FOCUSED INTERIM EVALUATION REPORT

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

APRIL 2007

Portland Community College
12000 Southwest 49th Avenue
PO Box 19000
Portland, Oregon 97280-0990

http://www.pcc.edu
(503) 977-4005

Table of Contents

Exhibits   Referenced on Page(s)

Introduction Regarding the Context for the Report

Portland Community College's 2007 Focused Interim Evaluation Report responds to the recommendations from the college's spring 2005 Comprehensive Evaluation Visit and subsequent Report. The recommendations focus on the areas of:

- Identification and publication of learning outcomes for all degree and certificate programs.
- Assessment of students achieving learning outcomes and how results lead to the improvement of teaching and learning.
- Programs using related instruction have clearly identified content that is taught by faculty who are appropriately qualified.
- Assessment of student services programs using evaluations as a basis for program changes.

In addition, the college was requested to report on its progress in reducing the backlog of faculty evaluations.

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│ Recommendation One                                                    │
│ The Committee recommends that the College identify and publish the    │
│ learning                                                              │
│ outcomes for each of its degree and certificate programs (Standard    │
│ 2.B.2).                                                               │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

After the recommendations were issued following Portland Community College's (PCC) spring 2005 Comprehensive Visit and Evaluation Report, a small task group (now referred to as the Outcomes/Assessment Team) met representing the Educational Advisory Committee (EAC) Curriculum Committee, EAC Degrees and Certificates Committee, and Curriculum Office to discuss the specific recommendations.

The Outcomes/Assessment Team reviewed the current status of degree and certificate outcomes at PCC. This review confirmed earlier data and information.

- There was no one central, visible administrative location identified that was responsible for PCC's outcomes and assessment processes.
- Most of the Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degrees and certificates did not have individual outcomes but rather program outcomes. These outcomes were not published in the catalog. There was no one central, visible location for AAS degree and certificate outcomes that provided easy access to the students or the college community.
- Through faculty and division dean retirements, PCC had experienced a high degree of turn over which meant that many of the current faculty and division deans had little direct experience with outcomes training.
- Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer Degree (AAOT), Associate of Science (AS), Associate of Science Oregon Transfer – Business Degree (ASOT-BUS), and Associate of General Studies (AGS) did not have degree specific outcomes but were linked to the broader PCC Core Outcomes: communication, community and environmental responsibility, critical thinking and problem solving, cultural awareness, professional competence, and self-reflection.
- A need existed to renew the college's emphasis on outcomes-based course, certificate and degree design.
- There was a realization that an operational plan was needed in order to achieve the goal of a clear, transparent system that communicates course, certificate, and degree outcomes while demonstrating the college's regular and systematic assessment of those outcomes.
- The college must first address the components of Recommendation One (i.e. identifying the outcomes) before formalizing an assessment plan (Recommendation Two).

2005-2007 Focus Areas

Over the past two years, the college has taken several corrective measures to address Recommendation One. Efforts have been focused on the following:

Focus Area One: Establishing clear organizational responsibility for outcomes, assessment, and catalog processes.

Focus Area Two: Gathering existing course, certificate and AAS degree outcome information.

> **Focus Area Three:** Providing faculty and administrators with direct access to an expert on outcomes through workshops.
>
> **Focus Area Four:** Developing a process for communicating PCC Core Outcomes and the Core Outcomes Matrix.
>
> **Focus Area Five:** Communicating the college's renewed emphasis on outcomes-based education.
>
> **Focus Area Six:** Devising a plan to develop degree specific outcomes for AAOT, AS, ASOT-BUS, and AGS degrees.

Focus Area One

In the summer of 2005, subsequent to receiving the recommendations from the college's spring 2005 comprehensive visit and evaluation report, the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs asked the Staff and Organizational Development Office to chair a Task Force to review the Academic and Student Affairs (ASA) organizational unit and provide recommendations for organizational change that would, among other items, strengthen ASA's ability to support the college's renewed emphasis on outcomes. Results of this effort included:

- The Curriculum Office was restructured and job duties were reassigned to ensure that course, certificate and degree outcomes would be reported, posted, and archived in a systematic fashion.
- Staff in Curriculum Support Services was assigned to develop a website where all AAS certificate and degree outcomes would be located and visible to the college community and students.
- With the retirement of the Director of Institutional Research, the job title was changed to Director of Institutional Effectiveness and the position was expanded to include assessment responsibilities.

Focus Area Two

The Curriculum Support Office initiated an effort to gather all current Professional Technical Education (PTE) Program Outcomes and publish them to a website under their respective certificates and AAS degrees. This endeavor was followed by providing support to the PTE Subject Area Committees (SAC) to review and revise outcomes to become AAS Degree and Certificate specific. PCC has initiated a three-year plan to review the printed and on-line catalog (Exhibit 1). Beginning with the 2006-2007 printed catalog, PCC began publishing an on-line website (http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/degree-outcome/index.html) where AAS degree and certificate outcomes can be viewed.

The EAC Curriculum Committee and EAC Degrees and Certificates Committee provide internal oversight to course and degree/certificate outcomes. Internal approval forms for new and/or revised courses, certificates, and AAS degrees were reviewed and strengthened, where needed, to focus on outcomes. In the course of the 1995-1996 academic year, members of each committee

met with Dr. Ruth Stiehl[1] for an all-day workshop where outcomes were reviewed and PCC Guidelines for Course Outcomes, and AAS Degrees and Certificates Outcomes Guidelines were drafted. Subsequently, both of these guidelines were reviewed by the internal college community and posted on the following website as resources to the college community http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/eac/degree/dc-outcomes-guidelines.html. Faculty and academic administrators were informed of these resources and reacquainted with the internal review and recommendation process.

