

FOOTHILL COLLEGE TENURE REVIEW:

Supplemental Packet to Accompany the
Tenure Review Handbook 2010-13
for
Tenure Review Committee Members
Probationary Faculty
Due Process Panel Members

*A joint creation of the Foothill Tenure Review orientation group:
Tenure Review Coordinator, Academic Senate President, FA Representative.
Contact person: Linda Lane (lanelinda@fhda.edu)*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RESOURCES.....	3
Tenure Review Webpage.....	3
Other Resources.....	3
CRITICAL AREAS OF THE TENURE REVIEW PROCESS	4
PHASE OVERVIEWS.....	5
Phase I Overview.....	5
Phase II Overview:.....	6
Phase III Overview:.....	7
J1: ADMINISTRATIVE AND PEER EVALUATION FORM.....	8
Pre-Observation.....	8
During Observation	9
Post-Evaluation.....	10
Feedback Tips	11
Filling Out the J1 Form.....	12
ACADEMIC FREEDOM STATEMENT	13
CULTURAL COMPETENCE	14
J2: STUDENT EVALUATION	15
Part "A"	15
Part "B"	15
Forms Needed	15
Process For Scoring	15
RECOMMENDATION REPORT	16
SIGNIFICANT CHANGES PROPOSED FOR 2010-13 ARTICLE 6A/TENURE REVIEW HANDBOOK.....	17

RESOURCES

Tenure Review Webpage

<http://www.foothill.edu/staff/tenure.php>

- **INFORMATION:** overview of committee membership/PGA units per Phase
- **BLANK FORMS** (downloadable as PDF or Word files with Adobe Acrobat Reader)

Schedules for committee activities: Phase I, Phase II, Phase III
filled out by committee chairs and distributed to members, candidate, TR Coordinator

J1 Administrative/Peer Evaluation
also available from FA website (<http://fa.fhda.edu>)

J2 Student Evaluation (Classroom, Counselors, Librarians, Child Development)
also available from FA website (<http://fa.fhda.edu>)

J3 tabulation for Student Evaluation (Classroom, Counselors, Librarians, Child Development)
also available from FA website (<http://fa.fhda.edu>)

Committee Signature Page (for end of each Phase)

Tenure Review Coordinator schedule forms (Phase I, II, III)

- **DOCUMENTS** (downloadable as PDF files)

Sample self-evaluation topic outlines

Sample recommendation report (Phase I and II)

Supplemental Packet to accompany the *Tenure Review Handbook 2010-2013*

Other Resources

- **ACADEMIC SENATE**

Contact: Academic Senate Office (650.949.7202) or division representative

- **FACULTY ASSOCIATION**

Contact: Foothill Conciliator Jordana Finnegan (650.949.7646, FinneganJordana@foothill.edu)
FA Office (650.949.7544)
FA website: <http://fa.fhda.edu> [Article 6A available under "Agreement" link]

- **TENURE REVIEW COORDINATOR**

Contact: Falk Cammin (650.949.7442, CamminFalk@foothill.edu)

CRITICAL AREAS OF THE TENURE REVIEW PROCESS

Job Description: The official "Announcement of Employment Opportunity" document each candidate is hired under is to be the basis for all evaluative activities. Candidates are to be evaluated only on areas or performance related to specific job description items (unless changes to the original job description were approved by administrator and candidate). If the job description under which a candidate was hired is forgotten or ignored, and the candidate is evaluated on tasks/duties not in the job description, he or she can request such statements be removed or contact the Tenure Review Coordinator or the FA conciliator for confidential assistance.

GOOD PRACTICE: Committee members review the job description BEFORE beginning evaluation.

Committee Members: To avoid conflict of interest/roles, members of the Tenure Review committee cannot serve as formal/informal mentors of the candidate (*Article 6A*). In small departments, this limitation can result in difficulty when candidate attempts to learn the current and past practices of the department/program from a faculty member who is also on the tenure review committee; such communication may constitute a conflict of interest in that the committee member may appear to be giving "advice."

