The study was designed to gain an understanding of the implementation of Performance Measures Funding at one Washington State community college. The research participants included the nine individuals who were charged with the design and implementation of the college's Improvement Plan, which addressed the four legislatively, prescribed goals outlined in the 1997-1999 Washington Appropriations Act. The researcher was interested in understanding how this new funding mandate was viewed and dealt with from the community college campus perspective.

Each participant responded to open-ended interview questions administered by the researcher. This qualitative, phenomenological study resulted in gaining insights into the shared experience of the nine participants, so that the implementation of this state mandate could be
better understood as told by the participants whose role was that of the "implementers." Data analysis was completed using a five-step process common to phenomenological research. As a result, three themes emerged: power, design flaw, lessons learned.

The findings indicate that the legislature should have involved the community college system in the design of the Performance Measures Funding program and that greater consideration should have been given to the time necessary to design and implement improvement efforts that had lasting impact. Assessment of the program at the campus and state level was lacking.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Over the course of this past century, higher education has experienced phenomenal growth both in terms of student enrollment and financial resources. State and federal policymakers have crafted higher education policies designed to provide greater student access. The consequence of these state and federal higher education policies is evident by the fact that a larger percentage of citizens in the U.S. is enrolled in higher education than any other country in the world. Much of the funding required to support this access effort was provided with a belief on the part of policymakers that higher education was inherently good. Colleges and universities approached policymakers with a list of needs, requesting that resources be allocated for those identified purposes and budget decisions determined the amount of resources that were made available. For the most part, colleges and universities were successful in convincing policymakers to support many of their requests.

During the 1980's, policymakers and the public began to question the “quality” of education in general, initially focusing on public schools but later including higher education. As a result, colleges developed
assessment programs, strategic plans, institutional effectiveness plans, and other efforts to identify and address quality improvement. The focus was frequently on enhancing student learning. By the end of the 1980's the majority of states had programs to assess institutions of higher education and regional accrediting bodies were requiring institutional effectiveness programs.

Also in the 1980's and 1990's the demand for increased funding in many states exceeded the available resources as a result of the increased financial requirements of social services (primarily health care), and the judicial system (prisons). As the demands for resources to support these and other programs increased, policymakers in several states developed new funding models that linked allocations to results.

In linking funding to results, legislators were primarily concerned about addressing issues of quality and efficiency. However, there was also a noticeable shift in looking at higher education as a "business model." The budget question had shifted from how could the states meet the needs of colleges and universities to how the states needs could be met by higher education (Albright, 1998). This shift resulted in a number of states establishing performance funding and performance budgeting, seen by many as a natural extension of the need for accountability that was born in the 1980's and now incorporated into the budgeting process. Alexander M. Sanders, a former veteran lawmaker and President of the College of
Charleston shared his observations about the paradigm shift to South Carolina's performance funding model: "As long as I remember, legislators financed higher education by poking money through a hole in the fence. Lately, they have been looking over the fence to see what was on the other side" (Schmidt, 1999, p. A27).

In states that chose to implement performance funding, policymakers used this new model as an additional tool in the budgeting process. The one exception was South Carolina, whose legislature boldly declared their intent to replace all higher education budgeting processes with performance funding by 2000 (Schmidt, 1999). The traditional forms of budgeting usually include incremental, and formula approaches. In most states that have implemented performance funding, the traditional forms of budgeting are still being utilized but these new funding models are frequently used to allocate "new money," making institutions accountable for meeting the needs of the state, and helping to ensure the quality and efficiency of higher education.

**Purpose of the Study**

By the end of the 1990's the connection between performance and college finances had grown dramatically with 74% of the states reporting the implementation of programs that either specified performance funding, performance budgeting, or a combination of the two. The most popular
choice is performance budgeting with 28 states reporting programs that somehow link performance to the budget decision-making process. This connection is usually described as a process that is less formal, uncertain and not direct. Performance funding, on the other hand, has a much more direct connection to budget, allocating resources on the basis of the results that institutions achieve (Burke, Rosen, Minassians, and Lessard, 2000).

The state of Washington mirrored this national trend for the 1997-99 biennium. In December 1996, Democratic Governor Gary Locke released his budget recommendations, which included a notation that performance should be linked to budget. Later in the legislative session, under the Republican leadership of the Ways and Means Committee Chair, language was inserted into the budget bill for community and technical colleges establishing a program of Performance Measures Funding. Clearly the state had bipartisan support to establish a system of performance-based funding. There were no public hearings concerning the establishment of this funding model and the involvement of the staff at the State Board for Community and Technical (SBCTC) Colleges was limited. A staff member was given three days to develop a list of goals that might be used as performance measures for the 34-college system. With this limited involvement, the following four goals were incorporated into the legislation:

1. Increase the median wage of job preparatory students from $10 an hour to $12.
2. Increase the rate at which transfer-oriented students successfully transfer from 49% to 67%.

3. Increase the rate of students who successfully complete core courses from 80% to 85%.

4. Increase the Graduation Efficiency Rate (efficiency that students use the college resources measured by college level courses taken versus those required) from 81% to 95%.

Both major and local newspapers throughout the state reported on this new higher education funding model, linking funding to performance. An article in the Seattle Post-Intelligence, November 14, 1997, serves as a good example of how the public was beginning to view this new legislative mandate. The headline read, “Making the grade: Washington’s two year colleges evaluated” (Schubert, 1997). In the article the House Higher Education Committee Chairman, Don Carlson indicated that, “I think the intent in accountability is that we move toward those goals. I am not interested in punishing people.”

In that same article, members of the community and technical college community voiced concerns about this new funding program. A State Board staff member, Bruce Botka, stated, “One of the scariest ways to improve the numbers is to quit serving the kinds of student that are really hard to serve.” Voicing his concerns about one of the measures, Jewell Manspeaker, President of Grays Harbor Community College, asserted, “Is
one of our missions to serve the employment needs of our district? If the answer is 'yes' then that means we need to attend to some industries or employment areas that don't have high salaries associated with them." And with that, the stage was set for the implementation of Washington's Performance Measures Funding.

Aside from the review of Tennessee's performance funding program, little is known about the experience of two-year colleges concerning the campus response to performance funding (Banta, Rudolph, Van Dyke and Fisher, 1996). The results of this study will add to the body of the literature available nationally and internationally concerning the use of performance funding to stimulate improvement in a community college setting. The purpose of this study is to understand what actually happened at one Washington community college when faced with the task of implementing performance funding. How did this new budget model impact the college? How did the college select their strategies for improvement? What alternatives were examined? How did the performance goals (measures) align with the other planning efforts of the college? What were reactions to this mandate from those chosen to implement this program at the campus level? Did they feel that their efforts were worthwhile? Did they determine that student learning had improved? What was the essence of their two-year journey down that road to performance funding?
This research project is important to understanding how Washington's model of performance funding impacted one community college. The results should provide insights to policymakers and educational leaders by gaining an understanding of the experiences of this particular community college: their successes; their failures; their struggles. By using a qualitative, phenomenological approach to this research project, the essence of their journey is revealed.

The Context of the Study

The Washington Community and Technical College (CTC) system is the 5th largest two-year college system in the United States with a total of 120,689 annualized full-time enrollment (FTE) students for 1998-99 (Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, 1999). Washington defines an FTE as total of 45-quarter credits equaling one FTE. In comparison on an annualized FTE basis, the CTC system is one and one half times the size of all of the Washington public four-year colleges combined (Center for Community College Policy, 2000). The total headcount enrollment for this 34-campus system was a total of 457,580 individual students during 1998-99 (Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, 1999).

The CTC system is governed by a nine-member citizens board, commonly referred to as the State Board, appointed by the Governor with
consent of the Senate. Appointments to the State Board take into a number of considerations including the public and private sectors, geography, labor, and diversity. The State Board for Community and Technical Colleges is headquartered in Olympia and has an Executive Director, various unit Directors and support staff. Each college in the system is governed by a local board of trustees, individually appointed by the Governor with consent of the Senate, to serve a 5-year term.

Washington's first junior college was founded as part of the Everett School District as a one-year college, admitting 42 students when the doors opened in 1915. The college was short-lived, closing due to a lack of students in 1923, only to be reopened in 1941. That year the junior colleges totaled 8 institutions, all locally funded and governed, and with an combined enrollment of 1000 students (Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, 1999).

Beginning in 1930, other public school districts started a parallel track to establish vocational schools in the state. The Edison Vocational School was established in 1939 by the Seattle School District followed by other districts creating trade schools and vocational technical institutes, which eventually totaled nine campuses throughout the state. The Washington Community and Technical College Act of 1991, merged the two systems, which now have a total of 34 campuses (Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, 1999).
In 1941 the legislature provided the first state allocations for Washington's junior colleges, but clearly specified in the provisions that junior colleges would not be established in counties having either a private or public institution. This prohibition was removed when the 1961 legislature changed the designation of the junior colleges to community colleges. However the funding of the community colleges remained part of the public school district budgets until 1963. In 1965, the legislature established a separate community college system. Vocational technical institutes were locally funded until the merger with the community college system in 1991 (Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, 1999).

Today the funding of the Washington's two-year colleges relies primarily on state appropriations, since local funding options are not permitted. The legislature designates a CTC appropriation, which is subsequently distributed to individual campuses using a system-developed allocation model based primarily on enrollment. The operating budget of the CTC campuses is provided by the following sources: 59% state; 5% Federal; 17% tuition and fees; and 19% other sources (Center for Community College Policy, 2000).

In comparison with the 1999 levels of state support for community colleges, both the amount of expenditures per FTE and the state allocation per FTE were both nearly the lowest of any state in the nation. With an
average expenditure per FTE of $3863, Washington ranks the third lowest nationally. The system also ranks third lowest nationally when comparing the level of state support for community colleges, which is $3560 per FTE. To help adjust for the low level of state support, tuition in Washington's CTC system is the 7th highest nationally at $1584 for a full time student enrolled for three quarters. Washington has followed the national trend of having less of the overall state budget allocated to the support of higher education since the 1990's (Center for Community College Policy, 2000).

**Pacific Coast Community College**

The college selected for this research project was assigned the pseudonym of Pacific Coast Community College (PCCC), in order to protect its identity. As a two-year public institution, PCCC serves a district whose population is approximately 650,000 residents and which geographically is comprised of a metropolitan area and portions of a single county. The college’s service district is described as an industrial and business hub. PCCC’s mission as reported in the 1999-2000 catalog is:

Pacific Coast Community College shall provide quality educational programs in a dynamic learning environment. The College shall be accessible, comprehensive, and flexible, and shall address the personal, professional, and social needs of its diverse community.

Based upon State Board Reports for 1999, PCCC enrolled 16,812 students during 1998-1999 with an FTE distribution by major of 43%
transfer and 25% vocational. The college has a significantly higher percentage of students attending full-time when compared with the average for the system, as indicated with 65% of the state-supported students enrolled for 12 or more credits compared to the system average of 47%. Additionally, the college's student demographics represent a strong non-traditional student enrollment pattern with approximately 60% women, 30% students of color and 41% receiving some form of need-based financial aid (Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, 1999).

Many of the students enrolling at PCCC come from disadvantaged backgrounds and are the first of any of their family members to attend a post-secondary institution. According to PCCC documents, which were used to prepare a federal grant proposal, in 1995-96 a total of 2481 new students enrolled declaring their intent to pursue a transfer major. Of those students, 51.6% were first generation; 30.3% were low income (as defined by federal standards); and 18.3% were both first generation and low income (Pacific Coast Community College, 1996).

