

# ORANGE COAST COLLEGE

Academic Senate Meeting | 03/02/21 | 11:30 am - 12:30 pm | Zoom Meeting

## Academic Senator Attendance

Jessica A. Alabi, <i>at-Large</i>	Present	Lee Gordon, <i>at-Large, Vice President</i>	Present
Eduardo Arismendi-Pardi, <i>at-Large (temporary replacement for SAL Blair)</i>	Present	Marilyn Kennedy, <i>Lit &amp; Lan, PDI Chair, Secretary</i>	Present
Carol Barnes, <i>Counseling</i>	Present	Jodie Legaspi, <i>Athletics &amp; Kinesiology</i>	Present
Tyler Boogar, <i>Math &amp; Sciences</i>	Present	Doug Lloyd, <i>at-Large, Parliamentarian</i>	Present
Sean Connor, <i>at-Large</i>	Present	Leland Means, <i>Visual &amp; Performing Arts</i>	Present
Eric Cuellar, <i>at-Large</i>	Present	Jeanne Neil, <i>Business &amp; Computing</i>	Absent
Tina De Shano, <i>Consumer &amp; Health Sciences</i>	Present	Charles Otwell, <i>Curriculum</i>	Present
Jodi Della Marna, <i>Library</i>	Present	Max Pena, <i>at-Large</i>	Present
Matt Denney, <i>Technology</i>	Absent	Clyde Phillips, <i>at-Large</i>	Present
Rendell Drew, <i>at-Large</i>	Present	Loren Sachs, <i>at-Large, President</i>	Present
Cyndee Ely, <i>Part-Time Faculty</i>	Present	Jordan Stanton, <i>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</i>	Present
Diogba G'bye, <i>Part-Time Faculty</i>	Present	Stella Tsai, <i>SGOCC Representative</i>	Absent

**Guests (Optional & Voluntary Sign-In):** Yilin Wang, Laura Reese, Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Renee De Long, Anna Hanlon, Bob Fey, Rob Schneiderman, Larissa Nazarenko.

## 1. Preliminary Matters

**A. Call to Order:** President Loren Sachs called the meeting to order at 11:30 A.M.

**B. Opportunity for Public Comment:**

Cyndee Ely

**C. Approval of the Minutes –** Minutes for the February 23 meeting will be postponed for a week because of concerns about confidentiality and the Brown Act.

**D. For the Good of the Order Announcements:**

**PDI Chair Kennedy:** PDI has salary advancement credits and possibly stipends for tenure-track faculty mentoring and recommends that the Senate consider a call-out to create a pool of potential mentors. The mentee/mentor have to agree to work together.

The Conference Authorization Request (CAR) form is PDF interactive and can be digitally signed, so thanks to the deans who were able to work with PDI on that last semester. Since the CAR form is an administration form, the administrative staff will now contact PDI conference attendees/presenters for that CAR approval, after PDI approval. In terms of timeliness and applications, PDI can be flexible if an application is late, but the closer to the event date, the more difficult that will be, and never the day of an event.

**Senator Drew:** Invited everyone to take a look at the Multicultural Center website for information on the Women's Month celebration and other events: there is a series of empowered women empowering women, a women's leadership and diversity series. Some of the presenters will be Dr. Dana Emerson, Dean of Instruction at Coastline; President Angelica Suarez, OCC President; Dr. Carla Martinez, GWC Dean of Students and Library; and Board of Trustees Member Mary Hornbuckle.

## 2. Consent Agenda

No Consent Agenda.

## 3. Officer, Senator, & Committee Reports

### A. President's Report – Loren Sachs:

Microsoft products are changing, a decision made by Microsoft; the District can assist in navigating those changes. The State Chancellor's office purchased a certain amount of Zoom storage for the state's community colleges, and that limit is almost reached; faculty are encouraged to download any recordings from past semesters before the cutoff date on March 8, 2021. After March 8, 2021, those recordings will be available in the "trash" for 30 days. **Dean Taylor** noted that there was an announcement that went out to every faculty inside Canvas that had the link to the chancellor's memo with instructions on how to download and rescue the recordings. President Sachs announced that the Spring Plenary will take place in mid-April, virtually. If any senators wish to attend, contact the President or the Senate Administrative Assistant, Beatriz Rodriguez.

