



Clark College
Focused Interim Report

Prepared for the Commission on Colleges
of the
Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges

October 2000

Table of Contents

Introductory Materials

Clark College Mission/Vision/Values Statements

i.

Clark College Leadership

ii.

Overview

Recommendation #1

Institutional Effectiveness

Recommendation #3

Full-time/Part-time Faculty Mix

Recommendation #4

Faculty Evaluation

Appendices

1. Taxonomy of Issues
2. Board of Trustees Results Policies
3. College Goals
4. Discussion Guide: Community Focus Groups
5. Report to the Community
6. College Budget and Results Policies
7. Foundation Allocations and Results Policies
8. Strategic Planning Calendar
9. Clark College/AHE Agreement: Faculty Workloads
10. Clark College/AHE MOU re Faculty Workloads
11. Paralegal Program Document
12. Faculty Evaluation Project Executive Summary
13. Faculty Job Descriptions
14. Clark College/AHE Agreement re Faculty Tenure and Evaluation

Overview

In October 1998, following its ten-year, full-scale evaluation, Clark College was granted re-affirmation of accreditation by the Commission on Colleges of the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges. The Report of the Evaluation Committee included six General Commendations and seven General Recommendations. The Commission further directed the College to prepare a Focused Interim Report and host a visit by a Commission representative in Fall 2000 to address three of the General Recommendations. The areas of focus included:

- **Strategic planning** (Standard One)
- **Utilization of full-time and adjunct faculty** (Standard Four)
- **Adjunct faculty evaluation** (Standard Four and Commission Policy 4.1)

Shortly following the accreditation visit, the President appointed four teams, composed of faculty, administrators, and classified staff members, whose primary charge was to address the issues raised in the General Recommendations. A corollary charge for the teams was to recommend ways to address issues identified in two recent organizational studies of the College: the O'Rourke Report and the Presidential Search Environmental Scan. The O'Rourke Report reviewed the organizational and decision-making structure of the College and the Environmental Scan focused on key areas needing attention by a new president.

The teams and their assignments included: (1) Transition Team, whose charge was to develop a more effective structure for governance and decision-making; (2) Research and Planning Support Team, whose task was to identify a structure and plan for institutional research, planning, and effectiveness; (3) Technology Team, whose charge was to research and develop a comprehensive technology plan for the campus; and (4) Administrative Processes Team, whose assignment was to review and streamline campus paperwork and business procedures. The work of the teams provided the foundation for actions taken to address the three General Recommendations of the Commission as well as issues raised in the two campus studies.

During the last two years the College has developed a comprehensive strategic planning process, expanded its research capacity, created a plan for faculty utilization, and adopted a consistent system for faculty evaluation. These goals were accomplished with broad participation of the campus community in the spirit noted in General Commendation #1 of the 1998 Accreditation Evaluation Committee Report: "The faculty and staff are to be commended for their open support of and commitment to campus-wide change initiatives . . . "

Clark College welcomes the opportunity to share its continuing progress through the Focused Interim Report.

General Recommendation #1.

“Strategic planning must be institutionalized. The evaluation committee observed considerable planning in progress, but these efforts need to be integrated into an ongoing institutional plan which identifies priorities and which will move the institution forward in a systematic manner in areas such as budget, faculty and staff hiring, information technology, and distance learning.”

--Standard One - Institutional Mission and Goals, Planning and Effectiveness;

Standard 1.A. Institutional Mission and Goals; Standard 1.B - Planning and Effectiveness.

College Response

Following the October 1998 accreditation visit, Dr. Tana Hasart, who had been appointed President of the College just three months earlier, moved quickly to address the recommendations relating to institutional planning and effectiveness. Although the College was flourishing, with strong enrollments and stable funding, it was clear that its separate planning efforts needed integration into a comprehensive planning and institutional effectiveness model.

