

Interim Report Form

Name of Institution:

Saint Mary's College of California

Person Submitting the Report:

John Hofmann, Director of Assessment, Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO)

Report Submission Date:

November 1, 2018

Statement on Report Preparation

Briefly describe in narrative form the process of report preparation, providing the names and titles of those involved. Because of the focused nature of an Interim Report, the widespread and comprehensive involvement of all institutional constituencies is not normally required. Faculty, administrative staff, and others should be involved as appropriate to the topics being addressed in the preparation of the report. Campus constituencies, such as faculty leadership and, where appropriate, the governing board, should review the report before it is submitted to WSCUC, and such reviews should be indicated in this statement.

Drafts of sections of the interim report were assigned to and completed by various individuals. Dr. Megan Mustain, Dean of the Core, focused on the assessment of SMC's core curriculum; Dr. John Hofmann, Director of Assessment and ex officio member of the Program Review Committee, focused on program review, and Dr. Shawny Anderson, Associate Dean of the School of the Liberal Arts and Special Assistant to the Provost, focused on faculty planning. Each member also identified and collected the supporting documents referenced in their respective sections. Dr. Hofmann, who also serves as the College's ALO, then compiled these sections and forwarded a draft report for commentary and revision to Dr. Margaret Kasimatis, Provost and Vice-President of Academic Affairs, and to faculty leadership, including members of the Core Curriculum Committee and the Program Review Committee.

List of Topics Addressed in this Report

Please list the topics identified in the action letter(s) and that are addressed in this report.

The Commission Action Letter (CAL) dated March 6, 2015 listed the following three topics for SMC to address in this interim report:

1. Completion, adoption, and implementation of assessment plans for the core curriculum and core competencies
2. A faculty and contingent faculty staffing plan, including elements listed in the CAL
3. Full implementation of the program review timeline and revisions in the program review process to include a greater emphasis on assessment

Institutional Context

Very briefly describe the institution's background; mission; history, including the founding date and year first accredited; geographic locations; and other pertinent information so that the Interim Report Committee panel has the context to understand the issues discussed in the report.

History and Mission [CFR 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 3.5, 4.1]

Saint Mary's College of California was founded in 1863 by the Roman Catholic Archdiocese as a diocesan college for boys; the campus was originally located in San Francisco. In 1868, the De La Salle Christian Brothers assumed direction of the school, and the first SMC bachelors' degrees were awarded in 1872. The College moved to Oakland in 1889 and then to its current location in Moraga in 1928 and was first accredited in 1949.

The world's largest Roman Catholic order dedicated to teaching, the Brothers of the Christian Schools have been working to transform lives for more than 320 years. The order was founded by St. John Baptist de la Salle, who devoted his life to the ministry of Christian education, especially for the poor. Today more than 75,000 lay colleagues work with more than one million students in 80 countries. In addition to elementary and high schools, the "Lasallian" network includes sixty-five colleges and universities worldwide, six in the United States. The Lasallian community strives to understand and live by the five core principles: faith in the presence of God, concern for the poor and social justice, quality education, inclusive community, and respect for all persons.

The mission of Saint Mary's College of California is to probe deeply the mystery of existence by cultivating the ways of knowing and the arts of thinking; to affirm and foster the Christian understanding of the human person which animates the educational mission of the Catholic Church; and to create a student-centered educational community whose members support one another with mutual understanding and respect (**Appendix 1--SMC Mission**).

At Saint Mary's, the liberal arts tradition informs and enriches all areas of learning. The College places special importance on fostering intellectual skills and habits of mind that liberate persons to probe deeply the mystery of existence and live authentically in response to the truths they discover. The College promotes the dialogue of faith and reason, building community among its members through the celebration of the Church's sacramental life, defending the goodness, dignity and freedom of each person and fostering sensitivity to social and ethical concerns. A distinctive mark of a Lasallian school is its awareness of the consequences of economic and social injustice and its commitment to the poor.

Today Saint Mary's College upholds its mission by offering a unique educational experience to a diverse student population of approximately 3,900 students, 36 undergraduate majors and 21 graduate programs in a range of subject areas across four schools: the Kalmanovitz School of Education, the School of Economics and Business Administration, the School of Liberal Arts, and the School of Science.

In addition to distinctive majors, the College offers an intentional, developmental, and integrated undergraduate core curriculum. Two hallmarks of the core curriculum are the Collegiate Seminar, which consists of a series of courses that examine major works of western civilization—literature, philosophy, history, political theory, art and science—and the January Term, a month-long session in which every undergraduate each year explores a single topic in great depth and at an accelerated pace, featuring a unique blend of opportunities on and off campus.

Other pertinent information

We highlight three issues which bear upon the content of this report:

1. Change in administrative leadership since the Fall 2014 accreditation review
2. Adjunct faculty unionization
3. Transition in assessment leadership

Change in administrative leadership

Since the March 2015 CAL, Saint Mary's College (SMC) has undergone significant transitions. In February 2017, SMC hired Dr. Margaret Kasimatis as the new Provost and Vice-President of Academic Affairs to oversee the operational management of the College, with specific responsibility for academic affairs, enrollment, student affairs, and technology. Also during the 2017-18 academic year, two school deans, the Dean of Library, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, and the Vice Provost for Enrollment and Communication left the college. These latter five positions are currently being covered by interim leadership and searches are underway. As we explain later in this report, these developments have led SMC to start new conversations about tenured and tenure-track faculty planning informed by new leadership, changing priorities, and new strategic directions regarding resource management and allocations. The progress we report in addressing the Commission's recommendation to develop a faculty staffing plan therefore should be interpreted with an understanding of these new developments.

Adjunct faculty unionization

In addition to developing a plan for tenured and tenure-track faculty, the Commission recommended that SMC "move from intention to developing a plan to orient and integrate contingent faculty into critical academic program activities." Our ability to develop such a plan, however, has been affected by the fact that SMC's adjunct faculty unionized since our last accreditation review and that a new Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) governs the relationship of adjunct faculty to the College. This new development has affected our plans to orient and integrate contingent faculty into critical academic program activities, and any such plans must incorporate the requirements of the CBA. At this time, SMC is acclimating to this new labor-management arrangement and not pursuing our aforementioned contingent faculty staffing plan.

