Date: Friday September 25, 2015   **Time/Location:** 1-3 PM / Room 113

Senate Roles and Responsibilities (The 10+1)	
1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines.	7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports
2. Degree and certificate requirements	8. Policies for faculty professional development activities
3. Grading policies	9. Processes for program review
4. Educational program development	10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development
5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success	11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate
6. District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles	

Senators: Matt Clark (President), **Donna McGill-Cameron** (CTE), **Donna Bahneman** (Adjunct), **Jaya Shah** (Math & Science), **Kevin Ferns** (Secretary, FaLaHum), **Greg Gassman** (Social Science), **Pam Geer** (Adjunct At-large), **Christopher Howerton** (At-large), **Jose Vallejo** (Student Services)

Representatives: Michael Sramek (ASWCC), **Harry Lyons** (CLC)

Absent: None!

Guests: Jesse Foster (ASWCC, Student Trustee), Vice President Konuwa, President White, D. Sperling, A. Willson, HR Director Whitfield

Call to order at 1:03 p.m.

Item	Description-Type	Lead	Background and Objective
I	**Approval of Agenda -Action**		Approve agenda of 9/25/15 (MSC Howerton/Bahneman).
II	**Public Comment**		Guests are welcome to comment on any item on the agenda or not on the agenda. For items on the agenda, they may comment now or during the discussion of that item.
	Discussion 1. J. Foster reports that AB 798 is headed to the governor's desk. This would offer a grant program for colleges to apply for open education resources. He would like to see this agendized this for the next senate meeting, as WCC needs to be ready to take advantage of this program if it is on a first come, first served basis.		
III	**Approval of Minutes-Action**		Review and approve the minutes of 9/11/15.
	Discussion/Decision: 1. The 9/11/15 minutes are approved as amended (MSC Howerton/Bahneman).		
IV	**President's Report - Information/Discussion**	Clark	
	Discussion/Decision: 1. See the attached report. 2. Clark states that a BSI report to the state is due soon that may need senate signoff. We may need to hold a special meeting to look at the BSI report.		
V	**Committee Appointments - Action**	Senate	**Objective**: Appoint faculty members to committees.

	Discussion/Decision: 1. No appointments today due to a technology glitch. We may be able to make appointments in a special meeting to fill important committee roles.		
	Senate/Committee Reports - Information	Senate	
VI	*Discussion/Decision:* 1. Vallejo reports that counseling is working with Dean Ortiz-Mercado on the SSSP plan and upcoming orientations in October and November. Counseling is in the process of doing some hiring for adjunct positions as well. In addition, counseling has a concern that counselors' individual mailboxes were taken down and replaced by a group mail bin. 2. Ferns: Some FALAHUM Division members are concerned about communication practices and process at WCC. A coordinator proposal was submitted on September 14 by members of the FALAHUM Division according to the protocols we have in place, but the dean blocked the proposal from being submitted to the HR Director. In her email on September 15, she stated: "At this time, we, as program administrators, cannot support this proposal and are electing not to move forward." When a member of the FALAHUM Division requested a meeting with President White on the issue of forming a proposal review committee, as the contract between faculty and the district requires, the president responded in an email on September 17: "While I do not want to create barriers between faculty and my office, I ask that you first check in with your Dean." This is in reference to the same dean who refused to forward the request in the first place. This is unfortunate because it is only the second time in the past year in which this member has requested a face to face meeting with the president, and for a second straight time the member was unable to meet with the president. This does indeed create the perception that a barrier is being formed between faculty and administration. In order for meaningful communication to take place, both faculty and administrators need to follow the protocols that are in place which are designed to allow all sides to be heard prior to making decisions. WCC's U.S. Department of Education HSI Strengthening Institutions grant application was rejected this summer because protocols were not followed by WCC. This was an issue of not following the proper procedure, and WCC potentially gave up thousands of dollars in grant monies. On July 28 of this year President White sent an email out to WCC faculty and staff regarding that proposal stating: "A glass half-full guy such as myself sees this as an opportunity to learn and strengthen our protocols." Members of the FALAHUM Division would like to see our administrators follow the strong protocols we already have in place regarding communication procedures. We are discovering that the glass may actually be half empty when it comes to doing what is right for WCC's faculty, staff, and students. I have served on the Communication and Technology Committee for 5 years, the past 3 years as the chair. I've dedicated hours of time to improving communication protocols and procedures on this campus. I donated my time to this cause because I believed that we all wanted to improve communication issues on this campus together. I find it sadly ironic that my work on communications at WCC has filled all the appropriate check boxes for accreditation purposes, but when our administrators are asked to apply effective communication practices in support of faculty, staff, and students, our protocols are disregarded and ignored. 3. Howerton reports that the curriculum committee will be piloting a few programs this spring regarding Meta. The realignment at CLC is also moving forward. In addition, the IERT meeting was canceled this past week. 4. Geer reports that the CCOF committee has not yet met. A meeting is scheduled for October.		

