EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As part of a more extensive overall review of payroll processes, the OHE Internal Audit Department reviewed the Community College of Rhode Island’s (CCRI) faculty assignment practices to evaluate whether these practices:

- Were in line with contract guidelines and industry standards
- Provided for the effective and efficient utilization of faculty

Our review indicated several opportunities for improvement.

- Current teaching assignment practices for full-time and adjunct faculty are controlled by elected department chairs, are not consistent across the College, and often are not in accordance with the faculty collective bargaining agreement or higher education industry norms. Teaching assignment and course scheduling processes are controlled by the elected department chairs and are not standardized across the College. Together, these conditions have resulted in some full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, and staff members teaching significantly higher than normal course loads with consequent potentially negative effects on the quality of instruction and other institutional responsibilities.

- Hiring and assignment processes for adjunct faculty are decentralized and vary among departments. The involvement of the Human Resources Department and Affirmative Action Officer in this process is limited. Current practices have restricted the pool of eligible adjunct faculty and contributed to some significantly higher teaching loads and lack of faculty diversity.

- The College lacks adequate management information reporting on class scheduling and faculty teaching loads. The lack of such information makes it extremely difficult to effectively manage a faculty of approximately 700 full-time and adjunct instructors.

Existing faculty assignment practices developed over time and often appear to reflect the faculty’s efforts to respond to constraints such as FTE caps on full-time faculty, non-competitive salaries, and skill shortages in various technical fields. Confusion among faculty concerning a one time waiver on overload limits included in the 1990-1992 contract and a lack of consensus on the meaning of some other contract terms may have also contributed to extremely high overload assignments.

The report findings and recommendations, detailed in the DISCUSSION section, have been discussed with College management. They originally agreed to provide a detailed plan of action and milestones with a goal of full implementation of all report recommendations by September 2005. The plan has not been submitted to date. While the issues listed above have been discussed within the College for some time, most recently
during the Spring 2004 NEASC accreditation process, a consensus has not been fully reached on resolving them.

In recognition of the urgency of the issues involved, the College also agreed to start implementing, on an expedited basis, those recommendations not requiring full-time faculty involvement/consultation, e.g., use of CCRI administrative staff as instructors during normal business hours, policy on adjunct faculty workload, and a formal exception process for approving teaching loads above contract or policy limits.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

The College agrees with the report’s recommendations and is planning, developing, and implementing the policies, procedures, and systems needed to respond appropriately. The policies needed to support the recommendations will be implemented by the start of the Fall 2005 semester. And, the related procedures and practices will be implemented beginning in the Fall 2005 semester and phased in over subsequent semesters until full compliance with the college’s newly developed policies is attained.

In order to fully implement all of the report’s recommendations, the administration will charge the Faculty Assignment Management Team to develop a detailed plan of action with corresponding timelines. However, prior to the plan’s full development, the administration must complete the collateral steps required to support the plan’s successful implementation. These steps include:

- developing and analyzing data reports that specify the scope and extent of the faculty assignment practice issues;
- working with the department chairs to identify unique underlying departmental issues and needs;
- creating a recruitment, hiring, and orientation plan to attract sufficient numbers of new adjunct faculty;
- fully implementing the college’s new management information system;
- assessing the need for new and reallocation of existing human resources and administrative staff to manage the required change initiatives.

The finalization of this report and the college’s proactive response are important first steps to address the issues related to the faculty assignment process. However, the fundamental operating conditions that led to and continue to promote the heavy reliance on teaching overloads by all categories of faculty remain. These externally driven issues include the college’s constrained state funding, FTE cap limitations, full-time faculty compensation levels, noncompetitive adjunct faculty salaries, unique departmental course scheduling constraints, and vague collective bargaining contract language. These significant organizational and structural issues will need to be addressed by the college administration in partnership with the Board of Governors.
OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The objectives of the review were to evaluate whether existing CCRI faculty assignment practices:

- Comply with contract guidelines and industry standards
- Provide for the effective and efficient utilization of faculty

The scope of the review included interviewing management, department chairs, and other staff to determine existing processes, practices, and issues. Contract documentation, management information systems, and applicable professional references were also reviewed. Faculty scheduling and payroll data for the 2003 summer session and the 2003-2004 academic year were tested.

