I. John Morton
   a. Important to understand that BOR says faculty will be evaluated at least every 5 years, in addition to UHPA, and ACCJC
   b. ACCJC (administrators, faculty, etc.) – A factor in the evaluation should be SLO’s
   c. Some principles:
      i. Evaluated based on the faculty classification document that describes what the duties and expectations are of CC faculty, at each rank. This is the foundation for the evaluation component.
      ii. Faculty are the primary evaluators of faculty. The bulk of evaluation is intentionally done by other faculty, as they are the best judge regarding the nuances within the field. We want it to stay that way.
      iii. No single measure that judges whether or not a faculty member is being effective. It is a multifaceted evaluation.
      iv. A related principle: Things that are quantifiable. Student evaluations, student retention, grades, some SLO’s as we get better at understanding them, post-class successes (ie: passing the nursing exam) are quantifiable. Whenever there are quantifiable measures, there is not a definite line on whether or not something is good or bad.
      v. We look at how the faculty member responds to the information, to using the information to being a better teacher for increasing student success. Far more damaging is a faculty member who says they will not do anything, upon receiving the data.
      vi. We generally know if a faculty member is moving in the right direction or not, within our disciplines. Corrective actions could be made early on, but if the faculty member didn’t act on it until tenure, it is likely that we may not consider the person for tenure.
vii. SLO’s: We were driven to SLO’s through accreditation, from a criticism of higher education, that there was no consistency when students would take classes between institutions. The inconsistency undermines the product of higher education, and so some level of quality control was needed to explicitly set the skills or knowledge appropriate for each class. This is what the SLO’s are.

viii. SLO’s: How do we measure if the student is attaining the SLO’s? This is the assessment component. If we do not have the outcomes, one teacher may say what the outcome is, compared to another teacher. It’s all about quality control, and to effectively communicate with students, and other institutions. It is not about evaluation.

ix. There was a lot of concern that SLO’s were going to become the evaluation tool. If you review the classification document, outcomes is written in the document.

x. Get agreement ahead of time as to what you are teaching so that courses can be evaluated.

xi. There were criticisms of us in the 5-year evaluation. They were in part because we were not doing it. There was a board policy, but it wasn’t happening. The accreditors will not let you get away with that.

xii. In the 1980’s, there was not a clear relationship between the post-tenure 5-year review and the classification document. There were things that were in the original policy that needed to be changed. People could avoid the 5-year review by saying they would retire but then not do it. If people applied for promotion (and were not granted promotion?) they felt they didn’t have to do it.


xiv. Criticism: We do not have a system wide evaluation policy for lecturers. All campuses varied greatly, and it was not acceptable. This was revised to mirror how the lecturers teach to the curriculum designed by the curriculum process completed by the full-time faculty. Lecturers are not solely responsible for students, students are also responsible to themselves.
II.  JN Musto

a. There are additional aspects to the classification document. In the 1980’s, BOR adopted an evaluation policy. UHPA went to the Labor board because the Regents could not adopt a policy without bargaining it. The Labor board said that the Regents could do so, however if the impact affects the faculty member’s employment, it is subject to negotiations. This led us to a joint effort of writing the 5-year review policy between UHPA and UHCC. This policy exists separately from policies invoking disciplinary actions. However, facts that underlie disciplinary actions and a 5-year review, cannot be ignored. They are subject to the grievance party, and a 3rd party (arbitrator). This is not a part of evaluation for disciplinary action nor does it lead to a disciplinary action.

b. 5-years were not intended to be a re-tenure process, as understood by Madeline Goodman. UHPA made a procedure that would not duplicate the tenure procedure, yet it incorporates departmental/divisional expectations. These expectations can exceed the baseline of the classification document, and the system wide expectations. UHPA required every department develop expectations, and submit to UHPA, and their employer (circa 1986) to ensure compliance with the contract. In the absence of expectations from the departments, they could be issued to the department, but typically it went back to campus standards. The compliance was interesting as there was a divide among the big organizational units of the system. The CCs tended to comply, and UHM did not.

c. 5-year review and discipline are separate procedures. Tenure means that the expectations on you are greater, it does not mean that the expectations no longer apply to you. The 5-year review was kept separate from tenure, and it does not separate from classification scheme.