			5. Lyons acknowledges that McGill-Cameron was right in that the program review at CLC will be a big deal when he previously thought that it would not be. They will work out the various program review issues together. The recent Valley Fire left approximately 10 to 20 students without a home and the unions and student organizations are working to support those students. 6. McGill-Cameron reports that the flex process is taking longer due to the number of questions and issues with the system, but the Flex committee will be filling vacancies soon and getting together to address flex concerns. 7. Gassman reports that the social sciences division has all its classes planned through Spring 2017.
VII	**Faculty Evaluation Process and Instrument – Information/Discussion**	Whitfield, Senate	**Background**: The YCCD Board of Trustees has asked that the faculty evaluation process be improved, especially the portion that deals with tenure evaluations. Independently, HR has been working with faculty to improve the evaluation instrument. **Objective**: Receive an update on the status of improvements and a proposed new instrument, with the goal of making a recommendation regarding the latter at our next meeting.
	Discussion/Decision: 1. A. Willson reports that she has been working on an updated faculty evaluation process for the past 10 years. This is meant to be a continuous process and is not meant to be punitive. The problem with the old form was that it was so vague and the presence of any suggestions for improvement could be interpreted as punitive in nature. The new forms, which have been approved by the YC senate on a trial basis (with consent of new YC faculty), are intended to promote development. The new forms are attached. Howerton agrees that the new forms are designed to promote a culture of continuous improvement. Howerton worked on the committee that developed the forms, and while there are still concerns that should be addressed, the forms are headed in the right direction. Director Whitfield notes that this has been a collaborative effort and that the forms will continue to evolve. We are constantly evaluating our processes and we are moving in the right direction. He would like both senates to confirm the pilot of the new forms and he is also working with YCFA. Howerton asks whether some deans are already using this form. Director Whitfield responds that deans have received training on the new forms. Howerton responds that he has concerns that the senate has not received feedback from faculty on the new forms. Director Whitfield notes that originally just first year faculty would pilot the new forms. YC has decided to pilot the new forms on tenured faculty in order to better assess the viability of the new forms. Clark corrects Director Whitfield that the YC Senate voted to pilot the new form on new faculty if they agree to it as well. Howerton expresses concern that the pilot is moving forward without adequate consultation. Director Whitfield responds that the pilot forms are not going forward yet. A. Willson notes that some of the terminology could still be adjusted on the form, and that it will evolve. For example, the word "marginal" has negative connotations for many people and may need to be adjusted. Clark states that it would have been better to have this discussion late last semester rather than being forced to rush it at this point. He is hesitant to pilot this with new faculty because the forms may change. There is also the YCFA contract that must be considered through the union since it designates specific forms that must be used. Geer responds that YC-AFT opposes the form. She states that adjunct faculty would like a different form and the adjunct union is working on a form better suited to adjunct faculty. Bahneman suggests that a self-evaluation might be helpful for faculty and this is something she does in her work in the Los Rios district. Howerton notes that the committee did recognize the need for more self-evaluation. A. Willson responds that faculty do have more self-evaluation opportunities using the new form. Clark would like for the district and the colleges to ensure that all the supervisors and faculty on evaluation committees to be properly trained to use the new tool effectively. The senate may need to speak with the committee members as to their responsibilities in using the new tool. Director Whitfield would like to hear from the senate by their next meeting as to how WCC will proceed. He will also bring any new adjunct forms to the senate when he hears back from YC-AFT.

		Sperling	**Background**: Dustin Sperling has been hired with duties to be split between teaching Ag classes and piloting dual enrollment in Ag with the intent to scale to other CTE programs.
	Dual Enrollment – Presentation		**Objective**: Provide the senate with information regarding the status, timeline, and scope of the pilot. Additionally, make the senate aware of its role in the dual enrollment conversations.

Discussion/Decision:

