

**Report of the Institutional Effectiveness Taskforce**  
*A Subgroup of the Faculty Compensation Taskforce*

***Charge***

The Institutional Effectiveness Taskforce, created by the Faculty Association Board, was created in August, 2004 to establish a plan for linking a portion of faculty compensation to institutional effectiveness. The specific charge to the group was as follows:

Recommend to the Valencia College Wide Faculty Association Board plans for compensation of achievement in Professional Development and Institutional Effectiveness. The process used to generate these plans must involve all stakeholders and be guided by both the original Compensation Design Principles and specific principles for the PD and IE components as outlined in the Valencia Faculty Compensation Plan. The plans must be ready for submission to the District Board of Trustees by February. Before the Faculty Association Board sends them forward to the DBOT, the plans must receive a clear majority of support by the full College Wide Faculty Association in an open election.

As mentioned in the charge, the Taskforce was guided by the original Compensation Design Principles as follows:

1. Establish a financially responsible competitive compensation model to attract and retain high quality and productive faculty.
2. Link one component of faculty compensation to rewards for excellence in job performance. The performance of teaching faculty will be measured by the criteria of student learning; other faculty members' performance will be measured according to criteria appropriate to their work.
3. Create an incentive system to encourage faculty members to practice professional development throughout their careers.
4. Reward team (faculty and staff) efforts that improve teaching and learning.
5. Maintain faculty purchasing power, equity, and morale.
6. Reward faculty contributions that support Valencia's mission and goals.

The group was directed further by the Institutional Effectiveness design principles as follows:

1. An Institutional Effectiveness component will be an enhancement to an already competitive faculty base salary schedule.
2. Assessment shall be based on clearly defined, measurable criteria that do not lead to negative, unintended consequences, such as grade inflation, at the expense of student learning. Faculty-led teams, made up of both faculty and deans, should develop these criteria.
3. The Institutional Effectiveness component shall have a simple faculty monitored documentation and evaluation process requiring minimal bureaucracy.
4. There shall be a wide range of options for activities that support learning across all disciplines.
5. Institutional Effectiveness monies shall reward activities that support student learning or other departmental, campus, college, or community goals.

6. Every faculty member who meets the performance criteria shall receive the Institutional Effectiveness reward.
7. Institutional Effectiveness monies shall reward both individual and team efforts.

The Institutional Effectiveness Taskforce was staffed by 8 faculty, one dean, and several resource personnel representing Academic Affairs, the Learning Evidence Team, and Institutional Research.

### ***Background***

As the Taskforce began to research Institutional Effectiveness and faculty compensation, it became apparent that there were no other public institutions in the country using such a system. Some institutions have linked faculty compensation to evaluation but not to institutional effectiveness (O'Banion). Because there are no models (successful or not) on which to base our work, we began literally from scratch. In creating the plan, the Taskforce considered a number of possibilities and evaluated indicators based on criteria found in a report of the Community College Roundtable titled *Community Colleges: Core Indicators of Effectiveness*. "Since the measurement of core indicators should reflect and support sound assessment practice, the following guidelines, framed as questions, make it more likely that their measurement will conform to accepted practice and that specific measures will become useful tools for determining effectiveness.

- Is the indicator supported by a comprehensive information system?
- Is it part of a commitment to track important data over time, ensuring that documenting and improving effectiveness is a developmental process?
- Is there a standard of comparison or a benchmark against which progress can be measured?
- Is the ongoing reliability of the indicator regularly assessed? Are changes made when needed?
- Is the indicator credible to college personnel who are in a position to change institutional behavior?
- Can the indicator be readily understood by external decision makers? Is it credible to them?
- Does the indicator provide information that will help the institution to improve? Does it encourage the institution to value the right things?
- Does the indicator reflect the perspectives and concerns of multiple constituencies?
- Can data be obtained for the indicator at a reasonable cost?"

Like most institutions, Valencia Community College has gathered data on the standard indicators of institutional effectiveness for years. These data can give internal and external reviewers insight into the performance of the college. However, these frequently used indicators, such as fall-to-fall persistence and graduation rates, are difficult to relate directly to faculty performance in the classroom and student success as a result of faculty/student interaction. In addition, these indices are subject to fluctuation based on events and circumstances well outside the realm of faculty influence. Finally, use of

these types of indicators may result in unintended consequences as outlined in the Institutional Effectiveness Taskforce Design Principles.