BACKGROUND

Current faculty assignment practices have developed over an extended period of time. Most department chairs interviewed saw them as practical responses to dynamic and often short fused scheduling requirements, FTE caps on full-time faculty hiring, perceived non-competitive salaries, skill shortages in various technical fields, and sometimes unatractive teaching schedules.

CCRI negotiates collective bargaining agreements for its full-time faculty with the Faculty Association (NEA/CCRIFA). The latest contract has expired and a new one is currently being negotiated.

The last several faculty collective bargaining agreements stipulate, with certain specified exceptions, that all full-time faculty maintain a weekly schedule of 12-16 clock hours and a minimum of 4-6 office hours. Clock hours are not defined. The only management report listing teaching workloads, the Faculty Load List (FLL), is designed for payroll purposes and does so by contact hours, which do not correlate directly to contract clock hours. For purposes of this review, the contact hours reported on the FLL have been converted to equivalent semester contact hours on the basis of one FLL contact hour per week for 15 weeks of classes equals an equivalent semester contact hour.

There are no specific scheduling guidelines for adjunct faculty, including full-time College non-faculty staff teaching adjunct classes, in the collective bargaining agreement nor is there an institution policy in this area. Overload courses are taught in excess of the standard workload for full-time faculty or taught by adjunct faculty. They are usually taught during summer, evening, and weekend sessions, but, in case of need, may also be taught during the regular school day. Overload courses are paid on CCRI’s internal monthly lecturers’ payroll.

Full-time faculty have first priority to teach overload courses but are generally limited by contract to a maximum of 11 contact hours and 3 courses per semester and a total of 18 contact hours and 5 courses per academic year. For summer sessions, faculty members
may teach a maximum of two courses with a minimum of one office hour for every three hours of teaching.

The 1990-1992 contract contained a one-time only alteration of the collective bargaining agreement lifting the cap on the overload maximum. This was in response to a State mandated salary reduction plan imposed to alleviate financing problems. As a result of an OHE Internal Audit Department review in 1997, the contract was amended to provide for approval of exceptions to the overload limits by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. However, there currently is no defined process in place for such approvals.

Public higher education industry norms indicate that faculty workweeks consist of both direct classroom hours and significant other hours outside the classroom. A 1999 US Department of Education (DOE) national study of postsecondary faculty indicated that the average workweek for full-time instructional faculty at public two year institutions was 49 hours including 17 hours of actual teaching (about 5.7 three credit courses). Generally, most of the remaining 32 hours of the average workweek are spent on other institutional responsibilities, which typically include:

- Participating in departmental meetings and on College-wide committees
- Preparing course materials and syllabi
- Developing and grading exams and evaluating student performance
- Meeting with students outside of class
- Responding to student Emails and other correspondence
- Arranging labs, studios, and field trips
- Writing letters of recommendation for students
- Developing new courses or restructuring the curriculum
- Keeping current with professional developments
- Engaging in community service

The DOE study is in line with the results from other national, state, and system studies. For example, the Rhode Island College faculty collective bargaining agreement also includes a basic formula that requires two hours of additional work for each formal class hour.

**DISCUSSION**

**FACULTY TEACHING LOADS**

Current faculty course assignment practices for both full-time and adjunct faculty primarily are controlled by elected department chairs, not by College management. Such assignment practices are not consistent across the College and, frequently, are not in accordance with the Faculty Association (NEA/CCRIFA) 2000-2003 collective bargaining agreement guidelines or higher education industry norms.

Non-compliance with the contract has resulted in some full-time and adjunct faculty, including full-time College administrative staff, teaching significantly higher course
loads than normal with consequent potentially negative effects on the quality of instruction and the performance of other College responsibilities.