GOOD PRACTICE: Committee members giving information about department or program practices should provide descriptive—not prescriptive—information. Committee members may also consult with the Tenure Review Coordinator, FA, or other resource parties when a potential conflict of interest arises.

Evaluation Tools: The official J1 Administrative and Peer Evaluation and J2 Student Evaluation ONLY are used for a candidate's evaluations; no other forms/processes can be used unless negotiated with FA prior to use. If evaluated with a tool other than the official and current J1/J2, a probationary faculty member can request it be discarded. Questions about evaluation forms should be directed to the Tenure Review Coordinator/FA conciliator.

Number Of Evaluations: The *Tenure Review Handbook* specifies only the minimum number of observations (J1) and student evaluations (J2) to be done each Phase; additional evaluations may be necessary for the committee to observe certain tasks, discipline topics, or areas of concern. Candidates may request and, whenever possible, should be granted additional evaluations to demonstrate particular skills or improvement.

J1 Evaluation: TRC members should be vigilant in making sure that in their own—and in other members'—J1 evaluations the objective scores and the corresponding narrative comments match. In particular, for any objective scores of "2" (satisfactory but needs improvement) or "3" (unsatisfactory), the evaluator is required to state the reason for that score and, if appropriate, offer suggestions. A major goal of a J1 is to make clear to a candidate any area in which he or she is expected to demonstrate improvement in future evaluations. If a narrative section does not include explanation of 2 and 3 scores, a candidate can request revision, a new evaluation, or contact the Tenure Review Coordinator or the FA conciliator. Narrative comments may also include a candidate's primary strengths ("1" scores). All narrative comments should be connected clearly to the corresponding objective score by referring to the number or subject-area words.

J1 evaluations can include only what an evaluator has seen or heard, either by observation, discussion with the candidate, or review of pertinent materials. If second-hand information/hearsay is included in a J1, a candidate can request it be removed or contact the Tenure Review Coordinator or the FA conciliator. (Information from outside the committee—from other faculty, staff, administrator, student, or website—can be used only as a trigger for additional observation/investigation.)

J2 Evaluation: Student evaluations should be done on the courses/duties the candidate will be regularly be assigned. For Part A, there are no established or official benchmark ("normal") scores or percentages, and for Part B, the anonymous student comments can't be cited in J1 evaluations or Phase Reports.

Phase Priorities: Though the phases overlap and all use the same evaluative tools (J1 and J2), each Phase is intended to focus on specific performance areas:

- Phase I focuses primarily on the candidate's expertise in the discipline and ability to accept constructive criticism.
- Phase II focuses on demonstrated improvement in areas identified in Phase I and participation/ability to work effectively in division/department/discipline activities.
- Phase III focuses on demonstrated improvements in Phase I and II and on professional contributions/growth.

PHASE OVERVIEWS

Phase I Overview

LENGTH	COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP	AREAS OF EVALUATION	5 MINIMUM REQUIRED EVALUATIONS
2 quarters: Fall Winter	5 members: dean 2 reps from dept/div at-large VP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>expertise in and diversity of methodology and technique appropriate to discipline</i> • <i>ability to accept constructive suggestions for improvement</i> • <i>rapport with diverse student population and colleagues</i> 	<p>3 J1 observations by core committee members (dean, div/dept faculty);</p> <p>2 J2 student evaluations</p>

TIMELINES:

FALL QTR 1st YEAR {

- weeks 2-4: committee meets to select chair, establish Phase I schedule; meets with candidate to outline process; candidate submits relevant written materials, e.g. Green Sheets, assessment tools.*
- week 4: chair sends written plan to Tenure Review Coordinator*
- weeks 4-7: all J1 evaluations completed*
- weeks 6-9: all J2 student evaluations completed*
- weeks 6-9 (after J1/J2 completed): committee meets to discuss evaluations, schedule any additional evaluations; meets with candidate to review performance*
- week 10: any additional J1/J2 completed*
- week 11: originals (J1, J3) forwarded to Tenure Review Coordinator*