At the time of the accreditation visit, the College had recently completed a comprehensive review of the Mission Statement, resulting in a redefinition of the Mission Statement and articulation of new Vision and Values Statements. The Board of Trustees, having made the decision to adopt the Policy Governance model of board leadership proposed by Dr. John Carver, had begun preliminary work on developing the Board Results Policies—broad institutional goals based on the Mission Statement.

Taxonomy of Issues

As an initial step in developing an integrated strategic plan, the President directed the Research and Planning Support Team (R&P) to analyze recent College research and planning documents and compile a list of common concerns and strengths. The team examined the College Mission/Vision/Values Statements, the Board of Trustees Results Policies, the O’Rourke Report, the Presidential Search Environmental Scan, the Accreditation Handbook, and the Recommendations of the Accreditation Evaluation Committee.

After considerable analysis and discussion of the data and recommendations in these key planning documents, coupled with sharing of experiences of team members, the team created an institutional “Taxonomy of Issues,” a comprehensive framework of issues to be used for addressing internal and external planning and reporting needs. (Appendix A) The taxonomy was distributed to the campus in May 1999 along with a request for suggestions and comments. It later became the basis for many of the College Goal statements.

Board of Trustees Results Policies

During the same time period, the Clark College Board of Trustees, which had adopted the initial version of the College Results Policies in January of 1998, reviewed the first draft of the policies, and, at the annual retreat in August 1999, adopted a revised version of the policy statements. In December 1999, responding to a recommendation from faculty and staff, the Board further amended the Results Policies and formally adopted the version in place for 2000-2001. The Results Policies are the backbone of the strategic plan. (Appendix B)

College Goals

The College community gathered in a work session on October 25, 1999 to develop a set of College Goals to support each of the seven Results Policies. The all-campus goal-setting session, attended by over 160 faculty and staff, produced a series of 1-3 year College Goals along with a recommendation to the Board of Trustees for revision of two of the Results Policies. The Board amended the Results Policies in December 1999. During winter and spring quarter of 2000 the Goals were prioritized by members of the campus community and clarified and edited by the R&P Team. As part of this process, the Team cross-indexed the Goals with the Taxonomy of Issues to assure that all issues were addressed. The College Goals provide the supporting structure for the strategic plan. (Appendix C)

Strategic Initiatives

The next step in the planning process is the development by faculty and staff of Strategic Initiatives—the real action steps that implement the College Goals. An initial inventory of Strategic Initiatives will be gathered from each unit during September and October 2000 (available in exhibit area) and a complete inventory of existing initiatives will be in place by the end of Fall Quarter. In some cases, campus units will also submit proposals for new initiatives.

Measures of Effectiveness

The College has continued to expand its capacity for research and evaluation in order to monitor progress towards achievement of Board Results Policies, College Goals, and other assessment activities. As noted in the 1998 Self-study, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness was created in spring of 1998 to integrate research activities in the areas of performance and outcomes. A Research Analyst (.5 FTE) was employed in 1999 to provide technical assistance in the collection and reporting of data. An experienced classified staff member provides full-time support for the office.

Evaluating Results Policies: Community Forums

In the language of the Carver Model of Governance, Results Policies describe the *end results* that the College will provide for the community. Results Policies reflect the external goals of the College. Consequently, the Board measures progress towards reaching ends through evaluations by stakeholders. The Board then matches external information with data on College performance.

The Board hosted a series of three community focus groups in June 2000—the first round of a regular schedule of stakeholder assessment of the effectiveness of the College in the seven areas of the Results Policies. Representatives from K-12, higher education, social service agencies, business, labor, and Clark College students, faculty, staff, and alumni attended the facilitated sessions. A fourth forum for business leaders was conducted by the Association of Washington Businesses and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges. The full report of the forums was discussed at the Board's August retreat and used as part of the review of the Results policies. (Copies of reports from the community forums are available in the exhibit area.)

