

COLLEGE OF NEW CALEDONIA

POLICY AND PROCEDURE

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF FACULTY EMPLOYED IN
NON-INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS**

December 3, 2002

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF FACULTY EMPLOYED IN NON-INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS

Contents:

1. Definition
2. Policy
3. Principles
4. Core Elements to be Considered
5. Methods of Assessment
6. Evaluation Procedures for Different Types of Appointments
7. Review Process
8. Collective Agreement Procedures

1. Definition

This procedure covers the evaluation of faculty employed in non-instructional areas (i.e. those faculty whose evaluation would not be appropriate under the terms of the Performance Evaluation of Faculty Employed in Instructional Areas).

Examples include Counsellors, Librarians, Athletics/Recreation Coordinators, Speech/Language Pathologists, Physical Therapists, Occupational Therapists, Curriculum Developers, Developmental Disabilities Services Personnel and other non-instructional faculty as agreed upon by the parties to the Collective Agreement.

2. Policy

The purposes for a comprehensive performance evaluation policy for non-instructional faculty at CNC are to:

- 2.1 Create a constructive environment within which professional services can be fully explored in the interest of student development,
- 2.2 Create a means by which faculty performance can be evaluated to determine areas of strength and areas that may need improving as a fundamental step in faculty planning to improve effectiveness of performance,
- 2.3 Recognize and reinforce best practices,
- 2.4 Create a means by which the supporting relationship between faculty evaluation and faculty development can be understood and achieved,
- 2.5 Identify, in some circumstances, where improvement is required to maintain competency and promote high professional standards.

3. Principles

The faculty performance evaluation process will:

- 3.1 Be designed and implemented through a consultative process,
- 3.2 Provide constructive feedback to help faculty facilitate student development,

- 3.3 Assist in identifying excellent performance,
- 3.4 Be applied and implemented consistently,
- 3.5 Be comprehensive, using core elements with the addition of other elements as decided by the faculty member in consultation with her/his administrator,
- 3.6 Provide input for individual faculty professional development, and instructional development where applicable,
- 3.7 Provide an opportunity for faculty to address the results of their performance evaluation,
- 3.8 Undergo regular review and revision as needed.

4. Core Elements to Be Considered

It is intended that activities related to the following functions could be evaluated:

- 4.1 Job-Related Professional Responsibilities
- 4.2 Professional Development
- 4.3 Service to College and Community
- 4.4 Special Assignments or Projects
- 4.5 Teaching and Instructional Development, if applicable

Any activities undertaken by faculty members which are not related to their responsibilities to the College will not be considered, except as defined in section 4.3 Service. The evaluation of Job-Related Professional Responsibilities will be the most important factor in assessing performance except where other activities (which are identified in advance) are of equal or greater importance. Other categories will be of lesser importance unless otherwise agreed upon by the appropriate administrator and the faculty member.

In preparing an evaluation, the appropriate administrator may make a reference to data suggesting an inability to work in concert with others that has led to demonstrated negative impact on the faculty member's activities related to the core elements.

4.1 Job-Related Professional Responsibilities

4.1.1 Components that May be Evaluated

Non-instructional faculty have a variety of different responsibilities (outlined in the Collective Agreement, and defined further in job postings and at the departmental level). Before an evaluation can be performed, each faculty member is expected to have a clear outline of his/her responsibilities, and these will be used as a basis for evaluation. Components of service that may be evaluated include:

- a. Service Delivery Skills
 - i. Enthusiasm and professionalism

- ii. Communication skills
 - iii. User/Client centered strategies and services
 - iv. Developmental focus
 - v. Organization
 - vi. Use of technology as appropriate
 - vii. Professional skills
 - viii. Initiative and creativity
- b. Content Expertise
- i. Knowledge of content area
 - ii. Inclusion of current knowledge
 - iii. Knowledge of regulations, policies and procedures

4.1.2 Methods of Assessment that May be Used

- a. Self-evaluation
- b. Administrative visitations / consultations
- c. Peer visitations / consultations
- d. User surveys or other forms of input from users/clients (if applicable)
- e. Unsolicited input as defined in 5.5
- f. Review of any instructional materials prepared by faculty member
- g. Evaluation forms and processes developed by service areas (if available)

4.2 Professional Development

Professional Development will be defined in terms of results expected or activities undertaken, and the evaluation of the results or activities will be the responsibility of the appropriate administrator.