As noted in other sections, management information on faculty teaching loads is limited and the faculty contract lacks a standard definition of a classroom hour. For testing purposes, a stratified sample of 49 full-time faculty with high academic year contact hour totals on the Faculty Load List was selected and those totals converted to equivalent semester contact hours (ESCH) with each contact hour per week for fifteen class weeks equaling one equivalent semester contact hour. For example, 3 contact hours taught for 15 weeks would equal 3 equivalent semester contact hours (one three credit course).

The contract provides for a normal teaching load of 12 to 16 hours (4-5 courses) per semester or 24-32 hours (8-10 courses) for the full academic year. In addition, the contract allows full-time faculty to teach up to 18 hours or five courses of overload during the academic year. If a faculty member taught the maximum allowed by the contract, generally 50 hours (32 normal plus 18 overload), it would translate to about 8 courses per semester. This is significantly higher than the national average community college teaching load of 17 hours (about 5.7 courses) per semester.

We reviewed the teaching schedules for the 2003-2004 academic year of 49 full-time faculty with high contact hour totals. Of these, 38 faculty (78%) taught more than the maximum 50 total regular and overload hours allowed by the contract. The range went from a high of 86 hours annually, the equivalent of 14 three credit courses per semester, to a low of 51 hours annually, slightly above 8 three credit courses per semester. Details of the distribution are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESCH per Academic Year*</th>
<th># of 3 Credit Course Equivalents per Academic Year*</th>
<th># of 3 Credit Course Equivalents per Semester</th>
<th># of Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80 hours plus</td>
<td>Greater than 26</td>
<td>Greater than 13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79 hours</td>
<td>23-26</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69 hours</td>
<td>20-23</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-59 hours</td>
<td>17-19</td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excludes Summer sessions.

The sample reviewed represented thirteen of the twenty-two academic departments. All had exceptions to either the annual 50 hour maximum teaching load and/or the 18 hour overload maximum.

The College also lacks standard policies governing adjunct faculty teaching assignments, including limitations on full-time temporary positions and full-time staff teaching adjunct courses. Some departments have developed their own written procedures. All full-time College administrative and professional staff teaching adjunct courses during normal business hours are required to secure prior approval from the Vice President of Business
Affairs. Employees in such cases normally charge vacation for the time spent teaching. Approval is in the form of a letter from the individual or their supervisor requesting such a waiver. Three such approvals were on file for the 2003-2004 academic year. The approvals were retroactive. Two cases were initially noted by manual reviews performed by the Business Office.

While the College has no standard policy on the subject, the NEASC Self-Study 2004 defined adjunct faculty members as:
- Teaching a part-time load of less than 12 contact hours
- Being hired on a semester-to-semester basis to meet student enrollment demands
- Not belonging to a bargaining unit

The lack of a standard College policy in this area increases the risk that the above criteria will not be understood or complied with across the College.

The actual status of some College adjunct faculty also may risk non-compliance with the RIBGHE Personnel Policy Manual. The manual provides that all limited period appointments of at least six months duration and 20 hours per week (57% of a typical 35 hour full-time work week) are eligible for benefits in the same manner as those given to permanent employees in similar positions.

Department chairs indicated that some adjunct faculty is hired on a regular basis over a period of years. Per the collective bargaining agreement, the normal teaching workload for permanent faculty ranges between 12 and 16 clock hours. A partial review of the 2003-2004 academic year Faculty Load List disclosed 10 examples of adjunct faculty teaching more than 18 ESCH (6 courses) per year, or an average 9 ESCH (3 courses) per semester. This could be interpreted to mean a 9 ESCH adjunct teaching schedule is the equivalent of between 56% and 75% of a permanent faculty member’s full-time schedule. The range in the sample was from 18.8 ESCH (6 courses) to 55.8 ESCH (18 courses) annually. One of the examples noted was a full-time College employee teaching 26.6 ESCH annually, the equivalent of 13 credit hours per semester (4 courses).