Yet another consideration is the state of infancy of our programs to assess student learning and mastery of the Core Competencies at an institutional level. This work, being led by the Learning Evidence Team, holds great possibilities for linking faculty work to institutional performance in a meaningful way. Other measures and instruments are in development stages that may lend themselves to assessing faculty contributions to institutional effectiveness. However, this work is just beginning and not yet ready for use as part of a compensation model.

In light of the aforementioned circumstances, it is important to note that the Institutional Effectiveness Taskforce presents this plan to address faculty contribution to institutional effectiveness in the 2006 – 2008 academic years. The Taskforce fully realizes that this is a first attempt to begin moving our compensation system toward a learning-centered model, where faculty are motivated and rewarded for gains in student achievement. We will fully assess the impact of the first plan and, in 2008, the committee will present a revised plan (which may or may not use the same instruments and measures) to the Faculty Council.

### *Plan*

The Institutional Effectiveness Taskforce recognizes that, in addition to full-time faculty, adjunct and temporary faculty have a significant impact on the institution's performance. At this time, we recommend that the Institutional Effectiveness incentive apply to full-time faculty, counselors and librarians, in keeping with the original compensation plan design. However, in future iterations of this plan, we strongly encourage the college to recognize the contributions of the full faculty community, including adjunct and temporary faculty. In the meantime, we intend to include adjuncts in all training offered to support the Institutional Effectiveness plan and support their professional development at the college.

After much investigation, the Institutional Effectiveness Taskforce found the Community College Student Survey of Engagement (CCSSE) to be a highly effective indicator of institutional performance. Created in 2001, this instrument has been administered to hundreds of thousands of students in community colleges across the country. The questions asked in the survey are based on the best research in adult learning and provide insight into student engagement with the college. From the CCSSE Website article titled "Why Focus on Student Learning," we learn the following:

"The research findings are unequivocal. Student learning and student retention are correlated strongly with student engagement. The more actively engaged students are — with college faculty and staff, with other students, with the subject matter being learned — the more likely they are to persist in their college studies and to achieve at higher levels. This connection has been emphasized in a number of major studies and reports on the undergraduate experience.

For example:

*Involvement in Learning*, a 1984 report sponsored by the National Institute of Education, clearly states “two fundamental principles about the conditions of educational excellence everywhere.” Those principles are:

1. The amount of student learning and personal development associated with any educational program is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of student involvement in that program.
2. The effectiveness of any educational policy or practice is directly related to the capacity of that policy or practice to increase student involvement in learning (p.19).”

“In “Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education” (1987), Chickering and Gamson provide this oft-quoted guidance:

Good practice in undergraduate education:

- Encourages student-faculty contact.
- Develops reciprocity and cooperation among students.
- Encourages active learning.
- Gives prompt feedback.
- Emphasizes time on task.
- Communicates high expectations.
- Respects diverse talents and ways of knowing.”

“In *How College Affects Students* (1991), Pascarella and Terenzini affirm from their examination of 20 years of research that “students who are actively involved in both academic and out-of-class activities gain more from the college experience than those who are not so involved.”

“In *Leaving College* (1993), Tinto summarizes recent evidence by saying: Simply put, the same forces of contact and involvement that influence persistence also appear to shape student learning. Though the research is far from complete, it is apparent that the more students are involved in the social and intellectual life of a college, the more frequently they make contact with faculty and other students about learning issues, especially outside the class, the more students are likely to learn (p. 69).”

The CCSSE survey results provide institutional level data as well as national benchmarks against which we can measure our success. The full survey as well as data on the 2002, 2003 and 2004 surveys (national and institutional level results) is available at [www.ccsse.org](http://www.ccsse.org).

Valencia Community College has administered the survey twice, in 2002 and again in 2004 as part of the Florida Consortium. Currently, the college plans to administer the survey every two - three years. “*The Community College Student Report* (the title of the survey) is administered to students in randomly selected classes (credit courses only) at each participating college. The required number of course sections to be surveyed is determined by the total sample size needed to reduce sampling error and to ensure valid results. Sample sizes range from approximately 600 to approximately 1,200 students, depending on institutional size” (CCSSE Website). CCSSE randomly selects classes to survey based on institution size and demographics. Selected classes are visited by a

survey administrator and the students complete the instrument (faculty do not handle the administration of the survey in their class). The data is gathered in the spring and institutional data is available in late summer, with national benchmarks published in mid-fall.

