

Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness

The rubric for assessing institutional effectiveness was adapted by IEC from the “Rubric for Standards 1.B.1 – 1.B.4” in NWCCU’s *2020 Standards for Accreditation*. The IEC completed the review and analysis on July 27, 2020. The assessment was further discussed on August 5 by SLT.

| Comprehensive, Systematic, Continuous Planning and Assessment | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| Criterion | ♦ Initial ♦ (Awareness) | Emerging (Development) | Developed (Proficiency) | Highly Developed (Continuous Quality Improvement) |
| 1.B.1 (part 1) The college has a well-defined process for assessing institutional effectiveness. | Preliminary dialogue and exploration of institutional effectiveness assessment structures and practices are underway. | Structures and practices for assessing institutional effectiveness are established; assessment occurs in some areas. | Systematic and regular process of assessing institutional effectiveness are implemented and address student learning, achievement, and support services. | Assessment of institutional effectiveness is systematic and leads to continuous quality improvement of all institutional systems, structures, practices, and student learning and achievement outcomes. |
| <p>Rationale: This rubric for IE assessment was created in July 2020. Rubric development started by extracting the “Rubric for Standards 1.B.1 – 1.B.4” in NWCCU’s <i>2020 Standards for Accreditation</i>. Small adaptations were made and then reviewed by the IE Committee. Based on Committee feedback, the rubric was edited and then adopted by the Committee. The IE Committee immediately used the rubric to reflect on 2019-2020 work throughout the College and rated the status of institutional effectiveness at UCC. The results were sent to the Senior Leadership Team for review and were then incorporated into the annual Mission Fulfillment and Institutional Effectiveness Report.</p> <p>Next steps: Now that the rubric is in place, the IEC can promote awareness of what is being assessed and use the criteria for periodic check-ins throughout the year. The process for application of the rubric will be codified; i.e., IEC will identify the systematic way in how the rubric is used, when it is used, what bodies review the results, and how results are incorporated into action.</p> | | | | |

| Comprehensive, Systematic, Continuous Planning and Assessment | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Criterion | Initial (Awareness) | ♦ Emerging ♦ (Development) | Developed (Proficiency) | Highly Developed (Continuous Quality Improvement) |
| 1.B.1 (part 2) Evaluation and planning process inform institutional effectiveness, assign resources, and improve student learning and achievement. | Planning and evaluation are evident in some areas of the college's programs and services; some data and evidence are provided to support program and institution-wide planning efforts. | The college has defined planning processes in alignment with mission fulfillment objectives and outcomes, including student learning and achievement outcomes; there is an emerging understanding of the alignment of unit* level, cross-functional*, and institutional* plans. | Integrated planning processes are clearly defined, understood, and systematic; the college assesses progress toward achieving mission fulfillment indicators over time. | Ongoing, systematic, evidence-informed evaluation and planning are used to inform and refine systems, practices, strategies, and assign resources; there is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning and achievement; educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes; there is sufficient evidence that the college has improved student learning and achievement as a result of ongoing and systematic planning and evaluation processes. |
| <p><i>*Unit: Department-level, division-level, and office-level; includes operational and tactical plans</i></p> <p><i>*Cross-divisional: multiple units working collaboratively, such as DEI and Guided Pathways Plans</i></p> <p><i>*Institutional: college-level strategic plan</i></p> | | | | |
| <p>Rationale: A new, more inclusive resource allocation process was launched this year, issues of concern were identified within the resource allocation process, and modifications were identified for implementation in 2020-2021. The major challenge faced this year was one of timing; the process was being created at the same time the process was being implemented. An example of an issue was that the resource allocation scoring template was developed after, not before, the resource allocation form was dispersed. Planning processes matured in 2019-2020, with institutional indicators, tactical plans, operational plans, and academic assessment in place and aligned. Academic assessment for learning outcomes took place at the course, program and universal learning outcome assessment levels; academic assessment occurred for the entire academic year; and the need for better alignment between academic and support areas was identified in order to make informed decisions about priorities and resource allocation to support student success. Mission fulfillment data were reviewed at the July SPOC meeting; recommendations were made for next steps, including assuring a more widespread knowledge of institutional indicators and better alignment of plans with institutional indicators.</p> <p>Next steps: Intentionally increase collaboration between academic and support areas for resource allocation; consider how intersectionality of academic and support areas can be better articulated in tactical plans to support student success and achievement; demonstrate tactical plan connections to institutional indicators; utilize monthly joint meetings of SLT and PC to increase integration of planning, actions, and assessments; expand meaningful data and evidence utilized in academic program reviews; and expand college-wide communication about planning, evaluation processes, results of assessments, and institutional indicators.</p> | | | | |

| Comparative Goals, Objectives, and Indicators | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| Criterion | Initial (Awareness) | ♦ Emerging ♦ (Development) | Developed (Proficiency) | Highly Developed (Continuous Quality Improvement) |
| <p>1.B.2 (part 1) The institution sets meaningful goals, objectives, and indicators to define mission fulfillment and improve effectiveness.</p> | <p>There is recognition of the need for quantitative and qualitative data, indicators, and analysis in planning and institutional effectiveness structures.</p> | <p>Mission fulfillment objectives, indicators, and goals are established; standardized data are accessible at both unit* and institutional* levels; the college uses applicable quantitative and qualitative data to improve effectiveness in some areas.</p> | <p>Progress toward achieving its mission fulfillment objectives is assessed over time, using longitudinal data and analyses; both standardized and program-specific data and performance measures are used to inform unit* planning, program review, and institutional* plans.</p> | <p>Mission fulfillment objectives, indicators, goals, and outcomes are widely distributed, discussed, analyzed, and used to determine strategic priorities.</p> |
| <p><i>*Unit: Department-level, division-level, and office-level; includes operational and tactical plans</i> <i>*Cross-divisional: multiple units working collaboratively, such as DEI and Guided Pathways Plans</i> <i>*Institutional: college-level strategic plan</i></p> | | | | |
| <p>Rationale: The College developed and implemented mission fulfillment objectives, indicators, and goals. Tactical and operational plans have measurable actions and metrics that are aligned with the strategic plan. Academic programs have measurable outcomes and metrics. Longitudinal, standardized data are currently available and are utilized for institutional indicator and academic program assessment; these standardized data will inform the next planning cycle at all levels. Qualitative data are derived from Program Learning Outcomes, Universal Learning Outcomes, employee surveys, student surveys, and unit-level surveys; qualitative data are used in planning cycles at the unit level. Review of institutional indicator data results and progress on strategic plan priorities are analyzed and used to inform new plans and priorities.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Next Steps: Evaluate the meaningfulness of the quantitative and qualitative data used at all levels of planning and evaluation; determine use of additional standardized data, such as data from the Voluntary Framework of Accountability; utilize survey results in a more systematic way to inform plans; distribute more widely the results of strategic plan progress and institutional data review.</p> | | | | |

| Comparative Goals, Objectives, and Indicators | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| Criterion | ♦ Initial ♦ (Awareness) | Emerging (Development) | Developed (Proficiency) | Highly Developed (Continuous Quality Improvement) |
| <p>1.B.2 (part 2) The goals, objectives, and indicators of mission fulfillment or institutional effectiveness are in the context of and in comparison with regional and national peers.</p> | <p>There is no evidence that mission fulfillment data has improved effectiveness in comparison with regional and national peers.</p> | <p>Regional and national peers have been identified; minimal evidence exists that mission fulfillment data has improved effectiveness in comparison with regional and national peers.</p> | <p>Regional and national peers have been identified based on clear criteria; evidence shows that mission fulfillment data has improved effectiveness in comparison with regional and national peers.</p> | <p>Regional and national peers have been identified with clear criteria; data are analyzed and there is extensive evidence that the college has improved institutional effectiveness in the context of regional and national peer institutions; regional and national peer institutions are regularly reviewed to ensure appropriate and meaningful comparison.</p> |
| <p>Rationale: The College’s goals, objectives, and indicators share context with other institutions of higher education, but regional and national peers have not yet been identified. The College’s institutional indicators were revised in Summer 2019, and the first year of data collection was primarily used to establish baseline data. Some units are utilizing national data averages to guide their tactical and operational metrics. The cross-divisional plan for guided pathways uses early momentum data comparisons with other Oregon community colleges participating in the statewide guided pathways project.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Next Steps: Determine the institutional effectiveness data that can be meaningfully and reliably compared with regional and national peer colleges; determine regional and national peer and aspirant comparison colleges; set metrics for institutional effectiveness that inspire improvement.</p> | | | | |

| Inclusive Engagement and Integration of Processes | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Criterion | Initial (Awareness) | ♦ Emerging ♦ (Development) | Developed (Proficiency) | Highly Developed (Continuous Quality Improvement) |
| <p>1.B.3 The planning process is inclusive, allocates resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.</p> | <p>There is minimal evidence of the involvement of the various constituents; there is minimal linkage between planning efforts, resource allocation, and outcomes.</p> | <p>Planning processes reflect the participation of an expanding constituent base; there is some evidence that formal planning processes are aligned with mission fulfillment and strategic priorities; planning guides resource prioritization and allocation.</p> | <p>Processes reflect the participation and meaningful contribution of a broad constituent base; formal planning is clearly aligned to institutional objectives, indicators, and outcomes; planning regularly guides resource allocation.</p> | <p>Evidence shows that planning processes are broad-based, offer opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocate necessary resources, and lead to improvement of institutional outcomes.</p> |
| <p>Rationale: A new, more inclusive resource allocation process was established during the FY '21 budgeting process in Fall 2019, bringing awareness to meaningful considerations for successful resource allocation. Issues were identified in the resource allocation process, and modifications are in progress for the Fall 2020 resource allocation process for FY '22. A planning process that is inclusive of various focus groups was established. Planning takes place at the department, division, and institutional levels with input from various constituents. The Strategic Planning Oversight Committee was established two years ago and conducted mid-year and end-of-year reviews and analyses of the strategic plan progress.</p> <p>Next steps: Better align the resource allocation requests with the budget development process; ensure that the budget development and resource allocation processes are aligned with strategic priorities; modify the resource allocation request process by merging current rubrics into one rubric to be used by all review groups; make the resource allocation rubric available to those who request and review resource allocation requests and to those who make the final decisions about resource allocations; refine the timeline for setting strategic priorities and creating tactical and operation plans in order to better guide the resource allocation process.</p> | | | | |

| Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adaptation | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| Criterion | Initial (Awareness) | ♦ Emerging ♦ (Development) | Developed (Proficiency) | Highly Developed (Continuous Quality Improvement) |
| <p>1.B.4 (part 1) The College monitors its internal and external environments to identify current and emerging patterns, trends, and expectations.</p> | <p>There is minimal evidence of monitoring internal and external environments; current and emerging evidence of patterns and trends are not developed.</p> | <p>Monitoring of internal and external environments has been initiated; data and evidence are used in some areas to inform planning and resource allocation.</p> | <p>Structures for monitoring internal and external environments are developed; data and evidence from internal and environmental monitoring are used regularly in planning and resource allocation.</p> | <p>Internal and external environments are monitored continuously and systematically to identify current and emerging patterns, trends, and expectations; data and evidence are systematically and regularly used to inform planning and resource allocation.</p> |
| <p>Rationale: The College is monitoring some internal environments (e.g., registration, facilities, energy consumption, academic quality, budget) and using data and evidence in planning and resource allocation (e.g., registration wait, online course quality, facilities maintenance schedule, budget forecasting and monitoring). Internal surveys of employees and students were conducted this year, and the results are being used in next year's tactical and operational plans of multiple areas. The external environment is monitored for some areas (e.g., workforce development needs, K-12 schools, state resource allocation, state and federal mandates, and technology) and evidence and data are incorporated into some plans (e.g., CWT and CTE offerings, budget adjustments, Title IX compliance, dual credit and high school/college alignment, cultural competence requirements, technology infrastructure and materials upgrades).</p> <p>Next steps: Develop intentional monitoring processes across campus operational areas; conduct business/industry surveys for employer needs; elevate work of advisory councils to include action plans and reporting; conduct the triennial community survey in 2020-2021; survey high schools for dual credit, expanded options, and high school/college alignment; include in SPOC semi-annual meetings a review of emerging patterns, trends, and expectations; use data and evidence for developing tactical and operational plans, which in turn inform resource allocation.</p> | | | | |

| Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adaptation | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| Criterion | Initial (Awareness) | ♦ Emerging ♦ (Development) | Developed (Proficiency) | Highly Developed (Continuous Quality Improvement) |
| 1.B.4 (part 2) Governance system engagement in institutional effectiveness | Planning and institutional effectiveness efforts are discussed in some areas of institutional governance. | Governance, policy, and decision-making processes are informed by a review of institutional effectiveness. | Institutional effectiveness reports, findings, and recommendations are regularly discussed and addressed through the institution's governance system. | The governance system uses findings and recommendations to assess the college's strategic position, define its future direction, and review and revise, as necessary, its mission, planning, the intended outcomes of its programs and services, and indicators of achievement. |
| <p>Rationale: Processes are in place to review institutional effectiveness through the monitoring and analysis of strategic priority progress and institutional indicator data. The results of the review are shared through the governance system, including with the Board of Education, and are incorporated into next steps for improvement.</p> <p>Next steps: Use fall in-service to explain institutional effectiveness and explain role of governance in institutional effectiveness; create intentional inclusion of institutional effectiveness reports, findings, and recommendations at monthly meetings of governance bodies; record responses and implementation of recommendations and report in annual updates.</p> | | | | |