Hartnell College 2018-2019 Tenure Review Committee Issues Encountered and Recommended Improvements

ISSUES

- 1. Inconsistent report format
- 2. Goals not measurable and difficult to determine if they were completed
- 3. There does not seem to be clear expectations for each year for governance participation
- 4. Difficult to determine if TRC and Evaluation Team recommendations are completed
- 5. Some SLO variation
- 6. Need a clear way to determine if regular load courses and all modalities were evaluated
- 7. Small number of student responses for online classes

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- 1. Electronic binders
- 2. New, standard forms/templates
- 3. Improved training
 - a. Some peers marked Excellent and Satisfactory on worksite observation form
 - b. On-campus required sessions at Flex and Convocation do not need to be included in the binder as activities/conferences.
 - c. More consideration needs to be given to the observation schedule. There have been cases where one member of the team observed the same class twice, while the other member did not see the class at all.
- 4. Clarify Evaluation Team and TRC roles
 - a. What documentation is required to show progress on prior year goals? Does the Dean verify process or is this a TRC responsibility?
- 5. Do faculty need to show evidence of SLO assessment?
- 6. Create new CWE evaluation form
- 7. Clarify the number of observations for Counseling (Counselors who teach vs counselors who don't) and number for Library Faculty
- 8. Update contract language to clarify number of evaluations required for instructional faculty. Recommend all regular load classes be evaluated, but no fewer than five evaluations must be completed.
- 9. Eliminate the binder for Year 1 (Deans and Directors Recommendation)
- 10. Make Year 4 a reflective, integrated report instead of binder (Deans and Directors Recommendation)