

**Foothill College
Follow-Up Report
Fall 2015**

Submitted to:
**Accrediting Commission
for Community & Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools & Colleges**

Prepared and submitted by:
Foothill College
12345 El Monte Road
Los Altos Hills, CA 94022-4599
October 15, 2015

**Board of Trustees
Foothill-De Anza Community College District**

Chancellor
Judy C. Miner, Ed.D.

Interim College President
Kimberlee Messina, Ed.D.

Follow-Up Report

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges,
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

*Kimberlee Messina, Interim President
Foothill College
12345 El Monte Road
Los Altos Hills, CA 94022-4599
October 15, 2015*

I certify there was broad participation by the campus community and believe this Report accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.

Signatures:

Kimberlee J. Messina 9/21/15

(Kimberlee Messina, Interim President) (Date)

Kurt Hueg 9/21/15

(Kurt Hueg, Acting Vice President, Instruction and Institutional Research) (Date)

Andrew LaManque 9/21/15

(Andrew LaManque, Accreditation Liaison Officer) (Date)

Carolyn Holdcroft 9/22/15

(Carolyn Holdcroft, Professor, Academic Senate President) (Date)

Karen Smith 9/22/15

(Karen Smith, Senior Library Technician, Classified Senate President) (Date)

**Foothill College
Follow-Up Report
Fall 2015**

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Statement of Report Preparation	4
Response to the Commission Action Letter	5
Appendix 1	6

Statement on Report Preparation

This report reflects the ongoing participation and input of the many groups and constituencies that make up Foothill College's campus community.

The Office of Instruction and Institutional Research oversaw the drafting of the report.

The draft report was submitted to the Governing Board for approval on October 5, 2015 (approval granted).

Response to the Commission Action Letter

In its February 6, 2015 Action Letter the Commission wrote:

“The Commission found that the College did not address Recommendation 4 and does not meet Standard III.A.1.c. The Commission acted to require Foothill College to submit a Follow-Up Report by October 15, 2015 demonstrating how its current faculty evaluation procedures meet the Standard. Based on the evidence in the College Report, the Commission finds that the College has addressed the remaining College Recommendations 1 through 3 and sustained the work accomplished.”

On February 17, 2015, G. Jack Pond wrote a clarifying letter that included these excerpts:

“ ... the College’s response to the requirement that it meet Standard II.A.1.c included a hyperlink to evidence It appears this document was included in error.

Please provide a corrected Midterm Report with a link to the appropriate document, and staff will ask the Commission to review the corrected Midterm Report.”

In response, Foothill College submitted a revised version of its Midterm Report with a corrected link to the evidence for Recommendation 4 to G. Jack Pond on February 23, 2015.

Recommendation 4: Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) & Faculty Evaluation

To meet the commission’s 2012 expectation for meeting Student Learning Outcomes standards, the team recommends that the college and the Foothill-De Anza Faculty Association work together to incorporate Student Learning Outcomes into the faculty evaluation process. (III.A.1.c)

The District and the Faculty Association renegotiated the faculty evaluation process. Effective Fall Quarter 2012, faculty members are evaluated on their participation in the SLO/SAO processes. The new language is in the professional contributions section and applies to all faculty members.

The form can be found at either of the following links and Appendix 1 contains the section of the form relating to SLOs.

<http://fa.fhda.edu/FA-forms-2013/Appendix-J1-2013.doc>

<http://www.foothill.edu/president/MidtermAccredReportAddend.pdf>

Appendix 1

**FOOTHILL-DE ANZA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
ADMINISTRATIVE AND PEER EVALUATION FORM FOR FACULTY**

This form may not be modified unless agreed upon by a majority of the contract and regular faculty employees in a division or department with the mutual approval of the Board and the Faculty Association.

This form uses both objective and narrative data. Please use the numerical rating system for each applicable criterion. Then write a brief narrative for each section and, finally, a comprehensive summary statement.

Rating system:

- 1. Satisfactory or better
- 2. Satisfactory but needs improvement in specific area(s)
- 3. Unsatisfactory
- N/O Not observed
- N/A Not applicable

SECTION I. PROFESSIONAL QUALITIES (to be answered for all faculty):

A. Professionalism

- 1. Keeps current in discipline 1 2 3 N/O N/A
- 2. Demonstrates cooperation and sensitivity in working with colleagues and staff 1 2 3 N/O N/A
- 3. Accepts criticism. 1 2 3 N/O N/A
- 4. Submits required departmental reports/information, including census, and/or positive attendance, and grade sheets on time. 1 2 3 N/O N/A
- 5. Maintains adequate and appropriate records. 1 2 3 N/O N/A
- 6. Observes health and safety regulations. 1 2 3 N/O N/A
- 7. Attends required meetings. 1 2 3 N/O N/A
- 8. Maintains office hours and is accessible to students. 1 2 3 N/O N/A

B. Professional Contributions

- 1. Contributes academically to the discipline/department/district 1 2 3 N/O N/A
- 2. Participates in special assignments, committees, projects, SLO/SAO processes, research and development areas as needed in the discipline/department/district. 1 2 3 N/O N/A
- 3. Shares in faculty responsibilities 1 2 3 N/O N/A

SECTION I narrative comments on professional qualities, specifying, where relevant, areas of excellence and areas requiring improvement: