

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Recognition should go to Dean Anderson for his direction in this project and to the Steering Committee for their hard work in grappling with the topics under discussion. Particular recognition should go to Barbara Davey and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee for their work. The editing skills of Bob Shepard and Elaine Case are evident in the product.

STEERING COMMITTEE

Patricia Bruneau-Gaber, Chairperson	Associate Dean, Extended Learning
Phill Anderson	Dean of Instructional and Student Services
Ray Daniels	Professional Technical Faculty
Mary Jane Fisher	Director, Coos Cooperative Library Services
Kirk Jones	Head Librarian
Dan Kelly	Physics and Mathematics Faculty, Director, Title III Project
Ron Pullen	Mathematics Faculty
Melanie Schwartz	Art Faculty
Jean von Schweinitz	Associate Dean, Student Services/Registrar

COMMITTEES

1. Institutional Effectiveness and Program Review: Phill Anderson, Steering Committee Liaison

Barbara Davey
Steve Bodnar
Hunter Fales
Sheila Ward
Steve Erickson
Professional Technical Faculty

Jean von Schweinitz
Kathy Wright
Mike Gaudette
Ron Pullen
Avis Dowers
Laura Devine

2. Faculty Effectiveness: Phill Anderson, Steering Committee Liaison

Instructional Council
Instructional Administrators

3. Evaluation Policies: Patricia Bruneau-Gaber, Steering Committee Liaison

Instructional Council
Sheldon Meyer
Linda Severson-Studer
Executive Committee, Classified Federation

Support Services Council
Betty Oyler
Joanne White

4. Financial Plan: James O. Love, Dean of Administrative Services

5. Equal Opportunity: Jean von Schweinitz, Steering Committee

6. Scholarship and Research: Dan Kelly, Steering Committee Liaison

Jan Hooper
Jim Phillips
Ron Wheadon

RECOMMENDATIONS 1 & 3

Recommendation 1: It is critical for the College, as a priority, to organize staff and resources to design and implement a multifaceted dynamic system for assessing institutional and educational effectiveness (Standards I & V). The system will include, but not be limited to information on:

- a. Student tracking and follow-up
- b. Community perceptions and levels of satisfaction
- c. Institutional members' commitment to mission, goals and objectives
- d. The level of congruence between program expectations and student outcomes
- e. The interface between data collected and decision making at all levels of the institution
- f. The process by which the institution will make educational decisions and prevent system failure.

Recommendation 3: The College should develop and implement a mechanism for systematic ongoing program review (Standard V).

Institutional Response:

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) was formed in the Fall of 1991. The College faculty and administration recognized the importance of moving to an outcome-based assessment and tracking system, as well as the necessity for having an ongoing system of programmatic review. Following the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges Commission on Colleges (NWASC) recommendation, the IEC developed a "multi-faceted dynamic system for assessing institutional and education effectiveness." The results of the committee's efforts, "A Four-Year Plan for Implementation of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment," was developed and implemented, setting parameters for establishing outcomes in all institutional areas. The report begins on page 3 and is included in its entirety as the institutional response to NWASC recommendations 1 and 3. The system proposed includes information gathering and analyzing in all of the areas recommended by NWASC.

Specific Responses to Recommendation 1:

- a. Student tracking and follow-up includes provision for internally- and externally-directed measures and is described on pages 7, 13-17, 20-22.
- b. Community perceptions and levels of satisfaction are gathered through surveys of the community, employers and institutions to which students transfer. These efforts are described on pages 4, 13-17, 20-22.
- c. Institutional members' commitment to vision, mission, and goals is ascertained by using a variety of assessment procedures on a cyclical basis. (See pages 4, 23, 24 and 25.)
- d. The level of congruence between program expectations and student outcomes is being measured for professional technical programs according to the plan on pages 26-29. The discipline areas, such as math, writing, and science, are developing outcomes for the AA degree that will be completed by June 1994 and will include primary measures on pages 14-17.
- e. The interface between data collection and decision making will be accomplished by discussion, deliberation, and information flow at all levels of the institution. This interface is shown in the matrices on pages 7-11.
- f. The process by which the institution will make educational decisions and prevent system failure is shown in the matrices on pages 9 and 11. Our system will change over time, but by maintaining an environment that involves participative decision making, the system will survive.

The schedule for implementing each of the activities of the assessment system appears on pages 24 and 25. A systematic, ongoing program review cycle, which incorporates all of the data described above appears on page 4 of the report.

Specific Responses to Recommendation 3:

The "Four Year Plan for Implementation of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment" is the College's "mechanism for systematic, ongoing program review." The elements of the "Plan" continue to be developed and defined by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, the Instructional Council, and the divisions.

SOUTHWESTERN OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE

**A FOUR - YEAR PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF
INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND
ASSESSMENT**

November 8, 1993

A Four-Year Plan for Implementation of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Activities

Decision to Implement Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Activities

Planning/Operational Activities

Assessment/Evaluation Activities

Building the Necessary
Institutional Foundation

Establishment & Review of
Statement of Institutional Purpose
(Mission and Goals)

Conduct of Inventory of
Assessment Procedures

Identification of
Intended Discipline
Outcomes - June 1994

----- 1994

T

Detailed Design at the
Department Level

I

Identification of
Intended Educational Outcomes
for all Prof/Tech programs,
Support Services, Student
Services Outcomes

Extensive
Consultation

Design of

M

Assessment

E

Process

----- 1995

Initial Implementation

↓

Implementation of
Departmental/Program
Activities to Accomplish
Outcomes/Objectives

Trial
Implementation
of Assessment
Procedures

Initial Feedback of
Assessment Results

----- 1996

Establishment of the Annual
Institutional Effectiveness Cycle

Review of Statement
of Purpose

Refinement of
Assessment Process

Review of Intended
Outcomes or Objectives

Conduct of Refined
Assessment Procedures

Implementation of Revised
Activities to Reach Original
Intended Outcomes and
Objectives

Second Feedback
of Assessment Results

-----_1997

REPEAT FOURTH-YEAR ACTIVITIES--CONDUCT COMPREHENSIVE
INSTITUTIONAL AND PROCESS EVALUATION IN EIGHTH YEAR

----- END OF IMPLEMENTATION YEAR

Assessment Components

The process by which the institution will make educational decisions and prevent system failure is shown on the following three pages. The College has intensified its efforts to use data as an integral part of decision making over the last three years. The institution has also moved to using cross-functional teams to review information and recommend or suggest possible courses of action to solve problems or to change course. The "Information Distribution Matrix" shows the relationship of personnel function and data collection for the Institutional Effectiveness Committee.

Southwestern Oregon Community College Institutional Effectiveness Measurement Plan

Purpose

Southwestern Oregon Community College believes in continuous evaluation for the purpose of improving its offerings, services, and community involvement. In 1986 a Strategic Plan was developed by the College and community which includes the following goal statements:

1. The College will maintain high academic quality in all of its instructional programs.
2. The College will evaluate its career/occupational programs with regard to curriculum, staffing, and length of program, in order to ensure that the content is timely and that the instruction leads to marketable skills and employability.
3. The College will strengthen the lower division programs.
4. The College will first assess, then integrate where appropriate, current technologies into all programs.

In addition, external forces increasingly mandate on-going institutional effectiveness assessment. A new policy statement from SWOCC's regional accrediting body (Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges) states:

...each institution has an obligation to plan carefully its courses of instruction to respond to student needs, to evaluate the effectiveness of that educational program in terms of the change it brings about in students, and to make improvements in the program dictated by the evaluation process.