Transition in assessment leadership

Both the site team report and the Commission Action Letter (CAL) recognized the College's work of improving assessment in part through the hire of the Director of Educational Effectiveness. Besides providing leadership and expertise in assessment planning, this director served as an ex officio member of both the Core Curriculum Committee and the Program Review Committee. The Director, however, left the College in Fall 2015, and this leadership position remained unfilled until the hire of the Director of Assessment in February 2018.

As we note in our report, assessment activity continued throughout the college during this interim 2.5 year period, most notably in the exemplary work of the Core Curriculum Committee and in the program learning outcome (PLO) assessments completed by various departments. However, PLO assessment in particular was not adequately supported during this time with the kind of planning and oversight that a director provides, and not all programs benefited from ongoing annual assessments. Moreover, our work revising our program review processes in order to enhance self-studies with assessment findings was delayed, given that the Director of Educational Effectiveness was assigned the responsibility of developing and implementing new initiatives related to this Commission recommendation. As a result, a

number of the initiatives described in this report to address this specific Commission recommendation originated within this past calendar year.

Response to Issues Identified by the Commission

This main section of the report should address the issues identified by the Commission in its action letter(s) as topics for the Interim Report. Each topic identified in the Commission's action letter should be addressed. The team report (on which the action letter is based) may provide additional context and background for the institution's understanding of issues.

Provide a full description of each issue, the actions taken by the institution that address this issue, and an analysis of the effectiveness of these actions to date. Have the actions taken been successful in resolving the problem? What is the evidence supporting progress? What further problems or issues remain? How will these concerns be addressed, by whom, and under what timetable? How will the institution know when the issue has been fully addressed? Please include a timeline that outlines planned additional steps with milestones and expected outcomes. Responses should be no longer than five pages per issue.

1. Completion, adoption, and implementation of assessment plans for the core curriculum and core competencies

Provide a full description of the issue

The Saint Mary's Core Curriculum consists of twelve learning goals, which students fulfill by successfully completing coursework or co-curricular experiences that are formally designated as meeting a particular learning goal(s). Within each goal are two to five learning outcomes; faculty propose courses/co-curricular experiences for designation as meeting a particular learning goal or goals. These proposals are reviewed by the Core Curriculum Committee for alignment with the goal's learning outcomes; approval of a course/experience for designation triggers catalog updating, enabling student records to reflect satisfaction of appropriate curricular requirements. Faculty members with expertise in learning goal areas serve on goal-specific "Working Groups," each of which is chaired by a member of the Core Curriculum Committee. These Working Groups meet regularly to review applications for designation; to design, implement, and analyze the results of assessment; and to recommend curricular or pedagogical changes to enhance student learning with respect to each working group's assigned core learning goals.

At the time of the Fall 2014 site visit, this newly re-designed curriculum was beginning its third year. Building protocols, policies, and establishing processes for course development and designation had consumed much of the first two years of implementation, and assessment of core learning goals and outcomes was in an emerging stage. Four well-designed pilot assessment projects were underway--one for Critical Thinking; one for Social, Historical, Cultural Understanding; one for Shared Inquiry; and one for the American Diversity learning goal. However, the remaining eight learning goals remained unassessed at that time.

In its report, the visiting team recommended that SMC establish a sustainable, systematic, and appropriately-resourced plan for the ongoing assessment of the core. While recognizing "the elegantly developed design of institutional learning goals," they added that "this structure needs to be further evidenced in assessment plans, rubrics, learning data collection and evidence-based analysis" (Report of

the WASC Team, 2014, p. 22). Following the recommendations of the site visit team, the Commission underscored the college’s need “to take the next step by developing a robust assessment plan” (Commission Action Letter, 2015, p.3). The Commission noted that the college had defined its core learning outcomes and had begun defining benchmarks, but reaffirmed the team’s recommendation: “what is needed now is a more systematic and robust way to use these benchmarks in assessing programs and courses in ways that will lead to curricular improvements and better teaching” (Commission Action Letter, 2015, p.3). The Commission summarized its expectations: “The Commission expects that at the time of the next interaction with WSCUC, assessment plans for the core curriculum and competencies will be completed, adopted, and implemented, with evidence of changes being made as a result of the findings” (Commission Action Letter, 2015, p.3).

Provide a full description of the actions taken by the institution that address this issue

As the following summary demonstrates, SMC has fully addressed the Commission recommendations to develop and execute a plan to assess our core curriculum and to use the findings of these assessments to make changes to our curriculum and assessment methods. The table below summarizes campus activities in the area of core curriculum assessment since 2014. These activities are listed in three categories of particular campus focus: (a) assessment planning, (b) assessment design, and (c) evidence-based analysis and change.

Assessment Planning	
2014-2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working Groups begin designing multi-year assessment project plans.
2015-2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working Group Assessment Project Plans adopted, summer 2016; Core "pathways" evaluation conducted to provide analysis of the arc of SMC students’ engagement with core curriculum, its learning goals, and its requirements.
2016-2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working Group Assessment projects launched; Core "pathways" evaluation report disseminated and discussed
2017-2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working Groups’ assessment projects carried out, with reports delivered to the CCC in June 2018; Curriculum mapping completed and updated to track alignments of Core Learning Goals, core learning outcomes, and course learning outcomes; CCC members and administrators selected for attendance at AAC&U’s 2018 Summer Institute on General Education and Assessment, where they were tasked with designing a six-year Core Curriculum program review process and timeline.