4.2.1 Components of P.D that may be evaluated

- a. Active involvement/service in professional associations and committees
- b. Reading undertaken, awareness of current practices, upgrading in the field or discipline
- c. Research and/or writing undertaken
- d. Courses/workshops taken
- e. Practical work experience in the field or discipline

4.2.2 Methods of Assessment

- a. Annual P.D. plan
- b. Self evaluation – list of involvement

4.3 Service to College and Community

Service activities identified by the faculty member, may be used to give

recognition of contributions.

4.3.1 Components of Service that may be evaluated

- a. Active on community Boards
- b. Active in community/business/industry initiatives and activities
- c. Participation in trade shows
- d. Visitation to schools, and by schools
- e. Active on college committees (e.g. Education Council, Faculty Association, Recruitment and Retention, Health and Safety, Divisional activities)
- f. Participation in college-wide events (e.g. Career Fair, Open House)

4.3.2 Method of Assessment

- a. Self reporting of above

4.4 Special Assignments or Projects

Previously agreed duties (e.g. Coordinator) or special projects wherein the faculty member may receive a workload reduction, should be taken into account when a comprehensive evaluation is done.

4.4.1 Components to be Evaluated

- a. Effectiveness in handling Special assignments or projects

4.4.2 Method of Assessment

- a. Self-evaluation: review of project reports and activities undertaken
- b. Administrative review of project reports and activities undertaken
- c. Peer visitations / consultation

4.5 Teaching and Instructional Development, if applicable

This section applies to non-instructional faculty who are engaged in some teaching functions, such as the delivery of workshops, seminars, small group training, etc.

4.5.1 Components of Teaching to be Evaluated:

- a. Instructional Delivery Skills
 - i. Enthusiasm
 - ii. Communication skills
 - iii. Learner centered strategies
 - iv. Learning focus
 - v. Organization
 - vi. Use of technology as appropriate
 - vii. Instructional techniques

- b. Content Expertise
 - i. Knowledge of content area
 - ii. Inclusion of current knowledge

4.5.2 Methods of Assessment that May be Used

- a. Self-evaluation
- b. Administrative visitations / consultations
- c. Peer visitations / consultations
- d. User surveys or other forms of input from users/clients (if applicable)
- e. Unsolicited input as defined in 5.5
- f. Review of any instructional materials prepared by faculty member
- g. Evaluation forms and processes developed by service areas (if available)

5. Methods of Assessment

5.1 Self-Evaluation

The practice of self-evaluation is very important as it has been determined that change is much more likely when a disparity of perceptions is recognized. Self-evaluation forms part of the assessment data, and will be based on the core elements under section 4.

5.2 Administrative Visitations / Consultations

Administrative visitations/consultations for the purposes of a comprehensive evaluation will be arranged with the faculty member involved, giving at least one week's notice, and will normally be limited to a maximum of three visits/consultations per year.

5.3 Peer Visitations / Consultations

The practice of using peer assistance to improve effectiveness is definitely encouraged but related input would not form part of the summative evaluation report, unless requested by the faculty member.

5.4 User Surveys and Other Forms of Input from Users/Clients

User surveys and other forms of input from users/clients will be developed by mutual agreement of the faculty member and the appropriate administrator.