This document and process has been developed to meet the goals of SWOCC and to demonstrate compliance with the Commission of Colleges that requires institutions to "identify the outcome measures employed by the institution to assess effectiveness in meeting its institutional mission and objectives." A copy of the NWASC policy statement may be found on pages 30-32.

SWOCC's Institutional Effectiveness Measurement Plan reflects current issues and data collection resources and will be completed in its entirety by June 1997. The plan is an ever evolving document that will be continuously reviewed as we move toward total institutional reviewing of mission and developing outcomes.

SWOCC's Plan represents a gradualist approach to change. By focusing on a few critical indicators, SWOCC will be able to anticipate needed college-wide curricular, service, or organizational improvements.

SWOCC's Primary Measures

A primary component of an institutional effectiveness assessment plan is the identification of key indicators. The following measures reflect essential desired outcomes identified so far. As shown in the Four-Year Plan for Implementation of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Activities, measures will be added as all departments complete their outcomes by June of 1995. The indicators are not presented in priority order. Definitions of selected terms can be found on page 17.

A double asterisk (**) indicates that data are not currently available. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee will work with appropriate departments and/or agencies to obtain the needed information.

Professional-Technical Offerings

In addition to the following primary measures, Southwestern Oregon Community College also gathers effectiveness data in response to the Carl Perkins annual reporting requirements.

Outcome 1: Students are employed in jobs related to training

Measurement: Percentage of program completers employed in jobs related to their training

Target Group(s): Program Graduates

No Formal Award Completers

Data Source: Oregon Automated Follow-Up (OAF) System **

Annual Student Follow-up Survey

Data Collection: Annually (Winter Term)

Collection Issues/Needs: Attorney General ruled in September 1993 that social security numbers could not be used to track students. State group is currently working on a uniform student permission clause.

Outcome 2: Students attain appropriate job skills

Measurement: Employer and former student ratings of student skills (i.e., general, technical, discipline related and personal)

Target Group(s): Program Completers

No Formal Award Completers

Data Source: Annual Employer Follow-Up Study

Annual Student Follow-Up Study

Data Collection: Annually (Winter for Student)

Annually (Spring for Employer)

Outcome 3: Students attain family wage jobs

Measurement: Percentage of students employed in family wage jobs

Target group(s): Program Graduates
No Formal Award Completers

Data Source: Annual Student Follow-Up Study
Oregon Automated Follow-Up (OAF) System**

Data Collection: Annually (Winter Term)

Collection Issues/Needs: See Outcome #1. Oregon Employment Division needs to improve information on students' full-time versus part-time employment status for the college to determine wage status.

Transfer Offerings

Outcome 4: Transfer students attain academic performance levels at four-year institutions comparable to what they achieved at SWOCC

Measurement: Grade point average (GPA) of transferring students with three terms of study at an Oregon State System of Higher Education institution compared to their GPA at SWOCC

Target Group(s): Former SWOCC students enrolled in OSSHE institutions**

Data Source: OSSHE institutions**

Data Collection Issues/Needs: * OSSHE policies and regulations must be modified so data may be shared by student social security number.

*Compare academic performance of "native" OSSHE students with SWOCC's transfer students using comparable control groups.

Outcome 5: Students who want a bachelor's degree transfer to a four-year institution

Measurement: Percentage of students with a baccalaureate degree intention who transfer to an OSSHE institution

Target Group(s): Former SWOCC students who declared a bachelor's degree intention when applying to SWOCC

Data Source: OSSHE institutions**

Data Collection: Annually (Fall Term)

Data Collection Issues/Needs: *OSSHE policies and regulations must be modified so data may be shared by student SSN.

*SWOCC began collecting and entering student intention (goals) spring of 1993 and some data collection problems have been identified by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and are being worked on. If OSSHE issues can be worked out, we would begin measuring this outcome in Fall of 1994.

Outcome 6: Students transfer to an institution or program of

choice with minimal difficulties

Measurement: Percentage of students reporting a positive experience (e.g., availability of information regarding the transfer process, number of credits accepted, acceptance into institution or program of choice)

Target Group(s): Former SWOCC students who transferred to an OSSHE institution during the previous year

Data Source: Transfer Follow-Up Study

Timeline: Every three years (beginning in 1994-95)

Data Collection Issues/Needs: * Develop a follow-up instrument by fall 1994

Outcome 7: Students attain appropriate skills for further academic study

Measurement: Percentage of former students reporting that their SWOCC studies prepared them for further studies

Target Group(s): Program graduates (continuing further studies)
No formal award completers (continuing further studies)

Data Source: Annual student follow-up study

Data Collection: Annually (Spring Term)

Personal Development and Enrichment Offerings

Outcome 8: Students attain their individual goals

Measurement: Percentage of former students reporting attainment of goals desired from their SWOCC experience

Target Group(s): Program graduates
No formal award completers

Data Source: Annuals student follow-up study

Data Collection: Annually (Winter Term)

Definitions

Early Leavers: Students who attended full-time, earned fewer than 70 credits, and failed to return to SWOCC after three terms of absence (excluding summer)

Employer Follow-Up Study: Annual survey of employers of former students who are working in jobs related to their training at SWOCC

Family Wage Jobs: Average annual covered wages for all workers. The definition is used by the Oregon Economic Development Department for use in the regional strategies efforts.

No Formal Award Completers: Students who declare a major and earn at least 24 credits toward a certificate or 60 credits toward a degree and do not return after three terms (excluding summer)

Oregon Automated Follow-Up System: System for tracking former students through the State Employment Division using unemployment insurance records

SWOCC's Benchmarks

Southwestern Oregon Community College's key benchmarks are categorized into the three themes of the college's goals:

- * Providing a quality teaching and learning environment
- * Managing for effectiveness
- * Fostering positive relations with the community

The systematic examination of these indicators represents a portion of SWOCC's efforts to focus on the institution's effectiveness in helping our students and community meet the changing demands of the 1990's.

Definition

Benchmarks serve as one type of measure of an institution's progress. They may be defined as **measurable indicators of the College's overall direction and achievement of its goals.**

Benchmarks provide a quantitative point of reference from which decisions can be made about the general direction of the College. They act as a thermometer, testing the general health of the institution and giving clues on areas needing further attention.

Benchmarks are general in nature, presenting historical trends or changes. They do not provide detailed information to guide the College's daily operations.

When the Institutional Effectiveness Committee was first formed in December of 1992, they went about the task of identifying a list of appropriate benchmarks by surveying faculty, reviewing data already being collected by various departments and studying other colleges' data collection policies and procedures. A list of benchmarks was adopted by President's Council in June of 1993, and the formal collection and reporting process began in the Fall of 1993.

Use of benchmarks

Benchmarks provide a mechanism for sharing basic information about the College with the Board of Education. The Board, Administration, Faculty and Staff may use the benchmarks as reference points in examining broad institutional policy and direction. The benchmarks can act as catalysts for discussions concerning SWOCC's future endeavors.

By tracking trends on selected items, we are more likely to sustain the focus and energy needed to accomplish our vision for SWOCC's future.

Benchmarks for the theme related to the college's goals in the area of providing a quality teaching and learning environment have been identified. Those that relate to managing for effectiveness and fostering positive relations with the community will be developed in 1996-97 after outcomes for all departments have been determined and assessment surveys, such as the Community Perception Study, have been completed.

Using the academic year of 1993-94 as a test year, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, with information from President's Council and/or Board of Education, will make any adjustments or additions to the quality teaching and learning benchmarks as needed.

The "Monthly Data to Assess Teaching/Learning Quality and Effectiveness" follows. This document specifies the benchmarks, data source, and timeline for institutional efforts to provide a quality teaching and learning environment.