Focus Area Three

Through faculty and division dean retirements, PCC experienced a high degree of turn over in recent years which meant that many of the current faculty and division deans had little direct experience with prior outcomes training. Additionally, shortly after 1995-1996, the college experienced diminished funding from state sources due to a statewide economic downturn. This prompted a significant decrease in funds earmarked for outcomes training. From this point forward, the understanding of outcomes and what was a "robust" outcome had begun to take on a life of its own. As a result of the college's intensive work on its 2005 Self-Study and the subsequent particulars in Recommendation One from the 2005 Comprehensive Evaluation Report, the Outcomes/Assessment Team requested that Dr. Ruth Stiehl return to the college to provide outcomes training to a newer audience. In December 2006, Dr. Stiehl conducted two workshops for faculty and academic administrators. One workshop focused on AAS Degree and Certificate outcomes; the second workshop on credit level outcomes. Both workshops were well attended. An additional workshop was conducted on January 31, 2007, which focused on course level outcomes. The workshop scheduled for April 12, 2007, will focus on degree and certificate level outcomes in the morning and course level outcomes in the afternoon. In addition, workshops focusing on degree and certificate level outcomes will be held again in September 2007 with the intent of having had all PTE program faculty participate directly in one of Dr. Stiehl's workshops.

Focus Area Four

In the late 1990s the PCC academic community developed and approved PCC Core Outcomes. In addition, a work group developed a Core Outcomes Matrix to link credit courses with PCC Core Outcomes. However, after numerous retirements, organizational changes, and energy spent in other areas, much of this work was not well understood by (or communicated to) the college community. In addition, the linkage between courses, certificates, degrees, and Core Outcomes needed to be strengthened. Initial work in this focus area had been around gathering information on Core Outcomes, which were housed in several PCC locations. Once gathered, a website was developed that communicated the Core Outcomes and work done by the college faculty to articulate courses with the Core Outcomes http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/core-outcomes/index.html.

---

[1] Dr. Ruth Stiehl is a tenured faculty member at Oregon State University (OSU), teaching in the area of education. She was one of the initial faculty selected to instruct in the Community College Leadership Program teaching an Instructional Leader II course which focused on degree/course outcomes and course flow. Dr. Stiehl was one of the co-creators of the Adult Education Master's Degree at OSU. Dr. Stiehl is a principle of a consulting company, The Learning Organization, and has written two books: *The Outcomes Primer and The Mapping Primer - Tools for Reconstructing the College Curriculum.* Dr. Stiehl has consulted with numerous institutions throughout the United States and abroad in the area of outcomes and degree/course construction.

Focus Area Five

The college's renewed emphasis on outcomes and assessment has been communicated to the college community through emails, new websites, and in formal meeting settings. At the September 18, 2006 Fall Inservice, faculty SAC chairs and academic administrators attended an afternoon meeting with the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs (VP ASA). Outcomes were a prominent portion of the agenda. Information included:

- Assurance of the college's renewed emphasis on outcomes-based course, certificate, and degree design.
- Review of the internal review and recommendation process.
- Information on the Dr. Ruth Stiehl Workshops.
- Identification of district resources for SAC chairs to develop degree, certificate and/or course outcomes.
- Explanations connecting the Program/Discipline Review Process with on-going outcomes review and evaluation. www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/program-review/index.html

Additionally, on October 6, 2006, the VP ASA brought faculty together to discuss district-wide academic initiatives. One of the primary initiatives discussed was outcomes and assessment.

Focus Area Six

PCC's college community will be asked to engage in a process to identify degree specific outcomes for its AAOT, AS, ASOT-BUS, and AGS degrees. Lead by the Outcomes/Assessment Team, this process will include workshops in 2008-2009 that will be attended by faculty in represented areas district-wide and led by Dr. Ruth Stiehl.

In summary, PCC has initiated the following to address Recommendation One:
1. Established an Outcomes/Assessment Team.
2. Developed an operational plan to achieve our goal of a clear transparent system that communicates our course, certificate and degree outcomes.
3. Reorganized the Curriculum Office infrastructure; Curriculum Support Services reassigned staff as resource personnel.
4. Strengthened the connection between course, certificate and AAS degree outcomes and the Program/Discipline Review process.
5. Increased the college community's awareness and knowledge of outcomes-based education
6. Developed additional college resources for faculty: PCC Guidelines for Course Outcomes and PCC Guidelines for Certificate/Degree Outcomes.
7. Developed a website to publish outcomes information, including AAS degree and certificate outcomes and PCC Core Outcomes.
8. Developed process for reviewing and revising PTE program outcomes against the criteria outlined in the PCC Guidelines for Certificate/Degree Outcomes.
9. In process of devising a plan to develop degree specific outcomes for the AAOT, AS, ASOT-BUS, and AGS degrees.

> **Recommendation Two**
> While noting considerable efforts in assessment at the course level, the Evaluation Committee recommends that the college demonstrate, through regular and systematic assessment, that students who complete their programs have achieved the expected learning outcomes. The Committee further recommends that the college demonstrate how results lead to the improvement of teaching and learning (Standards 2.B.2 and 2.B.3).

As previously mentioned, it was critical to make substantial progress related to Recommendation One before addressing Recommendation Two. Thus, with the completion of Focus Areas One through Six (and/or corresponding work well underway) the Outcomes/Assessment Team is now positioned to lead the college planning and implementation to support Recommendation Two.

The "PCC Academic Assessment Process" map provides an overview of the college's commitment to strengthen the connection between outcomes, assessment and institutional effectiveness (Exhibit 2). The numerous feedback loops complete the plan-do-assess-act cycle that enables the continuous improvement of teaching and learning. In preparation of that work, the following specific focus efforts unique to Recommendation Two were completed during 2005-2007:

> **Focus Area One:** Revision of the Program/Discipline Review process.

> **Focus Area Two:** Modification of Institutional Effectiveness measures and reporting.

Focus Area One

One of the outcomes of PCC's Program/Discipline Review process is for the Subject Area Committees (SACs) to demonstrate that students are successfully completing their program outcomes. SACs are also required to show how the results of these assessments are being used to improve instruction and revise curriculum. The college's Program/Discipline Review model was reviewed and updated in fall 2005 to better reflect the college's increased focus on assessment and learning. All PCC programs and academic disciplines are scheduled for Program/Discipline Reviews with a required cycle of no more than five years. In addition, each SAC is encouraged to review their Program/Discipline Review outcomes on an annual basis to ensure relevance.