WTR QTR 1st YEAR {

- week 1: candidate submits self-evaluation*
- weeks 2-3: any additional evaluation(s) completed*
- week 4: committee meets with candidate to discuss additional evaluations and to discuss and prepare Phase I report*
- week 4: deadline for filing due process complaint at end of 4th week*
- week 5: committee or designee informs candidate of recommendation; Phase I report sent to President; all original material sent to Tenure Review Coordinator*
- March 15: candidate receives official notification from Board*

Phase II Overview:

LENGTH	COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP	AREAS OF EVALUATION	9 MINIMUM REQUIRED EVALUATIONS
3 quarters: Spring Fall Winter	5 members: dean 2 reps from dept/div at-large VP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>all areas specified in Phase I</i> • <i>demonstrated improvement in areas identified</i> • <i>participation in dept/div activities</i> • <i>ability to work effectively within dept/div; for coordinators organization skills and follow-through</i> 	<p><i>5 J1 observations, one by each member</i></p> <p><i>4 J2 student evaluations</i></p>

TIMELINES:

SPR QTR 1st YEAR	}	<p><i>weeks 2-4: committee meets to review Phase I and with candidate to discuss expectations; candidate submits relevant written materials, e.g. Green Sheets.</i></p> <p><i>week 4: chair sends written plan of Phase II activities to Tenure Review Coordinator</i></p> <p><i>weeks 4-7: J1 evaluation(s) completed</i></p> <p><i>weeks 6-9: J2 student evaluation(s) completed</i></p> <p><i>weeks 4-10: any additional J1/J2 completed; committee meets to review activities; meets with candidate to review performance</i></p> <p><i>week 11: original materials (J1, J3) forwarded to Tenure Review Coordinator</i></p>
FALL QTR 2nd YEAR	}	<p><i>weeks 4-7: J1 evaluation(s) completed</i></p> <p><i>weeks 6-9: J2 student evaluation(s) completed; committee meets to discuss evaluations, schedule additional J1/J2; meets with candidate to review performance</i></p> <p><i>week 10: any additional evaluations completed</i></p> <p><i>week 11: original materials (J1, J3) forwarded to Tenure Review Coordinator</i></p>
WTR QTR 2nd YEAR	}	<p><i>week 1: candidate submits self-evaluation</i></p> <p><i>weeks 2-3: any additional J1/J2 completed</i></p> <p><i>week 4: committee meets with candidate to discuss Fall and any additional evaluations and to prepare Phase II report</i></p> <p><i>week 4: deadline for due process complaint at end of 4th week</i></p> <p><i>week 5: committee or designee informs candidate of recommendation; Phase II report sent to President; all material forwarded to Tenure Review Coordinator</i></p> <p><i>March 15: candidate receives official notification from Board</i></p>

Phase III Overview:

LENGTH	COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP	AREAS OF EVALUATION	8 MINIMUM REQUIRED ACTIVITIES
6 quarters: Spring Fall Winter Spring Fall Winter	3 members: dean 2 reps from dept/div (VP as consultant)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all areas specified in Phase I & II • demonstrated improvement in areas identified in Phase II • professional contributions/service • professional growth 	3 J1 observations by core members with one done Spr Qtr of third year; 5 J2 student evaluations

TIMELINES:

SPR
 QTR
 2nd
 YEAR

weeks 2-4: committee meets to review Phase II, plan Phase III; meets with candidate to discuss expectations; candidate submits relevant written materials
 week 4: chair sends written plan of Phase III activities to Tenure Review Coordinator
 weeks 4-7: J1 evaluation completed if scheduled
 weeks 6-9: J2 student evaluation completed if scheduled
 week 11: original materials (J1, J3) forwarded to Tenure Review Coordinator

FALL
 QTR
 3rd
 YEAR

weeks 4-7: J1 evaluation completed if scheduled
 weeks 6-9: J2 student evaluation completed if scheduled
 week 11: original materials (J1, J3) forwarded to Tenure Review Coordinator