MONTHLY DATA TO ASSESS TEACHING/LEARNING QUALITY AND EFFECTIVENESS

FOCUS: Providing a quality teaching and learning environment

BENCHMARKS BOARD	DATA SOURCE	WHY BEING MEASURED?	PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL	
1. FTE by cost center and state reimbursement categories (LDC, Voc. Prep., Voc. Supp., etc.)	Enrollment Summary Report	To assess areas that might need additional support through recruiting, publicity, etc.	Sept.	Oct.
2. Student headcount for credit, non-credit and total college	Term Headcount Report	To view unduplicated student numbers comparing credit with noncredit to assess changes that might reflect changes in mission and/or goals.	Sept.	Oct.
3. Labor trends by program code	Oregon State Employment Division	To monitor trends in light of numbers in existing programs, number of graduates, and possible new offerings.	Sept.	Oct.
4. Feedback from former students on overall satisfaction with (a) courses and (b) services	Student Follow-up Study	To assist in assessing quality of courses and services provided for students.	Oct.	Nov.
5. Feedback from former students about whether they achieved their intended goals	Student Follow-up Study	To assist in assessing services such as counseling, advising, supplemental instruction, tutoring, etc.	Oct.	Nov.
6. Employment and transfer status of former students	Student Follow-up Study. Oregon Automated Follow-up System OSSHE Report to Community Colleges	To assess program effectiveness in placement and transfer of students.	Oct.	Nov.

7. Percentage of students receiving zero credits	Course Completion Reports	To assist in evaluating courses that may need prerequisites, tutors and/or supplemental instruction or different teaching strategies.	Nov.	Dec.
8. Feedback from employers about skills, knowledge and work attitudes of former students	Employer Follow-up	To determine if program outcomes are carried into the workplace and to what extent.	Nov.	Dec.
9. Student degrees and certificates by gender and ethnicity	IPEDS Completion Reports	To assess equal opportunity access and completion of programs	Dec.	Jan.
10. Program Cost Data (including equipment)	Program Cost Report	To determine the cost/student which can help in determining budgetary impact. For example, if enrollment increases significantly, is it reflected in the budget? If not, why not?	Jan.	Feb.
11. Students making satisfactory progress (2.0 GPA) by program code.	Satisfactory Progress Report	To identify students who may need assistance after Fall Quarter to be successful and assist in retention.	Jan.	Feb.
12. Changes in applicant's educational goals.	Student Intentions Report	To identify students who may need more advising/counseling information or other services that may help in retention.	Jan.	Feb.
13. AA Transfers enrolled in OSSHE institutions	Office of Community College Service Report	To identify how many AA completers transfer within the year and to what institutions and in comparison to other CCs.	Feb.	Mar.
14. Structured Work Experience (enrollments in SWE by program, includes worksite-based lab time)	SWE Report	To identify work based applications of concepts learned in the classroom and to evaluate SWE's relationship to employment.	Mar.	Apr.

15. Students achieving licensure or certification.	Licensing/Certification Report	To identify accomplishment of program outcomes and services for individual students and/or program improvement goals.	Mar.	Apr.
16. Credit student distribution by gender, age, ethnicity and FT/PT status.	Student Characteristics Report (Done in Fall)	To assist in identifying course, program and student services needed to help with student success and retention.	Mar.	Apr.
17. Percentage of students enrolling from district high schools.	Oregon Department of Education Report	To determine effectiveness of college/high school collaboration efforts.	Apr.	May
18. Community rating of overall college quality and the quality of instruction.	Community Perception Study	To assess how the quality of the institution is perceived by citizens of the district.	Every 3-4 years in May	

SWOCC's Continuous Assessment Activities

The Commission on Colleges for the Northwest Association for Schools and Colleges urges institutions to use a wide variety of outcome measures to assess the achievement of their mission and goals. SWOCC's plan is to engage in a continuous cycle of three key institutional effectiveness measurements.

(1) **A Comprehensive Program Review System (CPRS)** is being established to evaluate SWOCC's offerings and services. Four CPRS components are currently in operation on a cyclical basis:

- * Professional-technical programs
- * ABE/GED offerings
- * WF 2000
- * Success Center

By 1997 the following components will be added:

- * Outreach Centers
- * Transfer/discipline offerings
- * Support services
- * Student Services
- * Library

(2) **Community College Mission and Goals:** A revised Mission and Goals Policy went to the Board for a first reading in December 1993. The revised policy that now includes a vision statement was developed by the Board of Education in a special retreat meeting. See page 33 for policy and background information. Review of the College Vision, Mission & Goals statements will be completed by the total institution by June 1994 and annually thereafter per Board policy.

(3) **A Comprehensive Community Perception Study** is scheduled for completion by June of 1996. This study will give us information for formulating benchmarks for the theme of the College's goal of fostering positive relations with the community.

Attached is the document listing timelines for annual and cyclical activities.

Southwestern Oregon Community College Quality Assurance
INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT UTILIZING
OUTCOME MEASUREMENTS

Schedule of Activities

Annual and Cyclical Activities: Directed toward Teaching/Learning Quality

Key Activities	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95
<u>Yearly:</u>			
Comprehensive Program Review *Professional Technical	x	x	x
Student Follow-Up Survey	x	x	x
Employer Follow-Up Survey	x	x	
Oregon Automated Student Follow-Up		<i>on hold</i>	
Student Tracking			x
WF 2000 & Success Center	x	x	x
College Vision, Mission & Goals			x
<u>Every 2 years:</u>			
Comprehensive Program Review *Disciplines (AA Degree Program)			x
*Non-Credit Program			x
*ABE/GED	x	x	x
*Outreach Centers			x

Key Activities	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97
----------------	---------	---------	---------

Every 3 years:

Comprehensive Program Review: x

Key Activities	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97
-----------------------	---------	---------	---------

Every 5 years:

Community Perception Study	x		
Comprehensive Program Review			
*Professional Technical Programs			x
(Uses Outside Review Team)			

OTHER CYCLICAL ACTIVITIES

Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges Accreditation	1993-94 (follow-up visit)
--	------------------------------

**SOUTHWESTERN OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE
EVALUATION PLAN FOR PROFESSIONAL TECHNICAL EDUCATION
1992-1997**

PROCESS OF PROGRAM EXCELLENCE AND AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT

The primary goal for the evaluation of Southwestern Oregon Community College's (SWOCC) Professional Technical programs is to develop a continuous evaluation process demonstrating the effectiveness of each program. To demonstrate this effectiveness, each program will focus on evaluating the following two areas:

- 1.** Documentation of standards (outcome and process) concerning each program that demonstrates accomplishments of excellence in program.

Standards: Specifications or descriptions of desired outcomes (student competence or enrollment) and the processes that should enable students to attain these outcomes for approved professional technical education program areas.

- a.** Outcome standards will be evaluated annually beginning in 1992-93 using 1991-92 for base data.
 - b.** Process standards will be divided up over a five year period except for B1f (Structured Work Experience), B4a (Advisory Committee Meetings), and B4b (Support--Funding) which will be done annually.
- 2.** Identification and analysis of data from the annual evaluation outcome standards will be used to determine if any adjustments need to be made in the process standards areas to improve the program.
 - a.** The data from the Outcome Standards will be provided in winter quarter each year. In 1992-93 minimum performance standards will be established for each outcome standard and structured work experience. The process standards to be evaluated will be completed at the end of spring quarter each year. The lead instructor, division chair, advisory committee and one district high school instructor will review data and assess process standards using forms provided. If so indicated a plan for improvement will be done following the review. This process will continue to the Five Year Comprehensive Evaluation at the end of FY 1996-97.