Surveys will be used to highlight areas of excellence as well as to "red-flag" any areas of concern. If necessary, clearer definition should then be pursued through the most appropriate vehicle (i.e. consultation between the faculty member and the appropriate administrator, consultation with the class or group, user group visitation, review of documents, more specific questionnaires, etc.) with the goal of identifying appropriate

corrective action if necessary.

Scheduling of any user surveys will be done at a time mutually agreeable to the faculty member and the appropriate administrator.

To maintain anonymity, all surveys will be administered under the direction of the appropriate administrator. Results shall be handled in a personal and confidential manner through direction of the office of the senior Administrator who reports directly to the President.

Individual comments will be solicited, typed and made available to the faculty member for the purposes of consultation during an evaluation interview. The solicited, written comments will be destroyed after the completion of the evaluation interview. Multiple comments from a single source will be identified as such.

Interpretation of Results:

- a. Results of any user input should be made known to faculty as soon as possible after being obtained. Results will be discussed with the faculty member.
- b. On an individual basis, historical data derived from user surveys may be used to indicate a trend in behaviours. The written comments may only be used to identify a trend and will not be quoted in comprehensive written report.
- c. Manipulation of quantitative data derived from user surveys which might lead to rating and rank ordering of faculty will not be done.

Faculty may, of course, seek user input in addition to that proposed in this procedure but such input will not form part of the evaluation process.

5.5 Unsolicited Input

When unsolicited input is received, the appropriate administrator will, as soon as possible, inform the faculty member of the precise nature of the input, and, through discussion with the parties involved, attempt to establish if there is, or is not, substance to the input. If the input cannot be authenticated or if it is anonymous or irrelevant to performance it will not be recorded or used as part of the evaluation. If, in the judgement of the appropriate administrator, the input is well-grounded and relevant to performance, related documentation may form part of the formal evaluation file for reference in preparing the comprehensive written report. The source of any such input which forms part of the evaluation will be made known to the faculty member.

6. Evaluation Procedures for Different Types of Appointments

In any serious attempt at improving professional competence and effectiveness, evaluation cannot be considered in isolation but rather must be seen as part of a growth plan which includes the establishment of expectations, evaluation of results and identification of opportunities for development. The appropriate administrator will meet at the beginning of the evaluation period with each faculty to be evaluated to agree upon and determine the process and activities to be pursued in the coming year and the dates that the self-evaluation and comprehensive written report will be completed. This meeting will be followed up with a written account of the decision made.

The following procedures will be used by the appropriate administrator for review with the faculty member in accordance with sections 7.2 of the Collective Agreement. A comprehensive written report prepared by the appropriate administrator constitutes the evaluation referred to in section 7.2.5 of the Collective Agreement. The evaluator will conclude the evaluation with a statement that the faculty member's performance is either satisfactory or unsatisfactory. The faculty member will have the right to bring in a colleague or Union representative to any evaluation meeting with the evaluator. A second representative of administration may be present.

6.1 Probationary Faculty

Probationary faculty will be assigned a mentor, when possible, during the first two years of appointment. In the first 6-months, the following methods of assessment may be used:

- a. Administrative visitations / consultations
- b. Peer visitations / consultations
- c. User surveys or other forms of input from users/clients (if applicable)
- d. Evaluation forms and processes developed by service areas (if available)

The emphasis during the first 6 months is to acquaint the faculty member with college policy and procedures in relation to performance evaluation, and to provide support which acknowledges needs and opportunities for improvement.

In the second 6 months, and in the second probationary year the following are required:

- a. Self-evaluation
- b. Administrative visitations / consultations
- c. User surveys or other forms of input from users/clients/affiliates (if applicable)
- d. Evaluation forms and processes developed by service areas (if available)

- available)
- e. Comprehensive written report by the administrator followed by a debriefing with the faculty member.