d. SLO’s: 2 approaches that could have been taken... no, we aren’t going to do it, who cares about accreditation, etc. Administration decided that was not a good idea. The other option: comply to what is necessary for the accrediting bodies, without discounting what faculty are promised. It’s a narrow walk.

e. Need to know: the objectives of a course; the objectives are consistent across the system; and a good measure to see if the student is achieving the objectives.
f. No Child Left Behind: They are using absolute measures: 80, 90, 100% of students shall be able to ___________. It is driven by federal funding, local school boards, etc. Obama wants to see higher education demonstrate it’s direct connection with a student obtaining a job, etc. However, a lot of us feel that higher education is more than getting a job. It is educating a person to be able to meet the job market even as it evolves, even after they leave their CTE program.

g. Lecturers: They have a lot of legitimate complaints, and the abuse of them can be an issue. We should not accept quality lower than any of our full-time faculty, because our students pay the same for courses taught by faculty vs. lecturers. There is not anything wrong with applying SLO’s, measuring them, if they are also going to be measured by a course taught by a full-time faculty member.

h. Role of remedial education at CC’s: There are unique problems to the state of HI, and the preparation coming out of K-12, and the role of open admissions. What’s the nature of our student populations, and how do we serve them best?

i. We are losing a reiteration of the responsibility of the student to the class, not just the instructor to the class. Repeating this does not hurt. Open enrollment means you have an opportunity, that you otherwise may not have, and you must engage, since it does not come free. We have a special relationship with a student, it is more like the relationship between a doctor and a patient, not like a consumer and a retail store.

j. UHPA and John Morton have a belief of how policies should be implemented, and the interpretation at the campuses can vary substantially. There should be some variability, but not the procedural aspects of a policy. There should be a uniform understanding of what policies mean.

III. Question and Answer Session

a. Q: So much of student learning is out of the control of the teacher. Students need to be prepared and willing to work hard for the privilege of getting and education.

A: But it does not mean that nothing about student success is related to the contributions of the faculty member. Morton: There is a component of student success that faculty members are responsible for, and that is what should be evaluated on.
Musto: As much as you know about your discipline, if there is not a capacity to translate that to students, the teaching aspect is not strong. It’s not a performance evaluation of the faculty member; it’s about teaching. It requires you to look at where the students are, and where do they end up. How much of a change was the faculty member able to effectuate of understanding things. It’s the reason for arguing lowering academic workload requirements. It’s a recognition of how much work CC’s do, not that you should do less. Overloads undermine the ability to be quality teachers. We do it for financial reasons, and lecturers can carry heavy workloads, but we should raise the wages so it can be comparable to full time faculty.

b. Q: Is the use of the actual results of SLO assessments in faculty evaluation will lead to the erosion of academic rigor? Where do benchmarks come from?

A: No one should be saying a specific number or percentage. Benchmarks should be coming from the faculty. The outcomes for the classes should be related to each specific class. If any faculty is doing something to lower their standards to improve retention and the net result is that the student flunks the next class they move on to, then the faculty member is not successful. You have to design a system that prevents that from happening. We have been very careful not to make SLOS and the assessment of SLOs the primary driver of faculty evaluation.

The SLO is not an isolated event, if any faculty member is doing something to lower their standards to improve their numbers; they are not successful because the student will not be able to succeed in the preceding class.

Musto: SLO’s become an easy way to evaluate, but also evaluate the other aspects of what’s going on.

What’s driving the grievances? Not SLO’s... but they are about people being not liked. Musto nor Morton has seen “not renewed for failure to meet SLOs”. Grievances for denying tenure that come to UHPA are not related to SLO’s.
Discussion: Administration wants to measure on teaching effectiveness. Faculty members are saying they are being evaluated on SLO's.

As long as a faculty member assesses their own teaching, and explain what they are doing to the overall student success. There is a hidden undercurrent of SLO pressure.

c. How can we make the process of faculty evaluation more transparent?

d. Inclusion of data on student achievement of SLO's:
   Required?
   Expected?
   Forbidden?
   Frowned upon?
   Up to individual campuses?