Program/Discipline Review presentations are scheduled through the office of the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs at least one month prior to delivery with invitations provided to the vice presidents, deans of instruction, division deans, related faculty, advisory committee members, and any interested staff. The formal presentation is an opportunity for SACs to present the most recent information about their discipline which includes current enrollment and completion trends, outcomes and assessment strategies, areas of exemplary performance, and areas of challenge. Since then, there has been a marked increase in "administrative response" to both the written and formal program discipline review. Additionally, findings from the Program/Discipline Reviews are now incorporated into the college's overall annual academic planning process. For example:
- Information describing the goals and process for a Program/Discipline Review are posted at: www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/program-review/index.html

- The Program/Discipline Review Schedule can be found in Exhibit 3.
- Data on program and discipline related enrollment summaries, student characteristics, detailed enrollment information, and graduate completers is posted at: www.pcc.edu/ir/program_profiles/main.htm

To date, 72 of 86 SACS have completed their Program/Discipline Reviews. Of those completed, 13 have used the improved review model. Scheduling into the future using a five-year cycle provides a tentative schedule of: 28 SAC reviews in 2007, 22 in 2008, 32 in 2009, and 6 in 2010.

Focus Area Two

Institutional reporting on student outcomes was previously addressed in the annual Institutional Effectiveness Report. This document included more than eighty measures and was generally sixty-five to seventy or more pages in length. To better keep SACs and the college community as a whole informed, six to eight shorter (two to three page) reports generated as part of an Institutional Effectiveness Reporting Cycle have replaced the Annual Institutional Effectiveness Report. The eighty plus previously reported measures have been edited into a group of twenty key measures. The college outputs identified in the PCC Academic Assessment Process map are trended over time and provide input and feedback to the Academic Planning Process. http://www.pcc.edu/ir/effect_ind/eff_ind.htm

In summary, the following Outcomes/Assessment Implementation Plan documents the action items that have been completed, those "in process", and activities planned for the current or next two academic years.

Outcomes/Assessment Implementation Plan
Revised January 16, 2007

Outcomes/Assessment Action Item	06-07	07-08	08-09
Develop AAS Degree and Certificate Website			
Design a website using state of Oregon Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) list	X		
Collect current Program Outcomes and post to website under each Degree/Certificate in a PTE program as per recommendation from Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities	X		
Have faculty review site for accuracy	X	X	X
Contact state of Oregon about discrepancies on CIP list and current offerings	X		
Develop a plan to maintain updated AAS degree and certificate outcomes on website	X	X	
Link development of catalog process of AAS degree and certificate materials with Degrees and Certificates website	X	X	
Publish degree and Certificate outcomes in the printed catalog			X
Develop a system to track and archive degree and certificate changes		X	X

Provide Assistance and Guidance to PTE Programs in Outcomes Review/Revision Process	06-07	07-08	08-09
EAC Degrees/Certificates (D/C) Committee members develop and publish PCC Guidelines for AAS Degree and Certificate Outcomes	X		
EAC D/C Committee members attend a workshop with Dr. Stiehl	X		
Guidelines are developed, approved and distributed	X		
Guidelines are used when new or revised AAS degrees and/or certificates come before the EAC D/C Committee	X	X	X
PTE SACs revisit their D/C outcomes using PCC Guidelines for AAS degree and certificate outcomes. In 2006-2007, revisions that occur within a Dr. Ruth Stiehl workshop will be reviewed and approved by EAC D/C via "fast track". Revisions due in Curriculum Office by May 18, 2007 for 2007-2008 printed catalog	X		
PTE SAC revisit their D/C outcomes using PCC Guidelines for AAS Degree and Certificate outcomes. In 2007-2008, revisions that occur will need to go through the complete EAC D/C internal approval process		X	
Explore methods for integration of Curriculum Services Support (CSS) personnel as support for faculty	X		
Develop strategies to sustain outcomes development resources through CSS		X	X
Provide Support to Faculty for Course Outcome Development and/or Revision			
Develop strategies and support systems for faculty to review and revise course outcomes	X		
Schedule Dr. Stiehl workshops for course outcomes	X	X	
Guidelines for course outcomes are developed, approved, and distributed by EAC Curriculum Committee	X		
EAC Curriculum Committee members attend a workshop with Dr. Stiehl	X		
Guidelines are developed, approved, and distributed	X		
Guidelines are used when new or revised curriculum come before the EAC Curriculum Committee	X	X	X
Task Force to recommend philosophy, procedures, and guidelines on assessments and relationship to courses, degrees, and certificates.	X	X	
Implementation of Task Force findings		X	X
Revitalize the Integration of Core Outcomes into PCC's Curriculum			
Publish PCC Core Outcomes information in printed and on-line catalog	X		
Review and reinvigorate Core Outcomes' Descriptors with Dr. Stiehl		X	
Develop a website for Core Outcomes - Course Matrix work completed by faculty	X		
Credit courses not on the Course Matrix need to be evaluated by SACs and information conveyed to the Curriculum Office for placement on Core Outcomes website		X	
Develop a plan that integrates Core Outcomes with assessment of degrees		X	
Perform an audit of the Core Outcomes Matrix for course accuracy: inactive or new courses		X	
New credit courses and course revisions include a Core Outcomes Matrix		X	X

Develop Degree Outcomes for AAOT, AS, ASOT-BUS, and AGS	06-07	07-08	08-09
Participate in state of Oregon Joint Boards Articulation Commission discussion on AAOT general education requirement outcomes	X		
Implement process to develop degree specific outcomes		X	X
Catalog			
AAS Degree and Certificate Outcomes website is printed in the catalog	X	X	X
AAS Degree and Certificate Outcomes website is a link in the on-line catalog	X	X	X
Assessment/Institutional Effectiveness			
Revisit/revise prior institutional effectiveness measures	X		
Transition from the creation of one annual report to on-going reporting (multiple reports) throughout the year.	X		
Continuously improve access to assessment/institutional effectiveness reporting through expanded use of the Institutional Effectiveness website	X	X	X
Identify "best practice" assessment models used in other institutions	X	X	
Modify (if needed) best practice model for implementation at PCC		X	X
Expand Outcomes/Assessment Team membership (as needed) to increase capacity and/or expertise	X	X	X
Explore available software programs to manage assessment information		X	X
Implement outcomes assessment model/process		X	X
Evaluate effectiveness of assessment model/process			X

Recommendation 3
The Evaluation Committee recommends that programs using related instruction have clearly identified content that is pertinent to the general program of study and is taught by faculty who are appropriately qualified (Policy 2.1).