### B. Guided Pathways Reporting – Jessica Alabi:

Asked that if there was feedback from departments or divisions on the Guided self-placement to contact her via email today so that she can take the feedback to the Guided Pathways Task Force at their meeting tomorrow. She would like to receive feedback from any department but particularly from Counseling, English, Math, or ESL. They can also talk to her personally about sending it out to their students, as that would be helpful. The ASCCC hosted an Ethnic Studies CID meeting and Guided Pathways came up in terms of onboarding students and helping transfer students in understanding that requirement.

### C. Statewide Guided Pathways Representatives – Anna Hanlon:

The Taskforce will be meeting tomorrow morning and she thanked Senator Ely for her division's feedback. The Taskforce and the Design Teams are getting ready to move forward to bring something to the Senate before the end of the semester for review and feedback.

### D. Union/Bargaining Unit Report – Rob Schneiderman:

Faculty should have received an envelope in the mail for nominations for CFE officers and that is due next week on Friday. At the same time, they are voting for attendees for the CFT statewide convention which will be a virtual convention. Faculty can write their name in and the union would be more than happy to have faculty participate.

### E. Board Administrative Policies and Procedures Committee (BPAP) Report (AP/BP 4105) – Marilyn Kennedy:

Displayed the Distance Education policy. The District has asked to keep the policy intact and add to it regarding cameras and Zoom, so Senator Kennedy suggests adding the eLearning language the OCC Senate went over last fall, in a compressed manner, as noted below:

#### VI. ACADEMIC FREEDOM, TECHNOLOGY AND PROTOCOL NOTICE REQUIREMENTS, FLEXIBILITY, AND ALTERNATIVE

Faculty members and instructors retain the right to set instructional rules and make informed pedagogical decisions to meet the needs of learners in a virtual setting. Faculty and instructors should communicate clearly and in advance of any possible requirements or expectations regarding the use of video (camera-on requirements, video recording policies, etc.) in the course and clarifying their essential nature for instruction and learning, even the right to modify based on class circumstances or needs; these class policies should be noted in the course syllabus. Notice should also include

information regarding any specific protocols students will be expected to follow including those used for a video proctoring system such as Proctorio or Respondus.

Faculty are encouraged to be flexible if a student faces a significant barrier to utilizing video for instructional or proctoring purposes. Significant or equity barriers include, but are not limited to, not having a working webcam, having an unreliable internet connection, having limited access to the appropriate hardware or software, having a verified disability as per DSPS, being homeless, or having a prohibitive living environment that prohibits privacy. Student may request formal accommodations for verified disabilities. Flexibility includes faculty working with student(s) to find mutually agreeable alternatives that allow for continuation of the course. Alternatives will be considered based on the Course Outline of Record (COR), andragogy, academic freedom of the instructor, and student needs. In cases where agreements cannot be reached, the faculty member will confer with the division dean to make a determination on alternatives.

This addition states that faculty members retain the right to set instructional rules and make informed choices about meeting the needs of student.

The second paragraph is about notifying students. Faculty would have the obligation to communicate clearly in advance of any possible requirements or expectations regarding the use of video recordings in the course. They would have to inform about protocol that students will be expected to follow using different systems, such as Proctorio.

Faculty are encouraged to be flexible. Some students might be facing challenges because of other people in their homes are interrupting their time on the camera. Students may request formal accommodations and flexibility and have a mutually agreeable alternative. If that does not work, then the professor would talk to the dean.

Regarding and reflecting on academic freedom and the student needs, there might be situations that could be altered or possibly the student would be moved to another class. Senator Kennedy asked for suggestions, questions, and feedback.

**Senator 1:** Asked about showing recorded Zoom lectures to students if students are in the recording. Can that be in the policy?

**Marilyn Kennedy:** Noted that since the Chancellor and privacy laws do not allow that, language for that cannot be added to the policy. The policies are vetted by Risk Assessment and legal.

