she was approached by a staff member with this specific request, Sivert indicated that she was not, but had heard of other campuses that include all employee groups in their commencement ceremonies.

Senators discussed all the possible issues needing clarification before other employee groups could participate: would participants be only those who have AA degrees or above?; would they wear cap and gowns and/or have access to cap and gowns?; what interest is there among other employee groups to participate?

There was agreement among Senate members that although there is tremendous support for faculty and all employee groups standing united on campus, commencement is an event that recognizes student achievement and highlights the teaching and learning that culminates in that success, emphasizing the role of faculty in the students' preparation. One alternative suggestion involved creating a section of seating for other employee groups in order to include them in the ceremony.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barb Neault Kelber, Secretary

TELEPHONE:
(323) 761-8377
FACSIMILE:
(323) 417-5015
LAW OFFICES OF

JEFFREY R. BOXER
101 SOUTH HARPER AVENUE
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90048-3505

EMAIL:
jrboxer@unionosity.com
jrboxer@pacbell.net

April 28, 2011

tlainelaughlin@gmail.com

Teresa Laughlin, Lead Negotiator
Palomar Faculty Federation

Re: Bargaining In Good Faith And All That Jazz

Dear Teresa:

It was nice talking with you yesterday. The ins and outs of bargaining law are often murky, and there is no question that some folks miss the principle points. I thought I would try and take part of our conversation and turn it into a question and-answer format. Maybe, that way, you could share what we discussed with other people as the need arises.

Why is PFF our only bargaining representative?

It is part practicality and partly the law. The law part is that PFF is the “exclusive bargaining representative.” The emphasis is on the word “exclusive.” If an employer could go bargain with anyone who showed up and said, “Hi, I’m here. Let’s bargain,” you can imagine the kind of chaos that would ensue. At any rate, the Union has legal obligations that go hand-in-hand with this authority. So the Union gets to bargain, but it also has to maintain information in the strictest confidence, and a whole host of other obligations that make it possible for it to serve as the representative of the bargaining-unit members. People often want to chime in and offer their ideas, but when the full responsibility of bargaining on behalf of their colleagues become clear, it’s a far more daunting task. In case anybody asks what the law is that applies to community college faculty, it’s the Educational Employment Relations Act, and it is found in the California Government Code.

What are the practical reasons why PFF is the sole bargaining representative?

Many of us have had occasion to use an attorney, often, unfortunately because of divorce or some other serious legal matter. That's the best way to conceptualize the practicality. Imagine if you were getting divorced, and your soon-to-be former spouse showed up with a lawyer for you, and said, "You don't get to use your own, you get to use this one." You would rightfully be incensed. PFF is the exclusive bargaining representative because PFF has elections, democratic accountability, and choice. And as those who have or make the time to do it know, being in a union is probably the most democratic thing you'll ever do in your life. So, if an employer got to choose the bargaining representative for the Union, the process would be horribly impacted.

But what about the Faculty Senate? Why don't they bargain for us?

This is a more complicated question with a more complicated answer. First, it's because the Faculty Senate has no power under the law to bargain on behalf of the faculty. To be sure, the Faculty Senate has very specific legal obligations under the Education Code. That does not include bargaining. And without the legal right to act, there is no ability to enforce. As the old law-school saying goes, there is no right without a remedy. If you can't enforce your contract, there's no point in having it.

But there is also a more complicated issue about the Faculty Senate and shared decision making that's not often fully appreciated. The Faculty Senate is not only a faculty body, although faculty often conceive of it as such. It is a hybrid legal creation under the Education Code that exercises authority that is delegated to it by the District administration to act on its behalf. The Faculty Senate, then, is in part a function of District management and cannot serve as the representative of the Bargaining Unit because of its sometimes role as District management. That would be like your soon-to-be former spouse hiring a lawyer for you.

Now this may seem unduly harsh, but it actually is not. PFF has authority as an exclusive bargaining representative that is separate and apart from the District management. PFF does not participate in District management, per se, in any role except to serve as faculty representatives. Not so for the Faculty Senate, which is bound up in hiring issues and the like. So what may sound like a bad thing may not be for Faculty Senate, depending on your point of view. Faculty Senates usually appreciate having the ability to exercise some managerial authority as made available by the District to achieve certain ends. But, unfortunately, you can't have it both ways in the legal framework. You're either a representative or you are not.