Evaluating College Goals; Baseline Data and Strategic Initiatives

Strategic Initiatives are the actions that accomplish College Goals. In turn, College Goals support the Results Policies. Progress in implementing Strategic Initiatives moves the College towards achievement of College Goals. Progress in Goal achievement is evaluated using measures developed by the R&P Team. Initial baseline data has been collected for several measures, and the goal of the 2000-2001 academic year is to complete the collection of data for key measures. (See Appendix C for sample measures)

Selected Planning Efforts

During the last eighteen months, several areas of the College have already developed and implemented corollary plans in support of the Board Results Policies. These action plans were developed in response to issues identified in the development of the Taxonomy of Issues and College Goals. A problem was identified, a review process set in motion, a plan developed, and actions implemented. The plans and the Results Policy they support include:

<u>Planning Document</u>	<u>Results Policy</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-Design Study for the Clark Center Clark College at WSU Vancouver 	Access, Focus on Student Learning, Broad-Based Partnerships, Positive Campus Environment, Respect for Differences, Relevant Education
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master Facilities Plan 	Access, Focus on Student Learning, Broad-Based Partnerships, Positive Campus Environment, Respect for Differences, Relevant Education
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full-time/Part-Time Faculty Mix Report 	Focus on Student Learning, Positive Campus Environment, Relevant Education
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Plan for Information Technology 	Access, Focus on Student Learning, Broad-Based Partnerships, Positive Campus Environment, Respect for Differences, Relevant Education

- Operational Plan for Information Technology Access, Focus on Student Learning, Broad-Based Partnerships, Positive Campus Environment, Respect for Differences, Relevant Education
- Administrative Processes Report (Travel) Positive Campus Environment
- Review of Child and Family Services Unit Access, Focus on Student Learning, Broad-Based Partnerships, Positive Campus Environment, Respect for Differences, Relevant Education

Copies of these planning documents are available in the exhibit area.

Communication to the Public: The Annual Report

In the new planning model, evidence of effectiveness is communicated to the public through the annual report. The first *Report to the Community*, published in August 2000, features the Board Results Policies and College accomplishments in each of the seven policy areas. (Appendix D) It also highlights College strengths and recommendations for action suggested by community leaders during the June forums. Copies of the report were mailed to every campus employee and to a broad cross-section of community leaders. In order to document College effectiveness to as broad an audience as possible, reports will be mailed to all advisory committee members and distributed at presentations and activities during the academic year. A brief response sheet is included with each report inviting comments on content and format so the College can continually revise and improve the quality of information we provide the public.

Resource Allocation

The new planning model links Results Policies and College Goals to the budget process. Beginning in 1998-1999, the College based its budget requests and allocations on the existing Board Results Policies and the 2000-2001 budget directly links new staff and services to the revised Results policies. (Copy in exhibit area) Complimenting the College operating budget development process, beginning in 2000-2001 the Clark College Foundation Funds Allocation Committee also funded requests based on the Board Results Policies. (Appendix E)

The cycle will continue and resource allocation and staffing decisions for 2001-2002 and thereafter will be based on the Strategic Initiatives (either current or proposed) that help accomplish College Goals which, in turn, impact the Results Policies. The Initiatives, gathered and prioritized at the unit level (Instruction, Administrative Services, Student Services, President's Office) will be forwarded to the Cabinet for review and further prioritization in development of the annual budget.

Monitoring Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

A newly-formed body, the President's Advisory Council, will monitor the planning and evaluation of institutional effectiveness. The Council will meet bimonthly to review progress towards achievement of College Goals, Results Policies, and College

Performance Measures. The Council will also oversee the prioritization of College Goals and Strategic Initiatives and the budget development process. A copy of the document describing the purpose and membership of the President's Advisory is available in the exhibit area.

The Planning Cycle

The College is entering the first cycle of an annual process of strategic planning and evaluation. In August, the Board reviewed its Results Policies in light of the data reported in the annual *Report to the Community*. In September, the College units reviewed College Goals and began an inventory of Strategic Initiatives. By December, the Strategic Initiative inventory will be completed and used as the basis for budget development for 2001-2002.