WTR
 QTR
 3rd
 YEAR

weeks 4-7: J1 evaluation completed if scheduled
 week 4: due process complaint filed by end of 4th week
 weeks 6-9: J2 student evaluation completed if scheduled; committee meets to review activities; meets with candidate to review performance; candidate provides report/summary of professional growth
 week 11: chair informs VP on progress of candidate; original materials send to Tenure Review Coordinator

SPR
 QTR
 3rd
 YEAR

weeks 4-7: required J1 evaluation completed
 week 4: observation by VP if scheduled
 weeks 6-9: J2 student evaluation completed if scheduled
 week 11: original materials send to Tenure Review Coordinator

FALL
 QTR
 4th
 YEAR

week 3: chair meets with candidate to schedule any J2 and any additional J1 evaluations
 weeks 4-7: J1 evaluation completed if scheduled
 week 4: due process complaint filed by end of 4th week
 weeks 6-9: J2 student evaluation completed if scheduled; committee meets with candidate to review performance; candidate provides final report/summary of professional growth
 week 11: original materials forwarded to Tenure Review Coordinator

WTR
 QTR
 4th
 YEAR

week 1: candidate submits self-evaluation
 week 3: committee meets with candidate to discuss Phase III and professional growth; committee meets to prepare Phase III report
 week 4: committee or designee informs candidate of recommendation; Phase III report sent to President; all material forwarded to Tenure Review Coordinator
 March 15: candidate receives official notification from Board

J1: ADMINISTRATIVE AND PEER EVALUATION FORM

Pre-Observation

Some tenure committee members and probationary faculty opt, often in Phase I and II, to schedule a meeting before an evaluation of performance (J1) takes place, i.e., a conference at which the parties can discuss teaching methods and class dynamics, exchange materials, and finalize plans for the observation:

Possible topics for pre-evaluation meeting:

- Pedagogy, teaching methodology preferences
- Goals within the department/college
- Student support activities
- Course objectives (SLO's)
- Course outline
- Lesson objective(s) for day to be observed
- Evaluation/assessment tools
- Grade rubric/criteria
- Texts and other materials used

Materials to exchange:

- Green sheet
- Syllabus
- Lesson plan for day to be observed
- Handouts for objective/lesson
- Sample exam/assessment TOOL or assignment
- Sample student work

Arrangements to finalize:

- Date and time of observation
- Length of visit (normally, one academic hour)
- Particulars about the class
- Number of students
- Role of observer (introduced?)
- Date for post-evaluation meeting

During Observation

Some tenure review committee members, especially those new to conducting peer evaluations, may welcome guidelines. The following questions may help prompt a discerning observation—though some areas will not be applicable or relevant to particular subject matters or courses. Notes taken during the observation can be used in responding to the Appendix J1 evaluation criteria.

1. Purpose, Objective(s), Structure of Lesson Plan:

- Was context/purpose of day's lesson given to students?
- Was the specific learning objective(s) given to students?
- Was the structure of the lesson plan conducive to learning the objective(s)?
- Was the lesson/learning objective clearly within the context of the course outline?
- Suggestion for change/improvement?

2. Pre- or Post- Assessment Activities:

- Was a pre- and/or post- assessment for day's lesson conducted?
- If so, what were students' reactions?
- If so, were results utilized/explained to students?
- Suggestion for change/improvement?

3. Instructional Activities:

- What activity/activities were conducted?
- Were students given instructions for activities, i.e. how they would learn?
- What was timing, sequencing of activities?
- What was student participation level?
- What was instructor role vs student role?
- How did activities relate to purpose and objective(s) of day's lesson?
- Suggestion for change/improvement?

4. Instructional Aids:

- Were instructional aids used?
- How effective/applicable were aids?
- Suggestion for change/improvement?

5. Participation Techniques:

- What, if any, student participation techniques were used? Were they effective?
- What types of questions were posed to students?
- How did instructor deal with correct and incorrect responses?
- How did instructor handle student disengagement?
- Suggestion for change/improvement?

