

General Recommendation #1 – Sub-Committee # 1

South Puget Sound Community College (SPSCC) should complete the evaluation process set forth by the Assessment Committee in all College programs and use the results of the assessment activities to improve teaching and learning (Standard 2.B – Educational Program Planning and Assessment; Standard Indicator 2.B.3)

This accreditation report reviews the progress that the college has made since the fifth year report, dated October 24 – 25, 2005. The questions that the commission asks include:

Standard 2.B - General Questions:

- How are we assessing instruction?
- How do we use assessment for teaching and learning?
- How has the assessment committee been involved with the process?
- Has SPSCC completed the evaluation, assessment of instruction loop?
- Has the faculty and instructional administrators completed the loop with teaching and learning?
- The faculty has developed good methods to assess if learning has taken place in their classroom, but what about the program?
- How are programs assessed?

Standard 2.B.3 is very specific and asks:

- Has the college provided evidence that its assessment activities lead to the improvement of teaching and learning?
- The Accreditation sub-committee's purpose is to show how we have improved or not.
- Where is the college as a whole in the assessment process today?
- What do we need to do to meet these requirements if we have not met them?
- Please be honest, what have we done to access, plan, implement the plan and assess again in all curriculum areas?
- What would it take for the college to achieve this goal?
- Do faculty have what they need to assess their program?
- Have the programs, divisions assessed their program?

Both the accreditation committee and the Commission have said a variety of things in past reports on our progress. Can we support what has been said in our prior reports, since the 2000 report? Or have conditions changed? Where is SPSCC for the fall of 2006?

What is our action plan, how do we correct the commission identified weaknesses?

General Recommendation #2 – Sub-Committee # 2

SPSCC should continue to improve educational program assessment processes and use the information obtained in ongoing planning? The institution should clearly define and integrate its evaluation and planning process into all College programs (Standard 2B – Education Program Planning and Assessment; Policy 2.2 Educational Assessment).

Standard 2.B - General Questions:

The second question asks how we have completed the work of assessment.

- What type of activities have we done to complete the loop?
- Do program plans, budgets, personnel and support provide the types of things to make these activities possible? How?
- What tools, do we have in place to assist all faculty to conduct assessment?
- Have faculty been trained in how to conduct program assessment?
- What would it take to make this process a success for each faculty member?
- What evidence do we have to show that we are doing or not doing this type of planning?

Policy 2.2

The second portion of this question concerns Policy 2.2 (page 37 – 39 of the guidelines and it is very specific:

- How has the college provided evidence that its assessment activities is responsive to its mission and goals?
- How has the college defined and integrated its evaluation and planning process into all College programs?

What is our action plan, how do we correct the commission identified weaknesses?

General Recommendation #3 – Sub-Committee # 3

SPSCC should complete the process of reviewing responsibilities of faculty with administrative assignments to assure adequate time for academic planning, curriculum development, advising, assessment activities and institutional governance (Standard 4.A – Faculty Selection, Evaluation, Roles, Welfare, and Development; and Standard 4.A.3)

Standard 4.A and Standard 4.A.3

The third recommendation relates to administrative assignments of faculty. Since the 2000 report the college has made a number of changes with faculty administrative duties. The questions would include:

- Have faculty received adequate time for 1) academic planning, 2) curriculum development, 3) academic advising, 4) assessment and 5) institutional governance?
- Is the new Division Dean structure working to assist faculty in each division?
- How has the ARC determined if the Division Dean structure accomplished the five identified points listed above?
- Are the faculty administrating programs?
- Are there faculty performing administrative duties for their instructional programs.
- What should be the professional expectations of a full time faculty member within the Departments?
- Has the College developed a process instructional program management?
- Do “Faculty workloads reflect the mission and goals of the institution and the talents and competencies of faculty, allowing sufficient time and support for professional growth and renewal”? Standard 4.A.3

What is our action plan, how do we correct the commission identified weaknesses?

General Recommendation #4 – Sub-Committee # 4

SPSCC should clarify and fully implement a more complete part-time faculty evaluation system, using multiple indices. (Standard Four – Faculty; Standard Indicator 4.A.5; and Policy 4.1 Faculty Evaluation)

The college has made many changes since the 2000 report and our part-time faculty evaluation system is different than what is described in 2000. We recommend that the committee:

- Review and describe the procedure.
- Indicate if the procedure has been followed.
- How are the procedures the same for each division?
- How are the procedures different for each division?

What is our action plan, how do we correct the commission identified weaknesses?