VIII

1. D. Sperling states that dual enrollment is similar to 2+2 articulation. It is designed to allow students to gain college credit for passing courses equivalent to the college course but taught at the high school. Last year our service area high schools had 1,500 students graduate in ag programs, but only 168 of those students went on to take ag courses at WCC. Dual enrollment serves to successfully reach underserved student populations, allowing WCC to tap into this potential market. These students are more likely to graduate and more likely to matriculate at WCC. The SEED program (Student Engagement and Economic Development) sought to define the pathway from the secondary system to the post-secondary system. A technical degree from the community college system is more valuable to graduating students than the typical A.A. degree. Counseling 25 and Ag 60 have been identified as courses well suited as a starting point in the high schools. This spring these courses will be offered at Pioneer High School, Esparto High School, and Woodland High School. In Fall 2016 we will look at the progression and determine the next courses. D. Sperling is working closely with counselors and ag instructors at all three high schools to monitor the progress of these courses. Once the "soft launch" takes place in the ag departments, he would serve as liaison to other CTE-area faculty to develop dual enrollment courses in other areas, train high school instructors to teach college classes, and develop new pathways for students. Clark notes a math class may also be in the pathway, so this may affect other areas besides CTE. Bahneman asks what types of career pathways are offered at the high schools. D. Sperling responds that WCC's programs would drive the process, and we would identify the pathways at the high schools that would be best suited to our offerings. As WCC grows and expands its CTE programs, dual enrollment will generate the student populations needed to fill new programs. Howerton is excited about the prospects of dual enrollment. Howerton asks whether D. Sperling has been able to maintain his teaching load while managing all the duties of the dual enrollment program. D. Sperling notes that the workload will decrease down the road once the program is up and running. It may eventually need a coordinator who would take ownership of the process. Howerton notes that we need to make sure that any programs we support are sustainable and will be supported going forward. Vallejo thanks D. Sperling for sharing this information with counselors at an earlier meeting. He wonders whether there is true collaboration with faculty. The counseling department was unaware that this was happening until August 2015. He also wants to make sure that any instructors meet minimum qualifications. There are also concerns that the instructor of record is the one actually teaching the course. There is a gap of information at the high schools and some of the teachers and counselors at local high schools may not be fully informed of WCC's plans. D. Sperling responds that WCC faculty would be consulted as far as recommendations for faculty who would teach the courses. Vallejo wonders aloud how we will be able to hire new faculty so quickly considering we already have these classes scheduled for spring. McGill-Cameron wonders how we came to the number of 1,500 students graduating from ag programs at local high schools. Vallejo also wonders about the number since we may not have that many students graduating in total each year in our service area. D. Sperling is going to check the numbers. Geer would like for ECE to be included in this program in the future. Clark asks whether dual enrollment is always taught at the high school. D. Sperling responds that they can be offered in other places depending on the program. Some could be on the college campus.

	Clark asks whether concurrent enrollment is the same as dual enrollment. D. Sperling states that dual enrollment is essentially the same as concurrent enrollment. Clark asks how these faculty will be evaluated. What kind of quality control will WCC have? D. Sperling responds that WCC faculty will have close professional collaboration with these faculty. Clark notes that professional evaluation is part of the senate's duties, so the senate needs to have some quality control regarding these offerings and faculty. D. Sperling agrees that the quality of our instruction is very important as it contributes to our overall brand, and we will work to ensure that this takes place. The process may be complicated because it deals with two unions and the senate, but it will be a priority.		
IX	**Senate Goals – Action**	Senate	**Background**: At the May 21, 2015 retreat, the senate drafted goals for 2015-2016. The list needs to be finalized, adopted and presented to the YCCD Board of Trustees. **Objective**: Adopt Senate Goals for 2015-16 and assign leads/teams to each goal.
	Discussion/Decision: 1. The senate refined the attached draft goals and attached names to each goal. Clark will update the draft goals and send out a revised copy for approval at the next meeting. ➢ **The senate approves the goals as amended (MSC Howerton/Gassman).**		
X	**Committee Structure (A) – Information/Discussion**	Senate	**Background**: College Council has adopted new language for governance structures at WCC. **Objective**: Provide feedback or consider adopting the language.
	Discussion/Decision: Not addressed.		
XI	**Committee Structure (B) – Information/Discussion**	Senate	**Background**: At a joint meeting of the Budget and Planning Committee and the Program Review Validation Team, it was decide to recommend the merging of the two committees into one committee. This could be a first step toward creating a Institutional Effectiveness Committee. **Objective**: Review the proposal and provide feedback.
	Discussion/Decision: Not addressed.		
XII	**Accreditation Midterm Report – Information/Discussion**	Konuwa, Howerton, Clark	**Background**: WCC will turn in a Midterm Report and two (2) Sub-Change Reports (CLC transition and CCOF curriculum). All three are due October 15. **Objective**: Receive updates on the status of each report.
	Discussion/Decision: Not addressed.		
XIII	**SSSP Plan – Information/Discussion**	Konuwa, Senate	**Background**: WCC must submit its SSSP plan to the state by the end of October. The plan requires senate sign-off. **Objective**: Receive a preliminary report on the status of the plan.
	Discussion/Decision: Not addressed.		
XIV	**Communication and Technology (CAT) Purpose Statement – Action**	Clark	**Background:** CAT has proposed changes to its purpose statement and membership. **Objective:** Consider adoption of the changes.
	Discussion/Decision: Not addressed.		
XV	**Future Agenda Items- Discussion**		Division Chairs, College Catalog, SSS Priorities, Ed Master Plan, CCOF, LGBTQ Safe Zones, ADA in the Classroom, Faculty Evaluation Forms, Curriculum Support Across the District
	Discussion/Decision: Not addressed.		

