November 27, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: Harry Davis, KCC Faculty Senate Chair

FROM: Kevin Roddy, Evaluation Committee Chair

RE: Committee Report

The Faculty Senate’s Evaluation Committee has met regularly to review, discuss and make recommendations on the past assignments given to it. Committee members solicited input from their colleagues, discussed the issues, and have made the followed recommendations.

**CONTRACT RENEWAL**

1. *Alignment of Contract Renewal with Tenure/Promotion*. Contract Renewal candidates are currently asked for a statement of teaching ability, a section outlining activities and accomplishments, and a statement of goals and objectives.

Tenure/Promotion applicants are asked to include their teaching philosophy and goals, the instructor’s perception of student needs and aspirations, how the instructor responds to these needs, and progress toward achieving professional objectives.

Tenure-track faculty should begin to develop their teaching philosophy early in their careers. Contract renewal applicants only have two opportunities for DC and DPC feedback on teaching philosophies before submitting the tenure application.

**Recommendation**: Amend the contract renewal document to require an applicant to describe his/her teaching philosophy. Doing so would better align the contract renewal process with the tenure/promotion process.

The Committee consulted a current copy of the “Guidelines for Contract Renewal Dossiers for Faculty with Renewable Appointments” and found that applicants are now asked to include their teaching philosophy in their dossiers. However, instructional faculty are being asked for a ½ page maximum statement on teaching philosophy, while academic support faculty are asked for a 1 page maximum statement. Why the difference?

2. *Contract renewal dossier page limit*. The Committee wholeheartedly agrees that brevity is preferred, but a six-page cap on the contract renewal narrative currently set by Campus Administration seems too limiting. Also, contract renewal applicants are contractually obligated to file only two contract renewal applications prior to the tenure application, so they have to cover two years’ worth of activity in each application. Committee members also noted that departments differ in the amount of information
required from applicants.

**Recommendation:** It would best serve contract renewal applicants and the departments in which they work if the contract renewal narrative length is determined by the department, and not by campus administration.

3. *Non-teaching evaluation written by peers.* The Committee understands that Contract Renewal procedures differ from campus to campus and are not required to follow any UH standard. The Committee realizes the importance of a probationary faculty member’s non-teaching activities in the overall evaluation of his/her performance. However, the Committee feels that it is the applicant’s responsibility, and not a peer, to show evidence of non-teaching activity in the dossier.

**Recommendations:**

Instruct the applicant to clearly present evidence of significant non-teaching activities for DPC and DC review, and eliminate the requirement that a peer must submit a separate non-teaching evaluation on his/her behalf.

If Administration elects to keep this procedure as is, the Committee recommends that the “Kapi‘olani Community College Peer Evaluation Procedures—Non-Teaching Responsibilities” be included in the “Guidelines for Contract Renewal Dossiers for faculty with Renewable Appointment” rather than being a separate document.

The Committee also recommends that the Administration properly format both the “Guidelines for Contract Renewal Dossiers for faculty with Renewable Appointments” and “Guidelines for Contract Renewal Dossiers for faculty with Renewable Appointment” to reflect the office of origin, the date the document was last edited, the person(s) responsible for writing the document, and contact information for faculty members with questions.

**FIVE-YEAR REVIEW**

KCC Administration has proposed policies and procedures for the five-year review (“post-tenure review”) in a document called the "K9.203." This document references several relevant Board of Regents Policies, along with "Guidelines provided in CCCM 7200, March 19, 1982."

The bulk of the document is sound. It is logical, reasonable, and follows ordinary and normal channels of procedure and communication. However, the Committee expressed concerns in the following areas:

1. *Language.* One sentence in the first paragraph reads: “Successful student learning is measured, in part, by ongoing assessment (emphasis mine) of faculty who provide direct instruction and student and academic support.”
The Committee is unsure of the meaning of this sentence. Is this somehow related to Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)? There is no mention of SLOs anywhere in the K9.203.

**Recommendation:** To dispel confusion about SLOs and faculty assessment, the Committee recommends that this sentence be deleted from the K9.203.

2. *Descriptive or prescriptive?* At first glance, the K9.203 appears to be a template document a department can follow if it chooses not to create its own set of policies and procedures:

   “A faculty member who has not otherwise undergone evaluation in the preceding five years shall submit a self assessment following guidelines established by his/her department or those suggested below (emphasis mine) according to the following timeline…”

I contacted Louise Pagotto to verify this. While she said departments may devise their own evaluation instruments (a required narrative, checklist, vita, etc.) all departments must follow the policies and procedures proposed by the Administration in Draft Six.

**Recommendation:** Departments determines their own Department Personnel Committee procedures or follow a set of procedures written by Campus Administration. Departments should also be able to write their own five-year review procedures, or follow a set of procedures written by Campus Administration.