In late spring 2001 data will be collected on the progress and outcomes of the Strategic Initiatives and College Goals. This information will be compiled in the annual report and submitted to the Board at its August retreat. The Board will again revisit the Results Policies in view of the context of the data from the annual report, and in September 2001 units will review progress towards 2000-2001 Strategic Initiatives and develop Initiatives for 2001-2002. (The model and planning calendar are included in Figures 1 and 2)

Conclusions and Future Plans

The College has taken major steps to set up structures and processes to institutionalize strategic planning. The Board of Trustees Results Policies provide the framework, the College Goals donate the supports, and the Strategic Initiatives furnish the energy. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness collects the data, the strategic planning calendar confirms the timeline, and the President's Advisory Council serves as monitor. Results of the plan are communicated through the annual report. The steps are complete: planning, implementation, analysis, and refinement.

The structures and processes are new and yet to be completely tested, but they have been developed in a thoughtful manner with broad participation from members of the college community. Our planning and evaluation system is now an integrated framework that will provide the direction to move the College forward in realizing its vision.

Figure 1

PLANNING AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS MODEL

MISSION

RESULTS POLICIES

Measure: Focus Groups

COLLEGE GOALS

Measure: State and Local Data

UNIT STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

Measure: Data, Reports, Goal
Accomplishments

Figure 2

Strategic Planning Calendar 2000-2002
--

2000

<i>June</i>	Community Forums held on Results Policies and College Effectiveness.
<i>July</i>	College Goals finalized.
<i>August</i>	Report to Community. Board reviews Results Policies and Goals data from Report.
<i>September - December</i>	Instruction, Student Services, Administrative Services, and President's Office units compile inventory of Strategic Initiatives, and, where appropriate, new Initiatives.

2001

<i>January - April</i>	Units develop budgets for 2001-02 based on current or newly-proposed Strategic Initiatives; President's Council prioritizes.
<i>May - July</i>	Units and Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) gather and assess data on progress and outcomes of Strategic Initiatives.
<i>July - August</i>	OIE prepares Annual Report.
<i>August</i>	Board reviews Results Policies and Annual Report.
<i>September-October</i>	Units review 2000-2001 Strategic Initiatives and develop Initiatives for 2001-2002.
<i>November - December</i>	Units develop budget for 2001-02 based on new and continuing Strategic Initiatives.

2002

<i>January - April</i>	Budget development continues. Council prioritizes.
<i>May - July</i>	Units and OIE gather and assess data on progress and outcomes of Strategic Initiatives.
<i>August</i>	OIE prepares Annual Report for Board Review.

****Note: Progress will be monitored monthly by President's Advisory Council.**

General Recommendation #3.

“In light of the institution’s mission, current enrollment, and anticipated growth, a plan should be created for addressing the utilization of both full-time and adjunct faculty. The College should review faculty work loads. This is particularly a problem where full-time faculty versus adjunct faculty ratios are high, or where no full-time faculty exist in specialized degree and/or certificate programs. Particular attention should be paid to the Paralegal Program as to oversight and supervision by full-time faculty and/or administration. This was cited in the 1989 and 1994 accreditation site reports.”

--Standard Four – Faculty; Standard 4.A Faculty Selection, Evaluation, Roles, Welfare and Development.

College Response

Full-time/Adjunct Faculty Utilization

The 1998 recommendation confirmed the College’s awareness of the need to create a plan for utilization of both full-time and adjunct faculty. An added incentive to review the faculty mix and produce a full-time/adjunct utilization plan was a mandate from the 1999 Washington Legislature to produce a plan with specific recommendations for future legislative funding.

