

FOCUSED INTERIM REPORT

**SOUTH PUGET SOUND
COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

MARCH 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GENERAL RECOMMENDATION # 1	1
GENERAL RECOMMENDATION # 2	5
GENERAL RECOMMENDATION # 3	10
GENERAL RECOMMENDATION # 4	13
EXHIBITS.....	16

INTRODUCTION

During the last year, South Puget Sound Community College (SPSCC) has gone through a period of introspection and transition with a new College President. This has provided the perfect time for examination and renewal. The College has examined itself with three specific instruments: 1) the Clarus Report, (Exhibit A) completed by an outside agency; 2) a campus climate survey, (Exhibit B) completed by the campus community and compiled by the President's Office; and 3) the accreditation interim self-study, as directed by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) (January 31 and March 24, 2006, letters). The results of each of these independently developed studies are being shared campus wide.

From these studies, a series of planning steps are taking place that includes educational planning sessions, community forums with external stakeholders, and revisions to the current Strategic Plan, Mission Statement, and a Campus Master Plan. The key elements incorporate taking the successful areas from the past to build a solid structure for the future.

This accreditation interim self-study has become the catalyst for the future of the College.

BACKGROUND

In the year 2005, SPSCC underwent a detailed five-year interim accreditation visit. This study was directed by an accreditation steering committee and was conducted in a way to include the College administration, staff, faculty, and students. On October 24 – 25, 2005, an external accreditation team from the NWCCU visited the College and submitted their findings. These findings are the primary focus of the current interim self-study.

The external accreditation team identified four specific areas that the College needed to examine. The four general recommendations are:

1. 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).
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 2.B - Educational Program Planning and Assessment; Policy 2.2 Educational Assessment).
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 Indicator 4.A.3).

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).

In September 2006, an Accreditation Steering Committee was identified to prepare an interim examination to determine the status of each recommendation. To this end, four subcommittees were established to review the 2005 Commission Report, collect data, investigate the process, analyze the deficiencies as noted, and develop a plan for the future. The College members who coordinated the work on the general recommendations are listed on the next page.

College members who coordinated the work on these general recommendations are:

General Recommendation 1

Dr. Rhonda Coats, Chair (Vice President for Student Services)
Claude Dotson (Division Dean of Humanities/Communication)
Carlea McAvoy (Mathematics Professor)
Linda Medcalf (Political Science Professor)
Anne Molenda (Running Start/High School Outreach Program Coordinator)

General Recommendation 2

Nancy McKinney, Chair (Vice President for Administrative Services)
Marsha Frank (Adult Basic Education Professor)
Yolanda Machado (HDEV Professor/Counselor)
Mike Martin (Drafting/Computer Aided Drafting & Design Professor)
Jenni Spencer (Speech Communication Professor)

General Recommendation 3

Jean Logan, Chair (Computer Information Systems Professor)
Dan Fortier (Physical Education Professor)
Kathy Lundeen (Dean of Enrollment Services)

General Recommendation 4

Dr. Patricia Hutcherson, Chair (Vice President for Human Resources)
Carlos Gemora (Student/Senator for Public Affairs)
Ginger Judd (Program Support Supervisor, Hawks Prairie Center)
Tony Simone (Director of Security)

The Accreditation Steering Committee Members are:

Administrative Representatives:	Norm Chapman, Co-Chair Mike Beehler, Vice Chair Rhonda Coats Claude Dotson	Patricia Hutcherson Kathy Lundeen Nancy McKinney
---------------------------------	---	--

Exempt Representative:	Tony Simone
------------------------	-------------

Faculty Representatives:	Russell Rose, Co-Chair Marsha Frank Dan Fortier Jean Logan Yolanda Machado	Mike Martin Carlea McAvoy Linda Medcalf Jenni Spencer
--------------------------	--	--

Assessment and Research Council Representative:	Jean Logan
---	------------

Classified Representatives:	Ginger Judd	Anne Molenda
-----------------------------	-------------	--------------

Student Representative:	Carlos Gemora
-------------------------	---------------

GENERAL RECOMMENDATION # 1

General Recommendation # 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).

INTRODUCTION

The accreditation subcommittee for General Recommendation #1 investigated how the College was implementing the evaluation process set forth by Standard 2.B, determined where the process might be breaking down, and provided recommendations.