In response to Recommendation 3, all Portland Community College (PCC) professional technical education programs that offer one or two year certificates must demonstrate to the Degrees and Certificates Committee that the program meets the related instruction requirements by spring 2008. This can be accomplished by either including specific stand alone courses or embedding the related instruction into the curriculum. If embedded, the Subject Area Committee (SAC) must show a minimum of 270 hours of instruction in three areas: A) computation, B) human relations, and C) communication. A minimum of 20% in each area must be part of the certificate program. If the related instruction is embedded, Subject Area Committees recommend to the administration which faculty are qualified to teach in each of the related instructional areas. The following process has been implemented to ensure compliance with the standards required by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities regarding related instruction and has in place a process to ensure this continues.

Guidelines have been developed for faculty to use in demonstrating related instruction that is embedded in existing courses. These guidelines include:

- which credit courses can be used as stand alone coursework meeting the requirement;
- the required number and distribution of hours for certificates of 45 credits or more;
- a template for tallying number of hours of related instruction within courses;
- principles by which the number of hours of student learning (including direct instruction, practice (as in a lab) or study can be estimated;
- different strategies for implementing related instruction;
- examples of content and activities that are embedded within a course within a course in Professional Technical Education; and
- how related instruction is to be reflected in Course Content and Outcomes Guide
  http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/ccog/index.html

Forms have been developed for faculty to use to request approval for the content and/or activities for embedding related instruction. There is a section in the Course Content and Outcomes Guide (CCOG) to specify related instruction. This section of the CCOG requires college approval for changes. The Subject Area Committees' (SAC) request is reviewed by the Curriculum Committee, the Deans of Instruction and the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs. A template has been introduced for faculty to record and track related instruction by certificate. SACs have been instructed to define instructor qualifications for PTE courses in which related instruction is embedded. A new section was added to the college-wide "Instructor Approval" form to indicate that an instructor has met these qualifications. When this box is checked, a second form is required, which details the related instruction content areas covered and qualifications required for the instructor.

Related Instruction web pages were developed and posted. These web pages are located under the Academic Services Curriculum Office web page:
http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/eac/curriculum/curriculum-office/related-instruction.html

The first page of the Related Instruction web page gives the definition of related instruction, general guidelines and requirements for the certificates. Links include:

- Guidelines (including a detailed description and examples)
- Related Instruction Form for PTE courses
- Related Instruction Template for Certificates
- New PTE courses and new or revised certificates are now required to submit information about their related instruction as part of the approval process
- Instructor Approval Forms:
  o Modified existing form to indicate that related instruction is part of the course content to be taught
  o Instructor qualifications regarding related instruction

(A form will be developed that SACs can use to define the instructor qualifications needed for the various courses.)

There are three aspects of the project that are still in progress:
- Identification of PCC Certificates that need to demonstrate related instruction (Exhibit 4).
- Presentation of related instruction to the Degrees and Certificates Committee for approval.
- Identification of barriers that exist that might hinder meeting the spring 2008 compliance deadline.

Recommendation 4
Acknowledging evidence of the assessment of student services programs, the Committee recommends that these evaluations be consistently used as a basis for program changes (Standard 3.B.6).

In response to Recommendation 4, the deans of student development and the dean of enrollment services have identified five effective assessments conducted within student and enrollment service programs, the consistency of the assessment tool utilized, and the **changes** made as a result of information collected in the evaluation/assessment. These assessments/evaluations include:

Assessment One: Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory

Assessment Two: Student and Enrollment Services Program Reviews

Assessment Three: Key Directions Planning and Assessment

Assessment Four: Accreditation Self-Study, 2005

Assessment Five: "Lean" Process Review

Assessment One: Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory

(Referred to at PCC as the Campus Climate Survey)
For survey distribution, a representative set of credit classes are identified and within those groups classes are selected by the office for Institutional Effectiveness for survey distribution and in-class completion. Students are asked to answer 98 pre-set questions, 10 college-developed questions, and 12 questions about demographic information. The difference between the importance of the service to the student and their satisfaction is the performance gap -- the higher the gap, the greater the concern.

Consistency of Use

All three comprehensive campus locations and the Extended Learning Center: spring 2005 and planned for spring 2007; Sylvania Campus only: spring 2001 and 2003

Program Changes Made as a Result of the Assessment - 2005 College-Wide Survey Distribution and Results (Exhibit 5)

Highest performance gaps were in the areas of textbook costs, parking, schedule convenience, financial aid, and academic advising. Changes include:

- A textbook committee was formed and active in 2005-2006. The committee was co-chaired by a student government leader and a faculty member and included a dean of students. Eleven recommendations were forwarded to the Educational Advisory Committee and over half of them have been approved and recommended actions are being taken.
- Financial Aid Days have been implemented on all campuses (after piloting on the Cascade Campus) to provide assistance to students and potential students in completing FAFSA forms and applying on-line.
- A new financial aid loan officer position was added at the Sylvania Campus.
- Sylvania Campus is piloting a newly revised block schedule format to help eliminate class scheduling conflicts for students.
- Increased advising opportunities have been made available at all campuses through the Mott Grant for developmental education students interested in pursuing a certificate or degree in Professional Technical Education.
- A new general advisor position was created when a counselor position was vacated at the Sylvania Campus.
- Increased advising efficiencies will be possible with the purchase and use of a new tracking system (Advisor Trac), piloted at Sylvania Campus winter 2007 for college-wide implementation in fall 2007.