In assessing the needs of PCCC students the college's findings were numerous. Student's need for academic support was clearly evident by the ASSET (college-readiness assessment) scores indicating that 59.7% of the students tested below the college-level. Student demand for tutoring, developmental education, and English-as-a-second language courses were all reported as high. Financial aid applications had grown by 30% from
1993-1994 to 1995-1996. Most PCCC students (79.4%) are financially independent from their parents with 32% indicating that they were parents themselves, including a significant number who were the sole support of a single-parent household. Many students work full- or part-time while attending college in order to support their families and meet educationally related expenses (Pacific Coast Community College, 1996).

Given these identified student needs, the major thrust of the Trio Grant proposal was the establishment of targeted support and intervention programs that would help students become more successful. The need for establishing these types of programs was further evident after the college examined the attrition rate of the 1994-95 entering cohort of students. It was found that 37.5% of the entering students did not return after the first year but even more troublesome was the fact that first-generation students had an attrition rate of 86% (Pacific Coast Community College, 1996). The issue of retention, which was a primary focus of the college's Trio Grant, has also been a study of several researchers (Tinto, 1993, Astin, 1975), whose findings call for the establishment of a variety of intervention and support programs for at-risk students.
Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study are as follows:

1. The focus of this study reflects the experience of one community college, PCCC, in implementing Performance Measures Funding in the State of Washington.

2. The experiences represented in the study reflect the perceptions of events as described by the nine individuals who served on the college’s PMF task force. Individuals, who may have had knowledge of or involvement with the college’s efforts to develop and implement PCCC’s response to the PMF mandate, may have been excluded.

3. Generalizations from this study are only applicable to the processes and events that occurred at PCCC and cannot be made to reflect experiences of other community and technical colleges in Washington or other states.

4. All of the participants served on the college’s task force for the two-year cycle, except the math faculty who each served one alternating-year. The experiences of these two faculty members were limited to their individual year of involvement on the task force. Therefore, their individual experiences were different than the rest of the task force.
Definitions

Accountability: "Refers to the responsibility of higher education to report on its failures and achievements to the government (and public) within a set of mutually agreed upon goals and objectives (Layzell and Caruthers, 1995)."

Accountability for Improvement Plan: The annual performance plan that each Washington community and technical college developed and implemented to address Performance Measures Funding for 1997-98 and 1998-1999.

Annual Institutional Assessment: An assessment as to whether improvement was demonstrated for each of the Performance Measures Funding goal. The state board staff then reviewed the findings to make a final determination as to whether improvement had been demonstrated and funds could be released.

Community and Technical Colleges (CTC): A system of 34 community and technical colleges in the state of Washington.

Incentives: Additional funding above the base allocation given to public colleges for the purpose of attaining certain defined outcomes.

Indicators: In Washington's performance funding model, indicators were those strategies chosen from a menu of options which colleges might implement which would hopefully result in improvement. Note: In
other states this term is synonymous with performance goals, commonly referred to as indicators of institutional effectiveness.

**Improvement Strategy Grants:** Resources that were made available to the community and technical colleges in 1998-99 to support improvement efforts. Colleges submitted proposals to access $190,900, which were monies pooled from colleges that did not demonstrate the needed improvement the prior year.

**Pacific Coast Community College (PCCC):** A pseudonym used to identify the Washington State college that participated in this research project.

**PCCC PMF Task Force:** A task force of nine college representatives was appointed by the college president and was assigned the responsibility for the design, implementation and evaluation the PMF program at PCCC.

**Performance Budgeting:** “Allows governors, legislators, and coordinating or system boards to consider campus achievement on performance indicators as one factor in determining campus allocations” (Burke, et. al., 2000, p.3).

**Performance Funding:** “Ties specified state funding directly and tightly to the performance of public campuses on individual indicators” (Burke, et al., 2000, p.3). Performance-based funding may include “new” money, a portion of the existing budget, or a combination of both.
Performance Measures: The four goals, referred to as performance measures, were identified by the Washington legislature and included wage rates of professional technical students, transfer rates, graduation efficiency index and core course completion. Note: The terminology can be confusing. For example, in most other states the term indicators, not performance measures, refers to specified performance goals.

Performance Measures Funding: The performance-based funding model developed by the Washington legislature that withheld 1% of the base allocation to the Community and Technical College system for the purposes of addressing accountability and improvement related to four identified goals.

State Board: Refers to the nine-member board appointed by the Governor, with consent of the Senate, to oversee the Community and Technical College system.

State Board for Community and Technical Colleges: Refers to the Executive Director and administrative and support staff for the system offices for the Washington community and technical colleges.

System PMF Task Force: The SBCTC appointed a 35-member task force to address the design and implementation of the PMF program for the community and technical college system.
Organization of the Study

Chapter I presented the introduction, purpose of the study, context in which the study occurred and limitations and definitions related to the study. In Chapter II, the reader will be provided a review of the literature related to the history of funding higher education in the United States, an examination of several funding models (incremental; formulas; planning, programming and budgeting system; and zero-based budgeting), and an overview of performance budgeting and performance funding, the Tennessee experience, and policy implementation. The three themes that are identified from an analysis of the data are found in the section of the literature review concerning policy implementation. The study's design and methodology are discussed in Chapter III. The findings from an analysis of the data collected are presented in Chapter IV. Chapter V summarizes the conclusions based on the findings from the collected data and suggests areas for further study. In the final section, the CODA, the reader is provided with an update on the status of Performance Measures Funding in the State of Washington.
Chapter II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

During the twentieth century, American institutions of higher education experienced unprecedented growth due largely to a number of federal and state policies, which were primarily developed to provide greater student access. The success of these policies can be partially measured by the fact that enrollment of students in public institutions of higher education grew from just over one million in the late 1940’s to over eleven million in the 1990’s (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1997). As higher education enrollments grew so did the support from both the federal and state government through direct allocations of operating and research funds, grants, student financial aid and other forms of assistance.

However, during the past three decades the financing of higher education started to change. During this period of time, states began to direct more of their resources to other needs as was noted by Hauptman (1997) “Since the 1970’s, however, corrections, health care, welfare, and K-12 education all have eroded higher education’s share of state budgets” (p. 22). Additionally, policymakers, legislators, and the general public began to question higher education in terms of quality issues and the return to the state on its investment.
The results of this questioning can be seen in new budget and finance mechanisms that have been developed by the majority of states to address issues of quality, reduced resources, and accountability. This review of literature examines the funding of public higher education (including community colleges), development of performance-funding and budgeting, and the implementation of public policy.

The History of Funding Public Higher Education

General Overview

Although institutions of higher education were established as early as the 1780’s, state support of higher education did not occur until almost a hundred years later with the passage of the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862. As a result of this act, each state established tax-supported institutions of higher education (Chambers, 1968). Even though these were state supported institutions of higher education, the students attending were usually from wealthy families since student financial assistance programs were essentially nonexistent (McKeown, 1989).

The federal government's role in higher education has been primarily focused on funding research, establishing various programs that provide greater access, including student financial aid, and implementing a variety of categorical programs (Hauptman, 1997). Numerous programs were developed whose primary focus was that of providing postsecondary
access. For example, following World War II, higher education experienced a large surge in student enrollments as a result of the GI Bill, which provided funding to veterans to pay for their higher education costs. Additionally, issues pertaining to access were a fundamental concern of the 1947 Truman Commission, who recommended the establishment of a community college system that would serve the local higher education needs through grade 14 with free tuition (Cohen and Brawer, 1996). As a result of the Truman Commission's identification of the need to provide greater access, America's system of community colleges, as it is known today, was largely developed from the 1950's through the early 1970's. The primary mission of the community college, then, as it is today, was to provide access to higher education by removing geographic and economic barriers.

In the 1960's a number of social programs, including student financial assistance, were passed by Congress, which provided increased access to higher education (Hauptman, 2001). These programs typically placed a strong emphasis on serving disadvantaged students.

In the early 1990's the concept that education through grade 14 should be provided at little or no cost, was once again stressed under the Clinton administration. When the President signed the Tax Payer Relief Act authorizing the “Hope Scholarship,” he authorized a federal tax credit for
individual taxpayers for the first two years of college expenses (Center for Community College Policy, 2000).

These examples, and other federal and state efforts, provided the impetus for the major expansion of U.S. institutions of higher education this past century. The policies, both at the federal and state levels, have resulted in the United States having more of its citizens, on a per capita basis, attend colleges and universities than most other countries in the world (Hauptman, 1997).

With this expansion, American higher education became a $200 billion enterprise. Funding for higher education is derived primarily from the budgets of the state and federal governments, student tuition and private donations. By the mid 1990's, state budgets were providing the largest source of funding for higher education allocating $45 billion annually. In comparison, the federal government provided $25 billion, with $10 billion of that amount earmarked for student financial aid programs (Hauptman, 1997). In his earlier work, Hauptman's (1991) documents a shift in the federal and state roles by noting that

At the end of the 1960's, total state support was roughly a third more than the level of total federal support for higher education, $4.8 billion for the states compared with $3.5 billion in federal support. In 1989, state support of higher education was two-thirds higher than the amount of federal spending, $35 billion for the states compared to $21 billion at the federal level (Hauptman, 1991, pp. 115-116).
Although the amount of money provided to the states had certainly increased, Hauptman (1997) indicated that by the mid 1990's "state funding constitutes roughly 35 percent of the current funds revenues for all public institutions, down from 45 percent a decade earlier" (p.22). It is also important to remember that due to the demands of other state programs (primarily prisons and health care), the percentage of overall state budget dedicated to support higher education was significantly less for the past two decades (Hauptman 1997, Lyndon and Layzell, 1991).

The development of the community colleges in America began at the beginning of the last century with the establishment of Joliet Junior College in Joliet, Illinois. The junior colleges were originally formed as an extension of many public school districts and were charged with providing the first two years of a baccalaureate education (Ratcliff, 1994). Because of their origins, the early financing of junior colleges was provided by public school funds. In 1918, two-year colleges received 94% of their revenues from local sources and 6% from student tuition and fees (Cohen and Brawer, 1996).

As local budgets were deemed inadequate to meet all of the demands of growth, states began providing additional budget support to community colleges. In the 1960’s state appropriations comprised 34% of community college funding, while in 1980 the support had grown to 70% (Strauss, 2001). Merisotis and Wolanin (2000) reported that the level of state support had fallen in 1996 to 50%. A recent survey by the Center for
Community College Policy (2000) found that all community college systems throughout the United States receive some state appropriations. This latest trend of reduced state support has many community college leaders concerned about the future of budgets as was expressed by Richard Vorhees, author of *Financing Community Colleges for a New Century*:

"At the turn of the new century, the nation's public two-year colleges stand at the financial crossroads. On the one hand, the need for the services and education they provide in a changing local, regional, national, and international environment continues to accelerate. On the other hand, community colleges now draw less of their total operating revenues from taxpayers than at any other time in their histories. If these recent trends are harbingers, the finance of community colleges will become even more critical in the foreseeable future (As cited in the Center for Community College Policy, 2000, p. 51).

It is important to note, that although states assumed a larger role in financing community colleges, local funding in the 1990's, primarily property taxes, still accounts for approximately $5 billion in resources for two-year colleges (Hauptman, 1997). Twenty six states report having local funding provisions to support community colleges (Center for Community College Policy, 2000). However, with the increased number of voter-approved property tax limitations, states have assumed an expanded role to make up for these lost revenues. Additionally, in states where community colleges are funded through property taxes, the trend has been for the state budget to assume a greater role in the financing of two-year colleges, so that
issues of equity can be addressed, since property values typically vary greatly from one area of a state to another (Center for Community College Policy, 2000).

Traditionally higher education budgets have been looked at as a fee for service, expressing the institutional needs in terms of student enrollments and increased operating costs (Albright, 1988). In examining the funding mechanisms that states use to allocate resources to higher education, it is clear that both two- and four-year institutions receive allocations through essentially the same types of budgeting/funding models. The models are unique to individual states but the two major categories of budgeting/funding consist of incremental and formula models (Strauss, 2001, Albright, 1988, and Layzell and Caruthers, 1995). Legislatures usually make allocations either directly to individual higher education institutions or as a lump sum to either all of higher education or separate amounts for two- and four-year systems (Center for Community College Policy, 2000).