With some adjunct faculty being hired over extended periods and having such significant teaching loads, questions about their appropriate employee status may arise. Implementation of a clear College policy on employee status that complies with all applicable laws, regulations, and policies would prevent issues from arising in this area.

A similar lack of compliance with contract terms and policy on adjuncts exists during summer sessions, except that summer courses are taught exclusively on an overload basis. The collective bargaining agreement provides that full-time faculty may volunteer to teach no more than two courses within their assigned discipline during the summer session. No limitation on clock hours is stated. For testing purposes, two courses were assumed to be equal to 8 ESCH, i.e., two four credit courses.

A stratified sample of 20 faculty, full-time and adjunct, who had 24 or more contact hours listed was selected from the Faculty Load List Data for the summer 2003 session.
Contact hours were then converted to ESCH to account for the differing durations of summer courses. All twenty faculty taught more than two courses. However, many of the courses taught appeared to be specialized and shorter than typical three or four credit courses. Nineteen of the twenty faculty taught more than the equivalent of 8 credit hours per semester. The range was from 9.6 ESCH to 22 ESCH. Five faculty taught at least 15 ESCH.

Two critical faculty management controls provided for in the collective bargaining agreement are not functioning effectively. While the contract provides for exceptions to maximum workloads with the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, there is no process to enforce this control. A second critical control, the requirement for all department schedules to be submitted to the responsible dean for approval, is also ineffective. Instead of preparing master course schedules several months prior to the upcoming semester in order to use them as a basis for determining faculty staffing requirements, department chairs traditionally submit their faculty assignment schedules to their respective dean after the start of classes with faculty already assigned. This practice limits management revisions except at the risk of seriously impacting students already enrolled in on-going classes. It also contributes to very high faculty teaching loads in some cases by eliminating lead time for determining and filling faculty staffing requirements.

The College also does not have management information systems that link faculty workload to effectiveness or performance measures. The DOE study referred to in the BACKGROUND section noted a roughly two to one ratio of other work hours to teaching hours (185%). Applying this percentage to an average maximum normal contract teaching load of 25 ESCH (50 hour annual limit divided by two) produces a total workweek of 71 hours to teach 8 three credit courses. As discussed above, the stratified sample of 49 full-time faculty included 38 with teaching loads higher than this. Using the DOE guidelines, the highest teaching load sampled extrapolates out to about 125 total work hours per week. These extrapolations illustrate the unusually high level of some current faculty schedules and the lack of effective management control over the situation. While the effects of current practices on quality of instruction or impact on other College responsibilities cannot be objectively measured at this time, the risk of a significant negative effect on one, the other, or both areas appears high.

Before overload courses are scheduled, the College may have an opportunity to reduce excessive teaching loads and overload costs by ensuring that full-time faculty teach the maximum load allowable under the contract. This load is generally 16 class hours (5 courses) or 12 hours (4 courses) for the English department faculty who teach at least two writing courses. From sampled data, it appears that almost all English faculty teach only 12 hours though not all teach the required two writing courses.

The issue of normal and excess faculty workloads is further complicated by an apparent widespread misunderstanding of the current collective bargaining agreement terms and definitions by faculty members. Management should consider providing additional orientation or information to the faculty. In the long term, management should also
consider clarifying various contract terms and conditions, e.g., definitions of normal faculty work schedules and clock hours, during its normal collective bargaining process.

In summary:
- Department chairs, elected by the faculty they oversee, have near complete control over faculty scheduling, full-time and adjunct, in their departments.
- Contract provisions are interpreted and understood differently across the College. Some critical provisions are either ignored or not complied with by some department chairs.
- There are no standard College policies or procedures governing adjunct faculty selection or assignments, including full-time College non-faculty staff teaching adjunct courses.
- The College does not consistently comply with its definition of adjunct faculty, e.g., teaching a part-time load of less than 12 contact hours. This may raise questions about the appropriate employment status of such employees.
- Actual scheduling and assignment practices vary between departments. Master class schedules are not developed in a timely manner and used to determine and manage faculty staffing requirements. There also is no standard definition of normal or exceptional faculty workweeks, although most departments interviewed said they applied a subjective reasonableness test.
- Full-time faculty need additional orientation on the collective bargaining agreement terms and conditions and some contract terms and conditions should be clarified.
- Overall, College management lacks the policies, procedures, and information systems in place to effectively manage class scheduling and faculty assignments.

