

## **VI. ASSESSING INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS**

---

As stated in the proposal for an experimental self study submitted to ACCJC, assessing institutional effectiveness is a critical component in monitoring and ensuring that the college is making progress towards and achieving the goals and objectives outlined in its mission and the 2002-2005 College Plan. The purpose of this section is to describe the approach that Santa Barbara City College has developed to assess its institutional effectiveness.

### **A. Institutional Effectiveness – Context, Definition, and Process**

#### **Context**

Santa Barbara City College has a strong tradition in the area of institutional effectiveness. The college published its first annual institutional effectiveness report in 1993 (Santa Barbara City College, May 1993). The first report was “a culmination of the work .... in coordinating the many ongoing SBCC evaluation, planning, and resource allocation processes into a comprehensive accountability system, as specified by AB 1725” (p. 7).

The college’s mission statement provides the overall guiding framework for the college’s comprehensive planning process, which was described in detail in the prior section of the self study. The goals and objectives included in the College Plan provide the specific framework for the assessment of institutional effectiveness. Whereas the fundamental areas of emphasis for SBCC are set through its college mission, its plan and assessment of institutional effectiveness are shaped by the forces for change that will drive the college’s functions and operations for the foreseeable future, as exemplified in the prior section. As Alfred et al (1999) point out, “Community colleges will need to ensure that their effectiveness systems are flexible and dynamic” (p.5).

#### **Definition**

The college has followed the definition of institutional effectiveness reiterated by Alfred et al (1999) and originally stated by Ewell (1992): “The heart of any definition of institutional effectiveness remains the ability of an institution to match its performance to established purposes as stated in its mission” (p. 6). In addition, the measures of institutional effectiveness are developed taking into consideration the perspectives of various internal and external stakeholders and the need to for accomplishing goals within the limits of available resources (Cleary, 2001).

#### **Process**

As indicated earlier in the self study, the Director of Institutional Assessment, Research and Planning, in consultation with the Superintendent/President, the Cabinet and the College Planning Council, conducts an annual review of the measures of institutional effectiveness to

ensure that they reflect the college’s priorities, address the college’s mission and state and regional accrediting accountability requirements, and reflect the most up-to-date research in the field (a list of references and resources reviewed is available at the end of this section). The development of a new College Plan every three years provides the opportunity for a broader review by the college community of the measures of institutional effectiveness. As part of this self study, the President, the Cabinet, the College Planning Council and the Academic Senate were actively involved in the review and update of the measures.

The criteria used for selecting the measures of institutional effectiveness are:

- Related to mission and College Plan
- Reflective of the changes in relevant literature
- Reflective of the ability of the Office of Institutional Assessment, Research and Planning to obtain the information from the college student system, other college databases/sources or external sources
- Quantifiable
- Accepted by the college community as valid

## **B. Institutional Effectiveness – Measures for 2002-2005**

The measures listed below are the result of the collective review and update process and represent the indicators that the college will track for the next three years to assess its institutional effectiveness.

The measures of institutional effectiveness are grouped under the major areas of the 2002-2005 College Plan:

- Student Learning, Achievement and Development
- Student Outreach and Responsiveness to the Community
- Faculty and Staff
- Governance and Management
- Applications of Technology
- Facilities
- Fiscal Support

<b>Table 1. Student Learning, Achievement and Development</b>
Preparation of Applicants to SBCC (distribution of results of English and Math placement tests)
Semester Number and % of Students on Academic Progress Probation or Disqualification
Number and % of Students who Transition from a probation/disqualification status to good standing (from Fall to Spring and from Spring to Fall, respectively)
Overall Annual Course Success for the College
Annual Successful Course Completion of Transfer Courses
Annual Successful Course Completion of Basic Skills Courses
Annual Successful Course Completion of Vocational Courses
Annual Successful Course Completion of English Skills Courses below ENG 100
Annual Successful Course Completion of Math Courses below MATH 100

<b>Table 1. Student Learning, Achievement and Development</b>
Annual Successful Course Completion of Alternative Instruction Courses (i.e., online courses, weekend courses)
Semester and Cumulative Average and Median GPA of Full-time Students
Progression through Basic Skills Sequence (English and Math)
Completion of Basic Skills Sequence (ESL, English, and Math)
Transition from Basic Skills to College Level Courses (ESL, English and Math)
Continuing Education Students Graduated with GED or Adult High School Diploma
Persistence of Newly Matriculated Students
Number of Degrees, Certificates and Skill Competency Awards (overall and in occupational programs)
Degree Completion Rates (by cohorts; Vocational versus non-vocational Associate degrees)
Student Right-to-Know Act Completion Rate – SBCC, CA CCs average
Number of Transfers
Number of Students Transfer Eligible
Rates of Transfer Goal and Actual Transfer by Ethnic Groups
Student Right-to-Know Act Transfer Rate – SBCC, CA CCs average
Number of study hours per week in relationship to units enrolled (This measure is self-reported in the Student Campus Experiences Survey administered once every three years.)
Number and % of courses with Web syllabi

<b>Table 2. Student Outreach and Responsiveness to the Community</b>
Annual FTES
Fall Applications
Overall Headcount (Credit and non-credit), Full-time, International Students, Students with Disabilities, EOPS
Online enrollment
Comparison of student ethnic composition to the make-up of the district
Number and % of students economically disadvantaged
First-time students from district high schools
High school student enrollment
Enrollment in employer-based training, work experience and service learning, respectively
Enrollments in courses offered through the Center for Management and Staff Development