6. Closure:

- How was the lesson ended: objectives completed or to be continued?
- Were students informed of relevant homework, assignments, future class topics?
- Suggestion for change/improvement?

Post-Evaluation

TIMELINE/PURPOSE FOR POST-EVALUATION MEETING

The *Tenure Review Handbook*, under subsection titled "Evaluation Procedures," stipulates that a post-evaluation discussion shall be held **within one week of the evaluation visit**.

The purpose of such a meeting should be to determine if what was observed is a fair and accurate representation of the visit. To provide an opportunity for dialog between the observer and observed, some tenure committee members discuss their observations at the meeting then complete the J1 after this conversation. Others give a "draft" J1 to the candidate prior to the meeting and are receptive to revision upon new or contextual information provided by the candidate during the meeting.

Helpful guidelines for post-evaluation meeting:

- Solicit the candidate's reactions to the class observed, both successful and unsuccessful activities, student behaviors, etc. After the candidate has offered his or her opinion, add your own summary of strengths and weaknesses.
- Ask the candidate for suggestions on what might be done differently, what s/he would change and why. Then add your suggestions for change/improvement. It is helpful to give specific examples of successful activities, teaching practices, etc.
- Clearly identify to the candidate the specific areas that were unsatisfactory and are expected to show improvement in subsequent evaluations.

Even if all areas were found to be "satisfactory," a post-observation meeting can provide an opportunity for the committee member and candidate to engage in a discussion of successes and areas for growth, both topics relevant to the candidate's continued developed and self-evaluation.

TIMELINE/PROCESS FOR COMPLETED EVALUATION

The "Evaluations Procedures" subsection of the *TR Handbook* also states that the final, completed evaluation (J1) is to be given to the candidate **no later than two weeks after the visit**. The candidate is to be provided ample time to respond to the evaluation in Section IV of the J1, without pressure to sign on-the-spot; evaluators can send an e-copy of the Section IV page to the candidate or the candidate can create a separate page to be attached to the J1. Signatures are entered usually in this order:

Candidate/Evaluator
Dean/appropriate administrator
VP (who returns signed J1 to committee Chair)

A copy of the signed evaluation is given to the candidate by the chair with original forwarded to Tenure Review Coordinator.

Feedback Tips

• DESCRIBE INSTEAD OF INTERPRET:

Refer to what the person does and says (what you see/hear) rather than interpreting what you think the person might be feeling or thinking or intending.

Examples:

- ☆ Describing: You didn't respond to student's behavior.
Interpreting: You were intimidated by the student. You didn't know what to do.

- ☆ Describing: The student did not respond/was texting during the activity.
Interpreting: The student was bored during the activity.
The student didn't understand your directions.

• USE "CONTINUUM" ADJECTIVES:

Describe observed behavior in terms "more/less" rather than "either/or" or "good/bad."

Examples:

- ☆ Continuum Adjective: The use of overheads was less effective in presenting "X" than...
"Good/bad" Adjective: The use of overheads was ineffective.

- ☆ Continuum Adjective: The group work involved more tasks than the time permitted.
"Good/bad" Adjective: The group work was unproductive.

- ☆ Continuum Adjective: Topic "X" was less clear than "Y" without visual aids.
"Good/bad" Adjective: Topic "X" was not clear.

• SHARE INFORMATION:

Give feedback that offers options rather than mandates.

Example:

- ☆ Option: I have found 3x5 cards useful to increase student participation.
Mandate: You must use 3x5 cards to increase student participation.

• BE SPECIFIC RATHER THAN GENERAL:

Give examples over generalities.

Example:

- ☆ Specific: The group work involved more tasks than the time permitted.
General: The pacing of the lesson was rushed. The groupwork failed.

• BE TIMELY:

Give feedback as soon as possible so it can be related to the actual events that transpired.

Filling Out the J1 Form

Guidelines for making sure the evaluation is complete in all respects.