The Research and Planning Support Team (R&P), composed of faculty, staff, and administrators, took responsibility for the initial research. In Fall 1999 the team analyzed historical data provided by the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and current data from the College management information system. Analysis revealed that the net use of adjunct faculty at Clark College during Fall 1999 was 36.1%. A series of tables were produced summarizing Clark’s current use of adjuncts by CIP program code. Comparison data was also collected from other state community colleges. Figure 3. shows the summary statistics on percentage of adjunct use by CIP code during Fall 1999.

Cluster	Total FTEF	Net FTEF Adjuncts	Net Adjuncts as PCT of Total FTEF
Basic Skills	27.4	18.1	66.0%
Business	23.8	5.9	24.7%
Humanities	56.1	18.6	33.1%
Math	29.5	13.0	44.2%
Mech. & Engr. Tech	16.2	3.1	19.3%
Public Service	61.1	24.5	40.2%
Science	18.7	2.3	12.4%
Social Sciences	21.2	6.2	29.1%
Total	254.2	91.8	36.1%

As a second step, the team carefully analyzed data on the use of adjunct faculty at the individual department and program level for Fall 1995 through Fall 1999. The data was adjusted to account for adjuncts replacing permanent faculty on temporary non-teaching assignments. Figure 4. shows the four departments with the highest relative use of adjunct faculty at that time: English as a Second Language and Adult Basic Education (Education Division), Mathematics, and English.

Dept.	Total FTEF					Net FTEF Adjuncts					Average Net Adjuncts, 1995-99	
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	#	Rank
ESL	9.5	13.76	14.06	14.36	14.6	8.5	12.62	12.92	13.28	12.49	12.0	1
MATH	23	25.27	27.2	27.68	29.27	6.19	9.45	10.75	11.31	13.02	10.1	2
ABE	7.06	10.1	10.07	9.94	10.68	6.06	8.1	7.51	7.92	4.485	6.8	3
ENGL	20.91	21.2	23.27	24.03	24.11	3.87	5.75	6.47	7.17	7.55	6.2	4

In Spring 2000 heads of departments with at least 0.8 adjuncts were surveyed as to their reasons for using adjuncts and how they might change the mix if more funding were available. Figure 5. shows a complete listing of responses. The predominant reasons cited for using adjuncts were lack of adequate funds for hiring full-time faculty and the need for instructors with specialized skills.

Reason	# Responses
Lack of adequate funding	20
Courses requiring instructors with specialized skills or knowledge	17
Permanent release time for full-time faculty	14
Seasonal demand for certain courses	12
Courses requiring the use of professionals in the field	12
Sabbatical/medical leave for full-time faculty	9
Inability to find qualified full-time faculty at current pay levels	8
Temporary release time for full-time faculty	7

Based on information submitted by the division chairs, a summary table of the “ideal” mix of full-time versus adjunct faculty was compiled, including department recommendations for the number of adjunct positions they would like to see converted to full-time positions in the event funding became available. (See Figure 6)

During April and May 2000, after further review of data from SBCTC and recommendations from division chairs, the College Cabinet developed priorities for the full-time/adjunct mix based on quantitative measures revealed in the data. Qualitative measures including anticipated growth in high-demand areas provided a second criterion for decision-making.

The report and plan submitted to the Legislature included a request for adding nine additional full-time faculty positions in order to reduce our reliance on adjuncts.

Six of the positions were requested in areas identified as the highest users of adjuncts: one each in ABE and ESL and two each in English and Mathematics.

In addition to the six positions requested for conversion, the College also requested funding of three additional full-time positions over the next biennium. The additional positions are needed to address anticipated growth in three areas: technology programs due to the continued growth of high technology manufacturing; environmental science; and education, in response to a new transfer programs at Washington State University Vancouver. If funded by the Legislature, these positions will come on line in Fall 2001.