**Recommendation #1:**
The College should provide additional orientation to the faculty on current collective bargaining agreement terms and conditions and require compliance with them to ensure that teaching workloads are reasonable and to provide faculty with adequate time within the workweek for other College responsibilities.

**Management Response:**
The college agrees that current and new faculty members require additional knowledge and understanding of the current collective bargaining agreement. The administration plans to involve the faculty union in this process.

- Management will work with the union and legal counsel to obtain clarification on specific collective bargaining articles. Such articles needing clarification and interpretation include a clear definition of contact hours, definition of summer semester/summer term, hours associated with lecture/lab/clinical assignments, and workload responsibilities, (e.g., office hours, committee work, curriculum development advising). Management will begin clarifying these issues beginning Spring 05 and continue until agreements can be reached among the various parties. Wherever possible, we will develop
informal agreements to expedite implementation, however, in some areas collective bargaining may be required to inform and finalize the process.

- The administration will schedule meetings with the union leadership to discuss greater union responsibility for providing faculty with ongoing opportunities to review and discuss the contract language, particularly regarding faculty workload and overload. The administration will request that this process begin during Fall 2005 and continue as needed.
- The administration will review with the department chairs the policies and procedures corresponding to the contract language on faculty workload and overload that require further clarification and documentation. This step will be ongoing until all outstanding issues are resolved.
- A goal of the college’s recent strategic plan is to develop an orientation program for all new employees that will include an overview of union contracts. When the new Director of Human Resources is hired, development of this aspect of the employee orientation program will be a priority. It is anticipated that this project will be initiated by December 2005.

**Recommendation #2:**
The College should implement, not later than for the summer 2005 semester, an effective and documented management approval process for exceptions to contract provisions on teaching loads.

**Management Response:**
The College will develop an effective and documented management approval process for exceptions to the contract provisions on teaching loads during summer 2005. The new policy and related procedures will be implemented for the Fall 2005 semester. The establishment of an effective management approval process to track faculty teaching loads and approve overload exceptions requires ongoing access to a fully integrated relational database that provides accurate and timely reports. The reporting process will need to interface in a timely manner with the extensive effort required of the 22 department chairs to schedule more than 700 full- and part-time faculty across four campuses, two satellites, and numerous business and industry sites.

- The vice president for academic affairs convened a meeting of the deans and department chairs in February 2005 to outline the core issues of this audit report and discuss its recommendations, existing procedures for assigning overload, and timelines for implementation.
- The academic deans have conducted follow-up meetings throughout the Spring 2005 semester with their respective department chairs to review current overload practices and will continue to discuss appropriate strategies to address appropriate overload teaching.
- Although language had been inserted in the 1997 faculty collective bargaining contract giving the vice president of academic affairs responsibility for approving faculty overload exceptions, a formal procedure with consistent and appropriate levels of oversight had not been developed at that time. Current
academic administration has developed a formalized management approval policy and set of procedures to approve exceptions to the contract provisions on teaching load. The academic deans are reviewing these procedures with their department chairs for implementation in the beginning of the Fall 2005 semester. Given the reliance of overload across all categories of faculty to deliver the ambitious array of course offerings, management will need to balance the full implementation of this policy with student enrollment patterns and course demands.

- A teaching load tracking system is under development to provide automated reports for the vice president, deans, and chairs to use in their decision-making (see Recommendation #6).
- The management information system used to develop and generate reports will be made available by May 2005. A management reporting and review process to track all teaching assignments will be implemented for the beginning of the Fall 2005 semester.