FRONT PAGE: for recording details of observation (e.g. date, length) and for signatures. *Note: observer or candidate sign first *, then J1 goes to Dean/administrator for signature, then to appropriate VP, who returns signed J1 to Tenure Committee Chair.*

**Signing a J1 indicates "approval" of its contents. Per Article 6A, a candidate who does not agree with the contents of a J1 (even if she or he has responded in Section IV) is not required to sign the form; however, it shall nonetheless be added to the personnel file.*

SECOND PAGE:

• **Explanation of objective rating system**

- 1 Satisfactory or better
- 2 Satisfactory but needs improvement in specific area(s)
- 3 Unsatisfactory
- N/O Not observed
- N/A Not applicable

More specifically the *Tenure Review Handbook*, section "Evaluation Goals," describes the goals of evaluation:

Recognize and encourage outstanding performance;	OBJECTIVE SCORE OF "1"
Improve satisfactory performance and further the growth of employees who are performing satisfactorily;	OBJECTIVE SCORE OF "2"
Identify areas which might need improvement and provide useful feedback for consideration;	OBJECTIVE SCORE OF "2"
Identify and document unsatisfactory performance and offer assistance in achieving the required improvement.	OBJECTIVE SCORE OF "3"

- **Section I: Professional Qualities.** Under narrative section, observer can include information directly from candidate related to statements under "A" and "B" sections, e.g., contributions made to department/program. Note that observers, in addition to marking objective scores, are required to include narrative comments that specify reason for any "2" or "3" scores (comments should be clearly connected to objective score by number or subject-area words).

THIRD PAGE:

- **Section II: Job Performance.** Includes five areas, each with distinct evaluative statements pertinent to classroom, librarian, counselor, resource, or child development faculty. Under Section II narrative, observer is restricted to including ONLY first-hand information: directly observed activities/behavior during the evaluation and materials used. Note that observers, in addition to marking objective scores, are required to include narrative comments that specify reason for any "2" or "3" scores (comments should be clearly connected to score by number or subject words).

FOURTH PAGE:

- **Section III: Evaluator's Comprehensive Summary Statement.** Observer may include, in addition to synthesis of Sections I and II, professional activities not previously mentioned, suggestions for further growth, and professional contributions to the District. If "2" or "3" objective scores were marked in Sections I or II, narrative should include clear suggestions for improvement and/or expectations for these areas in future evaluations.
- **Section IV: Faculty Member's Comments.** Faculty are encouraged to respond in writing to evaluations if "2" or "3" objective scores were marked, indicating agreement/disagreement and response to suggestions for improvement. Faculty can respond directly on the J1 form (if given an e-copy of this page by observer) or create a separate document to be attached to the J1.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM STATEMENT

[from the 2007-2010 *Tenure Review Handbook*]

Academic freedom encompasses the freedom to study, teach and express ideas and viewpoints, including unpopular and controversial ones, without censorship, political restraint or retribution. Academic freedom allows for the free exchange of ideas in the conscientious pursuit of truth. This freedom exists in all service areas, including but not limited to teaching, librarianship, counseling, coordinating and all faculty-student interactions. Academic Freedom is the bedrock principle of all institutions of learning and must be extended to all faculty regardless of their status as full, part-time, or probationary.

Faculty members have the principal right and responsibility to determine the content, pedagogy, methods of instruction, the selection, planning and presentation of course materials, and the fair and equitable methods of assessment in their assignment in accordance with the approved curriculum and course outline and the educational mission of the District, and in accordance with state laws and regulations. These rights and responsibilities include, but are not limited to, the faculty member's choice of textbooks and other course materials, assignments and assessment methods, teaching practices, grading and evaluation of student work, and teaching methods and practices. In exercising these rights and responsibilities, faculty members should be mindful that the course outline of record for every course represents the curriculum decisions of his/her department and/or the discipline faculty of his/her division. In addition, the course outline of record forms the basis for articulation between our colleges and those institutions to which our courses transfer. For this reason, faculty members should take care to ensure that in exercising their Academic Freedom rights they do not compromise the integrity of the course outline of record for any course they are assigned to teach.