Additionally, states have implemented other budget/funding models, only, later to abandon them. Both the Planning, Programming and Budgeting System (PPBS) and Zero Based Budgeting (ZBB) were implemented in an attempt to make improvement in the incremental budgeting process by creating a system that is data driven and thus more
rational. However both were later discarded. (Layzell and Caruthers, 1995, Wildavsky, 1984). Each of these four models will now be discussed.

Incremental Funding

Incremental is the most common and time-honored form of state budgeting (Albright, 1998). By means of this model, policymakers use the budgeted amount from the prior year and make funding increases or decreases based upon budget guidelines or decision rules. Examples of incremental budget adjustments might include increases for utilities, supplies and cost of living raises for employees. Usually incremental budgeting does not provide funding for new programs but there have been exceptions.

For legislative and budget officials, this is an attractive form of budgeting because the process is relatively expedient and the amount of money is usually small in relationship to the overall budget. Critics point to the fact that the discussions are only focused on the increment and not the entire budget and that it lacks rationality, is susceptible to political whim and has a tendency to perpetuate past inequities (Layzell and Caruthers, 1995). Essentially the incremental budgeting process is a relatively quick process that examines the cost of funding the same programs, plus or minus adjustments.
Formula Funding

Layzell and Caruthers (1995) define formula budgeting as the...

...mathematical basis for requesting and/or allocating dollars to institutions of higher education using a set of cost/staffing factors (i.e., rates, ratios, and/or percentages) in relationship to specified inputs (e.g., student credit hours, enrollments, federal research dollars) (p.3).

Various forms of state-developed formulas are in use, which are based on data usually provided from functional areas of a college or university, including such units as instruction, administration, libraries, student services and physical plant (McKeown, 1982, Hashway and Cain, 1993). Although formula budgeting has a number of characteristics that differentiate it from incremental budgeting, Jones (1984) points out that,

It is crucial to note that the factors that drive formulas are exactly the same as the factors that determine the size of the increment in incremental funding budgeting process. These factors are typically the number of students served or the price of certain resources. The difference in form should not obscure the fact that both approaches are very similar (p.23).

Funding formulas have been used by states to allocate resources in the 1940's with Texas being the first state to implement this type of budgeting process (Hashway and Cain, 1993). Originally formulas were intended as a simple means to distribute funds to public higher education institutions in a rational and equitable manner. Layzell and McKeown (1992), concluded in their study of all states which utilize formulas, that over the course of the past sixty years, formulas have become increasingly
complex in attempting to address a variety of purposes and desired outcomes. The way formulas are constructed varies from state to state, resulting in appreciable differences in the usefulness in the budget process. Caruthers (1989) reflected on these differences when he observed, “formula budgeting in the abstract, is neither good or bad, but there are good formulas and bad formulas” (p. 1).

Several researchers, including Hashway and Cain (1993), McKeown (1982), Caruthers (1989) and Layzell and McKeown (1992) have studied the development, trends, and limitations of formulas used in the higher education budgeting process. In tracking the modifications that have been made in formulas, Caruthers (1989) identified four long-term trends related to the use of formula-related budgeting:

1. More detailed budget categories and factors
2. More control and monitoring of formula categories by state boards of higher education and legislative/executive budget staff in response to increased demands for accountability.
3. More non-formula components such as categorical grants for equipment and economic development.
4. Decoupling/buffering formulas from enrollment changes in response to anticipated enrollment declines (p.4).

The critics have identified a number of concerns regarding the use of formulas. They point out that formulas typically do not take into consideration the institutions mission, growth factors, different delivery systems (i.e. distance education), and student demographics (Hashway, 1993). Additionally, McKeown (1986) indicates that because formulas
usually rely on data from previous years, the use of formulas may, in fact, help to continue the past inequities of segregated institutions of higher education.

In their study of the states who used funding formulas in 1984, 1988 and 1992, Layzell and McKeown (1992) found that formulas were becoming increasingly complex, institutions were protecting their base budgets and that attempts were being made to address equity issues. Further they concluded:

…it does not appear that funding formula usage will necessarily continue to grow; it does appear that formula usage will continue to become more sophisticated. If state resources for higher education remain constrained, it is likely that formula usage and refinement will become more creative in the 1990's (p.24).

Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System

The development of the Planning, Programming and Budgeting System (PPBS) occurred at the federal level in the 1960's, during the Johnson administration. The intended use of PPBS, at that time, was for the allocation of defense resources (Layzell and Caruthers, 1995, Wildavsky, 1984). The PPBS viewed government programs within a defined unit as an overall system of related programs, which need justification based on the development of a plan built upon the use of rational data-based evaluation procedures. The focus of this budgeting system is on the long-term impact of programs, usually five to six years into
the future (Layzell and Caruthers, 1995). There are three essential features to PPBS: objectivity, centralization, and political content. Wildavsky (1984) further offers this clarification concerning the role of PPBS in stating:

The general idea is that budgetary decisions should be made by focusing on output categories like governmental goals, objectives, and end products instead of inputs like personnel, equipment and maintenance. Once priorities among objectives were established, this budgetary procedure was supposed to determine the best expenditure mix in the annual budget to secure the largest future benefits (p. 186).

Smartt (1984) found that PPPS has been attempted in several settings in higher education in the past. He observed, "In short, it can prove to be an expensive way of saving money and improving systems" and "...can be inordinately time-consuming and demanding" (p. 43).

Consequently, most educators and administrators have failed to see the value of this budgetary and planning system.

Zero-Based Budgeting

Jimmy Carter introduced Zero-Based Budgeting (ZBB), first as Governor to the State of Georgia in 1972 and later to the federal government as President in 1979 (Wildavsky, 1984). ZBB assumes that the budget must be developed from "ground zero" each budget cycle with each department justifying all expenditures (Layzell and Caruthers, 1995).

Wildavsky (1984) indicates that ZBB's "declared purpose is to examine simultaneously all programs from the ground up, to ferret out programs
continuing through inertia which do not warrant being continued at all or should be continued only at the reduced level of expenditure” (p. 203).

Over the years, ZBB has been modified as a means of making budget reductions that, may for instance, call for a 25 percent cut by having the department head identify the impact on programs and services related to such a decrease (Layzell and Caruthers, 1995). In studying governmental funding, Layzell and Caruthers (1995) concluded that ZBB as well as PPBS were really never effectively implemented to any great extent because of the complexity, time consuming nature, perceived lack of effectiveness, and the unwillingness of some political leaders to rely on more rational forms of budgeting.

**The Development of Performance Based-Programs**

**General Overview**

As discussed earlier, concern for performance has been part of the government budgeting process in the past with PPBS and ZBB, but the practice of linking budget and funding to results really did not take shape with any significance in higher education until the 1990's. Layzell (1995), Albright (1998), Burke, Modaresi, and Serban (1999) and others conclude that this 1990's movement was being driven by policymaker's interest in accountability, quality, meeting state needs, and addressing budget constraints.
The issue of performance has not been limited to U.S. institutions, as Maassen and van Vught (1994) point out that world-wide, governments are concerned about accountability, evaluation, and the "return on investment" related to higher education and that new models of funding continue to be developed which address these issues. Clearly, higher education is being examined much more closely, as governments here in the United States and other parts of the world focus on issues that, at times, seem foreign to many faculty and administrators.

As I begin this review of performance programs, it is important to have the reader understand that, for the most part, performance funding and performance budgeting are both relatively new phenomena, as they are used today, having developed over the course of this past decade. The one exception is Tennessee's performance funding program, which was established in 1979. Because this is a new field of budgeting, the terminology that writers and researchers have used to describe programs found in the various states, has not always been as precise as one might have thought. For that reason, it is sometimes confusing to try to ascertain whether the research is descriptive of a funding mechanism that has a direct relationship to budget (performance funding) or if that relationship is less direct (performance budgeting).

It is also important to recognize that performance programs were never intended, with the exception of the program in South Carolina, to
replace the other forms of state budgeting. Rather, it was always
envisioned as being another tool in the budgeting or funding process; to be
used in conjunction with other processes that a state might utilize, such as
incremental and formula funding (Burke, et. al. 2000). Some researchers
indicate that performance programs, especially performance funding with its
direct link between performance and funding, will offer better tools to
policymakers and educators since the traditional budget models according
to Albright (1998) are "insulated from state and institutional strategic
planning, unresponsive to state and national priorities, and inappropriately
separated from the question of value" (p.1).

Joseph C. Burke, Director, Higher Education Program, The Nelson
A. Rockefeller Institute of Government, and his associates are some of the
leading researchers in this field. To help resolve some of the terminology
issues they have provided the following definitions of performance
programs (Burke and Modarresi, 1999):

**Performance funding** ties specified state funding directly and
tightly to the performance of public campuses on individual
indicators.

**Performance budgeting** allows governors, legislators, and
coordinating or system boards to consider reports of campus
achievements on performance indicators as one factor in
determining campus allocations (p. 3).

Regardless of whether the research is concerned with performance
funding or performance budgeting they have some common points of
connectivity. Both are based on the need to have higher education deal
with accountability. Both use performance measures, which vary by state,
to ensure that higher education is focused on issues that the state, higher
education system, and/or institutions feel are most important and will have
the best return on the investment of time and resources. Both have a
relationship to the issue of institutional finance with performance funding
having a more direct connection and performance budgeting, less of one.
At this point I would like to examine some of the issues that help to define
performance funding and performance budgeting.

Measurement of Quality

In the 1980's the issue of quality in higher education was called into
question. Issues of accountability—generally fiduciary—had been around
for decades in higher education but the discussions were changing to one
of quality. Ewell (1999) found that issues of accountability specifically as it
related to quality grew out of the public school's "report cards." During this
time it became apparent that state government was not just asking how
their money was spent; they wanted to know the results (Layzell, 1995).
These reporting mechanisms were designed to communicate to the public
about the issues of quality in our schools and were established in most
school districts throughout the United States in the early 1990's.

Leaders from local, state and national arenas not only focused their
concerns about the quality of education on our nations public schools but
also began to examine institutions of higher education. Quality in higher education is difficult to define in a way that results with agreement being reached from academicians, legislators and other policymakers. Jones (1984) pointed out "It is relatively easy to deal with the tangible notion of more students on campus; it is considerably more difficult to come to grips with the relatively abstract concept of academic quality" (p. 16).

Responding to the need to address academic quality, Astin (1982) outlined three modes of assessment: reputation of the college; level of available resources; and institutional outcomes. During the 1980's, this emphasis on assessment resulted in large numbers of colleges implementing outcomes assessment programs to address quality in instruction and services as well as teaching and learning (Neal, 1995).

As colleges began to develop assessment programs, it became evident that indicators/measures of quality needed to be identified, which eventually became commonly referred to as performance indicators or performance measures. Ewell (1999) discovered that performance measures/indicators are identified in the mandates passed by legislatures or developed by higher education systems or individual institutions. Further, his findings indicate that performance measures/indicators serve a number of public policy purposes including: pure accountability; informing policy and decision makers; leveraging improvement; and informing consumer choice (Ewell, 1999). Similarly, Sizer, Spee, and Bormans
(1992) concluded that they found five primary uses for performance measures/indicators: monitoring; evaluation; dialogue; rationalization; and resource allocation.

