



**TENURE & EVALUATIONS  
REVIEW BOARD**

**MINUTES – September 14, 2020**

**A meeting of the Palomar College Tenure & Evaluations Review Board was held on September 14, 2020 via Zoom.**

Members Present: Marquesa Cook-Whearty, William Dalrymple, Kelly Falcone, Erin Hiro, Teresa Laughlin, Lawrence Hamilton Lawson, Russ McDonald, Wendy Nelson, Shayla Sivert, David Wright

Recorder: Lucy Aguilar

---

**I. Call to Order**

Meeting called to order at 4:06 p.m.

**II. Approval of Minutes**

Approval of August 24, 2020 Minutes

MSC: Hiro /Laughlin

Abstentions: Dalrymple

No Vote: Nelson/Sivert

**III. Information**

A. Update on Student Evaluation Activities for AY 20-21

- Lawson reported that some training videos for probationary and peer online evaluations are nearly complete. He mentioned that the online system was recently changed so that evaluatees can add people to their Canvas shell.
- Lawson indicated that the approval to remove the VP from the TEC process was approved a week ago.
- Lawson stated that faculty evaluations are launching in October. He said that two probationary faculty evaluations would begin early due to a leave of absence and pointed out that they will miss less than 25% of the academic year so that this year will count for both faculty members.

**IV. Discussion**

A. Evaluation Matrices for Full-Time Faculty Evaluatees

- Lawson reminded everyone about the discussion that took place at the last TERB meeting regarding full-time faculty who are up for evaluation and do not have a teaching load or have a significantly reduced teaching load. He reported that he received project descriptions for these faculty members and would like to review and vote on the matrices.
- Laughlin indicated that she brought forth concerns regarding the equitability and consistency of the assigned projects to the Negotiations Team, TERB, and PFF. Laughlin mentioned that there is a signed MOU, and it is mutually agreed upon.
- Lawson reviewed the proposed matrices with the TERB committee. There was discussion amongst the members. Falcone asked for TERB's responsibility/role in the approval process for the matrices. Lawson pointed out that TERB needs to review and vote on all proposed forms used for evaluation.
- Nelson expressed concern regarding equitability and consistency. She suggested evaluating faculty once they are teaching again. There was discussion, and Lawson suggested swapping Spring 2021 for Fall 2020, due to the possibility of faculty teaching face-to-face classes in Spring 2021. Laughlin stated that this would require a new MOU.
- Laughlin pointed out that the only problem would be the March 15<sup>th</sup> notice for probationary faculty. Lawson reminded everyone of a current improvement plan for a faculty members. Given Laughlin's note, and this information, Lawson suggested the push to Spring 2021 would not work.
- Lawson advised approving the matrices but also noted more investigation into switching semesters for these faculty members.

- Falcone recommended adding an “other comments box” to the proposed matrices; Lawson noted “other” would open up the evals to too many unknown factors. Falcone noted that faculty members could provide a narrative on their assigned project, and Lawson noted the evaluation Chair could invite the evaluatee to complete a form as a self-evaluation of their work, and it could be looked at alongside the other data.
- B. Evaluation Matrix for Puente Coordinator
- Lawson reported that the TEC Committee for the Puente Coordinator requested a rubric for the Puente Coordinator position.
  - Lawson reviewed the matrix, and pointed out that the duties listed on the matrix were provided by the TEC Chair and that it is a 40% release time position.
  - Sivert indicated that there is a signed MOU by the district regarding Puente Coordinator/Co-Coordinator duties.
  - Falcone expressed concern regarding duties not being clear for all release time positions. She suggested including all coordinator duties in the PFF contract and mentioned that this information would help with future evaluations. Falcone suggested using a form similar to the matrices that were created. Laughlin suggested forming a committee and recommending this to the district.
- C. Workplace Observations for Behavioral Health Counselors
- Lawson reported that the Behavioral Health Counseling Services department expressed concern over the new evaluation report for counselors. He stated that Assistant Director Saviano indicated that an observation of a behavioral health counseling session is unethical. Saviano suggested observation of a workplace (non-session).
  - Lawson reviewed the newly revised evaluation report with the committee. There was discussion, and the committee agreed with the modification.
- D. Revisiting “Other” Methods for Obtaining Student Feedback
- Lawson received a request from a peer faculty member to have students meet with the TEC Chair instead of the normal student evaluation process. He stated that the TEC Chair would ask students how they felt about the course. Laughlin mentioned that her department had used this option in the past, and it was done as “small group feedback.” Falcone reminded the committee that this method is listed as an option on TERB’s website. Falcone also expressed concern that this method might provide an opportunity for inconsistencies. Lawson mentioned that the committee would revisit this agenda item in the future and discuss the possibility of revising this policy or form.
- E. Retired Faculty as Evaluators
- Lawson reported that he received a request from a peer faculty member to have an emeritus faculty member do his/her observation. He said the peer faculty member has also requested the emeritus faculty member to be a part of their Peer Review Committee. Lawson informed everyone that this process does not quite follow contract—emeritus faculty can, instead, conduct an observation (but not be on the evaluation committee).
  - Nelson suggested using a testimonial as part of the evaluation, and then the evaluator could decide if they will use that part of the evidence. Falcone added that the retiree could provide testimonial or evidence without being officially part of the committee. Everyone agreed.
- F. Simplified Ratings for Online Instructors (for ESL)
- Lawson reported that ESL is using slightly modified student evaluation questions for face-to-face classes. He said the language is simplified so that lower-level students can understand each question better. He said that he was informed that the online student evaluation questions did not contain the same simplified language. Lawson stated that the evaluation questions have been changed and are now the same, and many questions reflect the same language as the face-to-face evaluation.
  - Hiro suggested using the same format for all departments. Falcone noted that other classes include ESL students. Lawson stated that once we have approval on this evaluation mechanism, then we can examine how to use this format for the rest of the departments to, perhaps, simplify, student evaluation questions.

G. Revising Due Date for Probationary Eval Packets

- Lawson reported that the due date for the probationary evaluation packets on the TERB calendar needs to be amended. He stated that it should be changed to the middle of February to be in line with the March 10, 2021 board meeting.
- Falcone suggested using a relative date. She suggested the following: “evaluation packets should always be due three weeks before the March 10<sup>th</sup> board meeting.”
- Nelson expressed concern regarding the new electronic evaluation process and due dates.

H. Revisiting “Collegiality” in Faculty Evaluations

- Tabled

**V. Action**

A. Evaluation Matrices for Full-Time Faculty Evaluatees

B. Evaluation Matrix for Puente Coordinator

C. Workplace Observation Form for Behavioral Health Counselors

D. Simplified Ratings for Online Instructors (for ESL)

- Motion to approve Action Items A-D.
  - a. MSC: Hiro/Nelson
  - b. All in favor

E. Approve Peer Review Committee Chairs for Department Chairs

- Motion to approve Peer Review Committee Chairs for Department Chairs.
  - a. MSC: Laughlin/McDonald
  - b. All in favor

Meeting adjourned to Executive Session: 5:10 p.m.

**VI. Executive Session**

A. Out-of-Cycle Peer Evaluation: 3<sup>rd</sup> Member and Questions

**VII. Action**

A. Approve Out-of-Cycle Peer Evaluation: 3<sup>rd</sup> Member for Committee.

- a. MSC: Laughlin/Wright
- b. All in attendance in favor (Sivert absent)

Next Meeting: September 28, 2020 | Zoom 818 531 5929