Recommendation #3:
The College should promulgate and implement, not later than for the Summer 2005 semester, a policy that clearly defines adjunct status, establishes reasonable standards for adjunct faculty teaching workload, defines limits on full-time College non-faculty staff serving and being paid as adjunct faculty, and provides for management approval of teaching load exceptions prior to the finalization of departmental schedules.

Management Response:
Over the years the College has become increasingly dependent upon part-time faculty, especially during periods of lean budgets and constricted FTE. As a result, with few written policies and procedures for guidance, excessive teaching loads for adjunct faculty members have occurred, often as a responsive strategy to provide teaching coverage for the courses needed by our students.

- The administration and legal counsel have begun discussions regarding federal, state, and BOG statutes relative to the employment status of adjunct faculty and the implications for assigning teaching load. The college will use the pending written opinion of legal counsel to develop a “less than half time” teaching policy. This policy will become effective beginning Fall semester 2005 semester, but full compliance with the new policy will require a phase-in period of several semesters in conjunction with the implementation of a robust adjunct faculty recruitment effort.
- The President’s Council has developed and approved a policy regulating full-time non-faculty staff that teach as adjunct faculty members and receive additional compensation. A corresponding approval process to monitor this policy has been developed and will be disseminated in summer 2005. A copy of the policy will be sent to the Office of Higher Education by June 1, 2005. Full implementation of this policy will begin in Fall 2005.
Faculty who are employed under a full-time temporary appointment will be limited to a normal full teaching load of 12-16 contact hours. An exception approval process similar to that used for full-time faculty will be implemented for this category of faculty (see Response #4). This policy will be in effect for the beginning of the Fall 2005 semester.

**Recommendation #4:**
Effective for the summer 2005 semester, the master schedule, including faculty assignments for the upcoming semester, for the summer session should be submitted by May of each year. Effective for the Fall 2005 semester, the College should require that master schedules, including faculty assignments for the upcoming semester, be submitted for deans’ approval by November and March of each year for the upcoming Spring and Fall Semesters respectively. When adequate management reporting is in place, the deans’ review should be expanded to ensure that other sensitive areas are covered. These include:

- Full-time faculty being assigned maximum regular schedules before overload classes are scheduled
- Full-time College non-faculty staff not teaching or being paid overload classes scheduled during their normal workday, unless properly authorized

**Management Response:**
A key element to effectively managing the faculty teaching load process is accessing accurate and timely reporting information to support appropriate planning and decision-making. Course scheduling and faculty assignments begin many months prior to the semester start-up and are ongoing in the months that follow. This scheduling and assignment process through the first day of classes to accommodate enrollment fluctuations, student course demands, and required or emergency faculty replacement needs.

- The academic deans are working with their respective department chairs to determine whether May of each year is the optimal time to submit the master schedule and faculty assignments for the college’s summer sessions. Initial discussions indicate that March may be a more suitable date. A final decision will be made during the Spring 2005 semester.
- The administration supports the recommendation for submitting faculty teaching assignments by specific dates, such as November and May of each year, for the upcoming Spring and Fall semesters, respectively. Discussions are ongoing with the department chairs to develop strategies to support some of the unique considerations in their departments, such as course credit configurations, faculty campus assignment coverage, and faculty availability in high demand areas. A policy reflecting the timelines for each semester and summer sessions will become effective by the beginning of the Fall 2005 semester.
- The new faculty teaching load reporting system will support the academic deans’ ability to ensure that full-time faculty members are assigned full regular teaching schedules in accordance with the faculty union contract.


before overload classes are scheduled. The monitoring and control of teaching assignments for non-faculty staff will become effective by the beginning of the Fall 2005 semester (see Recommendation #3).

