3. Student Surveys ~~Evaluations~~ – Student surveys ~~evaluation~~ shall be a part of every evaluation of every classroom instructor except as provided in 9.A.3.7 below. Not every class ~~need~~ needs to be surveyed, unless the evaluatee or the evaluators so request. Student surveys may also be conducted for non-classroom faculty ~~Non-classroom faculty may also be so evaluated~~, provided that the members of the department determine that student evaluation is appropriate.
   3.1. Student surveys ~~questionnaires~~ shall be uniform, to the extent possible, for all classroom faculty.
   3.2. Student surveys shall generally be distributed to students through the College's Learning Management System. Departments may elect to use paper surveys for specific classes.
   3.~~2~~3. The distribution and gathering of the student survey ~~evaluation~~ forms shall not be done by the evaluatee.
   3.~~3~~4. Completed student surveys ~~questionnaires~~ and computer printed summaries shall be forwarded to the evaluators who shall prepare appropriate summaries of the results. The summaries shall become part of the evaluation report.
   3.~~4~~5. Completed student surveys ~~questionnaires~~ may be viewed by the evaluatee only after the evaluatee's final grades have been turned in.
   3.~~5~~6. Non-classroom disciplines/departments may develop student survey ~~evaluation~~ forms subject to approval by the Union and the District.
   3.7. Student surveys will not be required in certain noncredit ESL and noncredit DSPS courses, where the department determines that they are not appropriate. Where a department makes this determination, it should be consistent for all sections of the given course for the academic year.

Managers, evaluators, and evaluatees shall endeavor to meet the following deadlines:

At least a week before the first Flex Day of the Semester:	District provides department chairs with lists of faculty scheduled for evaluation
By End of Week 1:	Department chairs confirm with the Office of Instruction the names ~~lists~~ of faculty who are scheduled for evaluation

2.1.2. The Department Chairperson shall select two or three peer evaluators, in consultation with the Dean. The team shall ordinarily consist of three members but may be reduced to two based on departmental workload. Wherever possible, teams shall represent the diversity of California and be sensitive to affirmative action concerns (Ed. Code §87663(d) and see also Article 4). Where possible, the evaluators shall be from the same or a related department as the evaluatee. The evaluatee may elect to have one of the evaluators be from another discipline or department, with the Department Chair having final authority in consultation with the Dean to designate the specific evaluator from another discipline or department. The evaluatee shall have the right, within three working days of receipt of the notification, without stating cause, to make up to three (3) disqualifications, in writing, from those originally selected. The evaluators shall not be notified until the ~~challenge~~ disqualification period has passed. The Department Chairperson shall ~~recommend~~ identify a chair for the evaluating team. The chair of the evaluating team shall have the responsibility of facilitating the evaluation process and

9.F.2. Satisfactory but Needs Improvement: If the overall evaluation report rating is Satisfactory but Needs Improvement, the evaluators shall, in consultation with the evaluatee, ~~and~~ the department chair, and supervising dean, develop an improvement plan with specific goals, suggested means of achieving those goals and timelines for completion. The improvement plan will be presented to the evaluatee at the final conference. The faculty member will be scheduled for another evaluation in three years, in accordance with 9.B.1. The Dean shall receive a copy of the improvement plan.

9.F.2.1.5. If the faculty member fails to submit a report in accordance with 9.F.2.1.1, the Department Chairperson may, after conferring with the faculty member, write a letter to be included in the personnel file documenting the failure to submit a report. The faculty member may rebut the letter but may not appeal placement of the letter in ~~his/her~~ their file. Failure to submit a report shall be reported to the appropriate Vice Chancellor/Associate Vice Chancellor so that a determination may be made if follow-up evaluation in accordance with 9.D.2 is warranted. The Dean shall receive a copy of the foregoing documentation.

9.F.3. Unsatisfactory: If the overall evaluation report rating is Unsatisfactory, the evaluators shall, in consultation with the evaluatee and the Department Chairperson, develop an improvement plan with specific goals, suggested means of achieving those goals, and timelines for completion. The improvement plan shall be approved by the supervising ~~submitted to the~~ Dean ~~for approval, and approved,~~ before being presented to the evaluatee at the final conference.

2.2. The Tenure Review Committees shall ordinarily consist of four faculty members, the department chairperson, and the supervising Dean. If a faculty member under tenure review is the department chairperson, a department chairperson from a related department shall fill the department chairperson role. ~~and the immediate supervisor of the contract employee~~. ~~The immediate supervisor is the lowest level non-bargaining unit member who has supervision over the employee. A Dean may serve on the Committee when he or she is the immediate supervisor, where the immediate supervisor is out sick or on other leave status, where enough faculty are not otherwise available, as the replacement for an immediate supervisor who has been disqualified pursuant to Section 9.G.7.1, or where the Dean is the only available faculty member with subject matter expertise or is needed for diversity purposes.~~ A department of eight tenured faculty members or fewer may choose to use only two faculty members, the department chairperson, and the supervising Dean ~~and the immediate supervisor of the contract employee,~~

District Proposal ς Article 9 ς Evaluation

District Proposal

The parties acknowledge that Title 5 Section 53602 requires that "The evaluation of district employees must include consideration of an employee's demonstrated, or progress toward, proficiency in diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility DEIA-related competencies that enable work with diverse communities". The parties agree to meet ~~promptly~~ following ratification of this agreement and AFT's consultation with the Academic Senate, as required by Ed Code sections 87663 and 87610.1, to consider updates to ~~the~~ evaluation processes ~~forms in Exhibits D, G, H, and K~~ as needed to implement this Title 5 regulation.

1. Does the instructor organize the material well?
2. Is the instructor's presentation of material clear and understandable?
3. Does the instructor seem to have adequate knowledge of the subject area of this course?

~~4. When possible does the instructor relate subject matter to other fields and situations?~~

4. Does the instructor respect your efforts and opinions as an individual?
5. Does the instructor try to interest you in the subject and encourage you to learn more about it?
6. Were your responsibilities in the course (exams, ~~term~~ papers, attendance ~~regulations~~, etc.) clearly stated and explained?
7. Is the grading system fair?
8. Does the instructor follow ~~his/her~~ their stated grading system?
9. Are the methods of testing (examinations, papers, etc.) a valid evaluation of the knowledge and or skills you have gained from this course?

~~10. Is the instructor sufficiently available to you during regularly scheduled office hours or by appointment?~~ Does the instructor respond to student inquiries in a timely manner?

10. Are assignments relevant and helpful in understanding the subject area?
11. Is the instructor receptive to questions from students ~~either during or outside class~~?
12. Is the instructor enthusiastic about teaching this course?
13. Does the instructor meet and dismiss scheduled class sessions on time ~~at the scheduled time~~?
14. Does the instructor return assignments and exams ~~and homework~~ promptly with meaningful feedback?

~~15. Does the instructor speak clearly and understandably?~~

15. Does the instructor ~~show respect toward~~ racial, sexual, religious, and political groups ~~seem to be~~ free of racial, sexual, religious, and political prej reW*000ceitic338S4( )6(me)-12(a)-11(n)1i92 rey?

1. The teacher explains English well.
2. The teacher respects the students.
3. The lessons are ~~is~~ organized.
4. The ~~books and~~ teaching materials help me learn English.
5. The teacher helps me understand my mistakes.
6. The teacher gives time for questions.
7. The teacher answers questions well.
8. The teacher checks my work.
9. The teacher starts and ends the class on time.

1. The teacher explains the purpose of the class well.
2. The teacher respects the students.