Gaither (1997) studied the states which have identified performance indictors/measures and he concluded that educators and policymakers should consider the following when establishing indicators/measures:

1. The numbers of performance indicators should be kept to a minimum fewer than 20.
2. Performance indictors should not be developed in a top-down manner.
3. Both faculty and the state legislature need to be involved in the development of indictors for lasting success (i.e. gain “buy-in”).
4. One indicator model cannot be applied to all types of institutions effectively without diminishing diverse missions (i.e. one size does not fit all).
5. Policy-makers tend to prefer quantitative to qualitative measurement.
6. Indicators should have financial incentives for institutions.
7. Performance results must be communicated in a timely and understandable fashion for policymakers and the public at large (pp. 114 -115).

Determining what is measured and how it is measured depends upon whether the indicators/measures were developed by legislative mandate or by systems of higher education. Ewell (1999) reflects, “Much depends, moreover, on the political origins and the particular legislative form of the system put in place: in states where initiative lies with the legislature and where specific measures are written into law, PI’s (performance indicators) tend to have a different character and purpose
than those in which higher education agencies have established such
initiatives themselves…” (p. 192).

Another aspect of performance indicators/measures deals with how
to assess success. Attempting to clarify the quality and quantity of student
learning can be particularly troublesome. Reliable assessment instruments
do not exist for all performance goals. Additionally, the student may impact
the reliability of the assessment since it may have little, if any, meaning
since it has no connection to a class, grade or even graduation. Whether
the student completes the assessment with a sense of its importance, or if a
student will even elect to take it, is a matter which institutions have no
ultimate control (Albright, 1997).

Layzell (1998) identified certain limitations to establishing
performance indicators/measures which I have summarized below:

1. Data limitations. Systems will need to be developed, requiring time
and resources. If performance indicators/measures are developed
based on the current limitations of available data, the result may not
support what is needed.

2. More is not necessarily better. Having a large number of
performance indicators/measures results in each one becoming less
important. It also can increase the workload of campuses and
require more resources. More indicators/measures can result in
conflicting goals (e.g., high admission rates and high graduation rates might conflict).

3. No policy framework for performance indicators/measures. When there is a rush to develop a program, often the policy framework is overlooked. The goals for the state's higher education have to be clearly identified as well as how progress will be measured.

4. To be or not to be: Quantitative vs. qualitative. Quantitative is more comfortable to legislators who typically want hard data. However more than one dimension of performance can be realized by utilizing both qualitative and quantitative data.

5. Confusing inputs, processes and outcomes. States should not be hesitant in using all three but they should not confuse them.

6. Lack of broad 'buy-in' up front. Clearly the key to selecting appropriate indicators/measures is involving the stakeholders in the process. Without this 'buy-in' the program can be short-lived.

In a study to identify the efforts of states to develop performance indicators/measures systems, Ewell and Jones (1994), noted four approaches that are used:

1. Inputs, processes, outcomes: a 'production' process model aimed at measuring the value added to departing students, perhaps through pre- and post- assessments.
2. Resources efficiency and effectiveness: an approach designed to measure the efficient usage of key resources such as faculty, space and equipment, using ratio analyses or similar techniques.
3. State need and return on investment: an approach built on the assumption that higher education is a strategic investment for States: it is designed to measure the fit between higher education and state needs (e.g. work force preparation).

4. ‘Customer’ need and return on investment: an approach built on the notion of ‘consumerism’ that is designed to measure the impact of higher education in meeting individual needs (e.g. retention and graduation rates, employability of graduates) (p. 104).

Further, in this study they recommended that policymakers need to select freely among these four approaches as they are not independent from one another and that the desired program outcome may be best realized utilizing a variety of approaches.

Linking Results to Finances

At the 1986 Annual Governors’ Conference, which was chaired by Lamar Alexander, Governor of Tennessee, and co-chaired by Governors Bill Clinton, Arkansas and Thomas Kean, New Jersey, a report was issued to the nation entitled A Time for Results. In this report, Missouri’s Governor, John Ashcroft helped to detail a concept, which called for more of a corporate view for the funding of higher education; one that he envisioned would tie funding to performance. Ewell (1997) indicates that this report helped to form the foundation from which performance funding was launched. Governor Ashcroft indicated that:

The public has a right to know what it is getting for its expenditure of tax resources; the public has a right to know and understand the quality of undergraduate education that young people receive from publicly funded colleges and
universities. They have a right to know that their resources are being spent wisely, invested, and committed (Alexander, Clinton and Kean, 1986, p. 187).

Almost a decade later, Roy Romer, Governor of Colorado and Chairman, Education Commission of the States, echoed a very similar message to higher education concerning the need to be accountable and address quality issues:

For all of its rich history, there are too many signs that higher education is not taking seriously its responsibility to maintain a strong commitment to undergraduate learning, to be accountable for products that are relevant, effective, and of demonstrable quality; and to provide society with the full benefits from investment in research and public service. Thus, the challenge to higher education is to be sufficiently responsible and adaptable in light of these new demands and to propel our nation to the forefront of a new era. Unless political leaders, educators, and the public accept his challenge, higher education may be a worn-out system that had seen its best days (as cited in Rouche, Johnson, Rouche and Associates, 1997, p. 25).

During the 1990's the interest in performance programs used for budgeting and funding purposes grew significantly with 37 states (74%) reporting that either performance funding or performance budgeting was a part of higher education environment. Of these 37 states, 28 or 56% reported using performance budgeting while 17 or 34% utilized performance funding (Burke, et. al., 2000). Prior to the implementation of these two models, higher education's budget and financial accountability, outside of the fiduciary role, was through the use of formulas. Clearly performance programs have become a significant factor in higher
education's budgeting and funding processes (Layzell and Caruthers, 1995, Burke and Modarresi (2001), and Albright 1998).

In the next two sections, I will review the literature concerning these two performance programs, examining the extent of their use, issues related to program initiation, factors that contribute to the success or failure of such efforts, and other relevant information. From this review, the reader should gain a thorough understanding of the nature of performance-based programs in higher education.

Performance Budgeting

As stated earlier, Burke and Modarresi (1999) indicated that "performance budgeting allows governors, legislators, and coordinating or system boards to consider reports of campus achievements on performance indicators as one factor in determining campus allocations" (p. 3). With performance budgeting, the connection between performance and the actual allocation of resources is much less clear and distinct, given that fact the performance data is considered along with other factors that decision makers may choose to utilize. Burke, et. al. (2000) describes this linkage as "loose, discretionary, and uncertain" (p.1).

In the latest review of the two performance-based programs, which is based on a 50-state survey of the State Higher Education Financial Officers (SHEFO), Burke, et al., (2000) found that performance budgeting grew from
1999 to 2000 by 5 new states from 23 to 28 states. This means that 56% of the states now have performance budgeting as compared to Burke's first survey results, conducted in 1997 in which 16 states or 32% reported having this performance model (Burke, et. al., 2000).

It is clear from this research that states are keenly interested in selecting performance budgeting as their performance-based finance tool of choice, given a 76% increase in the states choosing this option over the past three years. Although, it is also important to note that not every state that has selected performance budgeting retains the program. Performance budgeting was determined to be both popular and volatile, as Burke and Modarresi (1999) noted that four states had dropped their programs in 1999 in comparison to the year before. This pattern was repeated in the next survey as reported by Burke, et. al. (2000) who indicted, that although seven new states developed programs in 2000, two had dropped.

Other issues that are important to note, summarized from this 2000 study of State Higher Education Finance Officers (Burke, et. al. 2000), are as follows:

1. The popularity of performance budgeting may stem from the fact that it represents a political advantage over performance funding since policymakers can deal with issues of accountability and
quality without causing financial problems to higher educational institutions.

2. Performance budgeting is used in most states for budget preparation and presentation with reports most commonly being included in the executive budget process.

3. In the 28 states with performance budgeting, all but one of the SHEOF respondents indicated a "high likelihood" or "likely" of continuing the program, so the programs appear to have stabilized.

4. Eleven of the performance budgeting states report that the programs were initiated either by the coordinating board or with the governor or legislature and the coordinating board or university system.

5. In ten states, programs have been developed that incorporate elements of both performance funding and performance budgeting recognizing the strengths and weakness of each. The rigidity of performance funding is replaced by the flexibility of performance budgeting. The lack of an identifiable connection to budget with performance budgeting is resolved with a more direct connection of performance funding. In 40% of the performance budgeting states, coordinating or system boards, report the use of performance data in the allocation of resources.
Performance Funding

“Performance funding ties specified state funding directly and tightly to the performance of public campuses on individual indicators” is the definition provided by Burke, et. al. (2000). In further describing this relationship of performance funding to the higher education allocations, Burke, et. al. (2000) uses words like, “direct, automatic, and certain” (p. 1).

Brenda Albright’s (1997) article, “Of Carrots and Sticks and Budgets,” in Trusteeship, identified one of the main objectives of policymakers in implementing performance funding programs when she observed, “By connecting funding policies to the state’s long-term needs, officials hope to compel individual campuses to align their own goals more closely with the public’s interest” (p. 18). Albright (1997) has also conducted research with SHEFO representatives, primarily concerning issues related to the design and results of performance funding. In her 1997 study, she expands on the purpose of performance funding by providing the following observation:

Performance funding is used to eliminate programs; deduct the size of programs; focus on outcomes rather than inputs; clarify state priorities; emphasize important state educational goals; provide better accountability information; assess the effective utilization of resources; link budgeting with planning and programming; promote improvement; reinforce existing quality; promote assessment; and encourage institutional change (p. 3).
In Burke's, et al. (2000) fourth annual survey, also of SHEFO members, a number of important performance funding trends were identified. I have summarized those findings as follows:

1. There are a total of 17 states or 34% of the total, which have implemented performance funding programs. One additional program was implemented since the 1999 survey.

2. A total of five states have dropped performance funding since 1996, with Colorado having the distinction of being the only state to eliminate the program, only to readopt it a year later, this time with the legislature giving the coordinating board and the local colleges the authority to develop the indicators/measures. Judging from the responses, performance funding not unlike performance budgeting, has been both popular and volatile with policymakers.

3. From the time of Burke's first survey in 1997, until the most recently completed one in 2000, performance funding grew in popularity by 70% from 10 to 17 states with programs in place.

4. The SHEFO responders indicated that it was either 'highly likely' (35%) or 'likely' (65%) that performance funding would be continued in their states. This leads one to conclude that the programs that are in existence may be entering a more stable era.

5. Of the 17 states that have performance funding, 10 states have initiated programs either directly by the coordinating board or higher
educational system or in consultation with either the coordinating board or educational system.

6. Many of the new programs are taking a more flexible approach in terms of allowing more time for colleges to develop plans and demonstrate improvement (up to 7 years in California). Additionally, the survey found that legislatures were less eager to mandate the indicators, rather, allowing the system or the colleges to take responsibility for their development.