Assessment Design - Rubrics, Assignments, and Artifact Collection

2014-2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● American Diversity working group develops, pilots, fully implements rubric and assignment prompt for assessment of American Diversity outcomes through course-embedded artifacts; ● Social, Historical, Cultural Understanding working group reviews/revises assignment prompts from 2013 assessment to better align with learning goals ● Critical Thinking (CAAP) instrument administered and scored;
2015-2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Community Engagement and Common Good working group develops and introduces Community Engagement/Common Good-specific questions into end-of-term course surveys; ● Collegiate Seminar develops signature assignments for Written Communication and Critical Thinking assessment; ● Course-embedded assignments collected within Writing in the Disciplines courses for evaluation using the Written Communication rubric. Rubric development begins.
2016-2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Rubric is developed for Artistic Understanding learning outcome, and a course-embedded assignment prompt is developed, piloted, and refined; ● Social, Historical, Cultural Understanding group refines its rubric for assessing the second learning outcome; ● Written Communication rubric for Writing in the Disciplines courses is developed in collaboration between CCC, the Composition program the Center for Writing Across the Curriculum, and discipline-based faculty
2017-2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Critical Thinking and Written Communication rubrics are developed, piloted with Fall Collegiate Seminar signature assignments, and adopted and used to assess all Spring Collegiate Seminar 104 classes; ● English Composition faculty design rubrics, collect, and score artifacts from English-004 for analysis of Written Communication, Critical Thinking, and Inclusiveness (a school-based priority), with report submitted to the CCC in May 2018; ● Mathematical Understanding working group develops and articulates benchmark skills for quantitative reasoning, collects and scores artifacts ● Theological Understanding group develops a rubric that maps course-level outcomes to core Theological Understanding--Christian Foundations outcomes and sets benchmarks; Assignment prompts also developed in collaboration with course faculty; faculty-scored artifacts collected and data analysis conducted; ● Artistic Understanding group reviews the previously developed rubric and assessment design; ● Social, Historical, Cultural Understanding group develops rubric for assessing the remaining two Social, Historical, Cultural Understanding benchmarks; ● In consultation with course faculty, the Global Perspectives group develops signature course-embedded prompt and rubric for assessment of the first of two learning outcomes in Global Perspectives;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Artifacts from Writing in the Disciplines courses scored by disciplinary faculty and CWAC staff using Written Communication rubric developed in 2016-17; ● Social, Historical, Cultural Understanding group develops course-embedded assessment prompt and collects/samples artifacts from Fall Social, Historical, Cultural Understanding courses for assessment using the newly-developed rubric; ● Global Perspectives group collects and scores student responses to the Global Perspectives prompt from course faculty; ● Community Engagement and Common Good group collects survey data; ● Information Evaluation and Research Practices group designs and conducts follow-up assessment to inform strategic deployment of library session offerings.
--	--

Evidence-Based Analysis and Evidence-Based Change	
2014-2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● American Diversity group samples and scores artifacts, conducts data analysis and inter-rater reliability analysis, and reports results to the CCC.
2015-2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 2014 Critical Thinking (CAAP) results analyzed, resulting in the consensus that standardized third-party assessments are overly reductive/constraining. Recommending focus on: (a) rubric refinement, (b) developing signature assignments. ● Signature Seminar capstone assignment development in Seminar begins, in response to analysis of Critical Thinking (CAAP) results; ● Collegiate Seminar, English Composition, and Center for Writing Across the Curriculum begin collaborating to better align and scaffold writing instruction and course content across these courses; ● Written Communication: Implementation of Writing Circles in Writing-in-the-Disciplines-designated courses ● Based upon 2013-14 assessment results, English 5 librarians and Composition faculty collaborate to integrate Information Evaluation and Research Practices skill development into coursework and library sessions; Librarians redesign library session content to foreground IERP skills.
2016-2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Core "pathways" evaluation report disseminated and discussed at faculty-wide meetings, at CCC-sponsored meetings of faculty teaching in broad areas of the core, and among Working Groups; ● Piloted structures and arenas for faculty development and consultation, including new faculty orientations, advisor training, and the evaluation of assessment results on the whole and within the clusters of faculty who teach within particular designation areas.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Social, Historical, Cultural Understanding group scored and conducted analysis of assessment of Social, Historical, Cultural Understanding signature assignments
2017-2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Summer retreats held for faculty Working Groups to analyze and develop recommendations based upon the results of outcomes assessment ● Social, Historical, Cultural Understanding group performs descriptive analysis of 17/FA assessments and submits report for CCC/faculty review; ● Global Perspectives group conducts data and inter-rater reliability analysis of course-embedded assessments and submits report with recommendations to the CCC for further dissemination and discussion; ● Community Engagement and Common Good group reviews survey data from 2015-2017, analyzing aggregate data, and reported its analysis and recommendations for curricular changes, process refinements, faculty outreach and development, and institutional support to the CCC for further discussion (note: disaggregation by gender, age, race/ethnicity, classification is a next-step in this analysis); ● Analysis of Written Communication data from Writing in the Disciplines courses evaluates integration of the Center for Writing Across the Curriculum Writing Circles to augment classroom instruction, with report to the CCC submitted end of 2017-18; ● Analysis of Written Communication, Critical Thinking data from English Composition assessments is conducted, including inter-rater reliability analysis. Report is submitted to the CCC in May 2018. ● Social, Historical, Cultural Understanding working group develops proposal for changes to curricular structure based upon the "pathways" evaluation and the assessment of signature assignments in 2016-17; ● Global Perspectives working group develops content and pedagogy recommendations for Global Perspectives-designated courses that respond to the assessed need to further develop students' skills in perspective-taking; ● Following from the "pathways" analysis and its quantitative reasoning assessment results, the Mathematical Understanding group works with the Collegiate Seminar program to incorporate quantitative reasoning content into the required Senior-level seminar course; new content selected, vetted by Seminar faculty, and approved for inclusion; groups begin discussion of embedded assessment design that would allow exit-level assessment of Mathematical Understanding benchmarks in the final Seminar course.

In addition to our work of assessing the core curriculum, we have also improved our capacity to support the Core Curriculum Working Groups. Recently, SMC created a new senior academic leadership position, the Dean of the Core. The position was filled via a national search in 2016-17, and the new Dean assumed the office in July 2017. Also a new Director of Assessment was hired via national search in February 2018. Working with the Core Curriculum Committee and its Working Groups as well as the

Collegiate Seminar Program, the Advising Office, and the Student Success Office, the Director of Assessment and the Dean of the Core provide training, direction, resources, and support for learning outcomes assessment and continuous improvement in curriculum and pedagogy.

Provide an analysis of the effectiveness of these actions to date. What is the evidence supporting progress?

The actions taken have effectively addressed the concerns of the Commission. The new core curriculum is fully implemented; all its learning goals have been assessed (**Appendix 2--Core Curriculum Assessments - Sample**); structures for analysis, discussion, recommendation proposals, and decision-making have been established; curriculum and pedagogy changes have been developed in response to assessment results; changes to curriculum and pedagogy have been implemented or have concrete plans for implementation and evaluation.

Although early in their tenure at SMC, the Dean of the Core and the Director of Assessment have provided support to our work of assessing the core curriculum. In addition to her responsibilities of overseeing the core curriculum, Dr. Mustain has helped the assessment Working Groups identify and recruit new members and developed a new onboarding process for new members that outlines assessment responsibilities. Also, Dr. Hofmann is now providing ongoing training, guidance, and support to the Core Curriculum Working Groups on designing and implementing assessments and on interpreting assessment results (**Appendix 3--CCC - Working Group assessment support**).