So why can't administrators just grab any faculty they want and ask them what each person thinks of their proposals?

In order to bargain, often the two sides have to be able to meet and frankly exchange information. There are mandatory obligations to bargain over certain things, such as negotiation ground rules, and a whole host of topics under wages and working conditions. This requires the Union having a great deal of information that is often unavailable to people who are not bargaining or fully prepared to

bargain.

I hope this letter will serve as a guidepost for you when you need to explain these issues to others in the future. Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

Jeffrey R. Boxer
JRB/mj

cc: Shayla Seivert
Shannon Lienhart

**PALOMAR COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT PROCEDURE AP 5055
STUDENT SERVICES**

AP 5055 ENROLLMENT PRIORITIES

References:

Education Code Section 66025.8;
Title 5 Section 58106

Enrollment in courses and programs may be limited to students meeting properly established prerequisites and co-requisites. (See Board Policy and Procedure 4260 titled Prerequisites, Co-requisites, and Advisories)

Enrollment may be limited due to the following:

- health and safety considerations
- facility limitations
- faculty workload
- availability of qualified instructors
- funding limitations
- regional planning
- legal requirements
- contractual requirements

No registration procedures shall be used that result in restricting enrollment to a specialized clientele.

Special registration assistance may be given to disabled students. It may also be given to a limited number of disadvantaged students upon specific recommendation of the Assistant Superintendent/Vice President for Student Services.

Students will be assigned registration appointments **on the basis of degree-applicable units completed at**

Palomar in the following priority scheme:

Category 1. DISABILITY RESOURCE CENTER, EOP&S, TRIO/SSS Students, eligible veterans, and active duty military personnel who are

- a. Continuing students ~~or~~ **and**,
- b. New, returning, and transfer students who submit an application and complete assessment and orientation prior to the deadline date.

Appointments are assigned in the following order:

A. Below 90 units (by descending unit order)

B. 90 units and above (by ascending unit order)

Category 2. New, returning, transfer, and continuing students who complete orientation and assessment in the immediate period of time prior to the deadline date.

Appointments are assigned in the following order:

A. Below 90 units (by descending unit order)

B. 90 units and above (by ascending unit order)

Category 3. Continuing students (students who are actively registered at census the prior

semester or actively registered in a course as of the deadline date) are assigned appointments on the basis of units completed at Palomar College.

Appointments are assigned in the following order:

A. Below 90 units (by descending unit order)

B. 90 units and above (by ascending unit order)

Category 4. New, returning, or transfer students who are not in category 2.

45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

Appointments are assigned in the following order:

A. Below 90 units (by descending unit order)

B. 90 units and above (by ascending unit order)

Category 5. Non-high school graduates age 15 to 18.

Some classes may have waiting lists for students wanting to enroll:

A. The department chair and the dean will establish the wait list size. The practice of establishing an unlimited wait list as a measure of demand for a course is to be minimized.

B. All instructors should follow the wait list system. However, if an instructor will not follow the wait list system, no wait list will be established for those sections taught by that instructor

C. Admittance into a closed class will occur only with permission of the instructor.

Office of Primary Responsibility: Enrollment Services

District/PFF Agreement
Board Ratified 5/12/10

ARTICLE 17 - EVALUATION PROCEDURE

17.1 General Provisions

17.1.1 Evaluation decisions shall be made in good faith and shall not be based upon factors that are not directly related to the faculty member's performance of his/her faculty assignment.

17.1.2 All evaluations shall be treated as confidential in accordance with Article 11.

17.1.3 Faculty and administrative evaluators shall notify the evaluatee that he/she is to be observed. This notice shall be given at least one (1) week prior to the observation, unless another time frame for the observation is mutually agreed upon.

17.1.4 Every evaluatee shall receive a signed copy of his/her evaluation.

17.1.5 A "business day" shall be a day when the District offices are scheduled to be open, but shall exclude Saturdays and Sundays.

17.1.6 Wherever a Department Chair or other faculty member is authorized to appoint a designee to assume the designator's role in the evaluation process, the appointed designee shall be a faculty member.

17.1.7 All final evaluation reports that rate a faculty member's overall performance shall use the terms *High Professional Performance*, *Standard Professional Performance*, *Substandard Performance* and *Unsatisfactory*.