**Online Coordinator Rossiter:** Informed that there should not be any student identifiers in any recordings shared with other students. If faculty want to record their lectures, they should not record the students in any way, only the professor's presentation. Hosting videos in platforms such as YouTube and sharing the public link is also a problem. Faculty want to make sure that only the students during that class can access the class recording.

**Dean Taylor:** Posting a recording to a class where the students are already participating in the class is not really any new knowledge, but posting it anywhere outside of the class would be revealing student information.

**Senator 1:** Asked if a student can attend another section of a professor's course if the student has missed their own class section.

**Online Coordinator Rossiter:** Faculty are not supposed to let students in the class who are not registered for that class due to privacy, legal, and safety issues.

**President Sachs:** There is an issue of liability and faculty should not overstep the student privacy boundary. He suggested a Flex Day or town hall on best practices for education from a risk management perspective, not academic freedom.

**Marilyn Kennedy:** Noted that she will ask at the District about the legalities of these issues brought up regarding cameras, privacy, and other class section attendance.

**OCC President Suarez:** If faculty finds that they need to get additional clarification, she is more than willing to seek that information.

- F. COVID Update – President Suarez:** There is a site that tracks all of the positive-COVID cases at the college. Not all of them are people that have been on campus. It is all self-reporting. Like the state and the county, OCC has seen a significant downward trend with the number of cases that have been reported. There are about 400 athletes on campus conditioning and practicing social distancing; they test twice a week onsite. For the past two weeks, there have not been any cases of COVID. Those are positive indicators. In a recent conversation with the OCC staff and the county health director, there is an indication that the county will be moving to a less restrictive red tier. The deans and VPI Grimes-Hillman have been working very closely on trying to make the best decisions with imperfect information. As mentioned during Flex Day, they are looking to prioritize a lot of programs that have not been able to come on campus that are focused on activity, performance, CTE, and sciences courses, etc., to make sure that they prioritize facilities for those programs. The deans are working with the schedulers because the schedule is due relatively soon. She emphasized that the door is not going to be wide open for the fall semester; they are just trying to make sure that the plans that they create have flexibility within them to bring some things back on campus. That is a priority right now. VP Niroumand is working with his team on identifying some of the priority student services programs that potentially can be on campus with all of the safety precautions. There are over twenty instructional programs currently on campus; they are operating successfully with a lot of the safety protocols, as well as a lot of very creative practices to help students in an online environment.

## 4. Unfinished Business

### A. Tenure Track Evaluation Discussion:

**President Sachs:** As a follow-up from last week and an introduction to today, there is a lot of discussion about tenure-track committees that falls under confidentiality, so we must use care. Who serves on the various committees is public knowledge because it is approved by the Senate and it goes into the Senate minutes, but once that happens there are a lot of layers. Nobody wants to be found in a position of liability because there is information that is confidential and is being shared.

President Sachs showed the portion of the CFE contract on evaluation with highlights in the areas referring to the Senate; those areas only show that the Senate makes appointments to tenure-track committees [see Appendix—Item A at the end of these minutes with those highlighted areas of the CFE contract]. There is a clear distinction about the piece that the Senate has control over or input on but there is a lot where the Union has control.

The discussion of the actual process of evaluation which is the negotiation between the Union and administration or management, the Senate would have the opportunity to participate in some of those discussions [as per Ed Code]. The body certainly has the power to go to the Union, express concerns, and discuss a way to find a solution.

**Senator 2:** At the Professional Development Advisory Committee (PDAC—formerly Staff Development), they support the Tenure-Track Academy. It is a two-year process. It is important to think about that as this is being discussed. It is voluntary. The new faculty

going through the process seem to be strong and participate well at the first year. Then they disappear in the second year. Is there an area where they are being lost? Is there something that faculty can do to help the PDAC group? They want to be able to evaluate that academy and make sure that it is viable and providing what is needed.