A final success indicator of our efforts in assessing the core curriculum is found in our plan for a comprehensive review of the core (**Appendix 4--AACU IGEA Action Plan_Final to CCC**). Having completed a full assessment of the core over the last six years, we are now in a position to benefit from an in-depth and comprehensive review of the core, including its curriculum, learning outcomes, and assessment structures and processes. This plan was developed by a team of faculty members and administrators sponsored to participate in the 2018 AAC&U Summer Institute on General Education and Assessment. We recognize this plan as a culminating piece in developing and formalizing a sustainable process for continuous improvement of the curriculum as a whole and in its parts. This CCC-approved plan will be proposed to and reviewed by the Academic Senate prior to adoption and implementation.

What further problems or issues remain? How will these concerns be addressed, by whom, and under what timetable? How will the institution know when the issue has been fully addressed? Please include a timeline that outlines planned additional steps with milestones and expected outcomes.

Further challenges include improving and clarifying alignments across courses in multiple disciplines and regularizing Core Curriculum Committee and Working Group activities to ensure continuity as committee memberships change. These challenges are constitutive features of curricular work. Left unaddressed they lead to misalignments and inconsistencies in student learning and development and compromise our assessment efforts. But acknowledged and attended to, they serve as positive challenges as we engage in efforts at enhancement, integration, and ongoing revitalization of our curriculum and our students' learning. The college plans to address these challenges through:

1. The creation, approval, and publication of a Core Curriculum Committee handbook that documents committee protocols and policies, including those related to assessing the core. This

work is well underway, with a penultimate draft ready for review, and project completion expected by the end of academic year 2018-19.

2. Together with the support of the office of the Dean of the Core, the Core Curriculum Committee is building an organized electronic repository of files and resource documents. The Core Committee members and each Working Group will have dedicated space in the repository, which will include historical documents and current/working files. The repository is built, populated, and undergoing final review of content and organizational structure by the Core Curriculum Committee in academic year 2018-19.
3. Finally, the maintenance of documents, reports, and plans is meant to ensure Working Groups' ongoing, iterative development and refinement of rubrics and signature assignments

2. Full implementation of the program review timeline and revisions in the program review process to include a greater emphasis on assessment

Provide a full description of the issue

The Commission Action Letter cited two related recommendations regarding SMC's process for program review. The first concerns the need to ensure that all scheduled reviews are completed according to the College's program review timeline. The second concerns the need to revise the College's review process to ensure that assessment results are incorporated into the program self-studies.

Since our accreditation was reaffirmed in Spring 2015, SMC has taken numerous steps and has made good progress addressing these recommendations. The following summary describes and reports our actions into two separate but overlapping series of initiatives. The first focuses on our work to ensure program compliance with our Academic Program Review (APR) timeline, and the second describes our progress to ensure that our APR self-studies are informed by results of faculty assessments of student learning.

Provide a full description of the actions taken by the institution that address this issue

Program Review Timeline Implementation

The College has implemented three initiatives to ensure and support ongoing compliance with the program review timeline:

1. Program sanctions
2. Program review orientation, training, and support
3. Annual program action planning

Program sanctions

During the 2016-17 academic year, the Program Review Committee (PRC) began the practice of requesting the faculty senate to sanction programs that become "delinquent" by submitting their APR self-study more than one calendar year beyond the scheduled submission date. According to a resolution passed in March 2017, sanctioned programs are "prohibited from pursuing any and all Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) actions related to their program until their review has been 'submitted and accepted as satisfactory' by the Program Review Committee" (**Appendix 5--ACT 54 Resol Sanc PRC**). UEPC actions include key program or departmental requests, new course approval, course renumbering or renaming, or program revisions. Since this resolution passed, two delinquent programs have been sanctioned by the senate.

Program review orientation, training, and support

As all SMC faculty understand, developing a comprehensive and detailed self-study is a major time-consuming project that requires effective planning and meaningful collaboration among faculty. Moreover, in order to conduct a thorough and evidenced-based analysis of a program that leads to meaningful program improvements, faculty also rely on the guidance and support of the administration to outline clearly the requirements of these self-studies and the expectations for substantive and reflective evaluations of program strengths and challenges. Absent this guidance and support, programs may find the prospect of completing an APR self-study daunting, especially when such a project competes with the ongoing demands of teaching, research, advising, curriculum development, and other governance responsibilities.

To help mitigate these concerns, the PRC recently augmented the orientation and training it provides programs as they plan and prepare their APR self-studies (**Appendix 6 - Program Review faculty training May 2018**). These trainings, conducted by the PRC chair and the Director of Assessment, have been designed as a step-by-step review of each component of the self-study, including educational effectiveness, curriculum design and pedagogy, and a review of key program data, such as enrollment and retention and graduation rates. These trainings also review exemplary SMC self-studies that exhibit high quality reflection and analyses of critical questions concerning program sustainability and effectiveness. In addition, the Director of Assessment, who serves as a PRC ex officio member, will provide additional trainings on strategies for analyzing, interpreting, and reporting program data and convene mid-year “check-in” meetings to help programs stay on track. We believe these more formal trainings and types of analytical and logistical support will provide faculty with clear direction but also the assurance they will receive adequate support from the administration to complete their self-studies and that these self-study should be seen as a manageable and achievable project.

Annual program action planning

Ensuring compliance with the APR schedule also comes with helping programs develop and execute annual action plans to improve their programs and prepare over time for their next review cycle. SMC’s program review cycle concludes when the program chairs, schools deans, the PRC chair, and Vice-Provost of Academic Affairs agree upon a five-year educational effectiveness action plan to improve the program based on the review findings and recommendations. These action plans translate the evidenced-based findings and recommendations into concrete actions to improve programs but also serve as a bridge to help programs plan and prepare for their next review.

SMC has initiated a new reporting tool and system that will ensure these action plans remain operational and are “refreshed” each year by helping programs document and summarize succinctly what key actions faculty implement. Starting the 2018-19 AY, programs chairs are expected work with the Director of Assessment to develop an annual action plan using a new report template dashboard that centralizes and standardize the reporting process (**Appendix 7--SMC Program Review Action Plan Dashboard**). In addition to streamlining our annual reporting process, we believe this tool will help programs be accountable for the improvement initiatives they identified following their reviews. Moreover we expect this new tool and system will help programs stay on track to anticipate and prepare for succeeding program review self-studies through purposeful, coordinated, and time-bound planning.