FINDINGS

As identified in the 2002 and 2005 Interim Reports, the College's assessment "loop" consisted of the following steps:

1. identify intended student learning outcomes
2. state measurable criteria for successful outcomes
3. create a tool with which to measure the criteria
4. collect the required data
5. analyze the data
6. take appropriate action based on the analysis

The accreditation subcommittee investigated how the College has implemented the "evaluation process set forth by the Assessment Committee" and determined where the process could be breaking down. Subcommittee members reviewed the quarterly and annual instructional division reports submitted to the Assessment and Research Committee (ARC) for the 2004-05 academic year (see Exhibit C). Following the review of the reports, the subcommittee interviewed seven of the eight Instructional Division Deans and the Vice President for Instruction. Finally, to gain information for comparing assessment processes in use at two-year colleges, assessment materials were collected from both Clark College and South Seattle Community College (see Exhibit D).

Upon conclusion of the interviews, it became apparent that the evaluation process was not being implemented in a consistent or systematic manner nor had the evaluation process been fully understood and articulated to the division deans. The review of the ARC reports, which was further substantiated by the interviews with the division deans, identified the following findings: (see Exhibit E-Subcommittee 1 Meeting Minutes).

- There appears to be no connection in the evaluation process between the classroom and the divisions or between the individual divisions.
- Assessment is occurring in the classroom, but it is not clear how classroom assessment fits into the larger program/division assessment and budgetary process.

- There is confusion about what constitutes assessment and how it should be used to improve teaching and learning.
- While measurable criteria have been established in some divisions, they are not consistent across divisions.
- Some divisions have student learning outcomes imbedded into program outcomes.
- The assessment loop is not closed in the current process. There is significant reporting occurring but no concrete evidence that assessment activities have influenced the College's budget and planning processes nor whether improvements to teaching and learning have occurred as a result of such assessment activities.
- It is not clear what the instructional programs are assessing.
- Divisions are using multiple evaluation templates to report assessment activities, some of which are missing essential components to complete the assessment process.
- ARC is considered by many to be ineffectual.

Most of the courses approved by the Instructional Council contain both the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) and College-Wide Abilities (CWA). However, determining how those learning outcomes are assessed and evaluating the results of the assessment remains with the faculty teaching the course in that the assessment occurring in the classroom must support the certificate and degree program assessment process.

On December 7, 2006, after much discussion, ARC agreed that each instructional division must use the same assessment template. The final agreed upon template model incorporates every component of the evaluation process identified in the 2002 and 2005 interim reports with a "time frame" component added. The divisions not currently using the template must resubmit their 2005-2006 assessment reports using the agreed upon report format (see Exhibit F). Using the same report template is the first step toward the College developing and achieving a systematic and consistent process for assessing student learning and program outcomes.

ANALYSIS

One major theme that emerged from the interviews and conversations with the division deans was the general lack of understanding of what constitutes assessment including what the College is assessing and how the current efforts are linked to classroom assessment. While faculty are conducting assessment in the classroom, it is unclear how those assessment activities impact the college-wide degree and certificate program SLOs identified in the 2000 self-study and subsequently modified to "philosophy statements" as shown in the college catalog. (See pages 30 and 32 in the 2005-2007 College Catalog.) However, these "philosophy statements" listed for the Associate of Arts, Associate of Science, Associate of Technical Arts, Associate Degree in Nursing, and certificate programs are now what the CWA students are expected to achieve upon completion. Clarity in our use of assessment language is needed to distinguish the difference between SLOs, CWA, program performance outcomes, and philosophy statements. (See pages 17 and 18 in the 2005-2007 College Catalog for program performance outcomes.)

Another major theme that emerged is the current mission and structure of ARC is neither contributing to effective assessment practices on campus nor serving its membership. The deans reported in the interviews that ARC members have expressed frustration with their roles and

view attending meetings to “hear reports” as a waste of time. In addition, the current outcomes listed in the ARC reports are varied, and the majority do not include any reference or connection to the college-wide degree and certificate program philosophy statements (SLOs) noted in the college catalog. Clarity is needed on what the instructional divisions are assessing and how program outcomes differ from SLOs. For example:

- While preparing accounting students to be employed in the accounting field is a measurable program completion outcome, the number of students who became employed after completion does not measure student learning. There should be a learning outcome that would identify the skills students would have learned as a result of completing the accounting degree program.
- The outcome “Students will indicate satisfaction with learning objectives in history courses based on student surveys” may be important, but what student learning actually occurred?