Faculty have the freedom and right to express differing opinions and to foster and defend intellectual honesty.

Special vigilance must be paid to the protection of the Academic Freedom Rights of probationary faculty undergoing the tenure process. While the tenure process is, at its core, an evaluative process, the evaluation of probationary faculty must never be used as a pretense for abridging or restricting the Academic Freedom rights of a tenure candidate. All members of a probationary faculty member's tenure review committee should bear in mind that differences between their own teaching methods and practices and beliefs and those of the tenure candidate should never be the basis for their evaluation of a probationary faculty member. These differences are protected by the tenure candidate's Academic Freedom. The evaluation of a probationary faculty member should be based solely on those criteria described in the negotiated faculty evaluation instruments and those listed in the advertised job description under which the tenure candidate was hired.

CULTURAL COMPETENCE

[Adapted from the webpage of the Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice (<http://cecp.air.org/cultural> 8/07/07)]

Cultural Knowledge: Familiarization with selected cultural characteristics, history, values, belief systems, and behaviors of the members of another ethnic group (Adams, 1995).

Cultural Awareness: Sensitivity and understanding of another ethnic group. This usually involves internal changes in terms of attitudes and values. Awareness and sensitivity also refer to the qualities of openness and flexibility that people develop in relation to others. Cultural awareness must be supplemented with cultural knowledge (Adams, 1995).

Cultural Sensitivity: Knowledge that cultural differences as well as similarities exist, without assigning values- i.e., better or worse, right or wrong- to those cultural differences (National Maternal and Child Health Center on Cultural Competency, 1997).

Cultural Competence: a set of congruent behaviors, attitudes, and policies that come together to enable a system, agency, or professionals to work effectively in cross-cultural situations (Cross, Bazron, Dennis, & Isaacs, 1989).

Operationally defined, **CULTURAL COMPETENCE** is the integration and transformation of knowledge about individuals and groups of people into specific standards, policies, practices, and attitudes used in appropriate cultural settings to increase the quality of services thereby producing better outcomes (Davis, 1997). Unlike the other terms, cultural competency emphasizes the idea of *effectively* operating in different cultural contexts.

The degree to which systems or professionals manifest cultural competence proceeds along a continuum: 1) cultural destructiveness, 2) cultural incapacity, 3) cultural blindness, 4) cultural pre-competence, 5) cultural competency, and 6) cultural proficiency.

To become culturally competent, a system/professionals should (1) value diversity, (2) have the capacity for cultural self-assessment, (3) be conscious of the "dynamics" inherent when cultures interact, (4) institutionalize cultural knowledge, and (5) develop adaptations to services that reflect an understanding of diversity between and within cultures.

For Tenure Review Committees, their awareness of cultural competence, along with attention to academic freedom, is an important factor affecting how candidates are evaluated.

J2: STUDENT EVALUATION

The student evaluation (J2) process is regulated by Article 6A.

Part "A"

Article 6A *The Student Evaluation Form shall be distributed and collected by a member of the Tenure Review Committee and completed in the absence of the faculty candidate. The committee member shall process the responses to "Part A" of the Student Evaluation Form and give them to the chair of the committee who shall meet with the committee and the candidate to review the results."*

Note that forms are not to be given to a Division Assistant or anyone else for scoring. A copy of the Part A tabulation form (J3) is to be given to the candidate when completed.

Part "B"

6A.2.3.2 *"Part B" of the Student Evaluation Form shall be given to the chair of the committee. The Part B responses shall be reviewed by the members of the Tenure Review Committee and by the candidate after submission of final grades for the quarter. In no case shall such materials become part of the written reports and recommendations of the committee.*

The Part B narrative responses are to be reviewed by the committee members (for discussion at next quarter's first meeting) then given to the candidate, along with original student scantrons, after s/he turns in grades for those students.