In her work with SHEEO members, Albright (1988) determined that there are both advantages and areas of concern in states, which have chosen to implement performance funding. Policymakers may be well advised to use this research in designing new performance funding initiatives or making modifications to existing programs. Albright's conclusions are as follows:

**Performance funding advantages**

1. Builds support from political leadership for higher education
2. Serves as an incentive to improve performance
3. Provides an alternative to enrollment-based subsidy approaches
4. Responds to calls for accountability
5. Connects planning goals with the budget
6. Serves as an image and credibility builder to reinforce confidence in higher education
7. Results in better communication with political leaders
8. Is more effective than considering only inflation and enrollment growth in funding decisions
Areas of concern

1. Performance measures or indicators must be acceptable to politicians and educators balancing institutional autonomy with state level review and control
2. Complexities in measuring quality are enormous especially in student learning
3. Institutions tend to “lower the bar” in setting goals so that they are achievable
4. Standardization of state goals for diverse colleges does not work.
5. Using only quantitative measures negates important institutional processes
6. Investment of time and resources to develop performance measures and assessment instruments can be significant, and development of a sound front-end process is essential
7. Current measures tend to be too simple, inadequately reflecting difference in institutional mission
8. Performance-based funding can create a highly competitive environment among institutions, with each more interested in its own net gains or losses than in effectively “sharing the pie”
9. States where performance measures are legislated find that legislative decisions and priorities can change from year to year (p. 7-8)

As noted earlier, a number of states that implemented either performance funding or performance budgeting programs have seen the effort disappear after a short time. Burke et al. (1999) studied what they considered to be stable programs, because of their longevity (Missouri and Tennessee), in contrast to programs that four states had discontinued. From this study they concluded that stable performance funding programs have the following characteristics:

1. Collaboration between governors and legislators, state coordinating and university system officials and campus leaders and trustees
2. Policy values that stress quality more than efficiency
3. Sufficient time for planning and implementation
4. Neither too few nor too many performance indicators
5. Assessment of the knowledge and skills achieved by graduates
6. Success standards that emphasize institutional improvement or quality maintenance, supplemented by peer comparisons
7. Limited by discretionary funding. Small amounts for stability 3-6%; let the colleges decide how to spend it
8. Additional rather than reallocated resources as the funding source
9. Continuity of state priorities and program requirements (p. 21-22)

In a similar study the following year, Burke, and Modarresi, (2001) again compared Missouri and Tennessee with states that had decided to retain their performance funding initiatives. Utilizing a survey of campus and state leaders in all five states the researchers sought to identify the common characteristics these retained programs have with the two long-standing programs in order to identify issues of stability. They identified the following characteristics that help to determine stability in performance funding:

1. Important input by state coordinating boards and their officers
2. A sense of achieving the goals of improving higher education, demonstrating accountability and increasing state funding
3. Policy values stressing quality more than efficiency
4. Sufficient time for planning and implementation
5. A limited number of indicators
6. Restricted by substantial funding
7. Prospects of a long-term future
8. Stable state priorities
9. Protection against budget instability
10. Curbed costs of data collection and analysis
That study also added three more characteristics based on agreements between respondents from both the stable and unstable programs.

1. Careful choice of performance indicators
2. Recognition of the difficulty of measuring results in higher education
3. Protection of institutional diversity (pp. 53-54).

There are numerous conclusions that can be made from these two studies. At this point I would like to share some of the insights that I have made. The participants were clear that collaboration needed to be deeply embedded in the process, involving government policymakers, system officials and campus leaders. Ensuring that collaboration is a consistently practiced standard, from the initial steps of developing performance funding through implementation and redesign, seems paramount, a fact that is also born out in other studies (Albright, 1997, Gaither, 1997). A small number of performance indicators/measures should be identified that emphasizes quality improvements over efficiencies and the process needs to identify reasonable timelines that allow campuses adequate time to plan and implement improvement strategies. Campuses need to have the assurance of budget stability both in terms of the percent of money dedicated for performance funding as well as the fact that using incentive funding or new money helps to ensure that the colleges' base budgets are not eroded.
The Tennessee Experience

Tennessee was the first state to establish a performance funding program for higher education. As a pioneer in the effort to link performance to budget, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), in 1976, implemented a pilot project on twelve higher education campuses to determine the feasibility of collecting data related to specific performance indicators/measures. Based on this effort, in 1979, the THEC was able to secure a 2% legislative appropriation to support institutions that voluntarily agreed to establish assessment programs and report the results (Banta, 1988). In 1986 Banta characterized Tennessee's movement into this arena as "the nation's first experiment with assessment of quality in higher education by means of student outcomes" (p.4).

Since the inception of the Tennessee program in 1979, the performance measure/indicators have undergone 4 revisions and the incentive funding that support improvement has increased from 2 to 5, to 5.45 percent of the instructional budget for the twenty-three public institutions (Banta, et. al., 1996). A comparison of original performance indicators/measures with those that agreed to after the fourth revision and their corresponding weighted value, as expressed as a percentage, is represented on the following page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1979-80</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1993-97</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Program accreditation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1. Accreditation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Graduate's performance on</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2. Major field tests</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major field test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Graduate's performance on</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3. Measure of general education</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general education outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td>measure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Evaluation of programs and</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4. Alumni and enrolled student</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services via surveys for</td>
<td></td>
<td>survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student, graduates, employers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Peer evaluation of</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5. Improvement actions taken to</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>remedy identified weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Peer review of non-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>accreditable undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Master's program review (4-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>year) or placement (2-year)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Enrollment goals for campus-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>specific groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Persistence to graduation for</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>minority and all students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Mission-specific objectives</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Points (Banta, et al. 1996) 100

The higher education community has been highly involved since the inception of the program in Tennessee. This involvement can be seen by the fact that the program was self-initiated by the higher education community and that annually the program has been renewed by a vote of Tennessee's higher education administrators. With each rendition of the program, improvements were made based upon the collective experiences of the 23 colleges and universities and the guidance of the THEC. Only limited data gathering was required in the 1979 version, which was focused on constituent
satisfaction surveys, and allowing institutions to choose from several generic general education outcomes assessment exams. In the revision for 1983-87, the evaluation theme played a key role with nationally or locally developed tests or external reviews for all undergraduate programs and mandating the ACT Comp exam as the tool to measure achievement in general education. Fine tuning the scoring methods was the primary result of the 1988-92 revision. Finally the revisions for 1993-97, redirected assessment into a more internal reporting mode as opposed to external and the number of indicators/measures were doubled from years previous (Banta, et al. 1996). It is also important to note that the Tennessee program allows institutions to receive funding for efforts to address institutional weakness if improvement can be demonstrated (Albright, 1998).

To gain an understanding of how individuals at the higher education campus perceived the 1993-97 performance indicators/measures and their effectiveness in promoting improvement, Banta, et al. (1996) conducted a survey of the twenty-three institutions. The survey was sent to the individual at each campus who was responsible for compiling the annual performance-funding report. A 100% return rate was realized.

The survey design asked the respondents to assign a grade of “A, B, C, D or F” to each of the ten indicators/measures based on their assessment of how it represented a measure of the quality of higher education. Next the respondents were asked if each of the
indicators/measure was effective in promoting success. Finally, they were asked to provide feedback as to what the most helpful features were and what improvements might be made for each performance indicator/measure (Banta, et al. 1996).

The results clearly demonstrated a preference for utilizing peers in the review and evaluation processes. Improvement actions and using surveys also scored in the top five preferred measures. These five indicators/measures (three peer review processes, surveys and improvement actions) were judged to be both the best measure of higher education quality and to have the most potential for supporting campus improvement (Banta, et al. 1996).

The survey results also indicated that the performance-funding program was assigned a grade of "C" in terms of improving institutional effectiveness. The researchers conclude that this mediocre rating may have been influenced by several factors. Since the respondents were directly responsible for the campus plans, their voices may have been more critical and their answers more candid. The new performance indicators/measures were much more complex, requiring additional planning and data gathering, which may have been frustrating to the coordinators (Banta, et al. 1996).

On the other hand, some researchers seem to agree with this assessment of Tennessee's experience in improving institutional
effectiveness. Ewell (1994) reflects on Tennessee's performance funding efforts as being more successful in

...developing and reporting state-level indicators and in using them effectively to account for and promote the state's higher education system than they have been in inducing institutions to engage in their own local planning and assessment activities (p. 8)

Additionally, Banta, et al. (1996) reported:

...the evidence of progress in promoting student achievement cited in the 1994 Annual Report of the THEC on 'Status of Higher Education in Tennessee' was scant. Students' scores on standardized tests of generic skills were equivocal, and the summary statement about student learning in major fields 'Scores on most licensure examinations remain at or above national averages' did not indicate gains (p. 40).

Tennessee's performance funding efforts over the past twenty-three years have been difficult to fully assimilate into the academic environment, although, the value appears to have been in the process of reform and steps taken to make improvement and the allocation of additional state funds. Tennessee's performance funding has resulted in a number of improvements; campus activities and projects that would not have occurred without the initiative and allocation of additional resources. Fisher (1995) reveals that educators often find difficulties with programs that are established to measure learning outcomes. Problems with reliability and validity for most methods of measurement are seen as major concerns. Banta, et. al (1996) review of the Tennessee experience would seem to
confirm these problems of reliability and validity and the perceptions coming from various areas of academic institutions. In reflecting about their individual campus experiences, they share:

The process of setting explicit goals, evaluating teaching and learning, and making the results public so runs against the grain of the academy that even fifteen years' experience with performance funding is not sufficient to convince a large segment of our colleagues that anything positive can be achieved by attempting to do this (p. 41).

Public Policy Development and Implementation

The primary purpose of this study was to gain an understanding of what occurred with the implementation of Performance Measures Funding at one Washington community college. Before examining issues related to implementation, it is important to gain insights and an understanding of policy development.

Guba (1984) provided a definition of policy as

...an assertion of intents or goals; policy is a guide to discretionary action; policy is a strategy undertaken to solve or ameliorate a problem; policy is the accumulated standing decisions of a governing body by which it regulates, controls, promotes, services, and otherwise influences matters within its sphere of authority (p.64).
In researching the development and implementation of public policy Majone and Wildavsky (1979) indicate that in

...most policies of interest, objectives are characteristically, multiple (because we want many things, not just one), conflicting (because we want different things), and vague (because that is how we can agree to proceed without having to agree also on exactly what to do) (pp. 182-183).

Underscoring the fact that policies are often unclear, Bickman (1987) observed, “Often the objectives, goals and theories underlying the program may be purposely ambiguous because of political concerns; that is, it may be kept intentionally vague in order to gain support from different groups” (p. 6).

The values and judgments of policy initiators and key stakeholders have long been recognized as the basic foundation of policy development. Researchers including Guba (1984) and Wirt and Mitchell (1982) have examined the role of values and influence of the stakeholders in the development of public policy. Guba (1984) concluded that policies are shaped by the values of key policymakers in addition to being influenced by key stakeholders. Policies are created with the intention of addressing or resolving an issue, which has been identified as important to policymakers and constituents.

Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983) identified three steps to policy development: “(1) the formulation/adoption of a policy, (2) its implementation by one or more administrative agencies, and (3) its
reformulation by the implementation experience” (p.7). In the development of policies, decision makers do not consistently consider issues of implementation (Wirt and Mitchell, 1982). The relationship between policy design and implementation is intertwined and should not be thought as separate or not addressed altogether, since the policy language and what is learned during implementation binds them together.

Majone and Wildavsky (1979) assert that, “Policy content shapes implementation by defining the arena in which the process takes place, the identity and role of the principal actors, the range of permissible tools for action, and of course by supplying resources” (p.174). These two researchers further explain that implementation actions interact with policy, noting that “each element is dependent on the other…” and that “program implementation thus becomes a seamless web” (p. 164). They further caution that “the separation of policy design from implementation is fatal” (p. 164) and “…knowing only the avowed programmatic objective without being aware of other constraints is insufficient for predicting or controlling the outcomes” (p.171).

There are a number of researchers that have studied the implementation of public policy including Pressman and Wildavsky (1984), Browne and Wildavsky (1983), Majone and Wildavsky (1979), Mazmanian and Sabatier (1981), Mazamanian and Sabatier (1983) and Fuhrman, Clune, and Elmore (1991). Even though several of the researchers differ in
their conceptual frameworks, general agreement exists concerning the dependency of successful implementation on well written policy, a clear understanding of what is to be achieved and the involvement of the stakeholders in the process. Browne and Wildavsky (1983) affirmed this observation in noting that "mandates are often sent downward from those in control...they have the power and the implementers are subordinate" (p.246). Additionally they noted, "where coercion may subdue political obstructions to the implemented processes, rarely can it compensate for a misshapen plan of action, for a misdiagnosis of the problem to be treated, or for a lack of foresight" (p.254).