**Senator 3:** He heard people talking about some not-so-good tenure-track experiences and they were not feeling they had any recourses; hearing later that there is a structure for recourses, he did not know any of those things. He said it was probably in the book that was incredibly thick that was given to him, but he did not know about those. There is a feeling of vulnerability when people are going through the tenure-track process and they are often not willing to take advantage of any kind of complaint. That is something to keep in mind.

**Senator 4:** Shared her document called "Tenure-Track Issues and the Union/Senate Purview: What Does the Ed Code and Contract Say?" and went over several pertinent legal details [see Appendix—Item B, at the end of these meeting minutes].

- **Senate/Union Purviews:** According to Ed Code, in those districts where tenure evaluation procedures are collectively bargained, the faculty's exclusive representative shall consult with the Academic Senate prior to engaging in collective bargaining on these procedures. The question is whether this was done before the last run of negotiations.
- **Confidentiality:** According to the CFE Contract, all aspects of the tenure-track evaluation process are confidential.
- **Tenure-Track Training:** According to the CFE Contract, the tenure-track training is a joint Union/Administrative action that has been in the contract for years. Because of what the union negotiated, CFE has the power and had it in the past to make the training more robust, especially if they were aware of problems. They have access to or receive confidential information the Senate does not.
- **Evaluators, Objectivity, and Diversity:** The CFE Contract discusses the necessity of the tenure-track evaluators being objective, unbiased, and fair, and having an understanding of teaching styles and a sensitivity to diversity. That should have been and should be in the union-administrative training. The CFE Contract is very clear about objectivity and open-mindedness as a requirement of people who are doing tenure-track evaluations. They must be objective and open minded to other teaching styles. It talks about diversity, too. All of that is already in the contract.
- **Complaint about a Tenure-Track Committee Member:** The CFE Contract has a process for filing a complaint about a member of a tenure-track committee member who is not following the contract; there is a process where the appropriate CFE Vice-President and the College Vice-President can consult and possibly remove, replace, or retrain that person as necessary.
- **Union and Legal Avenues:** The Union has monies from our membership dues for legal avenues to remedy violations and problems, as well. Those are avenues the Senate does not have. The union should use those resources if there are problems now.
- **Improvement Plans:** Improvement plans for tenure-track evaluatees have to be specific, detailed, and the tenure-track evaluatee may not advance to the next step if they fail to meet those. Normally, a problem should not crop up the last year of the tenure-track process that has not been noticed before. That is a red flag in terms of the process.

- **Mentoring:** There is also voluntary tenure-track faculty mentoring through PDI. It is highly recommended. The Senate can consider doing callouts for volunteers. It does not mean someone will be selected from that pool, but that those people are open to being a mentor. Mentees can choose their own mentors and mentors can get PDI salary advancement credits or small stipends.
- **Due Process:** At the very end of the contract there is a due process section. It should be re-negotiated and made much stronger.

**Senator 2:** Anyone on a hiring committee has to go through the EOC training. This is basically an extension of a hiring committee. Should not these people on the tenure-track committees also go through the EOC even more regularly?

**OCC President Suarez:** There is a commitment on the part of this administration and there was a conversation between the administration and the union about what we can do to strengthen the Tenure-Track Faculty Academy. It should infuse the equity lens and the heart and multicultural/inclusion discussions we have been having throughout the campus. She noted her own two tenure experiences, and some were better than others. She wants to do whatever possible to improve that experience for new faculty and is committed to working with CFE President Schneiderman in strengthening the training that they have.

**Senator 5:** The Senate has an oversight committee in the event of disputes between faculty and administrators and that is the Transparency Committee. The Senate needs to establish an oversight committee for the tenure review process, which would be separate from the Transparency Committee, because that is a faculty-to-faculty issue. They need to establish more subcommittees of the Senate. The Senate would function better as a body if there were more functioning subcommittees, so the Senate discussion is more focused and less granular.

**CFE President Schneiderman:** The union has talked to President Suarez and HR about adding equity components to the current training. That is important.

The union does a luncheon before school begins for first-year tenure-track folks. They talk about the importance of the process and how to manage it well.