A final theme that emerged from the discussions in the interviews was that faculty have become disenchanted about the assessment process. It appears that while internal evaluations are helpful, there is a feeling of “business as usual,” which has led to complacency and a lack of new ideas. Additionally, many faculty do not seem to understand the purpose of assessment because of the gaps in the process when it comes to budget and planning. The deans reported that some departments have conducted assessment that produced quantifiable data that pointed to a specific change, yet they were told that the budget will not allow the change. It appears to this subcommittee that the budgeting process is not clear to many faculty and staff; consequently, it is difficult to close the assessment loop in that changes identified through assessment cannot always take place without resources.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Since 2002, South Puget Sound Community College has made some progress in improving the assessment process. Using the same assessment template will help facilitate consistency in reporting student learning outcomes. Additionally, some departments have begun reconstructing their program planning guides to include the CWA as learning outcomes for their program (see Exhibit G). However, there are areas where the College can improve. The following recommendations outline some goals for the College:

- Provide campus-wide training to faculty and staff on assessment so the entire campus will have a baseline understanding of the concept and intent. Trainers should be aware that different programs and courses need different guidance to make the process valuable for those involved.
- Once the current employees have a common understanding of assessment, the College needs to provide training on an as-needed basis to ensure meaningful participation from faculty and staff.

- Clarify the language used to describe assessment activities which includes distinguishing the difference among SLOs, CWA, program performance outcomes, and philosophy statements. The campus should agree on definitions of key terms and processes related to assessment. The College needs to define a program, particularly in the transfer area. The campus should know what student outcomes and program outcomes are and how they differ, as well as their relationship to learning objectives. There should be an understanding about what core abilities (or CWA or outcomes from degree philosophy statements) are and how they relate to assessment (see Exhibit D-Clark College and South Seattle Community College for examples).
- Allow programs to choose the way they will assess their students, as long as they are addressing the program and SLOs that have been agreed upon. Understand that some programs lend themselves well to quantitative assessment while others do not.
- Update all course outlines so that program outcomes are directly tied to specific CWA (CWA). Ensure that faculty are familiar with the course outlines and the CWA they are supposed to address.
- Identify common definitions, agreed-upon processes, and a timeline for review and evaluation of courses and programs.
- Use personnel from outside the department to aid in program reviews to ensure an unbiased perspective and perhaps an input of fresh ideas.
- Once the College community updates the Strategic Plan, College Mission, and College Vision, come to common agreement on what role they play in linking the assessment plans to budget decisions.
- Allow the assessment process to make a real change in programs by establishing some form of budget hearings so that funding can be given to programs looking to make change based on assessment data.
- Review with faculty how classroom assessment is used in the College's budget and planning processes in order to close the assessment loop by improving teaching and learning.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATION #2

General Recommendation # 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 – Educational Program Planning and Assessment; Policy 2.2 Educational Assessment).

INTRODUCTION

The accreditation subcommittee for General Recommendation # 2 investigated how the College has pursued the process of improving educational program assessment and how the information obtained was used in ongoing planning. The subcommittee solicited responses from instructional deans and faculty who lead programs on how the College has completed the work of assessment through the following survey questions (see Exhibit H for all survey responses):

- What type of activities have been done to complete the evaluation and assessment of instruction loop?
- Do program plans, budgets, personnel, and other support provide the types of things to make these activities possible? How?
- What tools does the College have in place to assist faculty to conduct assessment?
- Have faculty been trained in how to conduct program assessments?
- What would it take to make this process a success for faculty members?
- What evidence does the College have to show that the divisions are planning based on assessment?

In addition, the following questions were presented to the Assessment and Research Council (ARC):

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

FINDINGS

The following findings were gathered from the survey of selected faculty and the division deans:

- The survey respondents noted several different types of activities that have been done to complete the evaluation and assessment of instruction loop. At the conclusion of every quarter, instructors and courses may be evaluated through a student evaluation depending on their evaluation timeframe. Additionally, instructors conduct self-evaluations to determine ways in which improvements to student learning outcomes may take place. Instructors are also interviewed by the dean of their program area regarding their satisfaction with courses, and course offerings may be adjusted based on this information.