Several researchers have focused on the implementation of educational reform and have developed strategies to execute change as well as the identification of factors that can help to predict the success of new policies. Majone and Wildavsky (1979) revealed the challenges of executing educational change in stating, "the implementation of innovative educational policies is much more difficult because of widespread lack of confidence in cognitive theories" (p. 174). Baldrige and Deal (1975) identified seven strategies needed for educational innovation which I have summarize as follows:

1. A serious assessment of needs is necessary. What is important to change has to be clearly identified. Diagnosis of
the problem is paramount. Identify that which will yield the most good for the organization.

2. Proposed changes must be relevant to the history of the organization. Organizations have deep, rich histories that need to be taken into account—patterns of life. If the history and traditions of the organizations conflict with the policy change it will not simply just “fit.”

3. Organizational changes must take the educational environment into account. Know the environment and the environmental demands. The environment can help identify and support the change that is needed.

4. Serious change must affect both the organizational structure and the individual attitudes. Changes in attitudes can occur with shifts in authority structure, participation in decision-making and development of new technologies.

5. Change must be directed at manipulable factors. If change is to occur, the areas identified must be issues over which the organization has influence.

6. Changes must be both politically and economically feasible. The suggested changes have fit the political environment both outside and inside the organization. Is the change viable given the costs?
7. The changes must be effective in solving the problems that were diagnosed. Solutions must address the problem.

Fuhrman, Clune and Elmore (1991) researched the process of implementation of policies and state reforms in the secondary schools, identifying five predictions for success of such efforts. Their work has implication for all areas of education, including post secondary and highlights the importance of how the policy was created and who will be involved in the implementation. The predictions based on their research are as follows:

1. Implementation success would be enhanced to the extent that reforms deliver clear, coherent signals to local districts.
2. There would be wide variation in local response; some local districts would resist reforms or refuse to comply; some would comply literally to the reform and most would adapt, taking from reforms the elements that best suited local goals and shaping them to local context.
3. The effects of reform would be lagged; there would be little impact in the short term as people adjust and began to translate policy into practice and much more actual change in the long term over years of phase-in and application.
4. The reforms would be mixtures of the symbolic and the actual; some forms would result in real changes in school practice; others might give the appearance of change but would mean little in the course of a student's school career.
5. The implementation process at the local level would be smoother to the extent that local actors were involved in shaping the state-level reforms; ownership would be important (pp. 199-200).

Given these strategies and predictions, it is clear that the successful implementation of policies is complicated and that policy development needs to be painstakingly developed from conceptualization through
implementation and evaluation. Implementation is not a short-lived process and desired changes must be viewed from a long-term point of reference. Considerations must be given to the history, people and dynamics of the institution both in the development and implementation of policy.

In a study mentioned earlier in this review, stable performance funding programs (Tennessee and Missouri) were contrasted with programs in five states that chose to abandon them (Burke, et al., 2001). In examining the results of this research, Burke, et al. (2001) concluded that their findings were consistent with the Mazmanian and Sabatier's (1983) policy implementation theory which identified three stages: formulation, implementation and reformulation (p.54). Burke, et al. (2001) also noted “previous studies of performance funding also tend to focus on the formulation stage and to slight the implementation and reformulation phases” (p.54). This finding is consistent with other research that identified most of the research is focused on the formulation stage (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1983).

The manner in which performance funding programs are initiated often predicts their success or failure. Burke, et al. (2001) reports that there are three methods which states have used to implement these types of programs which I have summarized:

1. Mandated/prescribed. The program is mandated and the indicators are prescribed.
2. Mandated. The program is mandated but the indicators and program details are developed by higher education coordinating boards in conjunction with campus representatives.

3. Not mandated. The program as well as the indicators and details are all developed by coordinating boards and campus representatives.

Burke's, et al. (2001) found that in the states that dropped performance funding the programs were almost exclusively mandated. The one exception was the State of Arkansas, but Burke, et al. (2001) pointed out that even though the program was developed through a higher education agency it “...responded mostly to the demands of the governor and slighted the concerns of the academic community” (p. 55). This lead Burke, et al. (2001) to conclude that these findings were consistent with guidance given by Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983) suggesting that policy implementation should "maximize the probability that implementing officials and target groups will perform as desired" (p. 41).

Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983) indicated that when a statute or policy represents a “substantive departure” from current status that the desired outcomes are more likely to be achieved, if their “six conditions of implementation” are realized. Those conditions are as follows:
1. The enabling legislation or other legal directive mandates policy objectives, which are clear and consistent or at least provides substantive criteria for resolving goal conflicts.
2. The enabling legislation incorporates a sound theory identifying the principle factors and causal linkages affecting policy objectives and gives implementing officials sufficient jurisdiction over target groups and other points of leverage to attain, at least potentially, the desired goals.
3. The enabling legislation structures the implementation process so as to maximize the probability that the implementing officials and target groups will perform as desired. This involves assignment to sympathetic agencies with adequate hierarchical integration, supportive decision rules, sufficient financial resources and adequate access to supporters.
4. The leaders of the implementing agency possess substantial managerial and political skill and are committed to statutory goals.
5. The program is actively supported by organized constituency groups and by a few key legislators (or chief executive) throughout the implementations process, with the courts being neutral or supportive.
6. The relative priority of statutory objectives is not undermined over time by the emergence of conflicting public policies or by changes in relevant socioeconomic conditions that weaken the statute's causal theory or political support.

(Mazmanian and Sabatier 1983) acknowledge the controversy concerning the first condition, reversing themselves by acknowledging that policy is seldom developed with objectives that are clear and consistent. One of their chief findings is that the "implementing agency support" is one of the most critical conditions to the successful implementation of public policy, which is also born out by research that shows that non-mandated programs are the most successful, giving greater flexibility to the higher education community (Burke, et al., 2001).
Burke et al. (2001) also found agreement with Mazmanian and Sabatier's (1983) conditions four, five and six. Burke et al. (2001) found that successful performance funding programs needed to provide "limited but substantial funding" which is consistent with the findings of Mazmanian and Sabatier who indicated the need for "sufficient resources." Both researchers identified that successful programs needed to have support of constituents, and legislators or executive officers. Burke et al. (2001) also noted, "...condition six confirms our characteristic of stable state priorities" (p. 57).
Chapter III: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

A qualitative research design framed this study in order to understand the essence of the shared experience of the individuals charged in implementing Performance Measures Funding, at one community college in the State of Washington. Qualitative research has its roots in the behavioral and social sciences and is widely used to study individuals, groups and organizational cultures (Strauss and Corbin (1990), Bogdan and Biklen (1998), Patton (1990)). In describing the characteristics of qualitative research Bogdan and Bilkin (1998) noted the following:

1. Naturalistic. Qualitative research has actual settings as the direct source of data and the researcher is the key instrument.
2. Descriptive Data. Qualitative research is descriptive. The data collected take the form of words or pictures rather than numbers.
3. Concern with process. Qualitative researchers are concerned with process rather than simply with outcomes and products.
4. Inductive. Qualitative researchers tend to analyze their data inductively.
5. Meaning. “Meaning” is of essential concern to the qualitative approach. Researchers who use this approach are interested in how different people make sense of their lives (pp. 4-7).

Qualitative research has been separated into five traditions of inquiry: biography, phenomenological study, grounded theory study,
ethnography and case study. Although each of these traditions is unique, Moustakas (1994) has identified the following common bonds that link qualitative research:

1. Recognizing the value of qualitative designs and methodologies, studies of human experiences that are not approachable through quantitative approaches.
2. Focusing on the wholeness of experience rather than solely on its objects or parts.
4. Obtaining descriptions of experience through first-person accounts in informal conversations and interviews.
5. Regarding the data of the experience as imperative in understanding human behavior and as evidence for scientific investigations.
6. Formulating questions and problems that reflect the interest, involvement and personal commitment of the researcher.
7. Viewing experience and behavior as an integrated and inseparable relationship of subject and object and of parts and of whole (21).

Research Framework

Given my desire to fully understand the essence of the shared experience of those involved in the implementation of this mandate, the phenomenological approach to qualitative research seemed to best meet my desired outcomes. This decision was reached after reading Creswell's (1998) scholarly work which indicated "...a phenomenological study describes the meaning of the lived experiences for several individuals about a concept or the phenomenon (p. 51)." As a means to help understand the objective of this research model, Patton (1990) found "phenomenological
inquiry focuses on the question: 'What is the structure and essence of
experience of this phenomenon for these people?'" (p.69).

The phenomenon that I wanted to understand—the implementation
of Performance Measures Funding—was best told from the voices of those
individuals responsible for the implementation of this mandate at one of
Washington's community colleges. In reviewing the literature concerning
the implementation of performance funding, I was unable to identify other
studies, which examined the effect such legislation had at the local campus
level. Understanding the experience by listening to the participants' voices
is the basis of phenomenological research and what Patton (1990)
describes as the

Essence or essences to (the) shared experience. These
essences are the core meanings mutually understood through
a phenomenon commonly experienced. The experiences of
different people are bracketed, analyzed, and compared to
identify the essences of the phenomenon. The assumption of
essence...that culture exists and is important, becomes the
defining characteristic of a purely phenomenological study
(70).

The Researcher

In a qualitative study, the primary instrument for data gathering is the
researcher. As the researcher, my background, knowledge, experience,
and relationship with some of the participants had an influence on my
research and the interaction I had with the participants in the study. To fully
understand the effect of that I, as the researcher, may have had on the study a summary of my background and experience is provided.

Graduating from Idaho State University in 1973 with an undergraduate degree in Marketing, I became the first in my family to complete college. After working for my alma mater for four years as the Assistant Director of High School and College Relations, I entered a Master's degree program in Student Personnel Work in Higher Education, receiving my degree in 1977. I have spent my entire professional life, totaling over 27 years, in higher education, primarily working in a wide variety of student services positions in several environments including the university, branch campus, and community college settings.

At the time the Washington legislature passed the Performance Measures Funding mandate in 1997, I was the Dean of Students at Centralia College and was completing my final year of service on the Washington State Student Services Commission Executive Board. During the five years of serving on this board, I became actively involved in a variety of legislative and community college system issues. For example, I worked with members of the Student Services Commission to craft a proposal for the CTC system to seek legislative funding for disability services, which resulted in a $1.5 million allocation. Because of this level of involvement on a statewide basis, I worked with many of the Presidents,
Deans of Instruction, Deans of Administration, Deans of Students and State Board staff and had knowledge of a variety of issues related to the Washington Community and Technical College System.

As part of my doctoral program in Community College Leadership at Oregon State University, I arranged to complete my internship working with the members of State Board staff to implement the Performance Measures Funding mandate. I worked directly with the SBCTC staff and the PMF Task Force. While completing this internship, I was immersed in a variety of responsibilities including the gathering of information on performance/accountability issues, updating a survey of all 50 states related to performance initiatives (Appendix A), attending PMF Task Force meetings and making presentations, helping to design the process and procedures for implementing PMF, developing the criteria for the evaluation of individual Accountability Plans submitted by each college, and serving on a panel to determine which colleges would receive PMF and at what level, based upon predetermined performance criteria.

The internship lasted from May 1998 through August 1999, which included my participation in the first full-cycle of reviewing and approving college accountability plans, evaluation of individual college performance, and the awarding of funding. This rich and rewarding experience allowed me to observe and work with members of the State Board staff, and be involved in offering testimony before the State Board as well as attending
and participating in a variety of legislative meetings. I experienced the process of implementing this legislative mandate first-hand as part of the process of implementing this policy for a 34 community college system.