The school needs faculty to serve on these tenure-track committees. It does not always work out for the person and that does not mean that these committees are racist. Just because there has been a disproportionate impact over the last five years means there might be a problem that they need to talk about, and talk about how to resolve it holistically, including recruitment, selection, training, and then the evaluation process. The union hopes that the Senate can partner with them on that training angle, maybe to advocate that they want more robust training. The union can go negotiate something and maybe make it mandatory for people.

**President Sachs:** We want to recognize where better training can be done to make educators the best they can be. Additionally, tenure-track faculty should be better informed of the options that are already available in the contract for them.

## 5. Adjournment of the Regular Meeting

**President Sachs** adjourned the meeting at 12:32 p.m.

## 6. Approval of the Minutes: March 9, 2021

**MINUTES:** First draft written by Beatriz Rodriguez, Administrative Assistant to the Senates. Revision of first draft and Senate-approved drafts written by Senate Secretary, Marilyn Kennedy, who also distributes the

final Senate-approved version to the Chancellor, Board of Trustees members and secretary, union presidents, GWC and Coastline Academic Senate presidents, OCC College President and faculty as per OCC Senate bylaws.

## Voting Tallies Chart

### Senate Membership

Alabi, Jessica A.: Senator-at-Large (2020-2023)
Arismendi-Pardi, Eduardo: Senator-at-Large (temporary replacement for SAL Blair) (2018-2021)
Barnes, Carol: Counseling Senator (2018-2021)
Boogar, Tyler: Math and Sciences Senator (2020-2023)
Connor, Sean: Senator-at-Large (2020-2023)
Cuellar, Eric: Senator-at-Large (2018-2021)
Della Marna, Jodi: Library & Learning Support Senator (2020-2023)
Denney, Matt: Technology Senator (2020-2023)
De Shano, Tina: Consumer Health Sciences Senator (2020-2023)
Drew, Rendell: Senator-at-Large (2020-2023)
Ely, Cyndee: Part-Time Senator (2020-2021)
G'bye, Diogba: Part-Time Senator (2020-2021)
Gordon, Lee: Vice President, Senator-at-Large (2019-2022)
Kennedy, Marilyn: Secretary, Literature and Languages Senator (2019-2022)
Legaspi, Jodie: Athletics and Kinesiology Senator (2020-2023)
Lloyd, Doug: Parliamentarian, Senator-at-Large (2020-2023)
Means, Leland: Visual and Performing Arts Senator (2018-2021)
Neil, Jeanne: Business and Computing Senator (2019-2022)
Otwell, Charles: Curriculum Chair (Non-Voting) (Open)
Pena, Max: Senator-at-Large (2019-2022)
Phillips, Clyde: Senator-at-Large (2020-2021)
Sachs, Loren: President, Senator-at-Large (2019-2022)
Stanton, Jordan: Social and Behavioral Sciences Senator (2019-2022)

## APPENDIX

### Item A

#### **Section 8.5. Evaluation of Contract Faculty Members. (Tenure Track)**

**Section 8.5.a. Evaluation Frequency. Each contract faculty member will be evaluated once each year until tenure is granted.**

Section 8.5.b. Tenure Track Team Training. To ensure quality, fairness, and objectivity, prior to serving on a tenure-track committee, all members of a tenure track evaluation team must attend training developed and presented jointly by union and management.

This Article must be reviewed by all team members, especially those who haven't recently served on this type of evaluation committee, or when this Article has been updated.

#### Section 8.5.c. Formation & Initial Steps of the Tenure-Track Evaluation Team (Team)

(1) The Team consists of the following members:

- (a) Division Administrator or designated Academic Administrator,
- (b) One tenured faculty member appointed from and by the search committee. In the case of administrative retreat, one faculty member will be appointed from and by the Discipline-Based Equivalency Committee;
- (c) One tenured faculty member appointed by the **Senate** from volunteers from the evaluatee's discipline,
- (d) One tenured faculty member appointed by the **Senate** from outside of the evaluatee's discipline,
- (e) All matters relating to the performance review process are a confidential nature and members of the Team have the responsibility of maintaining this confidentiality.