RESPONSIBILITY OF EVALUATION

The responsibility for the evaluation of the program will be assigned to the lead instructor or division chair by the associate dean. This process of evaluation will be accomplished under the direction of the Associate Dean of Professional Technical Education utilizing State Department of Education and Institutional Effectiveness criteria.

Each SWOCC Professional Technical Program will evaluate the following outcome standards annually:

OUTCOME STANDARDS

- A1a. Impact--Placement - All Completers
- A1b. Impact--Placement - Special Populations and Protected Classes
- A2a. Achievement and Enrollment--Licensure/Certification - All students
- A2b. Achievement and Enrollment--Licensure/ Certification- Special Populations and Protected classes
- A3a. Achievement and Enrollment--Program Completers - All students
- A3b. Achievement and Enrollment--Program Completers - Special Populations and Protected Classes
- A4a. Achievement and Enrollment-- Satisfactory Progress - All students
- A4b. Achievement and Enrollment--Satisfactory Progress - Special Populations and Protected Classes
- A5a. Achievement and Enrollment--Enrollment - All students
- A5b. Achievement and Enrollment--Enrollment - Special Populations and Protected Classes

PROCESS STANDARDS (The Process Standards will be evaluated in the year indicated below so that all standards are covered for all programs over a five year period).

- 92-93 B1a. Quality of Instruction-- Technical Competencies
- 92-93 B1b. Quality of Instruction--Academic Competencies
- 92-93 B1c. Quality of Instruction--Competencies - Measures
- 92-93 B1d. Quality of Instruction--Methodology - Technical Instruction
- 92-93 B1e. Quality of Instruction--Methodology - Academic Instruction
- Annual B1f. Quality of Instruction--Structured Work Experience
- 93-94 B2a. Availability of Instruction--Institutional Mission
- 93-94 B2b. Availability of Instruction--Labor Market Demand
- 93-94 B2c. Availability of Instruction--Recruitment
- 93-94 B2d. Availability of Instruction--Admissions
- 93-94 B2e. Availability of Instruction--Advising
- 93-94 B2f. Availability of Instruction--Other Support Services
- 93-94 B2g. Availability of Instruction--Availability in Sequence
- 94-95 B2h. Availability of Instruction--Tech Prep/Associate Degree
- 94-95 B3a. Resources--Instructional Materials
- 94-95 B3b. Resources--Library and Learning Resource Services; Audio-Visual Equipment
- 94-95 B3c. Resources--Tools and Equipment
- 95-96 B3d. Resources--Facilities
- 95-96 B3e. Resources--Staffing
- 95-96 B3f. Resources--Staff Development Plans

- Annual B4a. Support--Advisory Committee Meetings
- Annual B4b. Support--Funding
- 95-96 B4c. Support--Management

PROCEDURE FOR EVALUATION

Annual Evaluation

- A.**The individuals responsible for the evaluation will utilize the required annual outcome and process standards to determine excellence and areas of needed improvement in the program utilizing forms provided in the Professional Technical Education Evaluation Handbook provided by the State Department of Education.
- B.**The Lead Instructor, Division Chair, advisory committee and at least one district high school teacher will review the data and assess process standards using the forms provided.
- C.** The Lead Instructor along with the Division Chair will develop a plan of improvement with timelines and budget implications to be submitted on the form provided to the Dean of Instructional and Student Services and Associate Dean for review.

Five Year Comprehensive Evaluation

- A.**Every 5 years the Lead Instructor/Division Chair will put together a Program Improvement/Excellence (PIE) team, approved by the Associate Dean to do a comprehensive program evaluation. The team will consist of the following members:
 - 1.** Lead Instructor and/or Division Chair as Principal Reviewer
 - 2.** One Program Related Academic Instructor
 - 3.** Advisory Committee Chairperson
 - 4.** Student in program
 - 5.** Graduate from program
 - 6.** High School Instructor
 - 7.** Another Community College Instructor
 - 8.** Two individuals from Business/Industry
 - 9.** Other, as appropriate
- B.** The PIE team will:
 - 1.**Review the established minimum performance standards established in the first year of the cycle, the outcome and process standards, results and plans for improvement over the five years.
- 2.**Determine if there are other outcome or process standards to be evaluated other than those listed above.
- 3.**Complete worksheets with summary report on areas of excellence and the areas that need improvement, and submit copies to the Dean of Instructional and Student Services and Associate Dean within one month following the evaluation process.

Programs grouped together can use a single advisory committee:

Business, General	Nursing
1) General Business	1) Nursing Assistant
2) General Business, Interdisciplinary	2) LPN
	3) RN
Business Management	
1) Bookkeeping/Clerical	Automotive Technology
2) Accounting	
3) Banking and Finance	Welding Technology
4) Office Management	
5) Supervisory Training	Machine
Technology	
Fire Science	Electronics
Technology	
1) Firefighter Training	
2) Fire Science Technology	Forest Resources Technology
Human Services	Computer
Information	
1) Gerontology	
2) Social Services Systems	Emergency
Dispatcher	
3) Substance Abuse	Emergency
Medical Technician	
Office Administration	
1) General Secretary	Criminal Justice
Administration	
2) Legal Secretary	
Pharmacy Technician	
Medical Office Administration	
1) Medical Office Assistant	
2) Medical/Clerical	
3) Medical Transcriptionist	

REVISED 2/9/93

NOTE: The Professional Technical Education Evaluation Handbook includes criteria established by NWASC. Pages 1-4 of the Handbook can be found on pages 34-37.

RECOMMENDATION 2a

***Recommendation:* As a priority the College should review issues related to faculty effectiveness (Standard VIII) to include:**

- a. Assessing practices in place related to the use of part-time faculty who have workloads approaching full-time on a regular and continual basis.**

Institutional Response:

The College has used a system for hiring instructors on a part-time basis since its founding in 1962. One of the practices, hiring part-time instructors to teach full-time loads (80-percenters), was identified in 1991 as a problem that needed to be resolved. The NWASC recommendation to examine the issue and the College's commitment to bring equity to the employees affected resulted in elimination of 80-percenters and creation of "adjunct faculty." The resultant Letter of Agreement between Southwestern Oregon Community College and Southwestern Oregon Community College Faculty Association describes the system now in place.

During the 92-93 academic year the College addressed issues related to part-time faculty and their workloads. The body primarily responsible for this work was the Instructional Council. The council looked at those positions where faculty taught between 80% to 100% of a full load. With the help of the personnel office the council attempted to identify those positions that had been in existence the longest. They also considered issues such as program need, numbers of students served by the programs, staffing in the program, future potential for the program. As a result of this process, two positions were identified for inclusion as regular full-time faculty in the fall of 1993. These positions were included in the 93-94 budget. As revenue projections became more accurate, the administration was able to identify approximately \$115,000 that could be used to create additional full-time positions. The Instructional Council tentatively identified five additional positions that could be made full-time. However, there were 13 part-time positions at that time with loads between 80% and 100%. Further, the college president had decided that beginning with fall term, 1993, we would eliminate all positions where people paid on the part-time pay scale taught more than 50% of a load. The division chairs then looked at the situation again and decided that what we need to do is create a category of annually contracted faculty who are paid for teaching at a rate comparable to that of the full-time faculty and with such benefits as are accorded to the annually contracted faculty under the contract negotiated between the Faculty Federation and the Board of Education.

The following is the definition of an adjunct faculty member as worked out by the division chairs to be included in a letter of agreement with the Board of Education of Southwestern Oregon Community College District and the Southwestern Oregon Community College Federation of Teachers.