JN Musto: It’s up to the individual.

J. Morton: The form by which you are using that evaluation information, is going to vary by the nature of the outcome, the nature of the assessment, the departmental expectations, but needs to be communicated to the faculty member. You cannot say that SLOs are not a part of that equation. You cannot say that student evaluations are not a part of that equation. It is a part of defining the nature of the work in your department, and that faculty member’s contribution to student success.

SLOs should be used as a factor of evaluation. SLOS are something that faculty agree is what the course means. However, that is not the only thing happening in your class. You should not limit your analysis to SLOs. If a program keeps getting 100% licensure pass, then that is an important part of the analysis, even though it is not an SLO. Morton and Musto do not want to see 10th or 12th grade tests.
Pagotto: Let’s be sure to not confuse achievement and learning. Bad practices: If you take points away for attendance, that’s not a direct measure of student learning. We have to focus on what the students produce based on the activities and assignments assigned. It’s not okay to give a student an artificial grade to move them on.

The premise for tenure/promo/reappointment puts the burden of proof on the individual applying. For tenure: when you write the dossier, it is not your colleagues looking at you independently, it’s you making the argument that you have done what is necessary for tenure. This is different than the DOE: they say whether or not you have failed to meet that requirement. The idea of copyrights and intellectual property rights: It’s not for the idea/principle; it’s the way you present it. The idea can be shared among colleagues, but each person takes a different approach to how you address the idea.

There was a time before SLOs were well defined, and assessments were developed, so results were not requested to be included.

SLO info comes to you for you to process, and you make the appropriate changes, to better assure the students reach the outcome successfully, and you communicate that to your colleagues.

If you have a set of data that is positive... but omits the fact that one area students weren’t meeting an SLO, it is a problem, because the faculty have agreed on the SLOs for the entire course, not just certain SLOs for the course.

SLOs vs. Achievement: Assessing student learning is not about all students passing a class. Sometimes teachers will take into account other factors not related to student learning: attendance, late assignments, etc. Evidence of learning is the important thing, not the pass rate of a course. Grade inflation is not okay, if they are not ready to move on.
In the Contract Renewal process, it's more informative, versus the tenure process; it's either YES or NO. In promotion, one of the weaknesses is that the unsuccessful application for promotion has no feedback about why they fell short. The post-tenure review, no administrators are involved unless the faculty cannot agree.

Copyrights of faculty: The copyright is not for the idea, it is for the way you present it. The idea is to be shared among your colleagues.

e. Didn’t the KCC Faculty Senate SLO Committee propose a campus policy regarding SLOs for Faculty Assessment? What’s the status of that?

ACCJC says SLO’s are a factor in student success.

THE BIG STATEMENT: If the faculty have agreed on what the SLOs are for a course, (should be yes), and if the faculty have agreed on the assessment and how it is to be done (and this is not completed), then that should be part of the conversation that the faculty member includes in their application, along with student evaluations, along with other student achievement, etc. It is not more important, and it is not less important. Treat it as one more piece of data about what is happening with your students in your classes.

The assessment piece (whether students meet the outcomes) is what the department has to agree on. Then once agreed upon, it should be included.

Morton: If we can do something within our written framework then this might improve the process:
- The Faculty Tenure Promotion Guidelines (review)
- The UHCC office is looking at whether or not an e-portfolio can be used over time and submitted for the tenure process. We have to be sure to use evaluation methods that are applicable for all types of faculty. It does not say what should be included.
- Review the bullets at the bottom of the SLO Report are from the ACCJC Questions
- You can use data to inform the answers, and why you are making changes, without having to share hard numbers. Adopting the document will be discussed at the next Faculty Senate meeting.
- Combine J. Morton’s statement, Sally’s statement, and the document.

The faculty need to decide how faculty are evaluated.

f. Who is responsible for developing the 5-year review process, and what’s the role of the DPC & Chair?

The departments are responsible for developing the document for the criteria for assessing candidate. The DPC reviews for units that do not have a department chair.

The 5-year review procedure was decided upon by the employer and the union in the 1980’s.

This allows the department to set up expectations for senior faculty, and the department then has the right to share how they have been contributing to these expectations.