Figure 6. IDEAL MIX OF PERMANENT AND ADJUNCT FACULTY—FALL 1999			
Department	Total FTEF	Adjunct FTEF Net of Release Time	Added Permanent FTEF If Funding Were Available
Adult Basic Education	10.68	4.48	5
Anthropology	2.32	1.32	1
Art	5.86	2.67	1
Business Technology	9.13	1.67	1
Business Administration	6.23	0.55	1
Chemistry	4.83	0.83	0
Computer Software Applications	2.60	1.68	1
Computer Science	5.74	1.80	1
Dental Hygiene	7.22	2.05	1
Developmental Education	8.17	5.31	1
Early Childhood Education	2.53	1.29	1
Electronic Technology	3.94	0.99	1
English	24.11	7.55	3
English as a Second Language	14.60	12.49	9
Family Life-Parent/Child	3.19	0.75	1
Mature Learning	3.13	2.93	1
Human Development	2.95	2.32	2
Health Occupations	1.41	1.41	1
History	4.72	1.19	*
Machining Technology	2.15	0.80	0
Mathematics	29.27	13.02	6
Management	0.94	0.93	1
Music	3.47	0.88	1
Nursing	12.52	4.68	0
Physical Education	8.14	5.12	2
Paralegal	1.60	1.60	1
Psychology	5.19	1.16	0
Sociology	3.32	0.99	0.5
Women's Studies/Gender Studies	2.32	0.92	1
SUBTOTAL	192.28	83.38	44.5
Other Departments	61.94	8.41	
TOTAL	254.22	91.79	

* Survey not received from History Department.

The College has taken more immediate steps to reduce the use of adjuncts by deliberate decisions on new hires. Three new positions in the Education Division—one ABE faculty and two Corrections faculty—were added at the Larch Mountain site in 1999. In addition, three new full-time positions were added on campus beginning Fall 2000: one each in ESL, Education, and Mathematics.

Re-structuring of the instructional area has also improved the FT/PT faculty ratio at the College by relieving faculty members of administrative duties formerly required of division and department heads and allowing them to return to full-time teaching. A new administrative position, Director of Basic Skills, has been added, to provide full-time administrative support in the Education Division. These changes have essentially increased by three the number of full-time faculty in that area: one each in ABE, ESL, and Developmental Education.

Conclusions and Future Plans:

As a result of research conducted for the Commission and the Legislature, and increased reliance on data for decision-making by faculty leaders and the Cabinet, the College now has a model for utilization of full-time and adjunct faculty. The plan takes into consideration our mission, current enrollment, anticipated growth, the needs of the College, and the projected needs of the community. It is a combination of the quantitative data reflecting current use of adjunct faculty in each instructional area and qualitative data reflecting anticipated areas of growth to meet community needs. The information will be reviewed and updated annually and used as the basis for staffing and budget decisions for the following academic year.

Faculty Workloads

In response to the statement in Recommendation #3 that “The College should review faculty workloads,” the College has taken a number of actions to achieve an equitable workload for all faculty members. Workload issues are part of contract negotiations and any permanent changes in workload are documented in the faculty contract. Shortly after the accreditation visit, the 1998 Clark College/AHE Agreement was signed, including a detailed description of faculty workloads by instructional area. (Appendix F) Three Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) were also signed at that time. (Appendix G)

The first MOU describes the generic process whereby a faculty member who believes his/her workload is excessive may request a temporary adjustment. It stipulates that workload problems, which appear to require permanent modification of workload stated in the Agreement, will be considered by the AHE and the College during the next regularly scheduled negotiation of the Agreement.

The second and third MOU provide for workload modifications in specific areas. Under provisions of the second MOU, workloads in the ABE/ESL and Developmental Education departments will be changed from 21 hours to 18 hours when course changes have been approved that move all courses to the traditional mode of instruction. This has already occurred in the Developmental Education Department.

The third MOU reduces from 18 to 15 hours the workload for Business Technology faculty teaching at least 10 credit hours of lecture courses.

An additional temporary modification was made in Spring 2000 as a result of contract negotiations, reducing the workload from 21 to 18 contact hours per week for faculty members in the Applied Technology Division programs of Welding, Automotive, Machining, Diesel and Data Networks.