Because I was involved so extensively with the design and implementation of PMF in Washington State, I gained a unique perspective relative to CTC system's approach to the implementation of the PMF mandate. I reviewed all of the improvement plans submitted by the 34 community and technical colleges. However, I did not have first-hand knowledge of what occurred at the campus-level since I was not directly involved with the implementation of PMF at Centralia College. By choosing to study the implementation of PMF at campus-level, I felt that my knowledge of this type of budgeting tool would be more complete.

The first year, PCCC's plan focused their improvement efforts and ultimately all of their Performance Measure Funding, on one student population—students of color—rather than identifying multiple student populations or the overall student population as the focus of their improvement efforts. The second year, PCCC changed its center of attention from students of color to students enrolled in developmental math courses, again selecting a single population. By developing an improvement plan that addressed the four system goals—graduation rates, rate of pay for professional-technical graduates, basic skills course completion and graduation efficiency rates—solely on the basis of one
student population, PCCC made an intriguing statement and one that eventually lead me to conduct this research project. Because of this approach I believed that understanding PCCC shared experience would provide insight into how as a college, they processed this legislative mandate and what they learned form their efforts to improve in the four areas identified in the mandate.

The Participants

Since the purpose of this study was to understand the essence of the experience of those individuals who helped to implement PMF at PCCC, I decided to invite all members of the college's PMF Task Force to participate in this project. This decision is consistent with the guidance given by Creswell (1998) who stated, "researchers designing qualitative studies need clear criteria in mind and need to provide rationales for their decisions." As recommended by Creswell (1998), I reviewed Miles and Huberman's (1994) typography of 16 strategies for purposeful sampling, selecting "criterion" as a basis of participant selection. Miles and Huberman (1994) explained that "criterion" works well for "all cases that meet the same criterion" and that it is "useful for quality assurance" (p. 28). Creswell (1998) further explains, "criterion sampling works well when all individuals studied represent people who have experienced the phenomenon" (p.118). As the researcher, I felt that the quality of the study and ability to fully understand the essence of
this implementation journey could be best assured by inviting all members of the task force to participate.

In order to gain access to the participants, I sent a letter to the college President, providing her with an overview of my background as a researcher and the scope of the proposed project (Appendix B). At a meeting in the President’s office, we discussed the project in more detail and she expressed support for the project. Following this meeting, the President sent an email to the members of the Task Force informing them of my pending contact and letting them know she supported the goals of this project.

In a matter of days, I followed up with members of the Task Force by phone, inviting each member to become a participant in the project and scheduled an appointment to discuss the details of the study and seek their permission to become a participant. The phone contact followed a script that was approved by the Oregon State University Human Subjects Committee. I was encouraged by the fact that all of eight members were willing to participate.

Each of the eight-member PMF Task Force completed a Participant Data Sheet (Appendix C), which provided me with information regarding the participant’s educational level, length of time employed at PCCC and in higher education, instructional experience (if any) and current position held
at PCCC. This information was useful in providing some of the context of the data that was gathered.

The PFM Task Force members were selected by the previous college president who retired and was stratified to represent a variety of campus disciplines and levels of responsibilities within the college's organizational structure and included the following positions:

- Vice President of Instruction and Student Services
- Vice President of College Services
- Dean of Students
- Instructor and Chair of the English and Reading Department
- Instructor and Chair of the Math Department
- Assistant Vice President of Institutional Research and Workforce Education
- Director of Institutional Research and Budget
- Director of Advising and Assessment Services

After interviewing the math instructor/department chair, I discovered that he had recently assumed the position of Dean for Sciences and that he had been replaced on the Task Force near the end of the first-year cycle. I decided to invite his Task Force replacement, also a math faculty member, who subsequently agreed to participate in the research project. This brought the number of participants to nine and represented all of the PCCC Task Force members. With a total of nine participants my criterion
sample fell within the guidelines that Creswell (1998) suggested of “up to 10 people” (p.113).

**Data Collection**

Data collection occurred from August 1999 through November 1999 and consisted of a series of interviews with the nine participants about their experience in implementing PMF and review of various categories of documents. My background at the master’s level included a foundation in counseling so I felt particularly well suited to gather the data through a process of in-depth interviews.

Immediately after scheduling the interview, I mailed an informed consent letter, which was approved by the OSU Human Subjects Committee. Both the signed informed consent agreement and the completed data sheet were collected at the beginning of each in-depth interview. To help familiarize the participant with my background and to establish credibility, I briefly reviewed my professional background, educational preparation and overviewed the intent of the project.

Interviews with the key participants were conducted at the convenience of the participant and occurred in each individual’s private office. The initial interview lasted for approximately 90 minutes, with some follow-up interviews conducted, which lasted between 30-60 minutes. Because the interviews were conducted in the participant’s office, care was
taken to minimize any interruptions by each individual forwarding their phone and closing their door. Each participant was asked to respond to a series of open-ended questions as well as follow-up questions, which were asked in order to gain greater insights or to clarify information. As the researcher, I paid careful attention to avoid making any judgments concerning the information that was shared during the interview, allowing the participant to fully recall the details of the PMF implementation process. These steps were consistent with Moustakas' (1994) description of the interview process:

The phenomenological interview involves an informal, interactive process and utilizes open-ended comments and questions. Although the primary researcher may in advance develop a series of questions aimed at evoking a comprehensive account of the person's experience of the phenomenon, there are varied, altered, or not used at all when the co-researcher shares the full story of his or her experience of the bracketed question (114).

Each interview was tape recorded after obtaining permission from the participant. The tape recorder was switched on after permission was given and set aside in order to minimize any distraction from the interview itself. Filled tapes were replaced as discretely and quickly as possible so as to not interrupt the flow of data gathered in the interview process with each participant. Specific precautions were taken to ensure the proper working of the tape recorder and tapes. The batteries were replaced in the tape recorder prior to the beginning of each interview and the interviews
were recorded only on new mini-cassette tapes. No technical difficulties occurred during the data gathering.

At the conclusion of each interview, each participant was thanked and informed that they would receive a copy of an interview transcript, which they were asked to review and correct to help ensure the accuracy of information. In order to safeguard the collected data, I made a copy of each interview tape, which was stored in a lock file cabinet in my office. A professional transcriptionist transcribed the original tape verbatim. While the tape was being transcribed, I listened to the copied tape so that I could begin to review and gain insights into the data, and to prepare for the next interview.

Next, I carefully reviewed each transcript for accuracy and clarity. All "uhhs" and "ohhs" were deleted and misspelled words corrected. The areas the transcriptionist identified as needing clarification were individually noted and referenced in relationship to the meter on the tape recorder. After carefully reviewing the transcript and listening to the passage on the tape, I made minor corrections and insertions, which usually dealt with terminology that was unfamiliar to the person who transcribed the tapes. In a few instances, the participant's voice was so faint that I had to rely on my field notes in conjunction with carefully listening to the recorded passage before providing clarity to the transcribed document. A copy of the revised transcript was sent to each participant for his/her review and comment. The
participants were asked to return the transcript with any corrections and/or clarifications to me in two weeks. A postage-paid, self-addressed envelope was sent with the revised transcript to help ensure that the transcripts were returned promptly. A copy of the revised transcript was also secured in my office for safekeeping.

Each participant returned the revised transcript in the time allotted using the envelope provided. Almost all of the participants provided some level of feedback that corrected spelling and punctuation mistakes and helped to clarify or further enhance the data that was provided. The participants' feedback was incorporated into final editions of the interview transcripts.

Document Review

As a researcher, I had access to a number of documents, which provided valuable data, and insights into the experiences and relationships of the participants, the planning processes and the final outcomes of the taskforce. The documents that I reviewed included:

Improvement Strategy Grants Final Report, 1997 Baseline Data
Diversity Goals, and Yearly English, Reading and Math 1992-98
completion Rates Report.

- External documents including SBCTC Performance Measures
  Funding packet (timelines, instructions, forms, and indicators by
goal: transfer, core course completion, graduation efficiency index
and wage rate), system PMF Task Force minutes, emails, reports,
PowerPoint handouts and documents, a video of Peter Ewell’s
Performance Funding presentation and workshop handouts;
Retention in Washington Community Colleges Report, February
1997; Access and Success for System Goals for People of Color in
Washington Community and Technical Colleges: Fourth Annual
Report, June 1997; and Strategies to Improve Time to Degree and

I reviewed these documents thoroughly to gain a full understanding of
the participants’ experience so that this project was rich in detail and thick in
description. Additionally, I reviewed this extensive list of documents to
reduce the risk of researcher bias and to provide opportunities for
triangulation of the data (verification).
Data Verification

Qualitative researchers have long included data verification as an essential element of the research methodology. Lincoln and Guba (1985) describe this classification of procedures "whereby the naturalist's alternative trustworthiness criteria may be operationalized" (301). Creswell's (1998) review of the literature revealed eight verification procedures used to verify qualitative data and recommended as a standard that at least two be utilized in any given study. For the purposes of this project, I have selected the following three:

1. Triangulation. Bogan and Biklen (1998) traced triangulation in qualitative studies to its original meaning, which was the verification of facts through the use of documents, other research, photographs, histories, etc. However, these authors indicate that with today's research the term has been expanded to not only include its origins but also to "mean that many sources of data were better in a study than a single source because multiple sources lead to a fuller understanding of the phenomena..." (p.104). As indicated earlier, I used a wide variety of both internal and external documents for the purposes of triangulation.

2. Clarify researcher bias. Creswell (1998) identified that this is a critical data verification issue for qualitative researchers indicating
that the "researcher comments on past experiences, biases, prejudices, and orientations..." (p. 202). The section in this chapter dealing with my background as a researcher attempts to provide the reader with relevant insights into my background, which may have influenced this study.

In addition to identifying my past experiences, I practiced what Patton (1990) identified as a "phenomenological shift through a process called Epoche" (407). He further explains, "epoche is an ongoing analytical process rather than a single fixed event" (408). In accomplishing this phenomenological shift Katz (1997) indicates that the epoche requires a "suspension of judgment...critical in the phenomenological investigation and requires the setting aside of the researcher's personal viewpoint in order to see the experience for itself" (p.37).

I employed the epoche process throughout my data gathering and analysis processes so that I could fully understand and gain insights into the experiences of the participants. In doing so, this enabled me to "investigate the phenomenon from a fresh and open viewpoint without prejudgment or imposing meaning too soon" (Patton, 1990, p.407).

3. Utilization of rich, thick description. I provided the reader with detailed descriptions of the Washington CTC system, PCCC as well
as background information on each of the participants. Additionally, I used the voices of the participants organized thematically to tell the story of their implementation journey. In doing so, I have created a study that is rich and thick in description. As a result “the researcher enables readers to transfer information to other settings and to determine whether the findings can be transferred...” (p. 203).

**Data Analysis**

In a phenomenological construct, the data analysis provides the reader with the essence of the participant's shared experiences, which in this study, was the implementation journey. The goal is to provide the reader with an understanding of knowing what it was to experience the phenomenon. In providing a structure to perform data analysis in a phenomenological study, Moustakas (1994) and Patton (1990) identified five distinct steps in the process: epoche, bracketing, horizontalizing, themes and structured synthesis of the shared experience. The following is an overview of each of these five steps:

1. **Epoche.** As described earlier, the epoche process was used to "set aside" personal bias, knowledge and experiences so that the data can be analyzed from "fresh, open" perspective. I was aware that my involvement in the development of the PMF initiative at the SBCTC level provided me with a bias but I consciously put aside my
knowledge and experiences so that I could fully understand the experiences of the participants in the implementation process at the campus level.

2. Bracketing. I bracketed the data (phenomenological reduction) by reviewing the transcripts and listening to the taped interviews, noting key phrases and statements that spoke directly to the experience of implementing PMF. The bracketed data were transferred to a separate document, being careful to document from which participant the data was provided. These data were analyzed and compared with the data provided by each participant for each of the framing questions.

