

Standard III: Resources
Section A: Human Resources

III.A.6 The evaluation of faculty, academic administrators, and other personnel directly responsible for student learning includes, as a component of that evaluation, consideration of how these employees use the results of the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning.

To provide feedback on this draft, please use the feedback survey at:

<http://goo.gl/forms/HylqaWFfAy>

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

- MPCTA Contract, Article 14.3
- Faculty Self-Evaluation document
- Instructor Reflection/Program Reflection forms
- Management Team Evaluation Form
- Classified Staff Evaluation Form

Analysis and Evaluation

Personnel with Direct Responsibility for Student Learning

At MPC, faculty has been identified as the personnel group with “direct responsibility for student learning,” in that they are responsible for setting learning outcomes, determining the methods used to assess attainment of learning outcomes, and using the results to guide improvements to teaching and learning. As such, the faculty evaluation has an embedded component that considers how results of assessment of learning outcomes are used to shape improvements in teaching and learning. Those evaluation components are discussed below.

Other personnel groups on campus, such as administrators and classified staff, generally have an indirect (if still critical) role in student learning. Since the majority of these personnel do not have direct responsibility for student learning, consideration of learning outcomes assessment results does not appear as a required element of the standard evaluation instruments for the classified and managerial employee groups. In cases where individual classified or administrative positions have been assigned a more direct responsibility for student learning, outcomes assessment is addressed within regular evaluation of the employee’s overall job performance, as will be discussed below.

Faculty Evaluation and Results of Outcomes Assessment

Faculty evaluation processes are governed by the current collective bargaining agreement, which does not directly reference student learning outcomes. However, discussion of learning outcomes is an integral part of the institution’s ability to maintain the highest standards of quality among faculty. At MPC, the phrase “student learning outcomes” is understood to refer to a measurable or evaluable description of what students are expected to “know” or “be able to do” after they have successfully completed a course or program. Instructor & and Program Reflections are the mechanism for assessing the degree to which students attain outcomes at the course and program level. During the Reflections process, faculty document how results of learning outcomes assessment have informed changes to

Standard III: Resources
Section A: Human Resources

pedagogy or service delivery. During the faculty evaluation process, all faculty (including counselors and librarians) complete a self-evaluation that provides an opportunity to discuss participation in the Instructor and Program Reflections processes. Additional questions in the self-evaluation prompt faculty to discuss the effectiveness of their assessment methods, any changes they have made during the evaluation cycle that could affect teaching and learning (e.g., new teaching techniques, tools, lecture topics), and rationale for those changes. Per Article 14.3 of the MPCTA contract, the self-evaluation is a required component of the evaluation.

Non-Faculty Evaluation and Results of Outcomes Assessment

As noted above, the majority of non-faculty personnel at MPC do not have direct responsibility for student learning. Evaluation instruments have been designed (and in the case of classified staff, negotiated) to be useful and valid for the majority of these employee groups. For this reason, consideration of how outcomes assessments results are used does not currently appear as a required component in the standard evaluation instruments used for classified staff or administrative personnel. However, in some cases, individual classified or administrative personnel have been assigned a more direct responsibility for outcomes assessment. The job descriptions for these positions contain clear descriptions of the position's responsibility for student learning, which allows for consideration of how assessment results are used to improve teaching or service delivery as part of the regular evaluation of that individual's primary responsibilities. When this individual is evaluated, consideration of how effectively these duties are performed can be addressed in the "Quantity of Work" and "Performance Goals" components of the evaluation, along with other assigned duties and plans for improvement. Likewise, the standard managerial evaluation contains components for evaluating progress made on goals and objectives and performance of major position responsibilities. Direct responsibility for student learning and participation in outcomes assessment can be addressed within these components.

Conclusion: Monterey Peninsula College meets the standard; however, there are opportunities for continued improvement in this area with regard to formalizing consideration of how outcomes assessments are used to improve student learning for non-faculty personnel.

To provide feedback on this draft, please use the feedback survey at:

<http://goo.gl/forms/HylqaWFfAy>