Regarding student outcomes, some programs conduct a pre- and post-test competency assessment which is specific to their area. Additionally, a universal exit exam is required for all graduates which is intended to assess general education outcomes. Graduates are also surveyed on either their transfer experiences or their success in becoming employed. More detailed assessment is conducted for those graduates of technical programs through employer surveys and technical degree program advisory committees. Finally, all division deans are responsible for reporting all assessment results to ARC on a regular basis.

- The survey question “How do program plans, budgets, personnel, and other support provide the types of things to make assessment activities possible?” was answered with some variability. One respondent felt that funding is constrained, but there seems to be the required resources to complete the assessment activities, while another felt there is inadequate support and budget to design, implement, and analyze program assessment. Workload was also noted as an issue in that lead faculty are responsible for conducting the work and reporting to the dean, and adjunct faculty are not paid to do assessment, thus the reliance is on full-time faculty. One respondent felt that while program and curriculum assessment is done well and is manageable, there is a lack of skills and support to develop an effective way to collect data on employer needs and how our graduates are doing. Another respondent noted that while each program has identified student outcomes related to the program and identified indicator measures related to those outcomes, departments are hesitant to use standard measures, such as an outside test, because budgets are limited.
- The survey respondents also offered differing opinions regarding the tools the College has in place to assist faculty in conducting assessment. Some reported that there are no tools or support staff available, while others referred to the data from the student evaluations. Others mentioned the few data bases and resources that support assessment, such as the Student Management System (SMS) and the Data Link for Outcomes Assessment (DLOA). However, it was also noted that most faculty do not know how to access them, and of those that do, very few know what is in these databases.
- Almost all of the respondents reported having been trained in conducting program assessments at one time or another. Over the past five years there have been at least three workshops conducted on assessment. Last year there was an opportunity to send a team to Lower Columbia College to learn new assessment techniques, but the division deans were unable to get faculty interested and only one person attended. Regardless of past experiences, the majority of the respondents felt that training was necessary in order to make the assessment process a success for each faculty member. This training might include examples of the assessment loop that leads faculty step-by-step through the process from picking a meaningful assessment project to implementing program change. One respondent suggested having one expert on campus to assist and train faculty in assessment in addition to a seminar once a year conducted by outside experts. Another suggestion was to look at assessment models of colleges that have been reviewed by an accrediting team as having successful assessment programs. This may help clarify what

the College will need to do in order to comply with the Accreditation Commission's expectations.

In addition to in-depth training, time and resources are presented as imperative components of successful assessment practices. One respondent felt that "We've been trained to death. But you can't conduct assessment without time, information, and valid institutional measurement tools." One suggestion was using a computer system that provides internal information in a usable form within a reasonable period of time. Additionally, the workload issue needs to be addressed as time spent doing assessment might mean that the teaching workload needs to be adjusted.

- Over time the College has collected assessment data and has some limited results to show for it. The annual ARC reports, which contain summaries of assessment activities by department, provide evidence that the academic divisions are conducting assessment activities. However, what is reported is not necessarily meaningful assessment that leads to changes in budget, scheduling, course outlines, or other changes that would help improve the teaching and learning process. As mentioned in an earlier finding, various student evaluations are conducted at the end of every quarter, and the originals and summaries are on file in the division offices. One of the divisions reviews statistics every winter and assesses how the division is doing. The results are kept in a program notebook. Finally, the College administers a graduation exit exam that is designed to measure General Education learning outcomes. However, because of the manner in which the test has been administered, the integrity of the data is questionable. It is also unclear how these data have been utilized for assessment and planning purposes. Another concern about the exam is that it might be more appropriate for students in transfer degree programs only, rather than those in technical degree programs, yet both groups are required to take it.

The following findings were gathered from the questions presented to ARC:

- The mandated assessment activities reported to the ARC by departments and divisions have ensured that evaluation is integrated into all programs within instruction. These program assessment activities examine student and program objectives that are derived from stated goals and objectives of the departments/divisions. These goals and objectives should be derived from the wider mission and goals of the College, but the specific linkage is not clear. Assessment reports have been provided to the Board of Trustees annually in order to establish this link; however, in the fall of 2006, the Board of Trustees terminated these presentations because they felt that they lacked analysis and meaning. Additionally, the College has not taken the next step in relating assessment to the planning and budgeting process. Historically, the budget allocation has been a formula-driven process that has not been responsive to assessment data. But more importantly, the College has lacked a strategic planning process that sets out instructional goals and priorities. Implementing such a process should improve the connection between assessment and planning.