Program Changes Made as a Result of the Assessment - 2001 and 2003 Sylvania Campus Distribution and Results (Exhibits 6 and 7)

Highest performance gaps were in the areas of parking, parking lot lighting and security, schedule convenience, complaint processes, financial aid and academic advising.

- Campus deans worked with the safety committee and plant services to improve parking lot lighting.
- Sylvania Campus developed a committee to review schedule problems – resulting in recommendation for block schedule format discussed above.
- Complaint processes were clarified and information about where to find complaint forms, how to complete forms, and the difference between complaints and grievances were added to MyPCC and *Student Rights and Responsibilities Handbook.*
- A new developmental education advisor position was added at the Sylvania Campus.

Assessment Two: Student and Enrollment Services Program Reviews

Consistency of Use

The goal is for each service area to complete a program review every five years. Program review includes assessment of current services and recommended changes. Student and Enrollment Services Program Reviews include:

- Employment Services and Cooperative Education (first review completed in 2001; second review planned for 2007)
- Student Leadership/Government (first review completed in 2002; second review planned for 2007)
- Women's Resource Center (completed 2003)
- Advising (completed 2004)
- Counseling Career and Guidance Instructional Programs (completed 2004)
- Admissions (completed 2005)
- Disability Services (completed 2005)
- Counseling Services (completed 2006)
- Multicultural Programs (completed 2006)
- Grant Programs (planned for 2007)
- Testing and Assessment (planned for 2007)
- Registration and Records (planned for 2007)
- Financial Aid and Veterans Services (planned for 2008)

Program Changes Made as a Result of the Assessment

Examples of changes made after 2005 and 2006 program review recommendations are detailed below.

Admissions

- Coding and data entry to record the types of admissions contacts have been updated and simplified.
- While the recommended new committee for marketing and publications has not been formed, admissions staff have been meeting on a more regular basis with the marketing staff, and they have shared information about postcard mailings, updating of brochures, giveaway items, etc.
- A new website about Preview Days in spring 2007 has been initiated by Admissions staff (http://www.pcc.edu/admissions/preview-days.html)
- The Student Admissions, Registration, and Training (START) Lab Initiative has been discussed by a district-wide planning group, and preliminary steps have been taken on some campuses to provide accessible computers and student helpers. A more formal budget initiative was postponed until next year.

In addition to their own recommendations, admissions supported "LEAN" Process Recommendations, see Assessment Five.

Disability Services

- In response to a recommendation concerning counselor caseloads, a new initiative proposal (for 2006-2007) was forwarded by the deans of student development to create a new counselor position in the Office for Students with Disabilities. When that initiative was not funded that year, the Vice President for Academic and Student

Services (VP ASA) made additional Carl D. Perkins Title I resources available to increase part-time counseling hours at Cascade and Rock Creek campuses, and Southeast Center. Another new initiative proposal was forwarded to the Executive Cabinet for 2007-2008 and has been recommended as a high priority by the deans of student development and the VP ASA. If new initiative funds are not available for this position in 2007-2008, the deans of students are planning to submit a proposal for Carl D. Perkins Title I funding for the position.

- Also as a result of concerns raised in the program review about the lack of learning disabilities testing, OSD is working this year with a Portland State University Instructor and doctoral students to provide limited learning disabilities testing on a pilot basis. This pilot is being funded by the MOTT Grant and Carl D. Perkins Title I.

Counseling Services

- A Faculty Department Chair Compensation Study was conducted district-wide. This study, if funded, will allow the deans of students to assess equity for release time and compensation for counseling department chairs district-wide.
- Counselors at the Southeast Center/Extended Learning Campus now report to the Dean of Student Development who has the knowledge and expertise in counselor functions and roles.
- A district-wide appointment system was implemented that allows counselors to track an advising/counseling history with students and share information across campuses. This system (Advisor Trac) was piloted at the Sylvania Campus during winter 2007 with a plan for district-wide implementation in fall 2007.

Multicultural Programs

Program Review recommendations focused on five key areas including: campus life, research, professional development and hiring practices, resource allocation and international partnerships. Changes included:
- SylvaniaCampus held an Open House for students of color fall 2006.
- Campus Presidents established diversity committees on each campus.
- A budget request was submitted to increase the PCC Diversity Fund by $20,000.
- The Sylvania Campus Multicultural Center Coordinator is working on a job description revision/reclassification.
- The 2007 Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory will include specific multicultural questions to be used district-wide.

Assessment Three: 2004-2006 Student and Enrollment Services Key Directions Planning Process

In fall 2003 all student and enrollment service employees (approximately 150 staff) came together for a half-day assessment exercise to identify student and enrollment services issues. Twelve randomly selected mixed groups were asked and answered three questions:

1. What are the obstacles to delivery of service?
2. What services are we not providing that we should be?
3. What services should we scale back?

Each small group developed a list in response to each item and then met as a large group to share ideas and discuss. A smaller group of deans and directors synthesized the assessment information to determine six key directions. A second half-day workshop was scheduled to further refine the plans and identify changes and work plans.

Consistency of Use

In spring 2006, completed Key Directions Planning and Assessment Final Report for 2004-2006 (Exhibit 8).
Currently working on the development of a new planning document for 2007-2009.

Program Changes Made as a Result of the Assessment

Changes were made responding to each of the six key directions identified during the assessment process. A 27 page document highlighted the changes made – a few examples for each key direction are listed below.

Increased Consistency of Service

- Completed pilot testing of COMPASS ESL and implemented consistent assessment practices replacing paper/pencil ASSET placement test with COMPASS on all campuses.
- Listed tutoring and other student services for ALL campuses on the web with each campus providing information in a consistent format.
- Used consistent terms for similar services in explanations/descriptions to students about college departments and programs.
- Offered Panther Tracks orientation and student information services to all students via MyPCC.
- As a result of a business office survey and information from shared data, moved to common open hours and expanded hours, Monday through Thursday to 6:00pm.