ADJUNCT FACULTY SELECTION AND ASSIGNMENT

The College needs to improve the recruiting and assignment process for adjunct faculty. In terms of numbers, adjunct faculty comprise a majority of the existing faculty (426 of a total faculty of 712 for the Fall 2003 semester) and provide a vital, flexible resource to meet the fluctuating instructional requirements of the College. Their importance is magnified by the long-standing state mandated FTE restrictions on the number of full-time faculty and increased student enrollment.

Currently, there is no standard method for recruiting adjunct faculty and the Human Resources Department and the Affirmative Action Officer play almost no role in the process. Individual department chairs are responsible for selecting qualified adjunct faculty. Most appear to rely on a network of professional and personal contacts to identify eligible candidates. Occasionally, some advertising is used. The department chairs determine qualifications and are responsible for interviewing, selecting, and indoctrinating new adjunct faculty.

These practices have developed over time and are seen by most department chairs as a practical way to resolve recruiting constraints, e.g., FTE caps on full-time faculty, non-competitive salaries, skill shortages in various technical fields, and short fused, unattractive scheduling requirements.

However well intentioned, the current non-standard adjunct recruiting practices need to be upgraded. They appear to be labor intensive for department chairs, subjective, and may cause legal and compliance issues. They also limit the potential pool of eligible candidates and affect the College’s ability to address critical skill shortages, fill difficult time slots, and increase faculty diversity.

Recommendation # 5:
The College should develop and implement, by the Fall 2005 semester, a standard, transparent process for hiring qualified adjunct faculty to:

- Expand the pool of eligible adjunct candidates
- Increase administrative processing efficiency
- Actively involve the Human Resources Department and Affirmative Action Officer to ensure that all applicable laws and regulations are complied with

Management Response:
Every semester, the College must hire and manage over 400 adjunct faculty members, with the need to recruit additional adjunct faculty being stimulated by specific program needs. To reduce excessive overload teaching, the college will
need to intensify its recruitment of additional qualified full- and part-time faculty across more programs to compensate for the anticipated teaching load shifts.

- During Spring 2005, the academic deans, in consult with their department chairs, are reviewing teaching assignment reports to determine the amount of excessive overload in each program area. This baseline will be used to determine the level of need to increase full- and part-time faculty or other such adjustments for each program.
- Discussions among the vice president for academic affairs, the academic deans, and office of personnel are underway to develop appropriate strategies to increase the adjunct pool. The Affirmative Action Officer will work in conjunction with the Office of Human Resources to ensure compliance with appropriate laws and statutes to maximize the diversity of the adjunct pool. A written strategy and plan for increasing the size of the adjunct pool, especially for high demand areas, will be developed to provide needed staffing for the start of the Fall 2005 semester. A copy of the strategy and plan will be forwarded to the Office of Higher Education by July 1, 2005. For the Fall 2005 semester the number of adjunct faculty will increase as a result of these efforts.

MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS

The College needs more effective management information tools to manage master schedules of classes and monitor faculty workload and performance.

As previously discussed, the College lacks an effective master class scheduling process and does not produce final master class schedules until after the semester begins. The only faculty assignment management information report available to monitor these processes is the Faculty Load List (FLL) Report. This report’s primary purpose is to authorize payroll and it’s not an effective personnel management tool. The FLL’s unit of measure, the contact hour, is not defined in relation to the clock hour used in the collective bargaining agreement. While the FLL displays individual faculty teaching assignments by department in considerable detail, it doesn’t provide summaries or exception reports to highlight critical information or overall patterns. Department chairs perform the primary review and approval of the reports. Only the courses related to individual departments are listed on the department chair’s report. In some cases, faculty may teach in more than one department. The result is a report that is ineffective for overall personnel management.

Some departments have student feedback surveys and a professional review system, but there is no practical way, at this point, to correlate individual teaching workloads and specific student outcomes and other performance indicators. Nor is there a mechanism to relate payroll data to labor distribution to determine how the expenditure of resources aligns with management goals and priorities. The payroll system also lacks system controls, e.g., to flag or deny unusually high course loads or large payments.
Consequently, management lacks effective information to proactively identify and manage class scheduling and overall faculty assignments, e.g., unusually high individual schedules, scheduling patterns within and across departments, and correlations between teaching loads and student outcomes. The College intends to address these issues as part of its ongoing implementation of the new Banner/SCT management information system. However, during the interim, consideration should be given to developing cost effective summary level reports of critical information. Such reports would allow management to quickly identify potential issues in teaching assignments. Payroll system controls should also be implemented to prevent or identify inputs or payments beyond specified maximums.