Meeting adjourned 3:03 p.m.

Draft Senate Goals, 2015-2016 with Updates (12 goals)

#	Goal	Who	Status
1	**Student Success:** Identify and address barriers to student success (counseling availability, course offerings). Work with the Student Success Committee.	Clark, Bahneman, Student Success Committee	
2	**Curriculum:** Create catalog/class schedule subcommittee (via curriculum and scheduling committees), increase faculty awareness, establish program development structure and incorporate with EMP, and create a DE handbook.	McGill, Howerton	Ongoing
3	**Clearlake College (CLC) Transition:** Integrate	Clark, Howerton	In progress
4	**Sabbatical Leave:** (Re)define the sabbatical leave process in light of the multi-college transition.	Clark, Bahneman, McGill-Cameron	Look at this goal and determine how to rework it in the fall.
5	**Faculty Evaluation:** Improve the faculty evaluation process.	Clark, Howerton, Geer	In progress
6	**Sabbatical Leave:** Define sabbatical leave process in light of the multi-college transition	Clark, HR	
7	**Grading Policies:** Review, update, and distribute Faculty Handbook.	Clark	Awaiting Work of CLAS
8	**Colusa County Outreach Facility (CCOF)**: Create comprehensive process for Colusa County Outreach Facility (CCOF).	Clark, Geer	Early in process, awaiting notes from college president.
9	Revise **Senate Constitution and Bylaws**.	Clark, McGill, Gassman, Ferns	In progress
10	**Sustainability and Grant Funding:** Define process for seeking grants and sustaining work after grants or categorical funds expire.	Clark, Konuwa, B&P	TBD
11	**Education Master Plan (EMP):** Work with College Council to create the new WCC EMP		
12	**Distance Education (DE):** Work with the Curriculum Committee and the Dean of Student Success and Planning to strengthen the WCC DE modality. Work should include, but not be limited to, faculty training, student training, student supplemental resources, and ensuring regular, instructor initiated contact.		

Meeting with WCC Administration – Meetings of 9/15 and 9/22 were both canceled.

DCC (9/24) – YC President Kemble, Chancellor Houston, and I met with DCC (District Curriculum Committee to receive an update regarding the status and timeline for switching to CurricuNet Meta. Currently the plan is for some members of the two curriculum committees to beta test Meta early in Spring Semester and begin training for all faculty members late in Spring Semester. Two related topics: (1) Asmus has distributed a draft of curriculum support needs to DCC for feedback; I anticipate we will review at our next senate meeting, and (2) Dr. Walters may suggest DCC become a work group as needed rather than continue as a standing committee. The latter had been broached in a meeting that Asmus and I had with Dr. Walters at her request. Part of her charge is to look at completing the multi-college transition. An unrelated topic: **Dr. Walters stated that there are a number of Census Rosters that have yet to be certified.**

Budget & Planning/PRVT Joint Meeting (9/17) – Highlights:
1. We agreed to propose the merging of B&P and PRVT (possibly as a prelude to formation of an Institutional Effectiveness Committee).
2. We agreed that with excess funds from last year, a photo spectrometer would be purchased for chemistry. The item had been ranked very highly last year and then bypassed to allow a larger quantity of items to be acquired.
3. Konuwa informed us that the chancellor wants both colleges to provide an update on the Student Success Initiatives. [The senate needs to check follow-up with the Student Success Committee and Student Services on their suggestions regarding prioritizing same.
4. President White asked that EMP be a standing item on the B&P agenda.
5. Concerns regarding integrating CLC programs into WCC program reviews were discussed. Data should be available soon. There is a resource at YC and another at TracDat which we can access to help with the transition. It was agreed by the group that vigilance would be required to ensure that there were no unintended negative consequences of what will likely be a rough round of program reviews.
[In a related item, Kemble and I have requested a meeting with Chancellor Houston and CBO Kaur to receive clarification regarding the district budget process.]

DCAS (9/17) – Highlights:
1. It was agreed that CLC will submit program reviews with WCC, but that YC will be kept in the loop.
2. CLC will also be included in WCC's SSSP plan to be submitted at the end of October.
3. Chancellor Houston mentioned the possibility of moving the district offices. [I have received an email from a colleague at YC expressing serious concern about the proposal, citing district and college infrastructure as a reason that the move might not be financially advisable. E.g., there will be additional stretching of already thin IT and custodial services.]
4. In anticipating creating an AP regarding attendance policies, it was agreed to ask the senates to define excused and unexcused absences with an eye toward students participating in college related activities.
5. Houston proposed a process for streamlining AP revisions and asked for senate feedback. AP revisions would be classified as either: (A) minor revisions – to be taken care of through the chancellor's office, (B) minor revisions with lapse of time – to be dealt with in DCAS without an extended process involving senates (other that the senate presidents and VPs), and (C) significant revisions – requiring extended and broader discussions with the senates heavily involved. Although (B) risks a lack of thorough examination, if it was agreed that any member of DCAS could ask that a (B) be moved to (C), the risk would be mitigated.