3. *Involvement of peers in the review process.* As Draft Six currently stands, five-year reviews are conducted between the Department Chair and the Faculty Member under review.

The BOR By-Laws and Policies, Section 9-15, October 16, 1981, Section 9-15 "Evaluation of Board of Regents Appointees" stipulates that faculty peers must be given the opportunity to be involved in the faculty review process:

b. "In recognition of the special role of the Faculty in the academic mission of the university, procedures for periodic review of Faculty performance must provide safeguards for academic freedom and shall provide the opportunity for participation of Faculty peers in the process (emphasis mine). Accordingly, each Chancellor, in consultation with appropriate Faculty governance organizations, shall develop procedures that incorporate these principles. The procedure shall include a requirement for evaluation of every Faculty member at least once every five (5) years, and may provide for exempting Faculty who have undergone a review for appointment, tenure, or promotion, or who have received a merit salary increase during this period."

The Committee learned through Senate members and Louise Pagotto that UHPA does not favor faculty involvement in five-year reviews. A provision to include faculty was included in earlier drafts but was removed from Draft Six. UHPA contends that the tenure/promotion application process establishes Faculty Member’s competency, and that
a five-year review need not be at the same level of scrutiny as someone applying for tenure or promotion. Members of the Evaluation Committee concur.

However, the Committee also realizes that the workplace is a less-than-perfect environment and proposed the possible scenarios regarding five-year reviews:

1. Chair and Faculty member get along, faculty member is respected by peers
2. Chair and Faculty member get along, faculty member is not respected by peers
3. Chair and Faculty member do not get along, faculty member respected by peers
4. Chair and Faculty member do not get along, faculty member not respected by peers

Five-year reviews must be fair to both the faculty member under review and his or her Department Chair (or Unit Head), also a faculty member.

Draft Six calls for only one evaluator of the faculty member’s performance (the Department Head). According to the K9.203:

“If a faculty member believes that the results of the evaluation are unwarranted or inappropriate, s/he may consult with the program dean or an administrator designated by the Chancellor.”

This leaves the performance decision purely in Administrative hands.

The Committee found one department on campus that involves faculty peers if a five-year review is not favorable:

The Math/Science Chair uses a Yes/No checklist to determine whether a faculty member’s performance is satisfactory. If the Chair checks one or more NO boxes, s/he must convene the Math/Science Personnel Committee to discuss the NO choice. If the Chair refuses to change the NO vote, the Chair, faculty member, and DPC meet to discuss the matter. The DPC makes the final decision.

**Recommendation:** K9.203 be amended to include faculty involvement in five-year reviews (as stipulated by the Bargaining Agreement) if there is concern about faculty performance.

4. “Outcomes” column on the form titled “Suggested Guidelines for the Five-Year Review Document.” The instructions require a faculty member to state “the specific outcomes of (each) endeavor.” Committee members questioned, “How much should be filled out here, and it what form? A narrative, a bulleted list, etc?” “How much is enough?”

**Recommendations:** The Administration should review the K9.203 and be more specific (perhaps using examples) as to what it wants from faculty in the “Outcomes” column.
Satisfactory performance in Five-Year Reviews should be made by the Chair and one or more of the faculty member’s peers if there are areas of concern.

Overall, the Committee believes that five-year reviews be conducted fairly and consistently among campus departments.

We also wish to acknowledge and thank Leigh Dooley for submitting her vision of the five-year review as a showcase of a faculty member’s performance. Many of her ideas show great promise.

**STUDENT EVALUATIONS**

Some time ago, a faculty member expressed concern that evaluations submitted by students taking online courses didn’t ask the same types of questions that evaluations distributed and collected in a classroom did, and that online evaluations were “less secure,” meaning anyone could submit an evaluation. This prompted the Committee to investigate ways in which online and in-class evaluations could be made equal to one another, and how online evaluation submittal could be made more secure.

Herve Collins has been collaborating with two programmers at UH-Manoa to design and make available an acceptable, secure online evaluation form including standard evaluation questions and faculty-written discipline-specific questions.

Review and discussion is ongoing.

**EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS**

This is the most daunting of the Committee’s work, because the process is so poorly understood. KCC uses the “360” method as one means of evaluation. “360” evaluations are sent via email to superiors, peers, and subordinates selected by the candidate to be evaluated.

Kevin spoke with Sandra Uyeno, UH System Human Resources Office. She verified (twice) that the person to be evaluated selects his/her evaluators, submits this list to administration, who then send an evaluation form via email to a sub-selection of this list.

The Committee is in the process of reading how faculty of other community colleges are involved in the evaluation of administrators: a single community college (Broward Community College), a community college system (California Community Colleges), and the State University of New York.

Review and discussion is ongoing.