ANALYSIS

Assessment is being conducted at some level within most programs; however, most of the respondents to the survey reported that the findings have not yielded useful results. It is also clear that there is no consistent method of gathering data from one program to the next. While it is not possible to approach assessment in the same fashion for each program due to the variability of expected student outcomes, it is necessary to have some form of commonality in gathering and using data, which would make assessment more user friendly for all involved.

Faculty and deans are struggling to standardize assessment of programs and finding effective ways to conduct assessment. They are looking for more automated tools and technical assistance to improve program assessment. Time and resources continue to be a deterrent to high-quality and consistent program assessment.

There is a strong need to have a qualified Institutional Researcher. This person should be knowledgeable about the assessment needs of different programs and different research methods in order to help departments and programs select meaningful assessment tools. This person should also be able to help the College integrate assessment activities at all levels, (classroom assessment through institutional assessment).

Respondents also expressed a strong need for training on how to do assessment. One suggestion was that training should occur in a yearly seminar or with one-on-one consulting. It would also be helpful to see examples from colleges that are successful in their program assessment, such as Clark College and South Seattle Community College as noted in the previous section (Exhibit D).

Most of the respondents commented on the need for more support for assessment activities (release time, clerical help, and improved budgets). It was generally felt that there is neither enough time nor money to work on assessment activities. It was also mentioned that there needs to be money to include adjunct faculty in the assessment activities.

Finally, there were some respondents that felt that there needs to be a stronger leadership commitment from administration. The College needs to stand behind its commitment to assessment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and analysis, there are three areas that need improvement:

- Commonality in Assessment Methodology
- Technical Support
- Institutional Support

The following recommendations address the three issues noted above:

- Hire an Institutional Researcher whose initial focus is to work with the deans and faculty on student learning outcomes and program level assessment, as well as integrating assessment to all areas of the College. Note: The Institutional Researcher was employed by the College February 13, 2007.
- Conduct regular training for faculty and deans on assessment. The training can be done in a variety of ways from an annual seminar for all faculty to more focused training for departments that are not as advanced in assessment and program planning.
- Create better standardization for program planning and identify tools that will facilitate and simplify assessment activities.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATION # 3

General Recommendation # 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 Indicator 4.A.3).*

INTRODUCTION

The accreditation subcommittee for General Recommendation # 3 investigated what the College has done to analyze the workload of faculty with administrative duties.

This recommendation was originally made by the accreditation evaluation team in response to the 2000 Accreditation Self-Study. The College's response at that time was to convene an Instruction Structure Taskforce to review the responsibilities of faculty with administrative duties and to look at the organizational structure of the Instruction Division. As a result of their work, the Instruction Division was reorganized in July 2002. This reorganization created the current division dean structure. Previously the division chairs were faculty members who had 50 percent release time and stipends to compensate for additional administrative duties. Under the new system, the division deans are full-time administrators charged with the administrative activities required to manage and provide leadership to the division. In spring 2003, a faculty survey was administered to assess the effectiveness of the changes to the Instruction Division structure. The survey results did not reveal that the new structure enabled faculty to focus more attention on their teaching responsibilities.

FINDINGS

In the Fall of 2005, an Instructional Workload Taskforce was established in accordance with the newly ratified faculty contract. The Taskforce was charged with examining the current faculty workload, including faculty's administrative duties. The Taskforce administered a self-reporting faculty survey, analyzed the survey results, and reported these results in the fall of 2006 (Full report is available as Exhibit I). The data gathered by the Workload Taskforce revealed that faculty consistently work in excess of 35 hours each week. The amount of time required to teach a minimum 15 contact-hours course load plus office hours, class preparation, student evaluation, committee work, and administrative work exceeds the contracted work week for faculty in all divisions.

A survey of division deans addressing issues such as administrative assignments and workload was conducted in February of 2007 (See Exhibit J). The survey results revealed that while most deans have a clear understanding of what they believe to be administrative duties, there is no consensus within the group (See Exhibit K for actual survey results). Some commented that they have not been given specific guidelines.