Improved Information Sharing and Communication with Students and Staff

- Through remodeling or completion of new facilities at all campuses 30 new computers were added in or near student and enrollment services for use by students to access on-line business, enrollment and student services.
- Using a group page in Portals, Advising and Counseling created a place where changes and new information can be shared by all members who subscribe to the group web page.
- The document "How to Help Students in Distress" was created and distributed to full- and part-time faculty and staff. Training on how to use the 24 page document

was provided to all student and enrollment services staff as part of a district-wide retreat.

Helped our Students Expand Their Use and Understanding of Technology

- High tech solutions were made available to students 24/7 including: Ask the Panther, question and answer database on MyPCC, on-line orientation/Panther Tracks, and the on-line transfer center.
- Classroom overviews were offered to approximately 1,500 students per year providing information about how to better use MyPCC on-line tools.
- Software for employer recruitment, job intake and dissemination of job opportunities was reviewed and changed to better meet student and staff needs.

Implemented Continuous Improvement Driven by Program Review and Assessment

- Between fall 2003 and spring 2006 seven program reviews (further described in this document) were completed including: Women's Resource Center, Advising, Counseling, Career and Guidance Instructional Programs, Admissions, Disability Services, Counseling Services, and Multicultural Programs.
- Administrative assistants to the dean of students conducted a survey to assess services received by students in poor academic standing. Changes focused on better and more consistent communications with the students and planning for the implementation of an improved counselor/advisor tracking system.

Reviewed Staffing/Organization for Improved Efficiencies and Functionality

- A "Lean" Process (further described in this document – assessment #5) was implemented and changes made include: improving forms and processes for add and drop registration processes; creating an on-line application and inquiry process; improving delivery of acceptance letters; improving staff reporting; shortening time periods between admission and registration; providing access for additional staff to accept credit card payment for application fees; developing an electronic hold notification; and implementing electronic bill pay.
- The Office for Students with Disabilities was decentralized so counselors could work more closely with campus administrators and peers.

Adopted Best Practices to Increase Student Retention

Access and success for underserved and diverse student populations was improved through the following new grants and/or expanded programs.
- Received funding for the Sylvania Campus Roots Program, SSS Trio (second four-year cycle).
- Piloted a summer Bridge program at Sylvania Campus for students with disabilities.

- Received funding and implemented a Mott grant providing services on all campuses for students interested in professional technical education and who initially place into developmental education.
- Received funding from the Ford Foundation for the Sylvania Campus Illumination Project.
- Received the CCAMPIS grant for additional child care services and subsidies.
- Added a new Multicultural/Oregon Leadership Institute Coordinator position at the Rock Creek Campus.
- Expanded the Cascade Campus peer advisor program to triple the number of student ambassadors.
- Student Leadership Coordinators initiated a series of Stop the Hate programs. Over 60 administrators, staff, faculty and students participated in the train the trainer workshops

Assessment Four: Accreditation Self-Study, 2005

Consistency of Use

Every 10 years, in preparation for the submission of the college's self-study and subsequent accreditation team visit from the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, student services begins two to three years prior working on the details of the specific standards and evaluates every aspect of their programs district-wide.

Program Changes Made as a Result of the Assessment

- COMPASS/ESL testing was implemented in 2005 district-wide to facilitate consistent placement of students into appropriate college level courses. Procedures and practices have been designed to help guide staff on how to read scores in order to assist students in placement.
- A mandatory advising taskforce was created in 2006 to research possibilities of increasing the ability of staff to work with developmental education students. A mandatory advising pilot has been approved to start fall 2007.
- An Advisor Trac data base was purchased for all campuses to utilize and track student appointments and evaluate advisor to student ratios. Currently Sylvania Campus is piloting the Advisor Trac data base. Due to these changes advisors will be able to spend more time with students.
- The Deans of Student Development have submitted a request for a new 2007-2008 initiative for the district office to consider a new hire for a full-time counselor in the Office for Students with Disabilities to serve students at the Rock Creek Campus and Southeast Center.
- Implementation of the MyPCC portal system, an online communication method, has provided a place for consistency of information as well as 24 hour availability of services to students. As a result of implementing MyPCC, there has been an increase of communication to students. Examples of available services at PCC are:
  o Tutoring services hours and locations for all campuses are listed on MyPCC.

- o The *Student Rights and Responsibilities Handbook* (http://www.pcc.edu/about/policy/student-rights/) is accessible via MyPCC and hard copies are available at all Deans of Student offices.
  - o Students are provided with a venue to voice their questions, concerns or opinions through MyPCC via the "Ask the Panther". This has provided much needed information to our students and helps to ensure the consistency of the information that is given.
- The institution has begun to develop a systematic process for students to request their incoming transcripts be articulated upfront. The Dean of Enrollment Services has submitted a three-year plan to implement transfer articulation and degree audit to the Executive Cabinet. These proposals have been approved and full implementation will occur in several phases with a target completion date of fall 2009.
- District-wide advising and counseling meetings are scheduled once per term for all Advisors and Counselors to address new policies, changes and to gather their input. Other efforts are being made to have advisors meet with other departments, such as curriculum, to increase communication between departments.

Assessment 5: "Lean" Process

Consistency of Use

Selected program areas and processes are targeted for assessment and review. "Lean" is a method derived from the manufacturing industry that allows for evaluation and improvement of processes through a series of intensive staff driven exercises. The first "Lean" Process was conducted in 2005 to provide consistency to the admission and enrollment processes for PCC students (Exhibit 9).

Program Changes Made as a Result of the Assessment

A number of problems with PCC's admission and enrollment processes were identified during the "Lean" Process including:
- Problems with the on-line enrollment process
- Restricted registration access for new students
- No upfront transcript evaluations for students with prior college course work.
- Revisions needed on PCC acceptance letter
- Management and supervision of inquiry process
- On-line applications and student inquiries
- Make-up testing was drawing resources from college placement testing.