**Recommendation #6:**
As part of its overall administrative systems implementation, the College should develop a suite of class scheduling and personnel management reports to assist in effectively managing faculty assignments. In the short-term, the College should investigate developing cost effective, temporary personnel management reports in critical areas, e.g., summary level faculty utilization rates and faculty teaching schedules outside of specified norms. As noted in Recommendation #4, the College should implement a process, by May 2005 for the summer 2005 session, for proactively issuing master schedules of classes.

**Management Response:**
With full implementation of CCRI’s new Banner system, the College will finally gain the necessary management information systems to administer, support, and effectively monitor the faculty assignment process. The academic administrative staff had worked closely with the Banner design team and the SCT Banner consultant to ensure that the appropriate suite of management reports will be developed and made readily accessible.

- The Banner Student System went “live” mid-March 2005, and the College has recently generated some reports to test the tracking system’s adequacy. We anticipate that the validation and testing will be completed in May 2005.
- All academic deans, chairs, and support staff will need to participate in training in order to effectively understand and utilize the new tracking system and its ability to generate monitoring reports. The training materials will be available in May 2005.

**Recommendation #7:**
System controls should be implemented over sensitive payroll transactions, e.g., faculty workloads above specified levels and payments to College non-faculty staff for classes taught during normal work hours. Exception reports of such transactions should be provided to management.
Management Response:
By implementing the procedures outlined in response to Recommendation 1, 2, 3, and 6, monitoring mechanisms will be in place for the sensitive payroll transactions at the Vice President, academic dean, and department chair levels, as appropriate.

- The Banner Human Resources system, that includes the payroll modules, is scheduled for implementation in January 2006. Until that transition takes place, the mechanism to monitor these sensitive payroll transactions will be performed manually. This monitoring will be in place by the beginning of the Fall 2005 semester.
- The implementation of the Banner Human Resources system will include the automation of this manual payroll monitoring process.

PROJECT TEAM
Implementing the recommendations on more efficient faculty scheduling, standardizing adjunct faculty selection, hiring, and scheduling practices, and improving management information systems will entail significant process improvements and a major cultural change across the College. While the proposed recommendations are intended to improve faculty assignment procedures by increasing effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability, they represent a radical departure from current practice.

Successfully accomplishing such extensive change is difficult in any organization. In an organization such as the College, already dealing with other recent organizational initiatives and compensation issues, successful change management is likely to be especially challenging. To increase the chances for success and to shorten the time required to achieve it, the College should consider using an adequately resourced project team with an experienced team leader and employing recognized project management disciplines, to manage the change process. Such an approach is most likely to achieve the maximum possible faculty and staff buy-in to the recommended changes within a reasonable time frame.

Recommendation #8:
The College should consider using a project management approach to implement the review’s recommendations.

Management Response:
The College is currently working toward the full implementation of the recommendations of this report. The scope and complexity of this multi-faceted issue will require a phased in process to come into full compliance in order to ensure that the College is responsive to student course needs and scheduling demands. The breadth of the recommendations necessitates the formation of a management team with representation from the academic, administrative, and
information technology areas of the college. This team will assume an essential role in implementing, monitoring, and continuously improving the new system.

- The management team will consist of representatives from academic administration, department chairs, the offices of information technology, controller, personnel, and affirmative action. We request that the Office of Higher Education assign a representative to the team to serve as a technical resource for review, comment, and consultation. The team will be established and convened in May 2005.
- This management team will regularly make progress reports to the President who, in turn, will make status reports to the Board of Governors.
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