Whenever possible, the Team membership will reflect diversity with respect to ethnicity, age, and gender. Should vacancies on the Team occur, the vacant seat must be replaced, and the replacement will follow the initial procedures for the selection of the vacant seat.

(2) In the event there are no tenured faculty volunteering or available from the discipline, or, if the **Senate** has not made its appointments to the team by April 30th of the Spring term prior to the beginning of the tenure review process the faculty member selected from the search committee, the Division Administrator, the Academic **Senate** President, and a Federation Vice President representing the appropriate college will consult to resolve this issue. . . .

#### Section 8.5.e. Recommended Calendar.

##### (1) 1<sup>st</sup> Evaluation - first fall semester . . . .

(i) Accelerated Tenure Review. Before March 15 of the second year of evaluation, for compelling reasons, the Team may also request that the granting of tenure be considered by the Accelerated Tenure Review Committee.

(i) The Accelerated Tenure Review Committee, comprised of the following tenured faculty members and the appropriate Vice President shall be convened to review and consider the Tenure Review Committee recommendation:

1. One (1) CFE appointment, not from the evaluatee's instructional unit;
2. One (1) Academic **Senate** President or designee from the evaluatee's college, but not from the evaluatee's instructional unit;
3. Two (2) Academic **Senate** appointees from the other two colleges in the District, preferably from the evaluatee's discipline;
4. One (1) Vice President from the evaluatee's college.

(ii) The committee shall, if unanimous, recommend to the President of the college that the contract probationary faculty member receive tenure as a regular faculty member.

### Item B

## **Tenure-Track Issues and Union/Senate Purview: What does the Ed Code and Contract Say?**

### **Here's what the Ed Code 87610.1. says on Union/Senate purviews:**

(a) In those districts where tenure evaluation procedures are collectively bargained pursuant to Section 3543 of the Government Code, the faculty's exclusive representative shall consult with the academic senate prior to engaging in collective bargaining on these procedures.



### **What does the CFE Contract say about confidentiality?**

**ARTICLE VIII. EVALUATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS.** Section 8.1. Purpose/Definitions. Section 8.1.a. The purpose of this Article is to improve instruction, counseling and other educational services through the periodic evaluation of all Faculty Members -- TEMPORARY (employed only 2 out of 6 semesters), CATEGORICAL, PART-TIME (50% through 67%), CONTRACT (tenure track) and REGULAR (tenured). Section 8.1.b. The key to effective evaluation is frequent and dynamic communication between all parties. Management, the evaluation team, and the evaluatee all are responsible for ensuring adequate communication occurs. All evaluators have the obligation to be unbiased to the best of their ability, to rely on facts and firsthand observations, avoid hearsay, and to be accurate. **All aspects of the evaluation process are confidential.**

### **What does the CFE Contract say about training? It's a union-administrative joint action.**

**Article VIII. Section 8.5.** Evaluation of Contract Faculty Members. (Tenure Track) Section 8.5.a. Evaluation Frequency. Each contract Faculty Member will be evaluated once each year until tenure is granted. Section 8.5.b. Tenure Track Team Training. **To ensure quality, fairness, and objectivity, prior to serving on a tenure-track committee, all members of a tenure track evaluation team must attend training developed and presented jointly by union and management.** This Article must be reviewed by all team members, especially those who haven't recently served on this type of evaluation committee, or when this Article has been updated.

### **What does the CFE Contract say about a tenure-track member who is not following the contract requirements?**

**Section 8.5.c.** Formation & Initial Steps of the Tenure-Track Evaluation Team (Team) (6) If a tenure-track evaluatee or tenure-track committee member has a concern regarding whether a tenure-track committee member has properly followed the tenure-track evaluation contract requirements, the evaluatee or committee member may appeal to both the appropriate Vice President of the College and the CFE Vice President for an evaluation and resolution of the complaint. After receiving the complaint, the appropriate Vice President of the College and the CFE Vice President will meet to discuss and examine the concerns, and will determine within twenty (20) working days or any other mandatory deadline, whichever comes first, if retraining, retention, or removal/replacement is necessary.

