

CUESTA COLLEGE

INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY: DEAN EVALUATION FORM FOR INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGNER

Employee:			Semester/Year:	
Regular Tenured	Tenure-track	Temporary Full-time	Temporary Part-time	Temp. w/o assignment rights
Evaluators:	Observation Date:	Activity Name:	Room #:	
				Check if DE <input type="checkbox"/>
				Check if DE <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>For an off-cycle review, indicate below the third member of the evaluation team and check which Sections are under review:</i>				
				Check if DE <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Instruction (I)	<input type="checkbox"/> Interaction with Faculty (II)	<input type="checkbox"/> Materials (III)	<input type="checkbox"/> Professional & Divisional Responsibilities (IV)	

INSTRUCTIONS:

The processes and procedures that govern all faculty evaluations are set forth in Article VII of the *SLOCCCD/CCFT Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)*. The performance criteria utilized in this document reflect the professional standards established by the Academic Senate of Cuesta College.

Instructional Designers are assessed by their peers in four performance areas: Instruction (Section I), Interaction with Faculty (Section II), Instructional Materials (Section III), and Professional & Divisional Responsibilities (Section IV). The peer evaluators then determine an Overall Assessment of Performance, documented in Section VI.

The Division Chair (or Manager’s faculty designee where there is no Division Chair) shall provide input into the evaluation using Section V of this form. Section V should be completed by the Division Chair (or manager’s faculty designee where there is no Division Chair) **in consultation with the chair of the Division Tenure Committee/Peer Review Committee**. The Division Chair’s (or Designee) input is taken into consideration by the peer review committee in determining the Overall Assessment of Performance.

Instructional Designers are assessed by their Dean or Director in four performance areas: Instruction (Section I), Interaction with Faculty (Section II), Instructional Materials (Section III), and Professional & Divisional Responsibilities (Section IV). The evaluator then determines an Overall Assessment of Performance, documented in Section VI.

RATING RUBRIC:

Instructional Designers are evaluated in each of the performance areas using criteria specified in each section, and rated according to the following rubric:

	SCALE			
	Excels	Meets Standards	Needs to Improve	Unsatisfactory
Assessing Individual Section Criteria	The instructional designer is highly effective.	The instructional designer is consistently effective.	The instructional designer is not consistently effective.	N/A
Assessing Each Section	A majority of criteria are assessed as “Excels” and there are no criteria assessed below “Meets Standards.”	A majority of criteria are assessed as “Meets Standards.”	A majority of criteria are assessed as “Needs to Improve” or the evaluator deems a “Needs to Improve” is appropriate due to one or more essential criteria.	N/A
Overall Evaluation Assessment	Two (2) or more sections are assessed as	All sections are assessed as “Meets Standards,” or three (3) are assessed as	One (1) or more sections are assessed as “Needs to Improve.” This will trigger	Three (3) or more sections are assessed as “Needs to Improve” or the evaluator deems performance in SECTIONS I or

	<p>“Excels,” and the remaining sections are at least “Meets Standards.”</p>	<p>“Meets Standards” and one (1) is assessed as “Excels.”</p>	<p>an off-cycle evaluation for sections rated “Needs to Improve.”</p>	<p>It is gravely deficient. This will at a minimum trigger an off-cycle evaluation and may lead to action pursuant to Education Code Section 87660 et seq. and/or section 87730 et seq.</p>
--	---	---	--	--

SECTION IA: ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTION: FACE-TO-FACE MODALITY

Scheduled face-to-face activity visits, Visitation Form and faculty participant evaluations shall be the basis of evaluation for this section. Any other evidence used must be at the agreement of the faculty member being evaluated.

This Instructional Designer:

1. Clearly articulates goals and objectives for the activity.

- Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

2. Makes effective use of activity time.

- Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

3. Is prepared and organized for activity.

- Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

4. Presents different perspectives on issues or problem solving methods.

- Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

5. Creates and maintains an environment that promotes learning.

- Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

6. Provides presentations that demonstrate pedagogical currency and appropriate depth of knowledge with the topic.

- Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

7. Integrates challenging ideas or critical thinking in activity/workshop presentations.

- Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

8. Promotes participants' engagement in the subject matter.

- Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

Provide an overall assessment of Instruction.

ASSESSMENT OF SECTION IA: INSTRUCTION: FACE-TO-FACE ACTIVITY	Excels	Meets Standards	Needs to Improve	N/A if a traditional activity/workshop was not observed or not required in an off-cycle evaluation
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments: *Written comments are required only if the rating is below Meets Standards.*

SECTION IB: ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTION: ON-LINE MODALITY

Examination of the on-line learning environment, Visitation Form, and faculty participant evaluations shall be the basis of evaluation for this section. Any other evidence used must be at the agreement of the faculty member being evaluated. The examination of the on-line learning environment shall be mutually arranged between the faculty member being evaluated and the peer evaluation committee.