ADJUNCT FACULTY:

- (1) Teach 12-15 credits, or the equivalent, per term to be balanced to 45 credits for regular academic year, and maintain office hours daily
- (2) Are not responsible for advising, curriculum development, committee assignments, other duties as assigned
- (3) Are contracted annually
- (4) Are selected according to the procedures worked out by the Faculty Senate and the

Instructional Council for year one; persons presently filling the positions as 80 - 100% part-time faculty may, with the agreement of the appropriate divisions, be hired to fill the positions for the first year of this agreement

- (5) Are not tenure track positions; the persons hired for these positions will generally be granted no more than three annual contracts with a possibility of a fourth if agreed upon by the Dean of Instructional and Student Services and the appropriate division
- (6) Are evaluated annually
- (7) Are fully qualified for the positions in which they teach in accordance with the stipulations of the contract between the Board of Education and the Federation of Teachers
- (8) Would receive full benefits
- (9) Are paid 75% of a full-time faculty salary. The maximum initial salary base for adjunct faculty will be step 9 on the faculty salary scale, or the maximum beginning salary for new faculty (eg. 75% of step 9 is currently \$21,384 plus 43% for benefits for a total of \$30,580)
- (10) Adjunct faculty will constitute no more than 25% of the full-time faculty.

In order to enter the guidelines of the division chairs into negotiation, the administration proposed the creation of annually contracted adjunct faculty and the Faculty Federation and administration negotiated a letter of agreement which is presently appended to the Faculty Federation/Board of Education agreement (see pages 43-46). Through the process of negotiation, minor changes were made to items 3 and 4 of the above definition. For the 93-94 academic year, the Instructional Council and the Dean of Instructional and Student Services have identified 12 positions to be brought into the category of adjunct faculty.

In October of 1993, the Board of Education adopted a policy that defines a full-time teaching load for part-time faculty as 20 work load credits. In accordance with the mandate of the college president, part-time faculty will be hired for no more than 10 workload credits. Workload for part-time faculty will be calculated on a formula based on the full-time faculty workload calculation. It is the intent of the administration that no one will take a reduction in hourly rate of pay for equivalent work.

A process and criteria for identifying the need for additional regular full-time faculty are yet to be worked out.

The terms defined in this letter will be in force for the period of the negotiated contract.

RECOMMENDATION 2b

Recommendation: As a priority the College should review issues related to faculty effectiveness (Standard VIII) to include:

b.Planning and implementing a process which ties staff development to a planned, organized, and coordinated system of professional growth.

Institutional Response:

There are two sources of funding for faculty staff development budgeted annually:

1. For those needs identified by the institution through the deliberations of the Instructional Administrators identifying needs for new programs and/or for the modification and updating of existing programs, funds are budgeted in cost center 10-1701, Miscellaneous Instruction, program/staff development. In 1993-94 there was \$9,500 budgeted for this purpose. These funds have been used to send faculty for information and training in such areas as TQM, the use of technology for instructional enhancement, open-entry open-exit instruction, and the development of instructional modules.
2. For those needs identified by individual faculty members there is a Faculty Staff Development Committee of the Faculty Senate. The funds for the activities approved and recommended by this group are budgeted in cost center 10-2107, Instructional Staff Development, program/staff development. In 1993-94 there was \$11,750 budgeted in this account. Requests from the faculty are sent directly to this committee and are judged on the following criteria developed by the committee:
 - a. The request must be directly connected to the faculty member's area of teaching, and the travel to other activity must have potential to change or enhance what happens in the classroom. If a faculty member wishes to develop knowledge or skill in an area outside his or her teaching area, additional support materials are needed to explain and justify that request.
 - b. If the faculty member has been awarded significant amounts of staff development in the past academic year, his or her request will be denied so that others may have equal access to these funds.
 - c. When more than one faculty member is attending a given conference, the committee may limit the amount given each person and suggest that transportation and rooms be shared.

The Dean of Instructional and Student Services has recommended that Faculty Senate Staff Development Committee encourage faculty members to submit the Activities Plan portion of the Faculty Staff Development portion of the Administrative Evaluation in support of requests for funding. This would help to unite the formalized process of faculty involvement in personal assessment and planned professional development with the awarding of staff development funds. This suggestion has met with objections on the part of some members of the committee, and stalled the process of integrating faculty development and the granting of funds. We are continuing to meet to work out a process for integrating the institutionally and individually identified needs for staff development with the process of allocating funds.

RECOMMENDATION 2c

Recommendation: As a priority the College should review issues related to faculty effectiveness (Standard VIII) to include:

- c. Encourage faculty to develop innovative teaching strategies.

Institutional Response:

The faculty has been encouraged to develop innovative teaching strategies. Innovation has been supported through staff development funds, through release time for special projects, through faculty mini-grants from the Southwestern Oregon Community College Foundation, and through grants acquisitions.

The College has been the recipient of a Title III Grant, half of which is targeted to the enhancement of instruction through the application of technology. With the grant, we have done extensive staff development in a wide range of computer usage from basic introductions to Windows to more advanced applications of Tool Book for the creation of software to enhance learning. All of the English faculty, most of the math faculty, and members of the psychology, art, and other disciplines have been involved in projects in relation to the grant. In addition to the grant funds for the project, the College contributed \$20,000 for staff development and \$100,000 for equipment to support the effort.

Faculty are encouraged to develop innovative teaching strategies through the Faculty Mini-grants funded through the Southwestern Oregon Community College Foundation. These grants, for a maximum of \$1,000 each, are administered by the Faculty Staff Development Committee. They require the verification of the Dean of Instructional and Student Services as to the applicability of the project to the curriculum. Faculty projects that have been selected for funding have included:

- \$1,000 for a project to develop curriculum for a new philosophy course - Past and Future Utopias.
- \$1,000 for a project to videotape selected archeological sites around Oregon to be used in archeology courses.
- \$1,000 for the design of new biology laboratory procedures that encourage creative thinking and problem solving.
- \$1,000 for the development of course materials for a career planning course.
- \$1,000 for the development of curriculum and materials to be used in sign language courses.
- \$600 for the production of videotapes of forestry practices in France.

Through state and regional workforce development grants, we have put together an innovative Workforce 2000 Skills Center located in downtown Coos Bay. This center delivers instructional and support services to a widely varied client base. It provides a combination of technology supported instruction and personalized service that enables it to meet the individual needs of clients with a very high degree of success. Using the PLATO system as a base, the staff has developed a number of individualized modules that can be used in a wide variety of combinations to give short term remedial and developmental instruction for clients attempting to reenter the workforce.

In order to institutionalize the results of the Title III Grant pilot projects, integrate our efforts at instructional enhancement, and encourage faculty to pursue innovative teaching strategies, the Title III - Activity I Steering Committee was asked to act as an Instructional Computing Coordinating Committee. The committee solicits requests for instructional and student performance projects both directly and indirectly related to the grant before funding, release time, or other resources are committed. The committee provides recommendations to the Office of Instruction based on its review. The following information on pages 53-62 outlines the process, objectives, and criteria relative to the committee's activities.

RECOMMENDATION 4

Recommendation: The College should develop formal evaluation policies and procedures for all full-time and part-time employees including administration, faculty, and staff at all levels. Particular attention should be given to policy statement 26 - Faculty Evaluation (Standard VII).

Institutional Response:

The full-time faculty evaluation process for tenured and untenured faculty are described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement between Southwestern Oregon Community College and Southwestern Oregon Community College Faculty Association. The processes for tenured and untenured faculty were in place at the time of the NWASC visitation in April 1992. Since the NWASC visit, procedures for the evaluation of adjunct faculty have been developed and procedures for the evaluation of part-time faculty have been strengthened.