Incorporating Assessment into Program Review

In the March 2015 action letter, the WASC Commission cited the findings of the visiting team and supported their recommendation that SMC revise its program review process “to include a greater emphasis on assessment.” Our progress following this recommendation to develop robust and evidence-rich program reviews grounded in student learning results has been defined by a multi-pronged approach to strengthen the assessment-related processes and structures that undergird program review. These include:

1. Revising Academic Program Review (APR) guidelines focusing on educational effectiveness
2. Program review internal and external communications and action planning
3. Assessment planning and support

Each of these initiatives situate assessment as a focal point of program review and affect how faculty develop their program self-studies, how stakeholders provide feedback to programs about these self-studies, and how programs set priorities when developing their educational effectiveness action plans.

Guideline Revisions

The PRC has taken note of the need to modify further the APR guidelines that structure our program review self-studies. The current guidelines for evaluating educational effectiveness instruct faculty to address their assessment activity by asking them to a) reflect on their assessment processes, b) report assessment findings, c) report how they have used these findings, and d) provide evidence if the program changes made based on these findings were effective. While these prompts may be considered adequate in directing programs to address and reflect on assessment processes and results, the PRC observed significant variability in how deeply programs engaged these questions in their respective self-studies as well in the quality of evidence they provided to support claims about educational effectiveness (**Appendix 8—Art and Art History pp. 15-16**); (**Appendix 9 - 2017 JCL Assessment Report 2014**; **Appendix 10 - 2017 JCL Assessment Use of Results**). The PRC also noted that the very formatting on these instructions in the APR guidelines, where the directives cluster into a single and undifferentiated paragraph, do not encourage the types of analytical thinking or critical reflection needed to evaluate a program’s approach to and outcomes of educational effectiveness (**Appendix 11 - —see page 2 of APR Guidelines--updated 12-15-17**).

Based on these observations, the PRC has taken the opportunity to revise the APR guidelines so that they invite more evidenced-based thinking and reflection on student learning and direct faculty to make clear assertions about student achievement (**Appendix 12—see pp. 4-5 of Proposed PRC guideline revisions**). By intentional design, these revised guidelines require a holistic and comprehensive review of educational effectiveness by focusing on in sequential order the program’s learning outcomes, curricular mapping, learning outcomes assessment results, assessment practices (focusing on not only what programs are doing but how they may improve), and action planning. Assessment results within this context are not incidental but rather integral to the evaluation of educational effectiveness.

As of this fall, the proposed guidelines have been approved by both the PRC and Dean’s Council and awaiting final approval from the faculty senate. Once fully implemented during the 2019-20 academic year, we believe these new guidelines will help further achieve our purpose for evidence-based academic program review.

Internal and External Communications and Action Planning

We have identified a second opportunity to incorporate assessment into program review within our internal and external communications and the action plans that flow from these reviews. A recent review of communications from both internal reviewers (PRC and school deans) and external reviewers of program self-studies from 2016-17 showed that these stakeholders often paid less attention to assessment processes and results and instead focused primarily on matters concerning program enrollment, faculty staffing, and program infrastructure. The Committee also found that most of the recommendations for program improvement from both the PRC, school deans, and external reviewers have paid little to no attention to assessment planning or improving assessment systems and likewise focused on logistical, training, or resource issues. In sum, we found that our collective feedback and responses about our program self-studies dedicated an inordinate amount of focus on the conditions or factors affecting program sustainability and considerably less attention to the assessment processes and results that demonstrate student achievement and other measures of educational effectiveness.

Our practices guiding these key communication points have now changed. Starting with an array of program review self-studies submitted during the 2017-18 academic year, assessment results has become a focal point of PRC commentary and formal communications with the programs. For example, all PRC recommendations and action items in Spring 2018 addressed program assessment, whether recognizing the quality or paucity of assessment research completed by the program or other components of assessment planning, such as curricular maps and rubrics (**Appendix 13--2018 PRC Final Letter Art Art History**). In addition, each PRC summary and communication recommended programs work with the Director of Assessment to develop a five-year plan to conduct annual program learning outcome assessments. Moving forward the PRC will also request that all Dean's letters and reports from external reviewers provide commentary and/or feedback about assessment processes and results.

At the same time, annual assessment planning and research is now identified as a common key initiative for all action plans, irrespective of the quality or quantity of the assessment work that informed the self-study. Given that program review is a cyclical process, these action plans serve as the thread that connects to and builds toward the next review. By making assessment planning a staple of all action plans, we intend to accomplish at least two objectives. First, we ensure that programs adhere to a regular research schedule that will yield a robust body of assessment findings that should inform a program's next self-study. Second, we highlight the importance of and help further establish and reinforce a culture of expectation for program assessment.

Assessment Planning and Support

Concomitant with the revised guidelines, internal and external communications, and action planning is our renewed effort to build faculty capacity for ongoing and systematic assessment of program learning outcomes. This fall the Director of Assessment has convened two assessment trainings and will schedule numerous others throughout the year that provide faculty with a step-by-step review of assessment planning (**Appendix 14--Assessment Training - Oct 16 2018**). Besides reviewing the practice of writing learning outcomes, developing curricular alignment maps, and designing and implementing assessments, these trainings will put special attention on strategies for data interpretation and using results to structure curricular improvement, improve teaching, and enhance student learning. This latter phase of the assessment cycle has been identified as an area which faculty have expressed difficulty completing when trying to "close the assessment loop." As with the program review self-study workshops and trainings, the Director plans to use exemplary work completed by Saint Mary's College programs over the last few years to demonstrate and promote quality assessment practices.

Provide an analysis of the effectiveness of these actions to date. What is the evidence supporting progress?

Program Review Timeline Implementation

SMC has achieved measurable progress in ensuring that all scheduled program reviews are completed according to a timeline set by the College. As the table below summarizes, twenty-eight scheduled program reviews have been completed or are about to be completed since the Commission Action Letter from March 2015. Out of these 28 programs, only three were considered “delinquent,” which we define as a program that fails to submit its program review by the deadline (including any extended deadline) for more than one calendar year. Two of these delinquent programs completed their review after only one year of delinquency, and the third is scheduled to complete this fall, also after one year of delinquency. Looking ahead, only one of the 25 programs scheduled for program review over the next two years will be regarded as delinquent. These figures compare favorably to the eight programs in delinquent status just prior to our accreditation visit in Fall 2014.