ART (9/11) – We reviewed Dr. Walter's feedback on the midterm report and discussed the disparity in the lengths of the WCC report and the YC report (YC's is currently much longer). It was generally felt that we are happy with the approach that we are taking and don't think the more abbreviated nature will reflect poorly.

Miscellany
1. Ferns decided that he will not take on additional senate duties this semester and will not continue joining me in meetings with the administration.
2. Howerton will be following the progress of DCAS this semester (although unable to attend meetings) so that he will be up to speed when he assumes the VP position in January.
3. Kemble, Heilman (YC Senate VP), and I met with Mathews and Smith from YCFA to discuss concerns with the proposed new evaluation tools.

Yuba Community College District Faculty Evaluation Form IE 1F

Name of Person Being Evaluated: _____   Discipline: _____

Location: ☐ Beale ☐ CCC ☐ CLC ☐ SCC ☐ WCC ☐ YC   Date of Observation: _____

Class Observed: _____   Length of Observation: _____ minutes

Tenure-Track Contract Year: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4   Tenured ☐   Temporary ☐   Adjunct ☐

Current Assignment: _____FTE Teaching   _____FTE Other   Briefly describe assignments other than teaching:

_____

Prior to conducting a faculty evaluation, the evaluator should obtain the following:
- A copy of the faculty member's class syllabus
- A list of the committees and/or professional activities in which the faculty member is involved
- The faculty member's written description (a short narrative) of professional growth and contributions since the previous evaluation
- The faculty member's written reflection (a short narrative) on changes in his or her performance since the previous evaluation
- The faculty member's personal and/or professional goals with a timeline (a short narrative)

A. Evaluation

4 = Exceeds Expectations, 3 = Meets Expectations, 2 = Marginal, and 1 = Unacceptable

1. Professional Responsibilities   4   3   2   1

   In your assessment, consider the following: ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐
   - Communicates to colleagues clearly and effectively
   - Demonstrates collegiality and professionalism among peers and with other College and District employees
   - If a fulltime faculty member: Provides evidence of participation in college- and/or district-wide committees and/or other professional activities that further the growth of the college

   Explanation of Assessment:

2. Instructional Performance and Organization   4   3   2   1

   (This section may be skipped if the faculty members' current assignment does not include teaching)   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐

   In your assessment, consider the following:
   - Uses teaching methods and materials that are current, challenging to the student, and appropriate to the course matter
   - Changes the approach or offers new explanations when needed
   - Provides clear assignments or instructions to students
   - Demonstrates patience, fairness, and promptness in the evaluation and discussion of student work
   - Is willing and available to assist students

   Explanation of Assessment:

3. Professional Growth and Currency   4   3   2   1

In your assessment, consider the following: ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐
- Maintains current knowledge of field in performance of assignment
- Demonstrates innovation in area of assignment
- Demonstrates evidence of participation in professional growth and development activities

Explanation of Assessment:

| |
| |

If the faculty member being evaluated is one of the following, complete the appropriate addendum			
Coach	Counselor	Librarian	Program Coordinator

B. **Overall Assessment**

☐ Exceeds Expectations ☐ Meets Expectations   ☐ Marginal   ☐ Unacceptable

Overall evaluation and recommendations:

| |
| |

C. **Self-Evaluation** The faculty member being evaluated must attach the following:
1. Written response to Student Evaluations
2. Written response to recommendations made in this evaluation, which may include revisions or additions to personal and/or professional goals

_____   _____
Evaluator   **Date**

I have had the opportunity to read this report and discuss it with the evaluator. I recognize that I have the right to write comments regarding this evaluation and to carry out any additional self-evaluation that I wish to include.

_____   _____
Faculty Member   **Date**

Yuba Community College District Faculty Evaluation Form IE 1S

Name of Person Being Evaluated: _____   Discipline: _____

Location: ☐ Beale ☐ CCC ☐ CLC ☐ SCC ☐ WCC ☐ YC   Date of Observation: _____

Class Observed: _____   Length of Observation: _____ minutes

Tenure-Track Contract Year: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4   Tenured ☐   Temporary ☐   Adjunct ☐

Current Assignment: _____FTE Teaching   _____FTE Other   Briefly describe assignments other than teaching:

_____

Prior to conducting a faculty evaluation, the evaluator should obtain the following:
- A copy of the faculty member's class syllabus
- A list of the committees and/or professional activities in which the faculty member is involved
- The faculty member's written description (a short narrative) of professional growth and contributions since the previous evaluation
- The faculty member's written reflection (a short narrative) on changes in his or her performance since the previous evaluation
- The faculty member's personal and/or professional goals with a timeline (a short narrative)

D.   Evaluation

4 = Exceeds Expectations, 3 = Meets Expectations, 2 = Marginal, and 1 = Unacceptable

		4	3	2	1
4.	Professional Responsibilities				

In your assessment, consider the following: ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- Communicates to colleagues clearly and effectively
- Demonstrates collegiality and professionalism among peers and with other College and District employees
- If a fulltime faculty member: Provides evidence of participation in college- and/or district-wide committees and/or other professional activities that further the growth of the college

In your assessment as a supervisor, consider also the following: ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- Reads, complies with, and, when appropriate, responds to College and District communications sent to assigned yccd.edu email
- Participates in student learning outcomes development, assessment, and implementation. (SLO assessment results for individual faculty members shall not be included.)
- If a fulltime faculty member: Attends required meetings, maintains current knowledge of department goals, assessment activities, and curriculum development

Explanation of Assessment:

```
[blank text box]
```

		4	3	2	1
5.	Instructional Performance and Organization				

(This section may be skipped if the faculty members' current assignment does not include teaching)   ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

In your assessment, consider the following:
- Uses teaching methods and materials that are current, challenging to the student, and appropriate to the course matter
- Changes the approach or offers new explanations when needed
- Provides clear assignments or instructions to students
- Demonstrates patience, fairness, and promptness in the evaluation and discussion of student work
- Is willing and available to assist students

In your assessment as a supervisor, consider also the following: ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- Provides each student with a current course syllabus consistent with the approved course outline for each course taught (a copy of which is maintained in the area/division office)
- Meets classes as assigned, arriving on time to each class

Explanation of Assessment:

6. Professional Growth and Currency   4   3   2   1

In your assessment, consider the following: ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐
- Maintains current knowledge of field in performance of assignment
- Demonstrates innovation in area of assignment
- Demonstrates evidence of participation in professional growth and development activities

Explanation of Assessment:

If the faculty member being evaluated is one of the following, complete the appropriate addendum			
Coach	Counselor	Librarian	Program Coordinator

E. **Overall Assessment**

☐ Exceeds Expectations   ☐ Meets Expectations   ☐ Marginal   ☐ Unacceptable

Overall evaluation and recommendations:

F. **Self-Evaluation** The faculty member being evaluated must attach the following:
3. Written response to Student Evaluations
4. Written response to recommendations made in this evaluation, which may include revisions or additions to personal and/or professional goals

_____   _____

Evaluator   **Date**

I have had the opportunity to read this report and discuss it with the evaluator. I recognize that I have the right to write comments regarding this evaluation and to carry out any additional self-evaluation that I wish to include.

_____   _____

Faculty Member   **Date**

Pilot Student Evaluation Questions

1. The instructor explained the objectives of the course
   a. Clearly from the beginning
   b. Clearly but not from the beginning
   c. Generally
   d. Indirectly
   e. Never
2. The instructor organized the material of the course
   a. Always clearly
   b. Usually very well
   c. Adequately most of the time
   d. Not so well
   e. There was never any clear organization in this class
3. The instructor encouraged student participation and was receptive of student views
   a. Always
   b. Often
   c. Occasionally
   d. Rarely
   e. Never
4. The instructor was sensitive to students having difficulty in class, changing the approach or offering new explanations
   a. Always
   b. Often
   c. Occasionally
   d. Rarely
   e. Never
5. The instructor was willing and available to offer individual help if you needed it
   a. Always
   b. Often
   c. Occasionally
   d. Rarely
   e. Never
6. The instructor was clear and interesting in presenting the subject matter
   a. Always
   b. Often
   c. Occasionally
   d. Rarely
   e. Never
7. The instructor presented clear assignments and/or instructions to students
   a. Always
   b. Often
   c. Occasionally
   d. Rarely
   e. Never
8. The instructor returned graded material promptly
   a. Always
   b. Often

     c. Occasionally

     d. Rarely

     e. Never

9. The instructor used grading procedures which were

     a. Clearly explained and consistently applied

     b. Clearly explained and consistently applied for the most part

     c. Adequately explained and consistently applied for the most part

     d. Not explained very well and/or not applied consistently all the time

     e. Unexplained and/or never applied consistently

10. How would you rate this instructor overall ==(five stars being the highest and one star being the lowest)?==

     a. Excellent

     b. Good

     c. Average

     d. Fair

     e. Poor

NOTE: Please use the back of this form on which to explain what this instructor is doing well and/or what specifically the instructor should do better. Give examples.