The evaluation procedures for MASSC were changed in 1993 from a performance based job specific document to a generic evaluation document. MASSC evaluations are described on page 72.

The evaluation procedures for Classified employees were reviewed in 1992. The President, the Dean of Administrative Services and a committee of classified employees met to discuss the evaluation instrument. It was agreed that a new evaluation instrument would be developed and the Classified employees worked on its design. The process was delayed while the College implemented a new Management Information System. A new Director of Human Resources has been hired and the development of the Classified evaluation system is back on track.

FACULTY EVALUATION PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES

The faculty evaluation process has been designed for the purpose of maintaining the delivery of high quality educational services to our students and our community. It has as its focus the development of faculty, the improvement of programs, and the collection of substantive information upon which to base personnel decisions.

I. EVALUATION OF FULL-TIME FACULTY

Full-time tenured faculty are evaluated every three years on a rotational schedule. Probationary (tenure-track) faculty are evaluated annually each fall term. [If problems are noted, all faculty can be evaluated at any time, as needed, and solutions proposed and acted upon.] There are two aspects to the full-time faculty evaluation process: 1) the administrative evaluation, and 2) the peer evaluation process.

A. The administrative evaluation

The administrative evaluation is the responsibility of the Dean of Instructional and Student Services. The dean may delegate the responsibility to conduct the evaluation to the appropriate associate dean, depending upon teaching or service area of the faculty member.

At the beginning of the term in which a faculty member is to be evaluated, a meeting is held with the Dean of Instructional and Student Services, the Associate Deans, and the faculty members to be evaluated. During that meeting the processes, procedures, and timelines are reviewed. The content of the evaluation is tailored to the assignment of the individual faculty member, but in general consists of:

1. Teaching
2. Other assigned activities
3. Instructor defined evaluation area
4. Assigned release time activities
5. Administrative aspects of instruction
6. Collegiality/Professional demeanor
7. Student evaluations

The faculty member is asked to prepare and present a portfolio of material that supports the evaluation process. This portfolio contains a statement of teaching philosophy or methodology; course outlines, exams, syllabi, and other materials that support instruction; an identification of instructor defined evaluation area and desired outcomes; a statement identifying the faculty member's involvement with program and/or course development including work with faculty and/or advisory committees/groups; materials documenting the use of assigned release time, outlining goals and objectives, methods and an assessment of results, if applicable; and materials documenting the faculty member's professional relationship to subject matter, students, faculty and institutional involvement, and/or community activity.

In addition, each faculty member is asked to present a Faculty Staff Development Plan. The aim is to involve the faculty in a process of goal setting. The plan is not a commitment, but a device for involving the faculty in assessment and goal setting. The plan consists of:

1. *CAREER GOALS* - a simple statement which reflects the faculty member's current thinking about future career directions
2. *ANALYSIS OF STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES* - a brief statement of perceived strengths the faculty member would like to build upon, and weaknesses he/she would like to remediate
3. *ACTIVITIES PLAN* - a three-year plan of development activities with outcomes related to the above

The *ACTIVITIES PLANS* are used by the Faculty Senate Staff Development Committee in their deliberations relative to recommendations of approval of requests for staff development. Copies of their *ACTIVITIES PLANS* are available to faculty members who wish to forward them to the Faculty Senate Staff Development Committee in support of requests.

B. The peer evaluation

The peer evaluation is outlined in the contract between the Board of Education and the Faculty Federation (Article II - Evaluation: see pages 70 and 71). The chair of the division to which the faculty member belongs, either by the nature of the teaching area or by assignment, shall be responsible for overseeing the peer evaluation process.

By agreement of the division chairs in the Instructional Council meeting of 21 January, 1993, the peer evaluation process will use as a basis the portfolio created for the Administrative Evaluation process. This assures that the same basic materials and activities are being evaluated through each process.

Upon the conclusion of the peer evaluation, a written summary of the procedures outlining the membership of the committee, the procedures used and materials reviewed, and the commendations and recommendations of the review committee is prepared by the division chair and shared with the faculty member with a copy forwarded to the Dean of Instructional and Student Services.

C. Review and conference

The Dean of Instructional and Student Services, appropriate associate dean, and division chair will then meet to discuss the findings in each process. The Dean of Instructional and Student Services or associate dean writes a summary of the findings of the administrative evaluation process outlining the procedures and materials reviewed, a summary of the classroom visitation, an evaluation of non-classroom activities, an evaluation of release time activities if any, a list of commendations (if appropriate), a list of areas for improvement (if appropriate), and a summary recommendation. Finally the Dean of Instructional and Student Services, associate dean if appropriate, and the faculty member meet to review the summary report. The faculty member is asked to sign the summary recommendation affirming that he/she has seen the report, and is allowed to add comments relevant to the process or findings. This final report is placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

If remediation is deemed necessary at this time, the faculty member is asked to produce a **FACULTY ACTION PLAN** in consultation with the dean or associate dean. This plan outlines steps to be taken, timelines, and expected outcomes. This plan is filed in the faculty member's personnel file until such time as it is completed.

II. EVALUATION OF ADJUNCT FACULTY

Adjunct Faculty are hired to teach for a period not to exceed four years. The conditions under which Adjunct Faculty work are covered under the Letter of Agreement Between Southwestern Oregon Community College and Southwestern Oregon Community College Federation of Teachers. This agreement was finalized late in spring term, 1993.

A. Adjunct Faculty are evaluated by peers as follows:

The Division Chair and two (2) tenured faculty members of the division, as an Adjunct Faculty Review Committee, confer with the Adjunct Faculty member for the purpose of establishing evaluation procedures. This meeting must be held by November 1.

B. Normally, each year prior to March 1, all Adjunct Faculty will be evaluated by their Adjunct Faculty Review Committees. The evaluation will:

- (1) Assess the effectiveness of the Adjunct Faculty member as an instructor in his/her division.
- (2) Assess the Adjunct Faculty member in the performance of his/her duties for the purpose of determining whether or not the Adjunct Faculty member should be, if eligible, offered an Adjunct Faculty contract for the next academic year.

C. Recommendations of the Adjunct Faculty Review Committee regarding whether the Adjunct Faculty member should be offered an Adjunct Faculty contract for the next academic year will be forwarded to the Dean of Instructional and Student Services. The Dean will then forward this information along with his/her recommendation to the President of the College. The decision of the President will be forwarded to the Board for action.

D. The Office of Instruction will conduct student evaluations of Adjunct Faculty each fall term. The results of the student evaluations will be shared with the appropriate division chair to

be included in the peer evaluation process.

If the Dean of Instructional and Student Services or appropriate associate dean has reason to question the performance of an Adjunct Faculty as a result of student evaluation, peer evaluation, request of the Division Chair, or other information, the Dean or Associate Dean may perform a classroom evaluation of the Adjunct Faculty member. The result of this evaluation will be discussed with the faculty member and the appropriate Division Chair.

III. EVALUATION OF PART-TIME FACULTY

A. Goals

All new part-time instructors should be evaluated the first term they teach. Additionally, if instructors who have been teaching are given a substantially new assignment, they should be evaluated the first term of the new assignment.

Part-time faculty should be evaluated at least once every three years, or more frequently as deemed necessary by the appropriate department, division chair, or dean. Whenever possible, the evaluation of faculty should be conducted by full-time faculty who have expertise in the appropriate area.

A written summary of evaluations of faculty should be forwarded to the division chair and the Office of Instruction. (The Office of Instruction will forward a copy of the evaluation to Personnel for inclusion in the Personnel file.) Division chairs can obtain copies of previous evaluations from Personnel.