This Instructional Designer:

- 1. **Provides necessary pre-enrollment information, such as activity/workshop announcements.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve
- 2. **Clearly articulates goals and objectives within a learning module.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve
- 3. **Provides instructor-initiated regular and effective contact.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve
- 4. **Provides course materials in a well-organized, easily-navigable course delivery system.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve
- 5. **Presents different perspectives on issues or problem solving methods.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve
- 6. **Creates and maintains an on-line environment that promotes learning.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve
- 7. **Provides information that demonstrates pedagogical currency and appropriate depth of knowledge with the topic.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve
- 8. **Integrates challenging ideas or critical thinking in activity/workshop design.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve
- 9. **Promotes the participants' engagement in the subject matter.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

Provide an overall assessment of instruction.

ASSESSMENT OF SECTION IB: INSTRUCTION: ON-LINE MODALITY	Excels	Meets Standards	Needs to Improve	N/A if on-line modality was not observed or not required in an off-cycle evaluation
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments: *Written comments are required only if the rating is below Meets Standards.*

SECTION II. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF INTERACTION WITH FACULTY PARTICIPANTS

Faculty participant evaluations and observation of faculty interaction with participants shall be the basis of evaluation for this section. Any other evidence used must be at the agreement of the faculty member being evaluated.

This Instructional Designer:

- 1. **Provides timely and helpful feedback on participants progress in the activity/workshop.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

- 2. **Creates a learning environment that participants consider positive.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

- 3. **Provides timely and helpful responses to inquiries about instructional design.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

- 4. **Treats participants respectfully.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

Provide an overall assessment of Interaction with Participants.

ASSESSMENT OF SECTION II: INTERACTION WITH PARTICIPANTS	Excels	Meets Standards	Needs to Improve	N/A if not required in an off-cycle evaluation
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments: *Written comments are required.*

SECTION IIIA. ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS: FACE-TO-FACE MODALITY

Review of materials provided to faculty participants shall be the basis of evaluation of this section. Any other evidence used must be at the agreement of the faculty member being evaluated.

This Instructional Designer’s:

1. **Instructional materials are organized and relevant to the subject matter.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

2. **Materials clearly relate to activity/workshop goals and objectives.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

3. **Materials demonstrate currency and depth appropriate to the topic.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

4. **Materials present information clearly and effectively by utilizing visual, textual, kinesthetic, or auditory activities.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

Provide an overall assessment of Instructional Materials.

ASSESSMENT OF SECTION IIIA: INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS FACE-TO-FACE MODALITY	Excels	Meets Standards	Needs to Improve	N/A if a traditional activity/workshop was not observed or not required in an off-cycle evaluation
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments: *Written comments are required only if the rating is below Meets Standards*

SECTION IIIB. ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS: ON-LINE MODALITY

Review of materials provided to faculty participants shall be the basis of evaluation of this section. Any other evidence used must be at the agreement of the faculty member being evaluated.

This Instructional Designer’s:

1. **Instructional materials are organized and relevant to subject matter.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

2. **Materials are readily accessible on-line and clearly relate to activity/workshop goals and objectives.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

3. **Materials demonstrate currency and depth appropriate to the topic.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

4. **Materials present information clearly and effectively by utilizing visual, textual, kinesthetic, or auditory activities.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

5. **Activity/workshop materials meet accessibility standards.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

Provide an overall assessment of Instructional Materials in the on-line modality.

ASSESSMENT OF SECTION IIIB: INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS ON-LINE MODALITY	Excels	Meets Standards	Needs to Improve	N/A if on-line modality was not observed or not required in an off-cycle evaluation
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments: *Written comments are required only if the rating is below Meets Standards.*

SECTION IV. ASSESSMENT OF PROFESSIONAL AND DIVISIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

The Self Evaluation form and the Division Chair portion of this evaluation form shall be the basis of evaluation for this section. Any other evidence used must be at the agreement of the faculty member being evaluated.

This Instructional Designer:

- 1. **Maintains currency in his/her academic field (professional development).**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

- 2. **Demonstrates pedagogical currency in teaching.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve

- 3. **Maintains educational and professional contacts with the community when relevant to professional commitments (not applicable unless specifically required by law or job description).**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve N/A

- 4. **Works collegially with other faculty and staff in the division/service area.**
 Meets Standard Needs to Improve

- 5. **Contributes to the work of the division/service area (development and assessment of SLOs, curriculum development, peer evaluation, hiring committees, etc.).**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve N/A

Provide an overall assessment of professional and divisional responsibilities.

ASSESSMENT OF SECTION IV: PROFESSIONAL AND DIVISIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES	Excels	Meets Standards	Needs to Improve	N/A if not required in an off-cycle evaluation
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments: *Written comments are required only if the rating is below Meets Standards or if rating is inconsistent with that of the Division Chair.*

SECTION V: DIVISION CHAIR OR MANAGER’S FACULTY DESIGNEE EVALUATION

The Self Evaluation form, faculty participant evaluations and evidence of participation in divisional and college-wide responsibilities since the last evaluation cycle as required by employee status shall be the basis of evaluation for this section. Any other evidence used must be at the agreement of the faculty member being evaluated.