<b>Table 3. Faculty and Staff</b>
Number and distribution by gender and ethnicity of applicants for full-time faculty positions
Number of Contract Faculty, Classified Staff and Administrators and Distribution by Gender and Ethnicity
Number and distribution by gender and ethnicity of new hires
Opportunities for faculty and staff development (i.e., narrative plus numbers of staff and faculty, respectively, participating in SRC or FRC courses, Center for Management and Staff Development, etc).
% growth FTES compared to % growth for each of the following categories (categorically funded excluded): Permanent full-time faculty Permanent full-time classified staff Permanent full-time administrators and managers

<b>Table 4. Governance and Management</b>
Progress in implementation and deployment of iPortal and decision support system

<b>Table 5. Applications of Technology</b>
Ratio number of computers available on campus per FTES
Ability to renew and replace technology equipment on a regular basis, as measured by: a) average age of computers and servers at time of replacement; b) annual expenditures for technology replacement as a percentage of technology inventory; and c) technology equipment reserve amounts for committed replacements and for contingency funding.
Ability to fund new technology initiatives each year, as measured by: a) dollar expenditures for new technology projects over a five-year history; and b) stated benefits of new initiatives.
Ability to support and maintain instructional computer classrooms and labs, based on the ratio of instructional computer lab coordinators to the number of computers in such facilities over a five-year history.
Ability of the institution to support and maintain its network and telecommunications infrastructure, based on the following measures: a) ratio of network administrators to number of network users and servers; b) percentage utilization of Internet bandwidth capacity; c) ratio of User Support and training staff in relation to total faculty and staff.
Ability to support 7x24x365 access to the college Web applications, as measured by the percentage of annual available "up-time" compared to total hours of operation.
Availability of student services online (i.e., application, enrollment, access to grades, and information related to transfer, etc) and in computerized form (i.e., computerized placement testing) (narrative)

<b>Table 6. Facilities</b>
Square footage - total and instructional
Percent utilization of instructional space
Energy utilization/square foot
Annual expenditures for maintenance/up keeping of facilities

<b>Table 7. Fiscal Support</b>
Average funding per FTES – SBCC, K12, CA CCs, UCs, CSUs
Revenues per FTES
Expenditures per FTES
State General Apportionment as % of Total Revenue
Restricted Revenues as % of Total Revenue per Year
Number of Permanent Employees per FTES
Fringe Benefits (excluding STRS and PERS) as % of Salaries
STRS and PERS as % of Salaries
Total Salaries and Benefits as % of Total Expenditures
Instructional Salaries and Benefits as % of Total Expenditures
COLA versus Consumer Price Index % increase (maintenance of purchasing power)
Capital Outlay Expenditures as % of Total Revenue
Fund Balance as % of Operating Expenditures
Foundation – total funds raised annually

## C. References and Sources Reviewed

Alfred, R., Ewell, P., Hudgins, J, McClenney. (1999). *Core Indicators of Effectiveness for Community Colleges*. Washington, D.C.: Community College Press, American Association for Community Colleges.

Banta, T. W., Borden, V.M.H. (1994). *Performance Indicators for Accountability and Improvement*. In V.M.H Borden and T. W. Banta (eds.), *Using Performance Indicators to Guide Strategic Decision Making*. *New Directions for Institutional Research* No. 82: San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Burke, J. C., Modarresi, S., Serban, A.M. (1999). *Performance: Shouldn't It Count for Something in State Budgeting?*. *Change*, November/December, 31(6), 16-23.

Burke, J. C. (1998). *Performance Funding Indicators: Concerns, Values, and Models for State Colleges and Universities*. In J. C. Burke and A. M. Serban (eds), *Performance Funding for Public Higher Education: Fad or Trend?*. *New Directions for Institutional Research* No. 97. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Cleary, T. S. (2001). *Defining Quality Through the Eyes of Campus Stakeholders*. *Community College Journal*, August/September, 41-47.

Council for Higher Education Accreditation. (2000). *The Common Data Project*. CHEA Occasional Paper, August. Washington: DC: CHEA.

Ewell, P. T. (1992). *Outcomes Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness, and Accreditation: A Conceptual Exploration*. Resource Paper for the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation Task Force on Institutional Effectiveness (ERIC Document No. 343513).

McLeod, M. W., Cotten, D. K. (1998). *Essential Decisions in Institutional Effectiveness Assessment*. *Visions: The Journal of Applied Research for the Florida Association of Community Colleges*, 2(1), 39-42.

Midlands Technical College. (1997). *Managing Your Institution's Effectiveness: A User Guide*. Washington, D.C.: The Community College Press.

Nichols, J. O. (1995). *A Practitioner's Handbook for Institutional Effectiveness and Student Outcomes Assessment Implementation*. Bronx, NY: Agathon Press.

Ronco, S. L., Brown, S. G.. (2000). *Finding the "Start Line" with an Institutional Effectiveness Inventory*. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Cincinnati, OH, May 21-23, 2000.

Roueche, J. E., Roueche, S. D. E., Eileen E.. (2001). *Pursuing Excellence: The Community College of Denver*. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 25(7), 517-537.

Roueche, J. E., Johnson, L. R., Roueche, S. D., & Associates. (1997). *Embracing the Tiger: The Effectiveness Debate and the Community College*. Washington, D.C.: The Community College Press.

Santa Barbara City College. (1993). *Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness: First Annual Report on the Comprehensive Accountability System of Santa Barbara City College*. May.

Serban, A.M. (2001). *Institutional Effectiveness and Performance Funding for Community Colleges: Where Do Institutional and State Values and Priorities Converge?* Presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research. Long Beach, CA, June 4, 2001.

Sorensen, James E. (1998). *An Investigative Study on the Systematic Application of Effectiveness Indicators for Institutional Improvement in Northwest Community Colleges*.

Sullivan, M. M., Wilds, P. C. (2001). *Institutional Effectiveness: More Than Measuring Objectives, More Than Student Assessment*. *Assessment Update*, 13(9), 4-6.