### **What does the CFE contract say about tenure-track standards? Here is a list of standards:**

**Section 8.5.d.** Criteria for Evaluating Contract Faculty. (Tenure Track & Temporary)

(3) Within each FSA held by a Faculty Member, there is an expectation of the following performance standards, consistent with all relevant language in the Bargaining Unit Agreement: (a) Demonstrable progress towards excellence in teaching and/or in carrying out primary responsibilities for counselors, librarians, or special assignment faculty positions as specifically listed in the Faculty Member's position description, including, but not limited to the following items: • currency within the discipline(s); • depth of knowledge within the discipline(s); • verbal and written communication proficiency with students, colleagues, and staff; • use of effective teaching methods and materials appropriate for the course, discipline, modality, and students; • compliance with course outline requirements and student learning outcomes; • maintenance of regular and timely office hours; • confidential, accurate maintenance of student records; and • compliance with College and departmental requirements consistent with this bargaining agreement. (b) Appropriate respect for students by demonstrating the following characteristics: • patience, fairness, promptness in the evaluation and discussion of student work; •

appropriate sensitivity and responsiveness to the needs of individual students; and • support of the diversity of our students, colleagues, and staff in actions, words, and teaching and learning methods. (c) Respect for colleagues and the teaching profession characterized by the following conduct: • acknowledging and defending the free Inquiry of students, colleagues, and staff in the exchange of criticism and ideas; • acting in accordance with the ethics of the profession and with a sense of personal integrity; • working in a spirit of cooperation to develop and maintain a collegial atmosphere among faculty and staff while upholding and respecting academic freedom; • demonstrating a commitment to and an engagement with the College, the division, and/or the department (as appropriate), and the profession; • having the intellectual courage to share your professional opinion constructively, even when not the popular view, in pursuit of improvement; and having willingness to challenge yourself and others to re-evaluate practices in the pursuit of departmental, College, and District excellence. (d) The following standards are illustrative of the activities expected of permanent faculty. Tenure-track faculty after their first probationary year are expected to show participation in professional growth activities as evidence of continued professional growth and leadership. Examples include the following professional activities: • participation in self-Initiated professional activities such as course work, attendance at workshops, seminars, professional meetings; • conference presentation, artistic exhibit, classroom research, development of new curriculum, participation in publications and related work experience; • active participation in collegial governance and campus life, including College or District committees, and community activities.

**What does the CFE contract say about evaluation team members objectivity and open-mindedness? It says they should have those qualities.**

**Section 8.5.e.** Recommended Calendar.

**Evaluators must be objective and open-minded to other teaching styles beyond their own, and set aside their biases about how to best teach students. The Faculty Member will be given the widest possible latitude within the parameters of professional conduct so that academic freedom will be preserved.** (iii) Within ten (10) working days after the observation, the evaluator will complete the observation report, deliver it, and meet with the evaluatee to review what was observed and hear feedback from each other about the achievements and challenges of the lesson observed. During this evaluation conference the observation report will be finalized and signed. (iv) If the evaluator or evaluatee believe that there has been a serious problem with the observation, it shall be reported within one (1) working day to the Team, who shall determine by majority whether the evaluator will coordinate an additional observation with the evaluatee. The team will make a determination within five (5) working days. The problematic session's observation report shall be discarded and not included as part of the first-year tenure-track evaluation. (v) Guidelines for Providing Feedback During the Post-Observation Meeting Between the Evaluator and Evaluatee. Constructive criticism may be both difficult to deliver and difficult to receive. The following guidelines are to be reviewed by each Team member before observing evaluatees. A. Evaluators should be specific when providing feedback, including presenting specific observations that led to the constructive feedback in the evaluation. B. Evaluators should consider “sandwiching” critical feedback between compliments. C. Evaluators should include suggestions about how the specific behaviors observed could be improved. D. Evaluators should give examples from their own teaching experience. E. Evaluators should encourage the evaluatee to engage in a discussion when the observation report is presented and reviewed with the evaluatee. For example, evaluators might ask the Faculty Member to provide his/her “take” on behaviors the evaluator identified

critically. 19 F. Evaluators should demonstrate engaged and open-minded listening during the response, and commit clearly to working with the evaluatee to improve her/his skills