17.1.8 The evaluators shall give comments and/or recommendations the weight they believe appropriate.

17.1.9 Faculty review shall be the primary feature of the evaluation process.

17.1.10 Either the Dean or first level administrator or vice president in charge of the evaluatee's discipline may submit comments and/or recommendations to the evaluator(s). Such comments and/or recommendations shall become an official part of the evaluation record.

17.1.11 In accordance with Education Code 87663(c), evaluations of faculty members will include, to the extent practicable and applicable, student evaluations. Faculty members shall have access to their own student evaluation summaries within a reasonable period of time following the posting of final course grades for that semester or session, subject to the availability of the data from TERB. Student evaluations alone shall never be used as the sole justification for a decision in a summative evaluation or in denial of tenure.

17.1.12 Final evaluation reports for all faculty members (regardless of status) shall be filed in the evaluatee's official personnel file. However, an evaluation document will not be entered or filed in a faculty member's personnel file until the faculty member is given notice and an opportunity to review and comment thereon. Such notice will allow ten (10) business days for review and comment. This ten-day (10-day) period may be extended only with the mutual written agreement of the Assistant Superintendent/Vice President of Human Resource Services or designee and the faculty member. A faculty member will have the right to enter comments and have them attached to any such evaluation document. Tenure and rehire evaluations may be appealed by probationary faculty members under the provisions of Article 17.7. However, with the exception of the tenure and rehire appeal process, the attachment to the evaluation document is the sole remedy for the contents and/or recommendation(s) in any evaluation document being entered or filed in a faculty member's personnel file. However, substantial departures from the evaluation procedures prescribed in this Article shall be subject to the grievance procedure (see Article 14) of this Agreement, and the evaluation shall be invalidated if those procedural departures are found to have prejudiced a fair and objective evaluation of the faculty member's job performance.

17.1.13 The contents, including comments and recommendations, of any evaluation document shall not be grievable.

17.1.14 The Department Chair or director, or other faculty member(s) who is (are) responsible for making future assignments for part-time faculty members, shall have access to a part-time faculty member's evaluation documents **and may confer with previous evaluators and/or discipline specialists** for the purpose of making appropriate assignments.

PALOMAR COLLEGE

Part-Time Faculty Evaluation Report

Part-Time Instructor/Evaluated:

Evaluator/Dept:

After reviewing student evaluations and the classroom visitation report, the Department Chair/Director/Designee will complete the following report. A copy of this signed form must be given to the evaluatee and another copy must be sent to the TERB Office. Evaluatees have 10 business days; beginning on the date the report was signed by the evaluatee, to add a response to their evaluation by sending it to the TERB Office (AA-112). After the 10-day comment period, this report and any evaluatee comments become part of evaluatee's personnel file maintained in the Human Resources Office.

Summary Comments and Recommendations

Comments for each item are highly encouraged. It is appropriate to write positive comments for meaningful feedback and encouragement for each question where it applies. If a "Substandard Performance" or "Unsatisfactory Performance" is checked, **comments are required.**

Definitions of evaluation categories: (based on the Standards of Performance for Faculty)

High Professional Performance - Frequently exceeds accepted standards of professional performance. (Check this box when the professor's professional performance is beyond what is reasonably expected.)

Standard Professional Performance - Regularly meets accepted standards of professional performance. (This is the standard of performance that is expected of all professors when they are hired and they are expected to maintain this level of performance throughout their tenure at Palomar College.)

Substandard Performance - Does not consistently meet accepted standards of professional performance.

Unsatisfactory Performance - Does not meet minimal standards of professional performance.

1. Course objectives and requirements are clearly stated in the class syllabus and communicated to the class.

~~High Professional Performance~~

~~Standard Professional Performance~~

~~Substandard Performance~~

~~Unsatisfactory Performance~~

Yes: _____

No: _____

Comments:

2. The instructor meets classes as required, teaches according to the Course Outline of Record, and is well prepared.

High Professional Performance Standard Professional Performance
 Substandard Performance Unsatisfactory Performance

Comments:

3. The instructor treats students with respect and tolerance, demonstrates patience and a willingness to help when needed, and encourages student participation and questions.

High Professional Performance Standard Professional Performance
 Substandard Performance Unsatisfactory Performance

Comments:

4. The instructor demonstrates effective communication skills in the classroom or online environment, presenting course material in an interesting and engaging manner.

High Professional Performance Standard Professional Performance
 Substandard Performance Unsatisfactory Performance

Comments:

5. The instructor maintains fair and clearly stated grading policies and provides fair and reasonably prompt evaluation of student work.