Table 1: Program Reviews

APR Status	2015 AY	2016 AY	2017 AY	2018 AY *	Total
Completed on schedule or after 1-year deferral	4	5	7	9	25
Completed following 2-year delinquency	1	0	1	1	3
Total	5	5	8	10	28

* Program reviews in process

We are also confident that the combination of our most recent initiatives will coordinate well and have a cumulative effect of helping programs adhere to SMC’s timeline for program review. While the sanctioning authority of the faculty senate provides a clear disincentive to delay reviews, the training, analytical, and logistical support to help faculty plan and prepare for their reviews, conduct annual assessments that inform program self-studies, and streamline their reporting of annual action plans will build momentum and provide regular and ongoing monitoring that will lead to a program review process that is equitable and sustainable.

Incorporating Assessment into Program Review

SMC’s progress incorporating assessment into program review has been hindered since the departure of the College’s Director of Educational Effectiveness (DEE) in Fall 2015. While assessment activity has taken place since then, the consistency and regularity of this work was not maintained and programs lacked the guidance and support due mostly to the leadership vacuum that remained for 2.5 years until the hire of the Director of Assessment in February 2018. As a result, some but not all program review self-studies were able to draw upon of body of assessment research to evaluate educational effectiveness.

As with our work improving compliance with our program review timeline, our initiatives to incorporate better assessment research into program review have been implemented within the last year. One leading indicator these initiatives will be successful is the openness and receptivity faculty and institutional leadership have shown to the APR guideline revisions and to the renewed commitment to provide faculty training and support for assessment.

Moreover, the College has begun to implement a series of measures to build institutional capacity for assessment through training, support, and the promotion of the quality assessment work being completed:

1. As noted above, the new Director of Assessment has begun scheduling a series of trainings for faculty throughout the academic year that will focus on assessment design and implementation while also focusing on strategies for interpreting and using data.
2. In addition to our APR revisions of educational effectiveness, we are finding other opportunities to highlight the importance and priority of assessment. For example, SMC's *Committee on Teaching and Scholarship* recently revised the guidelines and review criteria for faculty teaching grants and developed new evaluation rubrics that focus on learning outcome assessment. All applicants will be offered training opportunities to help prepare their assessments while grant recipients will be required to report within a public setting on their assessment methods and results (**Appendix 15--Faculty Innovative Pedagogy Grant**).
3. The College also has plans to convene an *Assessment Research Colloquium* at the end of the current academic year to recognize and share meaningful assessment research. This colloquium will be a forum in which faculty and staff can share and discuss the results of their assessment work, promote dialogue and learning between and among leaders of curricular and co-curricular programs, and recognize the quality assessment work that our faculty and staff are doing.

What further problems or issues remain? How will these concerns be addressed, by whom, and under what timetable?

Program Review Timeline Implementation

While almost every SMC program has completed or is about to complete a program review since the College's last accreditation review, we continue to face some challenges with regular compliance. As the table below shows, five of eighteen SMC's programs over the last three academic years (AY) deferred for one year before completing their program review. Half of the ten programs scheduled for review for the current 2018-19 academic year had deferred for one year, while only half of the 18 programs up for review during the 2019-20 academic year are on schedule. We recognize that some deferrals may be at risk of becoming delinquent.

Table 2: Program Review Deferrals

APR Status	2015 AY	2016 AY	2017 AY	2018 AY *	2019 AY **	Total
Completed on schedule	4	2	5	4	9	15
Completed following 1-year deferral	0	3	2	5	8	10
Completed following 2-year delinquency	1	0	1	1	1	4
Total	5	5	8	10	18	46

* Program reviews in process

** Program reviews scheduled to be completed during 2019-20 AY

We have observed that a number of these deferrals were due to unplanned changes, such as sudden turnover in faculty leadership, or increased external pressures, such as program accreditation requirements that compete for faculty time and attention. Also, program review involves not only the work of faculty to evaluate the program but also depends on the reviews and assessments of other

stakeholders, such as an external reviewer or the library staff providing its review of library resources and information literacy. For various logistical reasons, the reports of these participants of a program review have on occasion been delayed, slowing or impeding the completion of the self-study and bringing about the need for a deferral. While the external factors are typically outside of the program's control, these latter internal factors that contribute to deferrals can be mitigated. This has led the Program Review Committee (PRC) to revise further the APR guidelines by modifying the sequencing of key program review evaluation activity completed by the faculty so that self-studies are not dependent on the reviews and reports of these stakeholders. Besides allowing programs to complete their self-studies on time, these changes will help the PRC isolate those specific moments in the review process where "breakdowns" occur that slow or delay the timely completion of our program reviews.

How will the institution know when the issue has been fully addressed? Please include a timeline that outlines planned additional steps with milestones and expected outcomes.

We expect to see significant improvement over the next two years in how consistently programs adhere to the program review timelines as well as in the quantity and quality of assessment research that informs the self-studies. Our progress with these outcomes will be measured by making one-year deferrals and especially delinquent reviews the rare exception and by a growing number of evidenced-based evaluations of educational effectiveness that are deeply informed by the results from annual assessments. We will also survey program faculty at the end of this and the following academic year regarding the efficacy of our initiatives. These surveys will ask faculty if they believe they were adequately prepared and supported to produce meaningful and useful program self-studies, and whether the review process itself yielded meaningful and actionable insights about program quality, sustainability, and effectiveness that helped them improve their programs.

3. Faculty Planning

Provide a full description of each issue, the actions taken by the institution that address this issue, and an analysis of the effectiveness of these actions to date.

As a means of helping SMC plan and prepare for program development and staffing, the Commission recommended that institutional leadership commit to developing a faculty staffing plan aligned with degree programs and disciplines. This plan should examine SMC's academic structure and define what the College deems equitable compensation and faculty loads as well as publish clear guidelines that determine the appropriate or optimal number of contingent faculty. Lastly, this plan should organize and concretize the College's intention to orient and integrate these contingent faculty into critical academic program activities, such as assessment, program review, and faculty development.

The summary below describes a number of important initiatives related to faculty planning and includes faculty hiring, compensation, and pay equity.