In January 2000, AHE and the College jointly sponsored a faculty forum to discuss issues related to faculty workload. Forum ideas and opinions and provisions of the current contract have been reviewed by the College and AHE in preparation for contract negotiations.

Conclusions and Future Plans:

Faculty workload is a topic of continuing review and is currently an item of discussion in the faculty contract negotiations. The College administration has made a formal request that a three-year plan for workloads be completed prior to April 2001. The request calls for a joint AHE/College task force to be formed during Fall Quarter 2000 to review workloads and develop a plan for how to address this issue. It is the intent of the College to implement the first phase of the new plan in the 2001-2002 academic year.

Paralegal Program

The College is cognizant of the need to respond to the 1989 citation and the 1998 recommendation that "Particular attention should be paid to the Paralegal Program as to oversight and supervision by full-time faculty and/or administration." The program staffing was reviewed following the 1989 visit and, as reported in the 1994 Interim Report, faculty reached the conclusion that the current staffing arrangement met the needs of the program.

The Business Division conducted another thorough review following the 1998 recommendation and the Division Chair submitted a memorandum dated December 4, 1998, that states, "In general, the research and the current experience of this Division suggests that a full-time Paralegal Instructor/Coordinator is not warranted at this time." (Appendix H)

Conclusions and Future Plans:

In re-structuring of the instructional areas, the Paralegal program has been placed in the "Business and Technology" program cluster, coordinated by a full-time faculty member. In this manner, a full-time faculty member will provide appropriate oversight and supervision.

General Recommendation #4.

“The evaluation committee recommends that a consistent system be developed to conduct, report, and monitor evaluation of adjunct faculty to ensure teaching effectiveness. This should be done in a way to be consistent with Commission policy regarding faculty evaluation.

--Standard Four – Faculty; Commission Policy 4.1 Faculty Evaluation.

College Response

Following the Commission visit, the College took immediate action to address the issue of adjunct faculty evaluation. In December 1998, the Research and Planning Support Team (R&P), composed of faculty, administrators and classified staff, began an initial review of faculty evaluation procedures at the College. The team’s goal was to develop a consistent evaluation system that, at the minimum, met the requirements of Policy 4.1 that “. . . every faculty member at every institution be subject to some type of substantive performance evaluation and review at least every third year.”

During Winter 1999 team members collected and reviewed the following documents:

- Accreditation Handbook and Commission Recommendations
- Sampling of Clark College Faculty Evaluation Processes
- Language in the Clark College AHE Contract including
 - Section 2.2. Duties of Tenure Review Committee
 - Section 3.0. Evaluation System for Tenured Faculty
 - Section 4.0. Evaluation System for Special Programs and Temporary Faculty
- Clark College Evaluation Forms
- Clark College AHE Contract, Appendix C: Faculty Responsibilities and Loads
- Faculty Evaluation Materials from Peer Institutions
- Literature Search on Faculty Evaluation
- 1996 Missouri Law Review—legal implications of faculty evaluation

Early in the document analysis, the R&P Team concluded that the College needed to review its evaluation procedures for all types of faculty members, not just adjuncts. This decision was strongly supported by faculty and the College Cabinet and will ultimately result in a comprehensive plan to update evaluation processes for all types of faculty: probationary, post-tenure, temporary, adjuncts, counselors and librarians.

After review and analysis of the resource documents, the R&P Team prepared a report to the campus, providing a context to support the revision of the faculty evaluation system. (See Appendix I for Executive Summary) The Faculty Evaluation Project Report confirmed the necessity of revising the evaluation system for all faculty members. It also cited the mismatch between the current CCAHE job description and

existing evaluation forms. The team recommended development of a new job description that more accurately reflected the current roles and responsibilities of faculty. Team members felt strongly that new evaluation instruments and procedures could not be adopted until the new job description was in place.