High Professional Performance Standard Professional Performance
 Substandard Performance Unsatisfactory Performance

Comments:

6. The instructor demonstrates depth of academic preparation and subject area competency.

High Professional Performance Standard Professional Performance
 Substandard Performance Unsatisfactory Performance

Comments

7. The instructor adheres to department guidelines and is responsive to communications from the department.

High Professional Performance

Standard Professional Performance

Substandard Performance

Unsatisfactory Performance

Comments:

8. Summary Comments (required)

Department: _____

Evaluee: _____ Date: _____
(print name): _____

Evaluator: _____ Date: _____
(print name): _____

Department Chair: _____ Date: _____
(print name): _____

Administrative Signature

My signature acknowledges that I have reviewed the materials.

Division Dean: _____ Date: _____
(print name): _____

Overall Recommendation: (Required)

High Professional Performance

Standard Professional Performance

Substandard Performance

Unsatisfactory Performance

Signatures

My signature acknowledges that I have met with my evaluator and reviewed my evaluation. It does not mean that I agree or disagree with the evaluation summary. I am aware that within ten business days after signing this report, I have the right to submit a response to this evaluation to the TERB Office (AA-112). I am also aware that this evaluation and my response, if any, will become part of my personnel file maintained in the Human Resources Office.

Part-Time Faculty Evaluatee: _____ Date: _____

Evaluator : _____ Date: _____

Evaluation Report Guidelines

Writing a peer evaluation report concludes a thoughtful review of a peer's performance. The report consists of a series of evaluation summaries so care must be taken to ensure that each summary is factually based and includes the evidence and reasoning that the committee used to reach a specific performance rating decision. The facts and analysis used in the report must justify the conclusions that the committee reached. Responses must specifically address criteria listed on the evaluation report form.

To assist you in filling out the evaluation report, listed below are the components relevant to each question.

1. **The professor establishes a classroom or online environment that promotes the active role of students as learners, encouraging questions and other forms of participation.**
 - a. Classroom observation / Online course observation
 - b. Professional Improvement Form - self goals
 - c. Student evaluations
 - d. Professional Development contract

2. **The professor treats students with respect, demonstrating a willingness to work with a diverse student body.**
 - a. Classroom observation / Online course observation
 - b. Student evaluations

3. **The professor teaches a course that is appropriately organized, with clearly-stated objectives in keeping with the Course Outline of Record.**
 - a. Course materials
 - c. Classroom observation / Online course observation
 - d. Student Evaluations

4. **The professor demonstrates subject matter expertise.**
 - a. Course Materials
 - b. Professional Development Contract
 - c. Professional Improvement Form
 - d. Classroom observation / Online course observation
 - e. Student evaluations

5. **The professor is proficient at integrating appropriate material and methods into the classroom or the online environment.**
 - a. Classroom observation / Online course observation
 - b. Course materials (including Course Outline of Record)
 - c. Student evaluations

6. **The professor communicates in a clear, informative, and professional manner.**
 - a. Classroom observation
 - b. Student evaluations
 - c. Course materials

7. **The professor designs fair and clearly stated grading policies that promote high standards for student work.**
 - a. Classroom observation
 - b. Student evaluations
 - c. Course materials

8. **The professor provides fair and reasonably prompt evaluation of student work.**
 - a. Classroom observations
 - b. Student evaluations
 - c. Professional Improvement Form

9. **The professor establishes the appropriate learning outcomes for each course and consistently assesses for student learning of those outcomes.**
 - a. Student evaluations
 - b. Course materials (including Course Outline of Record)

Please note: Evaluations relating to element #9 must not be based on information or data gathered in the Palomar Outcomes Database (POD). Evaluators should rely primarily on other course materials, observations, discipline expertise, and the Course Outline of Record.

10. **The professor fulfills the contractual requirements of the position.**
 - a. Professional Development Contract, service credits
 - b. Professional Improvement Form
 - c. Letter from department chair/program director
 - d. Contract (collective Bargaining Agreement, FY09 – FY11)

11. **The professor demonstrated continued professional growth by participation in professional development activities.**
 - a. Professional Development Contract
 - b. Professional Improvement Form

12. **The professor demonstrates commitment to the college and to education by service to the college.**
 - a. Professional Development Contract
 - b. Professional Improvement Form