Yuba Community College District Faculty Evaluation Form IE 1S
Coaching Addendum

G. Evaluation

4 = Exceeds Expectations, 3 = Meets Expectations, 2 = Marginal, and 1 = Unacceptable

	4	3	2	1
Coaching Performance	☐	☐	☐	☐

In your assessment, consider the following:
- Recruits and maintains student-athletes sufficient to field a competitive team that positively represents the college.
- Exhibits evidence that the dignity of the individual is respected.
- Exhibits professional behavior, adheres to the CCCAA Decorum Policy, and positively represents the college.

	4	3	2	1
Coaching Organization	☐	☐	☐	☐

In your assessment, consider the following:
- Develops organized practices
- Exhibits organized game management

	4	3	2	1
In your assessment as a supervisor, consider the following:	☐	☐	☐	☐

- Provides timely and accurate information in areas such as practice schedules, game schedules, behavior and eligibility expectations, contest scores, website information, travel requests, budget requests, and a thorough end-of-season report.
- Effectively communicates with support staff, and sport coaches.
- Effectively manages budget, raises funds, and stewards resources.

	4	3	2	1
Coaching Compliance	☐	☐	☐	☐

In your assessment as a supervisor, consider also the following:
- Consistently complies with the rules and regulations of the CCCAA, including stat reporting, Coutable Athletic Related Activity limitations, Non-Traditional Season limitations, recruiting and eligibility rules.
- Consistently complies with Yuba College Board Policies and Adminstrative Procedures

Explanation of Assessment:

H.   Evaluation

4 = Exceeds Expectations, 3 = Meets Expectations, 2 = Marginal, and 1 = Unacceptable

Librarian Performance and Organization	4	3	2	1
In your assessment, consider the following: • Effectively plans, implements, evaluates and accepts feedback on services • Provides evidence that the dignity of the individual/student is respected • Fosters an environment conducive to student research and study	☐	☐	☐	☐
In your assessment as a supervisor, consider also the following: • Maintains required schedule, making oneself available to students and other members of the academic community • Meets obligations on time, e.g., reports, products/services analysis, records, planning documents, orders, schedule requests, and projects • Demonstrates flexibility in providing coverage to meet the needs of the college	☐	☐	☐	☐

Explanation of Assessment:

Yuba Community College District Faculty Evaluation Addendum A
Counseling Faculty Performance Review

Name of Person Being Evaluated: _____ Discipline: _____

Location: ☐ Beale ☐ CCC ☐ CLC ☐ SCC ☐ WCC ☐ YC Date of Observation: _____

Class Observed: _____ Length of Observation: _____ minutes

Tenure-Track Contract Year: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 Tenured ☐ Temporary ☐ Adjunct ☐

Current Assignment: _____FTE Teaching _____FTE Other Briefly describe assignments other than teaching:

_____

Evaluation
4 = Exceeds Expectations, 3 = Meets Expectations, 2 = Marginal, and 1 = Unacceptable

		4	3	2	1

7. <u>Professional Responsibilities</u>   4 3 2 1

In your assessment, consider the following: ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- Communicates to colleagues clearly and effectively
- Demonstrates collegiality and professionalism among peers and with other College and District employees
- If a fulltime faculty member: Provides evidence of participation in college- and/or district-wide committees and/or other professional activities that further the growth of the college

Explanation of Assessment:

```
[blank box]
```

8. <u>Instructional Performance and Organization</u>   4 3 2 1

(This section may be skipped if the faculty members' current assignment does not include teaching)   ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

In your assessment, consider the following:
- Uses teaching methods and materials that are current, challenging to the student, and appropriate to the course matter
- Changes the approach or offers new explanations when needed
- Provides clear assignments or instructions to students
- Demonstrates patience, fairness, and promptness in the evaluation and discussion of student work
- Is willing and available to assist students

Explanation of Assessment:

```
[blank box]
```

9. <u>Professional Growth and Currency</u>   4 3 2 1

In your assessment, consider the following: ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- Maintains current knowledge of field in performance of assignment
- Demonstrates innovation in area of assignment
- Demonstrates evidence of participation in professional growth and development activities

Yuba Community College District Faculty Evaluation Form IE 1S
Distance Education Addendum
(Review links provided for regulations)

I.   Evaluation
4 = Exceeds Expectations, 3 = Meets Expectations, 2 = Marginal, and 1 = Unacceptable

Distance Education Performance and Organization	4	3	2	1
In your assessment, consider the following:	☐	☐	☐	☐

- Syllabus meets DE requirements (e.g. is posted and includes SLOs, lists methods for effective student contact.
- Student evaluations indicate compliancy with stated methods of student contact.
- Course content is compliant with the DE Checklist
- Student work is graded within a reasonable time period. At least before the next assignment is to be submitted
- Feedback given to students is effective and will guide them in methodically improving their work
- Student participation is defined, and a mechanism for measuring quality and quantity is provided.
- Course meets ADA compliancy

