

MCC PARc Team Membership & Process AY 16/17

Membership:

1. Pam Harrison
2. Patrice Nango
3. Paul Nunez
4. Bob Galloway
5. Rodney Holmes
6. Carol Achs
7. Michael Voss
8. Jeff Andelora
9. Jeff Messer
10. Daphne Rossiter
11. Andy Baldwin
12. Shereen Lerner
13. ~~Derek Bormmann~~
14. Elliott Cherner
15. Keith Hefner
16. Preston Cameron
17. Trevor Smith
18. JD Neglia
19. Paul Hietter
20. Marie Brown

Given the large number of Probationary Faculty at MCC, the PARc Team will work as a collective of four Sub-Teams. Membership of each sub-team will consist of one member of the Faculty Senate Leadership, one Academic Administrator, and three Faculty members.

The PARc Team members will not evaluate the IDPs of individuals that they have observed. Mentors will not evaluate mentees. Chairs will not evaluate Department members. Deans will not evaluate individuals in their Academic Areas.

Department Chairs will be invited to address the PARc Sub-Teams as non-voting members. Once the Chairs have addressed the PARc Sub-Teams, they will not participate in the PARc deliberations.

The sole basis of the PARc Teams' evaluations will be the information contained within the IDP and the Department Chair's PARc Sub-Team presentation. Outside information will not be considered.

Recommendations of *Renewal with Concerns* or *Nonrenewal* will be presented by the PARc Sub-Team to the full PARc Team. To forward these recommendations to the College President, the consensus of the entire PARc Team is expected.

Probationary Faculty are empowered to exercise their right of response to a PARc decision (see RFP 3.6.6). This response will become part of the official recommendation to the College President.

MCC Rubric for PARc Recommendation AY 16/17

The Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) process is an opportunity to support the professional development and growth of one another. This process exists for the purpose of improving the student experience, supporting a dynamic and professional faculty, and assuring faculty ownership over the process of faculty evaluation.

The PARc recommendation is one part of a Probationary Faculty member's ongoing professional development. This is one aspect of what is hopefully an ongoing dialog with Department Chairs, Deans, PAR Mentors, and colleagues. It is in this spirit that Probationary Faculty are encouraged to share their Individual Development Plans (IDPs) and PARc recommendations with those individuals mentioned above who are invested in your success. Peer review works best when we work together, share success, and collectively map out how to continually develop.

The PAR process emphasizes individual strengths and continuous development. The IDP allows for the showcasing of an individual's talents and is also an individualized approach to supporting growth. The PARc recommendation is, ultimately, a confirmation of a probationary faculty's year-long development as established by her/his evaluations and self-reflection.

The following rubric establishes the framework within which the PARc Teams will evaluate Probationary Faculty members' IDPs. These evaluations are recommendations to the College President (see RFP 3.6.7.).

An Individual warrants *Renewal* if:

- There is congruence in IDP, evaluations (Chair, Dean, and student), and Chair's PARc conference reflective of positive growth and professionalism regarding Instruction, Service to Department/Division, College, and District, and Professional Development.
- There is sufficient documentation that the Probationary Faculty demonstrates teaching skills that adhere to the standards set forth by District course competencies and the college as evidenced by student evaluations, VPAA/Dean evaluation, and Department Chair evaluation (See RFP 3.1 & 3.6.2.1).
- There is sufficient documentation that the Probationary Faculty actively serves the department, college or district reflective of expectations of a MCCCC residential faculty member. (See RFP 3.6.2.2. & 5.4)
- There is sufficient documentation that the Probationary Faculty engages in opportunities for professional development demonstrating a will and effort to remain current in her or his discipline (See RFP 3.6.2.3 & Appendix A). For year-one: fully participates in New Faculty Experience (attends, arrives on time, and engages in the activities). (See RFP 3.6.5.1)
- The Probationary Faculty member participates in the PAR process in a timely and effective manner (meets deadlines and regularly updates Google site. (See RFP 3.6.5).
- The Probationary Faculty member adheres to RFP's Appendix H - Professional Code of Ethics and the MCCCC Office of General Counsel Administrative Regulations.

An Individual may warrant *Renewal with Concerns* if:

- There is incongruence in the IDP, evaluations (Chair, Dean, student) or Chair report to PARc reflective of inconsistent investment in positive growth and professionalism related to Instruction, Service to Department/Division, College, and District, and Professional Development.

- There is inconsistent documented evidence that the Probationary Faculty member adheres to the standards set forth by the college as evidenced by student evaluations, VPAA evaluation, and Department Chair evaluation.
- There is inconsistent documented evidence that the Probationary Faculty member serves the department, district or community reflective of expectations of a MCCCC residential faculty member.
- There is inconsistent documented evidence that the Probationary Faculty member has engaged in opportunities for professional growth.
- The Probationary Faculty member's engagement in the New Faculty Experience (year-one), the PAR process, or the peer mentoring program was inconsistent or incomplete.
- There is documentation that the Probationary Faculty member does not consistently adhere to the RFP's Appendix H - Professional Code of Ethics and/or the MCCC Office of General Counsel Administrative Regulations.

An Individual may warrant *Nonrenewal* if:

- There is congruence in the IDP, evaluations (Chair, Dean, student) and Chair's report to PARc that establishes a record of a lack of professionalism and an unsatisfactory record of Instruction, Service, and Professional Development.
- There is sufficient documentation that the Probationary Faculty does not demonstrate teaching skills that adhere to the standard set forth by the college as evidenced by student evaluations, VPAA evaluation, and Department Chair evaluation.
- There is sufficient documentation that the Probationary Faculty does not actively serve the department, district or community reflective of expectations of a MCCCC Residential Faculty member.
- There is sufficient documentation that the Probationary Faculty does not engage in opportunities for professional growth and does not demonstrate a will and effort to remain current in her or his discipline.
- There is sufficient documentation that the Probationary Faculty demonstrates a deficiency that would indicate this individual would not fulfill the role and responsibilities of a MCCCC Probationary or Appointive Residential Faculty member.
- There is sufficient documentation that the Probationary Faculty does not adhere to the RFP's Appendix H - Professional Code of Ethics or the MCCC Office of General Counsel Administrative Regulations.

**IDPs Submitted 3/24/17
PARc Review 3/25/17 - 4/14/17
Recommendations to President and PAR Faculty 4/17/17
College President notifies faculty by 5/1/17**