**What does the CFE contract say about improvement plans? They must be specific, detailed, and objectively measurable. A tenure-track evaluatee may not advance to the next step if they fail to meet these standards.**

(h) Guidelines for Preparing a Tenure Track Faculty Improvement Plan. (i) If a tenure-track faculty member has the need for an improvement plan noted on his/her Tenure Track Evaluations Summary Report, the Tenure Track Committee shall be responsible for preparing an improvement plan designed to assist that Faculty Member to advance in the tenure review process. (ii) The improvement plan must be in writing, signed by the Committee Chair or a majority of the Committee, and agreed upon by the tenure track Faculty Member. (iii) The improvement plan must contain the following elements: A. A specific reference to the Faculty Evaluation Report element(s) where improvement is needed B. A detailed description of the performance to be improved, including descriptions of the current and desired performance C. Measurable or clearly discernible objective criteria by which to measure improvement D. A timeline or milestones (dates or outcomes) for assessing progress E. Identified resources available, or which will be made available, to assist the tenure track Faculty Member in his/her efforts to improve. (iv) Failure to satisfactorily complete an agreed-upon improvement plan shall be considered in the decision to advance/not advance the tenure track Faculty Member in the following year.

**What does the CFE contract say about mentoring?**

Option of Mentoring. (i) Introduction: **Every new Faculty Member is encouraged to have a mentor.** Mentoring is a formal or informal process outside of the tenure review committee. (ii) Definition: A mentor is one who offers guidance, wisdom, experience, and encouragement, one who explores and supports teaching and learning with new colleagues. A mentor is not supervisory, nor evaluative, but is willing to explore tough questions about practical professional life. A mentor communicates, not only where and how to get things done—the written laws and how to get copies—but also explains the unwritten rules about how we function at the Coast Community College District: the political circumstances in which decisions get made, the diverse campus cultures and values, and our unspoken expectations. Mentoring is a voluntary relationship for all parties. (iii) Qualifications: Qualifications include credibility with colleagues, the respect of staff, and expertise in his/her field of knowledge. The mentor must be willing to listen actively to the new faculty's goals, questions, and concerns. A mentor must be willing to be a primary relationship for new faculty and possess a desire to help, to build confidence, to encourage risk taking and progressive pedagogy, and to be a role model who isn't looking for a clone. (iv) Professional Development Salary Advancement Credits: There are salary advancement credits available through the Institute of Professional Development/Professional Development Institute (IPD/PDI). See the Institute of Professional Development/Professional Development Institute article in Article XXI this contract for more details. Additionally, there may be an organized program of activities or meetings at each College, as well. (v) Selection: A mentor must not be a member of the new faculty's tenure/evaluation Team, but it may be desirable that a mentor be from the original hiring committee. Nonetheless, a mentor may come from within the department, the division, or even be a respected Faculty Member from an entirely different division. The new Faculty Member may find the mentor on his/her own or ask for assistance from the Academic Senate; however, the mentor must be chosen by the new Faculty Member. The Academic Senate of each College will determine its procedure for how it

will assist new faculty in finding a mentor if that Faculty Member so chooses. The mentor/mentee relationship is of a confidential nature and the mentor has the responsibility of maintaining this confidentiality.

**What does the CFE contract say about due process in the case of tenure-track “failures”?**

**(k) Due Process and Grievance.** (i) Allegations that the Community College District in a decision to reappoint a probationary employee violated, misinterpreted, or misapplied any of its policies and procedures concerning the evaluation of probationary employees shall be classified and procedurally addressed as grievances. (ii) Allegations that the Community College District, in a decision to grant tenure, made a negative decision that to a reasonable person was unreasonable, or violated, misinterpreted, or misapplied, any of its policies and procedures concerning the evaluation of probationary employees shall be classified and procedurally addressed as grievances. Technical violations of the procedures and timelines that do not substantively relate to the outcome of the tenure recommendation shall not be sufficient to overcome the District’s decision.

---