In your assessment as a supervisor, consider also the following:	☐	☐	☐	☐

- Brian, you may or may not need to add anything here..
- Course abides be copyright and fair use laws

Explanation of Assessment:

* Brian there will be links to AP4105 – the DEE has been working on a new DE addendum checklist for curriculum, and explanation of Effective Faculty Generated Communication. There will be links for these for the evaluator

2015-2016 PURPOSE STATEMENT

COMMUNICATION AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Sponsor: Michael White
Committee Chair: Kevin Ferns
Recorder: Vacant

Committee Purpose: The purpose of the Communication and Technology Committee (CAT) is to enhance organizational communication by identifying and recommending effective practices, including technology-related practices, which facilitate decision-making and the exchange of information amongst college constituents.

Specifically, the committee serves the following functions:
➢ Develop guidelines to facilitate clear, open, respectful, and timely communication throughout the college community.
➢ Assist each college committee and project team in developing a communication review and evaluation plan for continuous improvement.
➢ Communicate and facilitate campus technology-related needs and issues.
➢ Review and update the WCC Technology Plan on an annual basis.
➢ Serve as an advisory group to the District Technology Committee.

Special Guidelines, Parameters, and/or Resources:
1. Committee recommendations will be consistent with Board policies.
2. Recommendations should reflect diversity and multicultural sensitivity.
3. Agenda should be distributed 3 days in advance of a meeting.
4. Meeting notes should be distributed 5 days following each meeting.
5. Committee members should come prepared for each meeting with completed assignments, as necessary, to move the business of the meeting forward.
6. Committee chair provides periodic reports to the College Council and Academic Senate.

Meeting Schedule:
<div align="center">First and third Fridays, 12-12:50 PM, Room 844</div>

How Work Is Communicated:
Members will communicate with their constituent groups. Agendas and committee-related documents will be posted to the committee website. Meeting notes will be distributed to committee members and updates will be periodically communicated with campus constituents.

Recommendations Go To:
1. College Council for review and additional recommendation to the President.
2. Academic Senate for information.
3. District Technology Committee for information.

Communication and Technology Committee
Membership

Position	Term	Name
Student Services/Student Success Representative (FT or Adj. Faculty, Classified, or Admin)		Vacant
Chair (Full Time Faculty)	2013-2016	Kevin Ferns
Full Time Faculty	2016-2019	Vacant
Full Time Faculty	2015-2018	Cay Strode
Full Time Faculty	2014-2017	Shawn Lanier
District IT Representative		Michael Plant
Adjunct Faculty	2013-2016	Vacant
Classified	2013-2016	Vacant
ASWCC	2014-2015	Vacant
Technology Resources		Chris Mejia, Julie Brown

Yuba Community College Faculty Evaluation Process Authority The authority for faculty evaluations is granted by California Education Code, sections 87610-87664. Basic Tenets 1. Our faculty are competent and skilled, content experts in their disciplines, and models of continuous professional growth. 2. The faculty's primary duties are to provide effective instruction and to be a contributing part of the district and their professional communities. 3. Benchmarks of effective instruction should be based on district teaching and learning values. 4. Effective evaluation requires reflection on practice. 5. Evaluation processes should be flexible and responsive to the varying job duties of faculty (e.g., teaching and non-teaching faculty). 6. An evaluation process should promote continuous faculty development in both instruction and their content disciplines where, if improvement is required, a separate plan will be developed. General Philosophy and Principles A cycle of continuous improvement is an integral part of good teaching and fulfills the vital mission of the district: to inspire students to achieve a lifelong love of learning, intellectual growth, personal fulfillment, and career success. Regardless of status (tenured or non-tenured, adjunct or fulltime), faculty should evaluate themselves informally regularly. Faculty should assess their own strengths and weaknesses pertaining to their employment throughout each year, and they should share their assessments informally with their peers to receive both encouragement and recommendations. Regardless of status (tenured or non-tenured, adjunct or fulltime), faculty are evaluated formally for two purposes: 1) to provide a structured process to assist faculty in assessing the strengths and weaknesses in their instruction; in their professional development both in the art of instruction and in their content discipline; in their contribution to the department, college, and district; and in their contribution to their content discipline; 2) to provide the Academic Senate, as well as the Board of Trustees, a means to determine a faculty member's reemployment, promotion, or a need for further training or retraining. Proof of a high level of skill in instruction, professional development, and contribution to one's department, college, district, and content discipline rests with the faculty being evaluated. Proof that tenure should be awarded, likewise, rests with the faculty member being evaluated. Tenure is a principle that entitles a faculty member to continuation of his or her annual appointment until relinquishment or forfeiture of tenure or until termination of tenure for adequate cause, financial exigency, or academic program discontinuance.