Forms Needed

- *Appendix J2* (with appropriate classroom, counselor, librarian, child development section):
available in most Division Offices, Tenure Review webpage, FA website (<http://fa.fhda.edu>) under "Agreement" link, "Appendices."
- Scantrons for student responses (blue/pink half-sheets # S-20):
available in most Division Offices
- Scantron for tabulation- optional (large orange scantron sheet):
available in most Division Offices
- Appropriate *Appendix J3* for recording objective scores (classroom, counselor, librarian, child development):
available in most Division Offices, Tenure Review webpage, FA website (<http://fa.fhda.edu>) under "Agreement" link, "Appendices."

Process For Scoring

Student scantrons can be hand counted and recorded on the appropriate J3. Or scantron machines are available in the Staff Room, adjacent to the main mail room, and in a few Division Offices. If using scantron machine, follow these steps:

- 1) Run "answer key" scantron through machine (both sides, one after the other);
- 2) Run student scantrons through machine (both sides, one after the other);
- 3) Run scantron for tabulation through machine (both sides, one after the other);
- 4) Record scores on appropriate J3.

RECOMMENDATION REPORT

- At the end of each Phase, the committee meets to prepare a Recommendation report whether or not to offer the candidate continued employment, which goes to the President. The report is to summarize the candidate's job performance (based on the J1 evaluations) and student evaluations (J2 evaluations) but is not to include specific quotes from either.
- This report should not include any information that has not been previously discussed with the candidate.
- The Recommendation must reflect the views of all committee members. When the members are in disagreement, the Recommendation must include a "Majority Opinion" and a "Minority Opinion" signed by the respective members (6A.22.1).

Sample Recommendation Report Form:

COMMITTEE EVALUATION OF TENURE CANDIDATE

CANDIDATE _____ 1st year ____ 2nd year ____ 4th year ____

Division _____ Discipline _____

Committee Chair _____

This form is to accompany the tenure committee's written evaluations [Phase report], which are submitted in winter quarter during week 5 for first-year and second-year candidates, and during week 4 for fourth-year candidates.

Suggestions for content of the committee's written recommendation can be found in the *Tenure Review Handbook* and relevant articles of the *Agreement*. In addition it can include evidence of the candidate's professional growth (in Phases II and III evaluations), and recommended areas for additional growth.

Signatures:	Date	Recommended for continued employment?	
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Division Faculty _____	_____	_____	_____
Division Faculty _____	_____	_____	_____
At-Large Faculty (Phase I, II only) _____	_____	_____	_____
Division Dean _____	_____	_____	_____
Vice-President (Phase I, II only) _____	_____	_____	_____
President _____	_____	_____	_____

Sample Recommendation Reports: available on the Tenure Review webpage (<http://www.foothill.edu/staff/tenure.php>)

SIGNIFICANT CHANGES PROPOSED FOR 2010-13 ARTICLE 6A AND/OR TENURE REVIEW HANDBOOK

PROVISION	REVISION	
<i>Performing duties</i>	<i>6A.7.1: To receive professional growth unit(s), the committee member must complete all evaluation duties delegated to him or her in a timely manner (within established guidelines). Failure to do so may result in loss of unit credit.</i>	Previously in effect but clarified
<i>Conducting evaluations</i>	6A.12.3.5: A probationary evaluation [Appendix J1] and a student evaluation [Appendix J2] shall not be performed at the same time, i.e., on the same day and during the same academic hour(s).	Previously in effect but not stated in 6A
<i>Conducting evaluations</i>	6A.12.3.6: A Tenure Review Committee responsible for performing both a probationary evaluation [J1] and a student evaluation [J2] during the same quarter shall provide the completed probationary evaluation to the candidate before conducting the student evaluation.	NEW
<i>Phase III Membership</i>	Tenure Review Handbook p. 32: "...The Vice President may attend meetings and provide input and consultation to the committee but he or she shall not be a voting member in the committee's final recommendation..."	Clarifying Language