This Instructional Designer:

- 1. **Works productively with faculty.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve
- 2. **Maintains currency in one’s academic field and faculty service area (professional development).**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve
- 3. **Maintains educational and professional contacts with the community when relevant to professional commitments (not applicable unless specifically required by law or job description).**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve N/A
- 4. **Is regularly available for help during posted office hours (not required for part-time faculty).**
 Meets Standard Needs to Improve N/A
- 5. **Meets scheduled service days and hours.**
 Meets Standard Needs to Improve
- 6. **Works collegially with other faculty and staff in the division/service area.**
 Meets Standard Needs to Improve
- 7. **Contributes to the work of the division/service area (development and assessment of SLOS, curriculum development, peer evaluation, hiring committees, etc.) Not required of part-time faculty.**
 Excels Meets Standard Needs to Improve N/A
- 8. **Attends required division meetings (not required for part-time faculty).**
 Meets Standard Needs to Improve N/A
- 9. **Meets divisional and college obligations in a timely manner (flex contracts, reports, and requisitions, etc.)**
 Meets Standard Needs to Improve
- 10. **Meets college participatory governance committee obligations.**
 Meets Standard Needs to Improve N/A

Comments: *Written comments are required only if “Needs to Improve” is indicated in one or more of the criteria.*

SECTION VI. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE

Provide an overall assessment of Sections I-V, taking into consideration the findings of the Division Chair (or Designee) as indicated in Section V.

N/A For off-cycle evaluations, check N/A and complete Section II of the Off-cycle Evaluation Form	<input type="checkbox"/>
EXCELS Two (2) or more sections are assessed as “Excels,” and the remaining sections are at least “Meets Standards.”	<input type="checkbox"/>
MEETS STANDARDS All sections are assessed as “Meets Standards,” or three (3) are assessed as “Meets Standards” and one (1) is assessed as “Excels.”	<input type="checkbox"/>
NEEDS TO IMPROVE One (1) or more sections are assessed as “Needs to Improve”. This will trigger an off-cycle evaluation only for sections rated “Needs to Improve.”	<input type="checkbox"/>
UNSATISFACTORY Three (3) or more sections are assessed as “Needs to Improve” or the evaluator deems performance in SECTIONS I or II is gravely deficient. This will at a minimum trigger an off-cycle evaluation and may lead to action pursuant to Education Code Section 87660 et seq. and/or section 87730 et seq.	<input type="checkbox"/>

Provide comments that specifically justify the overall evaluation. Attach additional pages if necessary. Written comments are required in at least one area below.

Commendations:

Comments in this area summarize how the instructional designer has demonstrated an ability that is especially noteworthy, or how the instructional designer’s performance reflects a high degree of effectiveness.

Considerations

Comments in this area constitute advice to help the instructional designer surpass standards for specific criteria. They may also represent specific challenges the instructional designer has had to overcome. However, these suggestions do not require adoption and do not have any bearing on future evaluations.

Required Improvements

Comments in this area address specific criteria for which the instructional designer fails to meet standards as enumerated in any of the sections of the evaluation. These comments will be documented here by the evaluator, and the proposed resolution will be provided by the instructional designer being evaluated and appended to this evaluation. Additionally, the resolution of these specific deficiencies will be addressed on the self-evaluation form during the next regularly scheduled evaluation cycle.

Explanation of Overall Assessment of Needs to Improve:

Comments are required in this area only if the Overall Assessment is “Needs to Improve.” Provide an explanation of the area(s) of substandard performance and recommendations for remediation. The peer evaluation committee chair will utilize this information to develop a plan for improvement and will document the plan on the Plan for Improvement Form.

Explanation of Overall Assessment of Unsatisfactory:

Comments are required in this area if the Overall Assessment of Performance is “Unsatisfactory.” This assessment usually indicates that in the judgment of the evaluator, the instructional designer’s performance is gravely deficient. Fully explain the areas of grave deficiency and provide either a recommendation for remediation or explain why remediation in these areas would not be effective. The peer evaluation committee chair may utilize this information to develop a plan for improvement and document it on the Plan for Improvement Form or may recommend that the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) initiate action pursuant to Education Code Section 87660 et seq. and/or section 87730 et seq.

Upon completion of this form (with all signatures), the chair of the DTC/Peer Review Committee must submit the following items to the Dean/Director's office:

Self Evaluation Form Peer Evaluation Form Faculty Evaluations

APPLICABLE SIGNATURES:

Committee Chair Peer Evaluator Date

Peer Evaluator Date

Peer Evaluator Date

Division Chair (or Designee) Date

Faculty Member Date

The above-signed individuals have read and discussed this evaluation. The faculty member's signature acknowledges receipt of a copy of the evaluation document. It does not necessarily signify agreement. The Division Chair's (or Designee) signature does not necessarily indicate agreement with the findings of the peer review committee; only that consultation between the Division Chair (or Designee) and the chair of the peer review committee has occurred. **In compliance with Articles 7.7 through 7.7.2 of the CBA, the faculty member may attach written comments to this evaluation prior to its submission to the Academic Dean.**