Provide a full description of the actions taken by the institution that address this issue

Faculty planning

Since the March 2015 CAL, we are pleased to report that we have taken important steps to increase the ratio of courses taught by tenured and tenure track faculty, and we have made measurable gains in this area. Two major issues that have arisen since 2015 have brought change to our overall context: 1) the

adjunct faculty have unionized and a new collective bargaining agreement governs the relationship of contingent faculty to the College, rendering obsolete our earlier plans to integrate adjunct faculty into governance structures; and 2) we have experienced a trend toward flattening (if not decreasing) undergraduate enrollment, making our plans for growth less urgent. It is important to note that these losses at the undergraduate level have been offset by surpluses in graduate enrollment and revenues.

Despite the many resource challenges we – like most institutions of higher education – have faced, we have continued to conduct a number of tenure track hires every year, maintaining our commitment to grow and expand our tenure track faculty. We planfully converted some full time adjunct positions to tenure track to increase our proportion of tenure track faculty. From Fall 2016 to Fall 2017, we raised our overall percentage of tenured/tenure track instruction from 49% to 53%, with undergraduate instruction reaching nearly 60% (**Appendix 17 - Faculty planning**). We have established supplemental pay options in some “hard to hire” areas (primarily in the School of Economics and Business Administration and the Computer Science program in the School of Science) and have allowed more latitude as deans negotiate these agreements. Our current system of tenure track faculty hiring is based in school by school analysis that leads to prioritized requests to the Provost from each dean. These requests are all submitted at the same time so the Provost may consider trends and comparative needs to make decisions that are informed by the full context of any given year’s needs.

The new Provost is building on this already strong model, making it even more strategic as we respond to changes in our student body and enrollments. On a practical level, she is focusing attention on the distribution of faculty lines, the process by which they are allocated, and opportunities to manage resources more strategically. In particular, rather than building new programs that are entirely dependent upon tenure-track faculty, she hopes to preserve our ability to be nimble and adaptive by deploying full-time term faculty under the leadership of a tenure-track faculty member, particularly in graduate and professional programs. Even at the undergraduate level we are seeing some creative staffing ideas, including establishing affiliate faculty relationships across programs and departments, such as between Women’s and Gender Studies, Ethnic Studies, and the Justice, Community, and Leadership program. In addition, we have started to plan for new programs to have “sunset clauses” that will allow the College to evaluate, redesign, and even close programs within a shorter time frame as market variables dictate.

Equitable compensation

Our work evaluating faculty hiring requires us to understand issues of “equity” by looking at both the internal and external aspects of compensation. This is to say we distinguish between *equitable compensation*, which focuses internally on whether salary scales are evenly applied, and the *market rate of compensation*, which focuses externally on how SMC’s salary scale compares to our peers or local competitors. We conclude our compensation policy is equitable insofar as we have a standard salary scale (i.e., without merit pay), and that all tenure track faculty enter and progress along a lock-step pay scale with the same points of review (interim reviews, promotion, tenure, and eventual promotion to full professor, assuming faculty meet established performance standards). As noted above, there are some instances in which “hard to hire” faculty receive supplemental pay in response to market pressures; these rationales are explicated in the Faculty Salary Policy in the Faculty Handbook (**Appendix 16-Faculty Handbook 2018-2019 final--see p. 137**). Additionally, the College added three steps to its Full Professor pay scale to raise compensation rates at that status level.

In terms of our competitiveness with peer institutions, the College’s Faculty Salary Policy has set a goal that average potential faculty salaries at each level (Assistant, Associate, and Full) should be 115% of the

average of our peer institutions. The Policy includes regular review of our relative salary position, allowing the Faculty Salary Task Force to make changes as needed. At this time the College's Faculty Salary Task Force has been re-convened to review and address compensation issues this academic year.

Equitable faculty loads

Our work addressing equitable faculty loads focuses on the evaluation of teaching, research, and service. At the time of the CAL in March 2015, evaluators observed that the instructional load was not shared equally across the College. For example, one area of particular interest has been the workload challenges within the School of Economics and Business Administration (SEBA). Due to the expectations of their accrediting agency (AACSB), SEBA meets the rigorous expectations of AACSB regarding the academic qualifications of the faculty who teach in their program. These program accreditation mandates/requirements increase the burden of SEBA faculty such that during the transition into accredited status, some SEBA faculty offered to teach overloads in order to meet their Academically Qualified (AQ) ratios. At the same time, in order to maintain AQ status, individual faculty must be highly productive in their scholarship. Further, SEBA faculty often teach at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, which might well involve different academic calendars and a range of course schedules, including evenings and weekends. SEBA is currently exploring a better alignment of their graduate and undergraduate calendars, which will improve the teaching schedules of the many faculty who teach at both levels.

We are also addressing the issues related to service inequities college-wide. In particular, the Committee on Committees is doing a comprehensive study of the workloads associated with faculty service obligations and assessing the appropriateness of compensation (in the form of stipends or course releases) for these duties. Likewise, the Committee on Committees is evaluating the relative workloads related to different committee assignments.

Lastly, we are finding opportunities to reallocate instructional resources to improve efficiencies and maximize the capacity of tenured and tenure-track faculty. There are a number of elements that are currently the subject of conversation related to the need for academic policy change and course correction. Chairs and directors of all academic programs have scheduled a series of meetings for Fall 2018 to discuss a range of issues that might lead to more appropriate allocation of academic resources. Review of the student overload policy, course cancellation protocols, compensation for independent studies, and other idiosyncratic policies should lead to significant cost savings. By addressing these interrelated issues, we also will achieve marked improvement in workload equity, including improving the ratios of tenured and tenure-track faculty to adjunct faculty in providing instruction. It is difficult to predict what the change will be until the specific policies are proposed by the appropriate faculty committees during this academic year.

Have the actions taken been successful in resolving the problem? What is the evidence supporting progress?

Our progress in addressing the CAL recommendations can be measured by the collaborative work, organizational assessments, and strategic thinking currently underway regarding how best to address issues regarding faculty hiring, workload, compensation, and overall equity.

At the same time, we recognize that these initiatives are nascent, that our context has changed due to recent developments such as the adjunct faculty collective bargaining agreement, that our new leadership structure will bring important transformation, and thus the effects of our current initiatives

remain to be seen. We are nevertheless confident we are moving thoughtfully and purposefully in the right direction.

What further problems or issues remain? How will these concerns be addressed, by whom, and under what timetable?