No increase in a salary step for the instructor should be granted unless that instructor has received a positive evaluation during the most recent evaluation cycle.

B. Evaluation Process

Adopted by Instructional Council 02/04/93

At the beginning of each term, the division chairs will forward to the Office of Instruction the names of the part-time faculty to be evaluated in their divisions.

The division chair will appoint the evaluator and make such special arrangements with the Dean of Instructional and Student Services as necessary.

Before the evaluation of an instructor commences, the evaluator will meet with the instructor and inform the instructor of the goals and procedures of the coming evaluation. The evaluator

should also meet with the Division Chair and discuss any areas of concern that either have.

All evaluations of faculty should include self, peer, and student evaluations. The self-evaluation should be part of a file compiled by the instructor which will include a copy of all syllabi, student evaluations, any available peer evaluations, and other material deemed necessary by the appropriate department. Some departments may also want the file to include a statement of teaching methods, examples of graded student work and, when possible, sample examinations.

The Office of Instruction should conduct student evaluations of all classes taught by the instructor during each term that the instructor is teaching. A summary of these evaluations should be sent to the instructor being evaluated, the evaluator and the Division Chair in a timely manner.

When the evaluator deems it necessary, the faculty member will provide the evaluator with student work that has been graded. If the evaluator or Division Chair deems it necessary, a review of final grades will be conducted.

A final summary of the evaluation process will be forwarded to the Dean of Instructional and Student Services by the Division Chair.

If the instructor being evaluated believes that he or she is not being evaluated fairly, objections may be presented to the Division Chair within 15 working days of receipt of the written summary of the evaluation. If the instructor believes that the Division Chair has not properly or adequately dealt with objections to the evaluation being conducted, those objections may be presented to the Dean of Instructional and Student Services within 30 working days of receipt of the written summary of the evaluation.

If the faculty member requests the Dean of Instructional and Student Services to review the process, the Division Chair will submit to the dean all materials used in the evaluation process.

All faculty being evaluated are required to send a copy of all course syllabi to their Division Chair by the second week of classes.

An evaluation policy for MASSC employees was adopted by the Board of Education September 24, 1986 and revised April 29, 1991. Procedures for implementing an evaluation were adopted January 10, 1978. The Board policy included a timeline for MASSC evaluations to be completed:

Continuing Appointments Annually by May 31

Annual Appointments Annually by January 31

Temporary Appointments Annually or at the end of the special funding period if earlier than the anniversary date

MASSC were evaluated with a generic evaluation form until 1989, at which time a job specific form was instituted.

In Fall 1991, President Kridelbaugh requested that all MASSC employees be evaluated at the same time, specifically by January 31. That procedure has been in effect since January 1992.

In December of each year, the Department of Human Resources notifies supervisors of MASSC staff that evaluations must be completed. The notification includes directions for completing the document and the time line. At the same time, notification goes to the college community that the evaluation process has begun and comments are solicited regarding the performance of individual MASSC employees. Evaluation documents are color coded: green for supervisor evaluations, blue for college community comments. Collected documents from the supervisors are placed in the individual's personnel file. Comments from the college community are included in the personnel file if the MASSC individual requests, and if the document is signed. Unsigned documents are delivered to the individual MASSC employee. Other signed documents from the campus community are held in the Department of Human Resources for three years.

In Winter term 1993, the evaluation document was changed from a performance based, job specific document to a generic evaluation document. This is a return to the format used before 1989. The Dean of Administrative Services worked with Manager's Council to redesign the document.

A sample of the MASSC Evaluation document is on pages 73 and 74.

SOUTHWESTERN OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE

1993 EVALUATION OF MASSC STAFF BY COLLEGE COMMUNITY

EMPLOYEE BEING EVALUATED _____

DIRECTIONS: There is a place for you to identify yourself at the end of the evaluation form. If you choose to do this, the evaluation will be given to the person you are evaluating and to the supervisor. If you choose not to sign the form, only the person being evaluated will receive a copy. These extra forms will not become part of the official personnel file unless requested by the individual being evaluated.

All evaluations should be returned to the Personnel Office no later than Friday, March 12.

* * * * *

1. Please identify this employee's strengths that are evident in accomplishing his or her position responsibilities. Please cite specific responsibilities and give specific examples of strengths.

2. Please identify this employee's weaknesses that are evident in accomplishing his or her position responsibilities. Please cite specific responsibilities and give specific examples of weaknesses.

3. What suggestions do you have that would help this employee do a better job? Please be specific.

4. Other comments:

Evaluator (optional)

Date

CLASSIFIED STAFF EVALUATION PROCESS AND PROCEDURES

There have been some reasons for the delay in the development of this standard:

- The start up of the new "Colleague" system has taken a considerable amount of time and effort.
- The need for a Director of Human Resources was established, the recruitment efforts have recently been successful, and that department is now at full strength.
- Previous work toward meeting this standard has now been refocused and is nearing completion. Field testing the new process and model is all that remains, followed by training for the staff who will be using the new Performance Appraisal process and form.

The classified staff evaluation process includes classified staff representatives as members of the development committee. The initial work of the committee was the development of a Mission Statement:

We are developing/creating an evaluation process in a way that is ongoing, constructive, objective, and open so that the process is consistent, non-punitive, criteria based, and employees grow from the process as measured by the satisfaction of employees and supervisors with the process and its value.

A rough draft of the form, which has been designed to incorporate the essential job functions into the Performance Appraisal form, is on pages 77-85. As can be seen, the form will need to have each employee's respective essential job functions listed before the appraisal begins. This will enable an ongoing evaluation of the job descriptions to ensure that employees are being measured against those responsibilities. With the inclusion of the essential job functions into the Performance Appraisal instrument, the evaluation of those job responsibilities will be an accurate measure of the employee's level of performance.

The Performance Appraisal Committee felt that employees should be rated as either "Needs Improvement" or "Meets Expectations." They did not see the need for extending the rating scale to more than these two ratings, in that each rating of each job responsibility will require a comment by the appraiser.

The adoption of this performance appraisal process will require training the supervisors and employees in the use of the form and of the value of the performance appraisal process.

This use of this process is not limited to the Classified Staff but can be utilized by any groups here at the College.

Each part of the Performance Appraisal form is complete with an explanation as to how to use it.

RECOMMENDATION 5

Recommendation: With the passage of Ballot Measure 5, the College should develop a financial plan that would serve the College during a time of decreased income, and still be able to provide the community with a comprehensive program for its citizens (Standard II).

Institutional Response:

The passage of Ballot Measure 5 by the Oregon voters caused a major shift in the College's tax base revenue stream. The purpose of the measure was to reduce the levy from the district property tax for education and shift the burden for replacement of the lost taxes to the state general fund. While the state through 1995-96 must replace lost property taxes dollar for dollar, the state grant in aid assistance to community colleges can be reduced by legislative action.

District taxes supporting the College have been reduced because of Measure 5. In 1990-91 district tax-payers contributed \$4,280,738. The contribution in 1993-94 is for \$2,893,373.

As the legislature replaced the lost property taxes, it reduced the College's state assistance grant. The grant was \$2,137,098 in the second year of the 1991-93 biennium and funded at \$1,942,681 in the first year of the 1993-95 biennium.

The 1993-95 Biennium

1. Revenue Enhancement and Cost Containment Committee

As a result of the funding uncertainties created by Measure 5, and the uncertainties of college funding for the biennium, and the need to have a financial plan that would continue educational services to the district, the President formed a Revenue Enhancement and Cost Containment Committee. The Committee was chaired by the Dean of Instructional and Student Services. The other committee members consisted of eight administrators, one faculty, and one student.

The committee had two charges.