The faculty contract states that a tenured faculty's "Duties shall include but not be limited to probationary review committees, post tenure review committees, college-wide committees and

councils, adjunct faculty appraisal, ad hoc task forces, coordination of adjunct faculty or administrative duties related to the professor's program." (Section 7.2.B of the 2005-2007 Negotiated Faculty Agreement). Conversations with faculty and administration indicated that some interpret the contract language to mean that any non-teaching activities are considered administrative duties. Others do not consider committee work or faculty appraisal committees to be in that category and think of administrative duties as those duties required to administer a program such as budgeting and scheduling.

The faculty contract that was ratified in Spring 2005 instituted a new procedure whereby an individual annual work plan would be developed by each faculty member in conjunction with his or her respective dean. The plan would outline the non-teaching duties of each faculty member for the coming year. This plan is an opportunity for the administration to review the faculty's workload and assign duties in reasonable proportions to each faculty member. The deans survey showed that there were a number of mechanisms used by the deans to review workload. Workload was discussed during Probationary Review Committee meetings and during the annual process of developing a faculty's Annual Work Plan. Workload was also discussed "unofficially" and on an "as-needed" basis. Different deans reported different mechanisms.

In summary, the subcommittee's investigation revealed the following:

- There is no clear and consistent college-wide definition of which activities constitute administrative duties.
- There is no college-wide, consistently-used mechanism to review faculty workload.
- Faculty consistently work in excess of 35 hours a week.
- All of the sources consulted in developing this report—the workload study, dean's survey, individual conversations, and faculty contract review—lead to the following conclusion: There are faculty who, because of program requirements, take on a heavier administrative role because an external accrediting body requires it. These faculty have release time and, in some cases, additional compensation. There are also some faculty who act as a department lead, and there are those who assume additional administrative duties voluntarily, out of habit or need, in order for their programs to operate in an organized, efficient manner. These faculty members are not recognized by the current system.

ANALYSIS

The lack of consensus regarding what constitutes administrative duties has caused problems in completing 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.

Lack of definition of what an administrative duty is may have caused inconsistencies with the results from the Instructional Workload Taskforce's survey. The survey results did show that regardless of how individuals may define administrative tasks, in their view they spend a significant amount of time doing them.

While the Annual Work Plan process may help distribute non-teaching activities more equitably among the faculty members, nothing has been accomplished to clearly identify which faculty routinely perform administrative duties as part of their workload.

The lack of recognition for performing department lead duties and the perceived inequities in workload has led to a climate of low morale for many faculty members.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- The College should continue to work, through the faculty contract negotiations, to address the findings of the Workload Taskforce with the goal of assuring adequate time for faculty to complete assigned duties within the contracted 35-hour work week.
- The College should define administrative duties for purposes of future review and analysis and for purposes of clear communication with faculty and between faculty and administration.
- The College should address the issue of low faculty morale that is the byproduct of the workload and administrative duties issues. Faculty who are put in the position of department lead or who otherwise perform additional duties should be officially recognized by the college.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATION # 4

General Recommendation # 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).

INTRODUCTION

The accreditation subcommittee for General Recommendation # 4 investigated how the College completed evaluation procedures of adjunct professors to determine if the system met the Standard's criteria.

The subcommittee was charged with the task of investigating change to the system since the 2000 report. The part-time faculty evaluation system is different than what was described in 2000. The subcommittee:

- Reviewed and described the procedures.
- Determined if the procedures have been followed.
- Determined if the procedures are the same for each division.
- Determined how the procedures are different for each division.

The accreditation subcommittee members met with the eight college Division Deans to discuss the evaluation procedures in place for evaluation of adjunct professors and to determine if current procedures as outlined in the 2005-2007 Negotiated Faculty Agreement described below are being followed.

Section 9.2 Adjunct Professors:

Adjunct professors will be evaluated using multiple indices and on a five (5) year cycle.

- A. Student evaluations will be administered during the first two quarters of teaching in all classes taught. Thereafter, student evaluations will be administered at least once per year and when the adjunct professor is teaching a course for the first time. The adjunct professor will receive the results of all student evaluations.
- B. When an adjunct professor teaches at least once per year, a peer observation will be carried out once every other year beginning the second year of part-time teaching. Adjunct professor peer evaluations will be done by tenured full-time faculty. The results of the peer evaluation will be discussed with the adjunct professor by the division dean and the observing faculty member.
- C. An adjunct professor who teaches at least once per year will complete a self-evaluation beginning with the third year of part-time teaching.