The following are optional:

- a. Peer visitation / consultation

6.2 Regular Faculty (Regular, regularized full and part-time – LOU#3 & Article 6)

Regular faculty may be evaluated annually; however as a minimum formative evaluation [*] is required 3 years after becoming a regular faculty member. Six years after becoming a regular faculty member a comprehensive evaluation [**] is required. There after, a minimum of every 6 years, a comprehensive evaluation is required.

For the 3rd year formative evaluation, the following will be required:

- a. Self-evaluation
- b. User surveys or other forms of input from users/clients (if applicable)

Every six years is a comprehensive review and the following will be required:

- a. Self-evaluation
- b. Administrative visitations / consultations
- c. User surveys or other forms of input from users/clients (if applicable)
- d. Evaluation forms and processes developed by service areas (if available)
- e. Comprehensive written report by the administrator followed by a debriefing with the faculty member

The following are optional:

- a. Peer visitation / consultation

6.3 Sessional Faculty

All sessional faculty will be evaluated on their first and second Sessional Appointment and thereafter on a reasonable interval based upon results of the first evaluation and number of Appointments.

The following are required:

- a. Self-evaluation if the appointment is more than one year
- b. Administrative visitations / consultations
- c. User surveys or other forms of input from users/clients (if applicable)
- d. Evaluation forms and processes developed by service areas (if available)

- e. Comprehensive written report by the administrator followed by a debriefing with the faculty member

The following are optional:

- a. Peer visitation / consultation

6.4 Part-Time Faculty

Part-time faculty members with at least 45 regular scheduled hours annually will be evaluated by the use of one or more of the measures outlined in 6.3 above until they reach Non-regular status.

6.5 Sessional and Part-Time Faculty on the Non-Regular Seniority List

Once a faculty member gains status on the Non-Regular Seniority List the following will be required every 3 years:

- a. Self-evaluation
- b. Administrative visitations / consultations
- c. User surveys or other forms of input from users/clients (if applicable)
- d. Evaluation forms and processes developed by service areas (if available)
- e. Comprehensive written report by the administrator followed by a debriefing with the faculty member

The following are optional:

- a. Peer visitation / consultation

Should a faculty member on the Non-Regular Seniority List go from having a Part-time Appointment to a Sessional Appointment, that faculty member may have their performance evaluated.

7. Review Process

Although the evaluation process is intended to be positive, disagreements do occur. It is recognized that there is value in third party advice when there are disagreements on matters associated with evaluation.

When the faculty member and the administrator cannot agree on the content of the evaluation, the faculty member may invoke the review process. The objective of the process is to provide independent insight into the evaluation, provide advice to both parties and provide a means to resolve the difference without immediately proceeding to grievance/arbitration should the faculty member so choose.

Within 10 working days after reviewing the evaluation, the faculty member may choose to seek a third party review by notifying in writing, the administrator and

the Faculty Association. The Faculty Association appoints a faculty member and the College appoints an academic administrator to form a review team. With 10 working days following such a hearing, each member of the review team will provide written advice to the faculty member and the administrator on all matters relating to the disagreement.

It is anticipated that the faculty member and the administrator will give serious consideration to the advice provided and attempt to resolve the differences.

8. Collective Agreement Procedures

Faculty are reminded that this policy and procedures are designed for the fair and systematic implementation of the Collective Agreement reached between the Faculty Association and the College Board. Specifically this means that:

- 8.1 The evaluation process will be described in advance of its application for all faculty members.
- 8.2 The faculty member and appropriate administrator will review all evaluation results in a meeting prior to the submission of the final comprehensive written report.
- 8.3 After completion of the final comprehensive written report, the faculty member will sign the report indicating its receipt and perusal. The faculty member will also have the opportunity to add written comments to be attached to the comprehensive written report in the file, or ask for an additional meeting with the administrator.
- 8.4 As has been the practice, existing evaluation procedures will remain in force until superceded by new procedures. Evaluation procedures for Non-Instructional Faculty will be reviewed jointly on an annual basis in conjunction with the Instructional Faculty Evaluation review.