Changes made after the above problems were identified include:
- Modified time ticketing process so that applicants do not have to wait 24 hours from the time they apply to the time they can register online.
- Revised acceptance letter to include MyPCC information for students to access registration and other pertinent information.
- Reviewed and revised procedures in order to assure more efficient storing and mailing of publications.

- Placed inquiry process and staff under admissions supervision -- The staff member providing responses to inquiries and admissions acceptance letters was reassigned to the Admissions Coordinator at the Rock Creek Campus.
- Responded to mailings immediately as received – no longer wait to batch mailings.
- Sent acceptance letters via e-mail for those students who submitted their application on-line.
- Consolidated multiple permission forms.
- Trained faculty to better use the on-line forms.
- Trained employees to avoid creating duplicate identifications.
- Changed the process to upload test scores the day of the test instead of at the end of the week.
- Increased the number of licensed seats to view imaged documents.
- Allowed registration and admissions staff to post application fee charges to an account and payments to the web.
- Created an on-line drop process for students who have holds.
- Purchased and are piloting software (Advisor Trac) to allow students to set an appointment on-line.
- Revised testing center procedures to limit or completely restrict make-up testing.
- Added new testing staff.
- Re-designed the waitlist process and standardized it college-wide.
- Began designing and producing new brochures describing degree programs in a consistent format.
- Admissions applications that are submitted electronically will be entered automatically into Banner by late spring 2007, instead of entered manually.
- Admissions inquiries will be entered automatically into banner by July 2007, instead of entered manually.

Backlog of Faculty Evaluations

During the college's accreditation self-study and the subsequent accreditation team visit in 2005, the evaluation of college staff, and the backlog of evaluations, surfaced with a primary focus on faculty, both full-time and part-time, and academic professionals. The information generated in the self-study was in large part anecdotal as the college's ability to generate comprehensive reporting was lacking. The question of performance evaluations for college staff in all employment categories has received renewed attention across the PCC district over the past two years. Last year, a revised approach to assessment for management staff of the college was implemented. The following details address what efforts the college has undertaken since that time and next steps in the process.

Background and Collective Bargaining History

Since both the full-time and part-time faculty (with the exception of Community Education and Continuing Education instructors) are represented for collective bargaining purposes by the PCC Faculty Federation, an overview of the bargaining history relating to assessment procedures is important to understanding the evolution of this topic, especially with regard to part-time faculty.

Procedures for assessment of faculty have been a topic at the bargaining table in each round of negotiations during the past 15 years. In some years those discussions resulted in substantive changes, in other years the changes, if any, were relatively minor. Prior to 2001, full-time and part-time faculty constituted separate bargaining units, with separate contracts.

Full-Time Faculty and Academic Professionals

The contractually mandated procedures for full-time faculty and academic professionals were substantially changed in the collective bargaining agreement negotiated during 1991-1992, with an implementation date of fall term, 1993. Throughout 1993 a series of training sessions were offered to college management staff regarding those changes. However, at that time, the college did not maintain a tracking system to ensure evaluations were completed and submitted to Human Resources for the employee's official personnel file. From 1994-1995 to the present, when Banner, the college's electronic database was implemented as our Human Resources Information System (HRIS), Human Resources has worked to improve record keeping and tracking of full-time faculty and academic professional evaluations.

Although academic professionals are part of the same bargaining unit as faculty, this is, in part, a factor of unit definition decisions of the Oregon Employment Relations Board. Academic professional positions cover a broad range of work, but only a few academic professionals "teach". Generally academic professionals are those with professional level responsibilities in program coordination or leadership in various aspects of student services.

Part-Time Faculty

Evaluation of part-time faculty has historically been cumbersome due to the disproportionate number of part-time faculty to division deans. The college has worked with the Faculty Federation to address this issue over several successive contracts. All "adjunct faculty" contracts prior to September 1994 contained minimal procedural guidelines which addressed the evaluation of part-time faculty.

Beginning with the "part-time faculty" contract effective September 1994 the parties agreed to establish three different types of part-time faculty evaluations: an evaluation for new part-time faculty; an evaluation for "assignment rights"; and, subsequent evaluations based on a cycle as requested by the part-time faculty member. Effective September 1997, the parties agreed that faculty department chairs (who are full-time faculty within the full-time bargaining unit) could conduct the initial evaluations and the subsequent evaluations, but not evaluations granting assignment rights. However, no language in the full-time contract allowed department chairs to fulfill this role.

Effective September 2000, implemented in June 2001, the two faculty bargaining units (full-time and part-time) were merged into a single unit with a single contract. In addition to the previously established evaluations, a "third year" evaluation for new faculty and subsequent evaluations to be conducted on a three-year cycle for all faculty were adopted as part of the evaluation process.

Records and Tracking of Evaluations

As noted earlier, prior to the implementation of Banner as the HRIS system in 1994-1995, there was no systematic method of tracking completion of evaluations. Subsequent to 1994-1995, Human Resources implemented a tracking system for full-time faculty and academic professionals. Tracking of part-time faculty evaluations began following the contract revisions in 1997, but only those evaluations which granted assignment rights were required to be sent to Human Resources for entry into the tracking system.

Accreditation Team Visit Follow Up

Since 2004, Human Resources has periodically provided reports to the Executive Officers (District President, Campus Presidents and Vice Presidents) regarding the status of completed evaluations for full-time staff. A Banner report was developed to allow division deans to generate information on part-time faculty in their departments. In fall 2006, that program was revised to allow Human Resources to generate a "global" report for all part-time evaluations. A summary status report on full-time faculty and academic professionals, generated on November 20, 2006, is provided below.