As we continue to consider faculty needs related to hiring, workload and compensation, ongoing budget pressures and Bay Area cost of living issues will remain a challenge. Finding a balance between increasing efficiencies and providing an appropriate living wage for faculty of all types will never be achieved with simple decisions. More specifically, we find that housing costs in the Bay Area, whether renting or buying, are highly prohibitive based on our typical faculty and staff salaries. Because housing costs are driving employees farther from the College to find places they can afford to live, transportation and other costs -- such as childcare and eldercare -- become problematic as well. Though the Faculty Salary Task Force and the Faculty Welfare Committee will maintain vigilance on these issues, the Cabinet and Board of Trustees will need to take the lead on managing these elements constantly for the foreseeable future.

In particular, the College needs to identify new revenue streams to support and expand existing programs. The Business and Academic Resources (BAR) Task Force is one new entity created to address issues related to revenue. Additionally, using some of the surplus from graduate program overhead costs, the President and Provost have established an Innovation Fund, which will allocate grants to SMC faculty and staff who have ideas for new revenue generation. We are hopeful that certificate programs, specialized academic offerings, and new graduate programs will be among the many ideas generated through the directives of the BAR Task Force and the incentives provided by the Innovation Fund.

How will the institution know when the issue has been fully addressed? Please include a timeline that outlines planned additional steps with milestones and expected outcomes. Responses should be no longer than five pages per issue

1. 2018-19 AY: Review our current Faculty Salary Policy through the Faculty Salary Policy Task Force. Beginning in Fall 2018, this step should be completed by the end of the Spring semester of 2019. After review, the policy should be in full effect and uncontested by the faculty or administration.
2. 2018-19 AY: Review current academic policies that lead to inefficiencies. Beginning in Fall 2018, chairs and directors will take the lead in course correction on 1) the student overload policy, 2) billing policies related to partial credit courses, 3) course cancellation protocols (related to low enrollment classes), 4) contractual obligations related to independent studies, and 5) overall workload equity. By Spring 2019, new policy proposals should be in place that will allow us to calculate overall savings and effects on distribution of instructional workload.

Identification of Other Changes and Issues Currently Facing the Institution

Instructions: This brief section should identify any other significant changes that have occurred or issues that have arisen at the institution (e.g., changes in key personnel, addition of major new programs, modifications in the governance structure, unanticipated challenges, or significant financial results) that are not otherwise described in the preceding section. This information will help the Interim Report Committee panel gain a clearer sense of the current status of the institution and understand the context in which the actions of the institution discussed in the previous section have taken place.

Please note that these issues were addressed at the beginning of this interim report.

Concluding Statement

Instructions: Reflect on how the institutional responses to the issues raised by the Commission have had an impact upon the institution, including future steps to be taken.

Program Review

As our report hopefully illustrates, our responses to the Commission's recommendations have required us to develop and execute a coordinated tactical plan that addresses the related and inter-relating issues affecting program review, program learning outcome assessment, and core curriculum assessment. With the hire of the Director of Assessment, SMC has taken steps to build institutional capacity for assessment and strengthen its alignment with program review. The Director provides regular and ongoing trainings on how to design and implement learning outcome assessments and has consulted broadly with programs on various assessment projects. The Program Review Committee's revisions to the Academic Program Review guidelines make explicit the expectation that all reviews should draw upon the findings of these annual assessments when evaluating the quality and educational effectiveness of their programs, and faculty now receive more direct training, guidance, and support on how to plan and prepare comprehensive evidence-based self-studies. Taken together these initiatives help program review at SMC continue its essential role of evaluating the quality and educational effectiveness of our academic programs.

Core Curriculum Assessment

Having completed a full assessment of our core curriculum, the Core Curriculum Committee (CCC) is now about to initiate a comprehensive program review that will allow the College to evaluate and improve the systems and structures we have in place to assess the core (**Appendix 4--AACU IGEA Action Plan_Final to CCC**). Meanwhile, the Director of Assessment provides ongoing training and support to the CCC Working Groups as they continue their work of assessing the College's core learning outcomes.

As we worked to address the Commission's call to attend carefully and systematically to the assessment of our new core curriculum, we came to recognize a need to refine and clarify our systems of responsibility for curriculum governance and stewardship. Committee structures that pre-dated the new curriculum caused unnecessary confusion in decision-making, and the regular turnover of membership in the faculty committees and Working Groups charged with developing and assessing the core presented challenges to continuity. Committed to addressing these meta-challenges, we worked at all levels to review, retool, and clarify structures of responsibility; create systems that support continuity of institutional knowledge and decision-making; and enhance coordination and cooperation across the units responsible for carrying out and improving our curriculum.

Among the lasting changes made in the service of the curriculum are: (a) reviewing and refining the membership and charge of the Core Curriculum Committee and its Working Groups to clarify its authority, membership, and intersection with other administrative and faculty governance bodies; (b) creating and hiring a Dean of the Core to support and provide continuity to the Core Curriculum Committee's work; (c) creating a centralized information system to maintain and make available the working documents and records of the Core Curriculum Committee and the Working Groups; and (d) undertaking to document the processes and policies by which the Core Curriculum Committee does its work, enhancing transparency and consistency internally and for our faculty, staff, and students.

Together with the maturing of our assessment processes, these institutional changes provide a strong platform for sustaining our collective efforts at continuous improvement of the core curriculum.

Faculty Planning

Our efforts toward developing a faculty staffing plan coincide and align with the organizational assessments and strategic directions SMC's new Provost and VP of Academic Affairs has begun to implement. This work includes encouraging a fresh new way of estimating resource needs for instruction. Thus, any previously articulated targets for tenure track hiring/instruction are now under review as we re-evaluate our system of deciding about the need for new hires of all kinds. Further, our recognition that any new programs we develop must be flexible and adaptive to changing markets means that we need to build flexibility into our faculty pool as well, whether tenured/tenure track or adjunct. We will continue to use our resources as strategically as possible, given the realities of our current situation.

At the same time, the unionization of adjunct faculty has brought a significant change in direction related to our efforts to incorporate contingent faculty into the structures of decision-making at the College. The Collective Bargaining Agreement into which we have entered has established safeguards related to the use of adjunct faculty time and therefore complicates our ability to incorporate adjuncts into meetings and gatherings that are not required for the delivery of their contractual obligations. We will continue to work to foster warm and welcoming relationships among various types of faculty within and among departments, but our previously stated goals are no longer viable.