The first charge was to survey the six small Oregon Community Colleges: Rogue, Clatsop, Umpqua, Central, Blue Mountain, Treasure Valley. The purpose was to collect information about support and educational services, FTE required to provide the services, and the cost of providing the services.

The survey gathered data for the following support service areas: legal, labor, personnel, administrative computer services, switchboard, bookstore, print shop, mail services, financial aid, and plant services. Instructional areas that were surveyed included counseling, extended learning, library, media services, and registration and records. A copy of the cost containment survey for the Business Office is on pages 92 and 93.

The surveys for each service area were summarized by the committee. A copy of the summary for the Business Office is on pages 94 and 95.

The second charge was to identify revenue sources that could be enhanced to offset the decreased

revenues that were anticipated because of Measure Five. The committee was asked to consider fees, tuition, and new revenue sources. Initially, eighty-four revenue enhancement ideas were gained by brainstorming by the committee. Six were identified and included in the committee report. A summary of six is included is on pages 96 and 97.

2.College Mission Committee

The President formed a College Mission Committee. The Mission Committee was chaired by the Dean of Instructional and Student Services and had representation from all groups on campus. The committee members consisted of six administrators/ supervisors, four faculty, two classified staff, and two students.

The committee's charge was to examine the findings of the Revenue Enhancement and Cost Containment Committee, and to provide the President with revenue and expenditure recommendations that would address the revenue shortfalls for the 1993-95 biennium. A copy of the President's November 19, 1992, memorandum to the committee is on pages 98-114. Attention should be given to the President's affirmation that service to students should drive the committee's recommendations. His statement of important considerations in the memorandum specifically addresses the necessity of providing a comprehensive program for the College's citizens.

The Dean of Instructional and Student Services wrote the Committee on the College Mission report. The report was given to the college community on April 7, 1993. In the report, the committee established three consideration levels for resource alternatives and for expenditure considerations. Two of the first resource alternatives recommended by the committee -- closing the credit hour window and eliminating the mileage offset -- were immediately taken to the April Board of Education meeting for proposed implementation. A copy of the committee's report is included with this report on pages 105-114.

Many of the revenue and expenditure recommendations of the College Mission Committee were proposed during the 1993-94 budget process, approved by the Budget Committee, and included in the adopted budget document by the Board of Education.

The 1995-97 Biennium

The 1995-97 Biennium holds the most critical phases of Measure Five implementation and the possibility of major revenue shortfalls.

- 1.Oregon education will have to accept the mandate of the Oregon voters. For the ninth time the voters rejected a sales tax that would have eliminated school property taxes. The sales tax revenues were to be dedicated to K-12 and community college education.
- 2.The legislature will finally have to face the issue of tax reform.

3. In the first year of the biennium, the replacement of property tax dollars could leave a state general fund shortfall of four billion dollars.
4. In the second year of the biennium, the state's mandate to provide replacement dollars for lost property tax revenues ends.

To prepare a financial plan to address the budget reductions that will come in the 1995-97 biennium and into the future, and to continue to provide services to the college community, the College has or will take the following steps:

1. The College received a five-year Title III grant. This grant provides funds for the purchase and implementation of the Colleague management information system. The College has purchased two software modules that will enhance both fiscal and staffing projections. The Budget Management Module, which will be live for the 1994-95 budget year, has provisions for five-year budget projections and what-if scenarios. The Position Control/Management Module allows for projections and what-if scenarios for the analysis of staffing budgets. Both of these modules will provide analytic management tools that will allow the College to develop a financial plan to address Measure Five considerations.
2. The College will again use a Committee on the College Mission to recommend expenditure and resource considerations. If necessary, staff or another committee may address the possibilities for revenue enhancement and cost containment. The Mission Committee will be free to consider these possibilities as well as any others that the Committee may identify.

Recommendations from the Mission Committee and the Budget Management and Position Management modules will provide the financial plan that the College will use to address Measure Five and the mandate to provide comprehensive educational services to the college community.

RECOMMENDATION 7

***Recommendation:* Scholarship and research are an important part of a community college mission. Because of the lack of a response to Standard X in the self study report, the College should develop a process to identify appropriate scholarship and institutional research activities and their place in the overall program of the College.**

Institutional Response:

Southwestern Oregon Community College is a teaching institution and takes pride in the quality of its faculty. As a teaching institution, the College believes that any research conducted should directly improve individual and institutional performance in instruction.

A committee of faculty members developed the institutional response to Recommendation 7. The response includes a philosophy statement, reviews present practice and offers suggestions for strengthening the effectiveness of scholarship and research at the College.

Southwestern Oregon Community College recognizes the importance of supporting continuing scholarship and research opportunities for its faculty. This support is reflected in a multitude of mechanisms used throughout the College operation to encourage faculty to pursue professional development through scholarship and research. The unifying principle amongst these extensive options is the goal of improving the learning environment for our students. As additional support for faculty participation in these opportunities, the College is undertaking a process of strengthening its staff development system based on insights gained through this accreditation process.

This report is the product of the work done by a committee of faculty chosen by the College President. We were assigned the task of responding to the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges recommendation regarding scholarship and research. This recommendation followed the formal accreditation process which was completed during Spring 1992.

After meeting to review the Northwest Association's recommendation, its Standard X, and the general status of scholarship and research at SWOCC, the committee structured its work as follows:

PHILOSOPHY:Develop a general statement of the rationale and objectives for scholarship and research at the College.

PRESENT PRACTICE:Summarize the current formal and informal avenues of institutional support for scholarship and research.

STRENGTHENING:Describe the ongoing process used to strengthen the effectiveness of scholarship and research at the College.

PHILOSOPHY:

Scholarship and research activities for faculty at SWOCC are essential in order to maintain and strengthen the effectiveness and quality of instruction for our students. We view scholarship and research as characterized in Standard X of the Northwest Association's Accreditation Handbook. Specifically, as a community college, we recognize the need to focus on scholarship and research that enhance classroom instruction through development of both subject area content expertise and teaching methods.

PRESENT PRACTICE:

The following elements of support for scholarship and research are presently in place at SWOCC:

A funded staff development system operated through a faculty based staff development committee

An administrative staff development fund that supports faculty in institutionally identified needs and projects recommended through the Office of Instruction

Relevant teleconferences received on campus

Individual faculty release time for special research and development projects

Faculty excellence award grants supporting instructional development projects (These are Institutional Advancement awards that are funded by the College Foundation.)

Grants acquisition support through The Office of College Advancement

Sabbatical leaves

In-service sessions addressing improved teaching

Access to on-campus courses

Educational increments to salary

An instructional computing committee process that reviews faculty proposals for integration of the use of instructional technology into their teaching. This committee grew out of an ongoing U.S. Department of Education Title III grant. Faculty-initiated proposals for researching and testing the use of technologies to improve learning are reviewed by the committee, which then makes recommendations for support to the Office of Instruction. Such support may include release time, funding for equipment, travel, and special pay for development of instructional materials.

STRENGTHENING:

Scholarship and Research practices at SWOCC are reviewed periodically by faculty committees as assigned through the Faculty Senate. This year a committee will focus on the issue of accessibility of faculty development opportunities. Their work will be to explore ways to involve more faculty more often in the staff development process. The existing system of staff development is comprehensive: many and varied opportunities for professional development are available. The aim is to enhance the utilization of this system by recognizing the special needs of busy teachers.

The committee will make recommendations for improving access to the existing staff development opportunities. The committee will identify specific issues of concern to faculty along with proposals to enhance access. Then the committee will examine the feasibility and effectiveness of each proposal. Finally, the committee will prepare a report containing their recommendations for Faculty Senate action.