Evaluation Summary Status Report
Full-Time Faculty / Academic Professionals

	Count	Percent
Cascade Campus		
Total Headcount	80	
Assessment Current	55	68.8%
Total Past Due	25	31.3%
Past Due from July 2006	7	8.8%
Past Due from Prior Years	18	22.5%

	Count	Percent
Extended Learning Campus		
Total Headcount	149	
Assessment Current	129	86.6%
Total Past Due	20	13.4%
Past Due from July 2006	4	2.7%
Past Due from Prior Years	16	10.7%

	Count	Percent
Rock Creek Campus		
Total Headcount	106	
Assessment Current	81	76.4%
Total Past Due	25	23.6%
Past Due from July 2006	4	3.8%
Past Due from Prior Years	21	19.8%

	Count	Percent
Sylvania Campus		
Total Headcount	209	
Assessment Current	186	89.0%
Total Past Due	23	11.0%
Past Due from July 2006	15	7.2%
Past Due from Prior Years	8	3.8%

	Count	Percent
Academic and Student Affairs		
Total Headcount	44	
Assessment Current	38	86.4%
Total Past Due	6	13.6%
Past Due from July 2006	4	9.1%
Past Due from Prior Years	2	4.5%

	Count	Percent
Total All Campuses/Departments		
Total Headcount:	588	
Assessment Current	489	83.2%
Total Past Due	99	16.8%
Past Due from July 2006	34	5.8%
Past Due from Prior Years	65	11.1%

	Count	Percent
Part-Time Faculty*		
Total Employed Fall Term 2006	958	
Employed More Than Two Terms and Have Been Evaluated	392	40.9%

Employed More Than Two Terms and Have Not Been Evaluated	477	49.8%
Employed Less Than Two Terms and Have Not Been Evaluated	89	9.3%
		100.0%

*Based on part time faculty teaching credit or ABE/GED/ESL classes during fall term 2006.

Contract requires part-time faculty to be evaluated by end of second term of employment.

Count includes some retired full-time faculty, college administrators or classified staff who teach on a part-time basis.

Next Steps

Dr. Christine Chairsell, Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs and Jerry Donnelly, Director of Human Resources, have developed a proposal for addressing these issues in the longer term. The proposal has four phases:

Phase 1:   Establishment of accurate baseline data.
            (fall 2006 – winter 2007)

As noted above, reprogramming of Banner reports was completed in fall 2006 and a first "global" report on part-time faculty was generated. Because departments were not required to send part-time evaluations, other than those granting assignment rights to Human Resources until recently, it is likely that numerous part-time faculty have been evaluated in recent years, but the information was not been entered into the Banner database. The data from the November 20, 2006 report will be shared with the executive officers and distributed to the division deans for review and correction. Evaluations which have been completed but filed only at the division level will be sent to Human Resources and added to the employee's official personnel file.

Dr. Chairsell and Mr. Donnelly jointly submitted a budget initiative request for FY 2007-2008 and FY 2008-2009 which would set aside funds to cover release time or additional paid hours for full-time faculty to conduct "catch-up" evaluations of part-time faculty. Concurrently, we propose to bring together the deans of instruction and deans of student development to develop and implement a plan to complete overdue evaluations for full-time faculty and academic professionals.

Phase 2:   Development plan to complete overdue assessments and establish mechanisms to monitor and periodically report on progress.
            (winter 2007 – spring 2007)

Phase 3:   Implement plan to complete overdue assessments.
(winter 2007 – spring 2009)

Phase 4:   Development of long term plan to ensure evaluations are kept current.
(Completion by spring 2009)

Recommendations One, Two and Three

The academic assessment process at Portland Community College (PCC) has undergone significant improvement since the college's 2005 Self-Study and findings from the Comprehensive Evaluation Visit and Report. From an organizational perspective, a new Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs was hired in January 2006. There has also been an addition of a Dean of Curriculum and Support. Academic functions including catalog, outcomes, curriculum design, and faculty support have been consolidated and are now under the direction of the Director of Curriculum and Support Services. There was a strategic change and shift of emphasis from a Director of Institutional Research to Director of Institutional Effectiveness with responsibilities extended to include assessment. This position was filled with a new Director in September 2005. In addition, there has been a significant shift in collaboration with the PCC Educational Advisory Council (EAC) and two subcommittees, the Degrees and Certificates and Curriculum Committees. These two committees have provided significant guidance and insights into improving our academic processes.

The new administrative restructuring has permitted significant reevaluation and emphasis placed on academic input to assessment processes. Inputs that were given weight include: students, institutional effectiveness, external stakeholders, and academic planning. These inputs inform the structure of assessment through the PCC Subject Area Committees (SAC) review of: core outcomes, course outcomes, certificates; and AAS, AS, AAOT, ASOT-BUS, and AGS Degrees.

Specifically, academic processes were either enhanced or created to identify and publish learning outcomes for all Degree and Certificate Programs with particular emphasis on the catalog and college website. Methods for assessing learning outcomes and program/discipline results were emphasized through an improved Program Discipline Review Process. A much improved method of ensuring compliance with related instruction was developed and implemented during the preceding two years.

An elaborate self-study in preparation for the 2005 accreditation visit, as well as the visit itself was the catalyst from both immediate and systemic improvements in the PCC academic process. Although much has been accomplished, more importantly the structure and systems are in place to ensure continuous improvement of the academic system at Portland Community College.

Recommendation Four

Management and staff in Enrollment and Student Services will build on the culture of planning, assessment, and evaluation to better serve the students in the PCC community.

Building on the information gathered from the assessments described in this Focused Interim Evaluation Report, a draft three-year Student and Enrollment Services Plan is being finalized. This follows an all-staff December 2006 retreat and smaller group functional area planning in January and February of 2007.

On-going program reviews will continue to be conducted including the following slated for 2007: Assessment and Testing, Cooperative Education and Student Employment, Student Leadership/Government, and Student Records.

The "Lean" process will continue to be an effective action tool with potential future events focusing on financial aid and facilities/events planning. The Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (known as the Campus Climate Survey) will be repeated on all campuses in spring 2007. In addition to the standard items, supplemental questions will focus on facilities (in preparation for Bond planning), MyPCC/portals, and diversity themes.