

Tenure Review Process

Presented to Governing Board

Hartnell College

February 15, 2011

Purpose of Tenure Review

- Improve educational programs
- Assure compliance with district policies and procedures
- Recognize excellence
- Enhance performance and assist with improvement

Evaluation Process

- Team Composition
- Frequency
- Criteria
- Components
- Review of materials
- Conferences
- Results

Team Composition

- Evaluatee
- Administrator
 - Area Dean
 - Director Library/Instructional Services
 - VP Student Services
- Peer
 - appointed by the Academic Senate
 - From discipline or reasonably related discipline

Frequency

- Probationary faculty
- Undergo evaluation process at least once during each year of probation

Criteria—“shall be evaluated”

- Professional Competence
- Professional Conduct

Professional Competence

- Teaching practice and techniques
- Knowledge of the field
- Effective preparation and planning

Professional Conduct

- Adherence to course outline of record
- Observance of district policies
- Collegiality
- Willingness to grow

Criteria—“may be included”

- Additional areas of Professional Competence
- Professional Growth
- Professional Activities

Typically seen at increasing levels in years 2-4

Additional areas of Professional Competence

EXAMPLES

- Curriculum development/revision
- Development/revision of classroom materials
- Timely return of exams and papers

Professional Growth

EXAMPLES

- Research in field or in pedagogy
- Publication, editing professional journals, reviewing textbooks
- Participating in professional organizations

Professional Activities

EXAMPLES

- Department and college committees
- Academic Senate committees
- Recruitment activities
- Student club advisement
- Community service

Components

- Reports and class materials by evaluatee
 - By October 15
- Worksite Observations
 - By November 15
 - Three classes each by administrator and peer
- Student appraisals
 - By November 15
 - Every class

Review of materials

- Administrator and peer review materials
 - Reports by evaluatee
 - Worksite observation reports
 - Instructional materials
 - Student appraisals

Conferences

- Pre-evaluation conference
- Conference with peer
 - At least twice a semester
- Conference with administrator
 - At least once a semester
- Peer and administrator meet
 - By Dec. 1
- Post evaluation conference
 - By Dec. 10

Results

- Summary Evaluation Report
 - Overall performance rating
 - Years 1-3: Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory
 - Year 4: Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory
 - Recommendation to Tenure Review Committee
 - Renewal or nonrenewal
 - No recommendation given year 3

Results

- If “Needs Improvement” rating given
 - Team must prepare a remediation plan
 - Submitted to Tenure Review Committee
 - Reviewed by Tenure Review Committee

Assistance

- Constructive Criticism
 - Expected
- Counsel and advice for improvement
- Remediation Plan
 - Formal process
- Can be at Evaluation Team level or Tenure Review Committee level or both

Tenure Review Committee

- Composition
- Review Process
- Recommendation Process

Composition

- Vice President for Instruction
- Vice President for Student Services
- Academic Senate President
- Academic Senate Vice President

Or designee

Review Process

- All members read entire packet for each evaluatee
 - All years reviewed
 - Each candidate reviewed
- Complete review for each evaluatee
 - High level of scrutiny
 - Evidence of criteria

Review Process

- Meet and discuss findings
 - Thorough discussions
- Develop recommendations and write recommendation summaries
 - Documentation of findings

Recommendation Process

–Recommendation to Board of Trustees

- Enter into next contract or not
- No recommendation given year 3

Why not in year 3?

Recall...

- At end of first year
 - Renewal of appointment for year 2
- At end of second year
 - Renewal of appointment for years 3 and 4
- At end of third year
 - No Board of Trustee action
 - Appointment in effect for years 3 and 4
- At end of fourth year
 - Decision to grant tenure or not

Recommendation Process

- For evaluatees in years 1 or 2
 - Enter into next contract
 - Do not enter into next contract
 - May recommend tenure at end of year 2

Recommendation Process

- For evaluatees in year 3
 - No recommendation

Recommendation Process

- For evaluatees in year 4
 - Employ as tenured faculty for all subsequent years
 - Do not enter into next contract

Recommendation Process

- TRC Recommendations forwarded to President
- President recommends to the Board of Trustees

Prior to March 15th

- Board action
- District contacts to report status

Board's Study Session
developed by and presented by

Dr. Kelly Locke, Faculty
Dr. Suzanne Flannigan, Vice President
Academic Affairs/Accreditation