Several survey questions are broken into five benchmarks including: Active and Collaborative Learning, Student Effort, Academic Challenge, Student-Faculty Interaction, and Support for Learners. These benchmarks are helpful as they aggregate data from similar questions to give a more accurate picture of the institutional and national impact on these measures.

The Institutional Effectiveness Taskforce recommends the following use of the CCSSE to measure faculty contributions to student engagement and institutional performance:

- In 2006, the Taskforce will review the results from the 2006 CCSSE administered in the spring semester. The group will identify an area of the survey where Valencia's results could be improved and influenced directly by faculty interaction with students in and outside of the classroom. The group will look at overall mean scores as compared to national benchmarks, Valencia scores as compared to previous surveys, as well as frequencies of responses to identify areas potentially ripe for improvement.
- Upon determining the area of focus, the Institutional Effectiveness Taskforce will set goals for achievement and present their recommendations to the Faculty Council for approval.
- Over the next two years (until the next CCSSE survey is administered in 2008), the Institutional Effectiveness Taskforce will work with Faculty Development to create and offer targeted training and workshops in the goal area so that faculty are well-equipped to implement effective tools in their teaching practice and ultimately, affect student learning.
- The CCSSE will be administered again in 2008. The results of the survey will be measured against the goals set in 2006. If the goals are met, the faculty will be rewarded with the Institutional Effectiveness incentive.
- The Institutional Effectiveness committee will monitor developments at the college, faculty input and engagement in training activities, and the results of this first plan to create or revise this portion of the faculty compensation plan in 2008.

The use of the CCSSE offers Valencia Community College the opportunity to measure our performance as compared to similar institutions across the country and to our previous performance on the instrument. In addition, use of the above mentioned cycle is supportive of reflective teaching practices and represents strong academic research methodology. It is imperative that faculty have the opportunity to assess their current practice, receive training to influence their methods, implement interventions and then, once again, measure their performance. The use of carefully selected questions allows the faculty to clearly focus their training and intervention efforts in ways that reflect the stated mission and current goals of the college.

The first Institutional Effectiveness incentive award will be available after review of the 2008 CCSSE results. In the years leading up to the next CCSSE administration, faculty will work toward improving student learning and educational practice as reflected in CCSSE results in the key areas defined by the Institutional Effectiveness Taskforce (and approved by the Faculty Council).

### ***Compensation Recommendations***

The Institutional Effectiveness Taskforce recommends that an amount equal to one percent of the total faculty compensation budget (including GL codes: 520010, 520020, and 520030) be awarded as the Institutional Effectiveness Incentive. It is recommended that this incentive be paid in a lump sum, payable in the first paycheck of December and divided equally amongst all full-time faculty employed at the time the bonus is awarded. In 2004, this amount would equal approximately \$500 per person.

- The Taskforce recommends that the incentive be awarded in addition to the base salary as outlined in the design principles and defined in the adopted Faculty Compensation Plan.
- We recommend that the first award of the Institutional Effectiveness incentive be made in 2008, should the faculty meet their goals as established in 2006.
- Because learning is influenced by many people and is a team-based enterprise, we recommend that all full-time faculty receive the Institutional Effectiveness incentive (rather than awarding it on an individual basis) should the faculty meet their established goals.

### ***Additional Recommendations***

The Institutional Effectiveness Taskforce recommends the following:

- The CCSSE is used as the first measure of faculty contribution to institutional effectiveness. As new assessment tools, models and our own experience become available, and as the goals and needs of the institution change, it is imperative that we review our plan frequently and adjust our strategies to reflect the best practices of the time. The plan, as presented, is effective for the 2006-2008 CCSSE cycle. The committee will return to the Faculty Council with a revised plan for faculty approval.
- The Institutional Effectiveness taskforce recommends that the taskforce be changed to a long-term (standing) committee, continue to be led and staffed by full-time faculty on a rotating schedule, and that representatives from Academic Affairs, the Learning Evidence Team, and Institutional Research be invited to participate as resource personnel on an “as-needed” basis. Full-time faculty participation will be solicited through the Faculty Council who will appoint members to the group. Faculty will serve a two-year term beginning in May with one-half of the faculty membership rotating off each year. The chairmanship of the group will rotate yearly and the chair will be selected from the faculty serving their second year on the committee. The immediate past chair will serve one additional year to enhance continuity and provide resources to the group.