The Faculty Evaluation Project Report was distributed at an all-faculty forum in May 1999. Feedback was solicited, revisions made, and the revised report was forwarded to the College President for review.

During Summer 1999, the Vice President for Instruction and the President of AHE jointly appointed a 10-member Faculty Evaluation Task Force to develop a new faculty job description and evaluation instruments. The task force was a collegial one, composed of five full-time faculty, one adjunct, three members of the R&P Team, and the Vice President for Instruction. The group met regularly over the next several months, reviewed the data in the Faculty Evaluation Project Report and reached consensus on several issues, including a statement of purpose and philosophy of a faculty evaluation system. In February 2000, five members of the task force attended a national conference focusing on faculty evaluation.

The task force came to agreement on the multiple purposes of a good faculty evaluation system: to improve professional performance; provide support; acknowledge and recognize faculty excellence; and promote and enhance professional development. Building on this philosophy, the group drafted a new faculty job description. The language was written so the roles and responsibilities listed could be effectively evaluated by quantitative or qualitative measures.

Several drafts were circulated among faculty for review and response. Copies were made available in both print and electronic form. Upon receipt of faculty feedback, which was considerable, the draft was revised and re-circulated. The final version of the new job description was accepted and approved in May 2000 and was forwarded to the negotiating team for consideration in the contract negotiations. (See Appendix J for the full text of the new job description for faculty, librarians and counselors.)

The faculty job description and the faculty evaluation process are currently an item of discussion in the faculty contract negotiations.

A Memorandum of Understanding between Clark College and the Clark College Association for Higher Education, signed on August 29, 2000, agrees to the revision of the faculty evaluation system for all types of faculty members. The MOU states that:

“Clark College and the Association for Higher Education agree that Article III, Section C – Faculty Tenure, and Article III, Section D – Evaluation System for Faculty, Other Than Probationary, as revised in the attached document, will be implemented effective Fall quarter 2000.”

The full text of Article III, Section C, and D, appears in Appendix K. The specific language related to evaluation of adjunct faculty reads:

“All adjunct faculty teaching credit classes will be evaluated in at least one class taught in the first quarter for which they are appointed. This evaluation will consist of a classroom observation by a peer or supervisor, and student evaluations. After the first three quarters of teaching, all adjunct faculty will be evaluated in at least one class (classroom observation and student evaluations) each academic year. The evaluation instruments for adjunct faculty will be collected and delivered to the Faculty Coordinator by a person other than the faculty member being evaluated. All evaluations will be reviewed with the adjunct faculty member. Upon completion of a subsequent evaluation, the evaluation summaries will be turned over to the adjunct faculty member.”

Conclusions and Future Plans:

The Commission recommendation to develop a consistent system of adjunct faculty evaluation provided the impetus for a major review and revision of the entire faculty evaluation system. As a result of current contract negotiations, the College administration and faculty have collegially agreed upon a new job description for all levels of faculty and a consistent and comprehensive evaluation system for all faculty. The process includes multiple measures and is designed to ensure teaching effectiveness. The contract now includes specific language that requires consistent and continuing evaluation processes for adjunct faculty.

Responsibility for conducting evaluations rests with the four instructional deans, who report to the Vice President for Instruction. In order to monitor evaluations of adjunct faculty, the Vice President has collected all adjunct evaluations conducted during the last two years. Effective Fall 2000, responsibility for conducting and monitoring evaluation of adjunct faculty has been delegated to the Faculty Coordinators of the eighteen educational clusters. Faculty Coordinators report to the instructional deans. The Senior Secretary in each cluster will provide clerical support for consistent record keeping and tracking of adjunct evaluations.

Evaluation instruments will be developed during the 2000-2001 academic year under the guidance of a joint administration/faculty task force. The goal is to pilot the new evaluation tools by spring 2001. During the current year, adjunct faculty will be evaluated through the use of existing evaluation instruments.