- D. When an adjunct professor teaches at least once per year, his/her supervisor (division dean or appropriate administrator) will carry out an evaluation with the fourth year of part-time teaching. The supervisor will review the peer evaluation, student evaluations, and the supervisor's evaluation with the adjunct professor. The division dean or appropriate administrator may conduct an observation/evaluation at any time, if in the judgment of the dean/administrator such observation/evaluation is warranted.
- E. The instructional administrator/division dean shall compose a summative evaluation, which encapsulates all performance data for the five-year evaluation cycle for each adjunct professor in the fifth year of the evaluation cycle for that faculty member.
- F. The adjunct professor being evaluated has the right to attach his/her response to any evaluation information. The evaluation information shall be considered confidential. This information will be kept in the faculty members' evaluation file for a maximum of five (5) years from when the evaluation activity was conducted unless the individual faculty member requests the information be kept longer.

“Agreement By and Between the Board of Trustees of SPSCC and the Community College Dist No. XXIV Federation of Teachers Local # 4603, AFT/AFL-CIO.”

FINDINGS

The subcommittee found the evaluation procedure to be consistent throughout seven of the eight divisions. The subcommittee identified the following:

- The schedule, as outlined in the 2005-2007 Negotiated Faculty Agreement, is being followed through the evaluation of all new adjunct professors within the first two quarters continuing through with the five-year cycle.
- One division dean uses a memorandum, identifying the evaluation process when orienting the new adjunct faculty member, while the other deans refer them to the Adjunct Faculty Handbook and 2005-2007 Negotiated Faculty Agreement.
- The Adjunct Faculty Handbook was updated in June 2006 and again in January 2007. The updated copy of the handbook can be found on the “S” drive, available college-wide: the handbook will be updated annually by the Staff Development Office.
- Each division is responsible for tracking its own faculty. The division secretary is charged with keeping a spreadsheet for each adjunct faculty member. The spreadsheet contains the schedule for each adjunct faculty member's evaluation process.
- The use of standard evaluation forms is consistent throughout the divisions. Some divisions have additional requirements for instructor evaluation that are based upon other accrediting organizations.
- All divisions perform the following evaluations: peer faculty evaluation, division dean evaluation, student evaluation, and self-evaluations.
- Some divisions utilize scan sheets for student and instructor evaluations while others use the equivalent manual forms.

- The administrative procedures performed by full-time faculty in the divisions are inconsistent; some divisions have full-time professors administer the evaluations while others utilize night supervisors, division secretaries, or department technicians. Additionally, full-time professors serve as program coordinators in some divisions and are in charge of their budgets for adjunct faculty, scheduling, hiring, and evaluations.
- The location of the completed evaluation forms is not consistent; three divisions retain them in the division offices and five divisions send them to Human Resources (See Exhibit M-Subcommittee 4 Meeting Minutes).

ANALYSIS

The evaluation procedures are generally followed throughout the College with some minor inconsistencies among divisions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The College should ensure that all division deans follow the same procedures when evaluating adjunct faculty:

- Forward completed evaluation forms to Human Resources.
- Maintain tracking systems to ensure all adjunct faculty are evaluated in a timely manner.
- Allow release time for full-time faculty (especially those with small departments or if there are numerous evaluations) to conduct peer evaluations.
- Schedule evaluations before mid-terms to correct any problems if necessary.
- Identify support staff in each department to administer student evaluations for adjunct faculty.

EXHIBITS

Directory of On-Site 2007 Focused Interim Report Exhibits

INTRODUCTION

Exhibit A- Clarus Report

Exhibit B- Campus Climate Survey

GENERAL RECOMMENDATION 1

Exhibit C- 2004-2005 Annual ARC Report

Exhibit D- Assessment Materials from Clark College and South Seattle Community College

Exhibit E- Subcommittee One Meeting Minutes

Exhibit F- 2005-2006 Annual ARC Report

Exhibit G- 2006 and 2007 Program Planning Guide's for the Associate of Arts

GENERAL RECOMMENDATION 2

Exhibit H- Responses to Subcommittee Two's Faculty and Dean Survey

Exhibit I- 2003 Faculty Survey

GENERAL RECOMMENDATION 3

Exhibit J- Instructional Workload Taskforce Data

Exhibit K- Faculty Workload Survey Questions for Division Deans

Exhibit L- Faculty Workload Survey Results for Division Deans

GENERAL RECOMMENDATION 4

Exhibit M- Subcommittee Four Meeting Minutes