3. Horizontalizing. In the horizontalization stage, Creswell (1998) indicated that the data needs to be viewed as "having equal weight" and that the researcher "works to develop a list of nonrepetitive, nonoverlapping statements" (147). After the data has been represented horizontally, I organized it into clusters based upon similar characteristics and patterns.

4. Themes. The clusters were then analyzed into groupings that resulted in the identification of themes from which the data could be represented. As a result, I found that the data was represented by three themes: power, design flaw, and lessons learned.
5. Structured synthesis of the shared experience. Reviewing and analyzing horizontalized data, the textural descriptions of what happened, the structural descriptions of how the phenomenon was experienced, and the themes, the essence of the shared journey is identified.
Chapter IV: FINDINGS

Introduction

In order to fully understand PCCC's experience in implementing the Performance Measures Funding (PMF) mandates, I used in-depth interviews to gain a thick description of their work, as described by each of the nine participants. The transcriptions of the taped interviews coupled with my research notes and numerous written documents formed the basis of my research. A detailed list of my research data included the following:

- The taped interviews.
- The transcriptions of the interviews, including the original, proof and final copies.
- The research journal.
- Researcher's field notes.

- External documents including SBCTC Performance Measures Funding packet (timelines, instructions, forms, and indicators by goal: transfer, core course completion, graduation efficiency index and wage rate), system PMF Task Force minutes, emails, reports, PowerPoint handouts and documents, a video of Peter Ewell's Performance Funding presentation and workshop handouts; Retention in Washington Community Colleges Report, February 1997; Access and Success for System Goals for People of Color in Washington Community and Technical Colleges: Fourth Annual Report, June 1997; and Strategies to Improve Time to Degree and Graduation Rates Report, September 1994.

- The informed consent from each participant.

- The interview framing questions (Appendix D).

- Document Inventory List with all data and documents collected.

- A Thematic Analysis Chart (Appendix E).

- Participant Data Forms.

During the interviews, the participants shared their individual stories about their journey in developing and implementing PMF during the 1997-99 biennium. Their personal accounts are the basis of understanding how, as an institution, they addressed the implementation of this new state
mandate and helped me, as a researcher, gain an in-depth understanding of their journey. The research thus provides an examination of the challenges, successes and failures of one Washington community college in the implementation of PMF.

The Legislative Mandate

In Washington State, performance funding came into being through bipartisan support. Governor Locke, a Democrat, included performance-based funding in his budget proposal to the legislature in December 1996. Later, similar language concerning performance-based funding appeared in both the House and Senate budgets, ultimately gaining enough support to be included as a budget proviso. The legislative process did not include any direct involvement from the university or community and technical college campuses with regards to need for or the development of this performance-funding model. Rather, those crafting the budget language for the two-year colleges contacted the staff at the State Board for Community Technical Colleges (SBCTC) and asked for suggestions of possible improvement goals. In an interview with the SBCTC staff member, who was contacted by those writing the budget provisions, she reported "they met with us independently and said we want some performance measures and numerical goals put into the budget and ‘by the way we need them by Tuesday (request was made on Thursday)’."
Given the short deadlines, involvement from the colleges was not practical so the SBCTC staff worked independently, identifying goals, in which it was thought the colleges could best demonstrate improvement. Some of the identified goals tied to other efforts that the CTC system had earlier identified as priorities such as the transfer goal. The SBCTC reasoned that if the PMF goals were linked to efforts that the system already identified as priorities, that the opportunity to demonstrate improvement would be greatly enhanced.

The legislature incorporated the four goals, provided by the SBCTC, into 1997-98 budget language. It is important to clarify that the technical colleges were required to address three of the four goals, since transfer was not part of their institutional mission. Additionally, the legislature recognized the difference in the mission of the community and technical colleges from that of the universities, by specifying separate goals for the university system.

Even though the goals were viewed as long-term, the legislature's expectation that improvement would be expected during the first years was clear. The budget law stated that the community college system would develop a plan "...for measurable and specific improvements in productivity, efficiency and student retention in academic years 1997-98 and 1998-99..." (Washington State Appropriations Act, 1997) In other words, improvement had to be demonstrated in a short time period, initially
as little as one quarter, the first year. The PMF goals for the community and technical college system were identified as:

1. Increase the median wage of job preparatory students from $10 and hour to $12.

2. Increase the rate at which transfer-oriented students successfully transfer from 49% to 67%.

3. Increase the rate of students who successfully complete core courses from 80% to 85%.

4. Increase the Graduation Efficiency Rate (efficiency that students use the college resources measured by college level courses taken versus those required) from 81% to 95%.

Additionally the legislature noted in the budget law an interest in a "new efficiency compact" with the higher education community in the next legislative session. This interest in future discussions, lead many SBCTC staff to believe that the legislators were open to a review of what was learned over the first two years of PMF, so that improvements might be negotiated for the 1999-01 biennium. The legislator's interest in future discussions expressly stated:

Accordingly, the legislature requests that the institutions of higher education, working together through the council of presidents' office and the state board for community and technical colleges, identify opportunities for changes in state law that would form the basis for a new efficiency compact
with the state, for consideration no later than the 1999 legislative session (Washington State Appropriations Act, 1997).

The State Board Response

With the passage of the budget proviso language providing for PMF in Washington State, the SBCTC was charged with the development and implementation of a system to accomplish what the law mandated. The SBCTC developed strategies that would help provide colleges with an understanding of this new funding model and the implications for the 34 individual campuses.

At the beginning of summer of 1997, the SBCTC convened a 35-member system PMF task force to develop the processes, timelines, forms, evaluation procedures, and address other related issues, so that PMF could be implemented at the local college level in the Fall of 1997. This system task force consisted of broad representation from the community and technical college system, including four college presidents, six chief instructional officers, four chief student services officers, two chief business officers, four data group representatives, three public information officers, four faculty and eight SBCTC staff. Moreover, careful attention was made to ensure that the representation included large, small, rural, urban, community and technical colleges.
The task force met over most of the summer to offer input and oversight into the development of the PMF system. Additionally, in an effort to help college leaders gain an understanding of this new funding model and begin to build support for colleges to begin the work on their improvement efforts, the SBCTC provided workshops and presentations to the CTC Presidents, and the CTC Commissions, including Instruction, Student Services and Business Affairs. Furthermore, to help colleges gain a national perspective and insights pertaining to how other states have approached various performance-based funding models, Peter Ewell, a leading authority in this area conducted a workshop.

This system taskforce met numerous times over the summer to develop a plan and “flush out the details” for the CTC system. The State Board reviewed the work and recommendations of the PMF Task Force at a retreat on August 10-12, 1997 with final approval of the System Implementation Plan on September 18, 1997.

PMF packets were mailed to each college at the beginning of September, 1997 and included the PMF goals and specific individual college data elements, a menu of approved performance indicators for each individual goal, timelines, forms, and instructions. The first deadline called for each college to submit an Accountability for Improvement Plan by November 14, 1997 for the 1997-98 year. Once the Accountability for Improvement Plans were reviewed and approved by the SBCTC staff, half
of the money held back for PMF was released to the colleges. The other half could not be distributed unless colleges demonstrated improvement. The timeline for demonstrating improvement was eventually extended through spring quarter since several colleges were unable to document the quantifiable results by the end of winter quarter. During the second year (1998-99), the same format was essentially followed, releasing half of the PMF money after the SBCTC approved the improvement plans and the other half was released if improvement was demonstrated.

The PCCC Response

The retiring college President appointed a PCCC PMF Task Force in the summer of 1997 and his selection of members included the college's executive leadership team, faculty and other key college personnel. The eight-member task force remained constant both years except for the math department representative position, which had to have a new faculty member appointed, since the original person accepted an administrative position. The Director of Institutional Research and Budget chaired the PCCC PMF task force, in addition to his serving on the system task force.

All nine task force members agreed to participate in this research project. Each of the participants disclosed that they were selected on the basis of their position held at the college and/or their area of professional expertise. None of the participants had any previous performance-based
funding experience. The task force included the following individuals and the reason that they believed that they were selected to serve:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Reason Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of College Services</td>
<td>Potential budget impact and Institutional Research is a direct report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs</td>
<td>Areas of supervision/responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Department Faculty Member (1(^{st}) year)</td>
<td>Academic discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Department Faculty Member (2(^{nd}) year)</td>
<td>Academic discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>Areas of supervision/responsibility. Proven ability to work effectively with instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Advising and Assessment Services</td>
<td>Student Services representative. Involvement with Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness, Advising, and Multicultural Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Vice President of Institutional Research and Workforce Education</td>
<td>Areas of responsibility and professional expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair of English and Reading</td>
<td>Areas of responsibility and experience in assessment and quality improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Institutional Research/Budget</td>
<td>Areas of responsibility and experience serving on the system PMF task force</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The college had its first PMF Task Force meeting on September 25, 1997, after receiving the materials from the SBCTC. This first meeting was described by a number of the participants as an opportunity to "come to grips with the reality of PMF," understanding that an improvement plan needed to be crafted in less than two months (the deadline for submission of the plan was November 14, 1997) and for the participants, as one described, to "vent, grouse and complain" about the task that lay before them. In the researcher's opinion, even though their charge seemed formidable the task force members were committed, from the beginning, to do the best that they could for students and for the college.

The first year (1997-98) was particularly challenging and difficult for PCCC. There was little "ramp up" time to implement this new funding model given the fact that the timelines were particularly short. To fully appreciate these specified timelines, the following excerpts are provided from the 1997-98 SBCTC materials that were sent to the colleges:

- **9/1/97**
  SBCTC distributed guidelines for college plans for 97-98 improvements

- **Sept/Oct/1997**
  Colleges develop plans for 97-98 improvements, which include areas of focus, and indicators that help college and judgment group decide if improvement occurred

- **11/14/97**
  Last day to submit college improvement plans to SBCTC
SBCTC staff reviewed implementation plans and requested rewrites if needed

State Board approved implementation plans and released funds

Colleges implemented strategies for improvement

Colleges prepared data on indicators using data provided by SBCTC or own data based on approved protocols

Colleges reviewed evidence and made judgment of improvement

Colleges used findings and direction from other college efforts to develop implementation plan for 1998-99

Colleges submitted report on data from indicators and made self-judgment about 1997-98 improvement and the 1998-99 implementation plan

Review group reviewed all college reports and implementation plans to determine if funding can be released

State Board approved implementation plans and released funds for 1998-99

Cycle repeats with data gathering, judgment, release of funds, implementation plan 1999-00

(See Appendix F for complete SBCTC Timeline)

PCCC found it difficult to involve many faculty and staff in the discussions, identification of possible improvement strategies to address
the PMF goals and development of the college’s Accountability for Improvement Plan, given these required deadlines. The faculty, as well as a number of staff, did not return to work for the academic year until the third week of September, 1997. Therefore, most of their attention was directed towards preparing for the first day of fall quarter. Consequently, the members of the task force were the only ones who had much knowledge of PMF.

In addition, the expectation was clear that as a result of implementing the college’s PMF Accountability for Improvement Plan, the college would lose part of its base funding unless improvement in each goal needed was demonstrated by the end of Winter Quarter, 1998. The participants reported that as a result of the timelines and this short-term improvement approach, most faculty and staff were reported to be disengaged from the process unless they were directly impacted by the college’s improvement efforts.

As the members of the PCCC task force began to work on the development of a plan, they were confronted with the dilemma that most of their ideas required additional resources to implement; something PMF did not provide. One of the challenges the task force faced was the PMF mandate did not provide any new money to pay for improvement strategies. Reflecting on the parameters the task force had to work in, one participant shared "...one of the overall strategies was to not go out and start any new
programs. We weren't starting new initiatives given as they were withholding money instead of giving us money. We looked around to see what we could do with what we have got.” Additionally, this participant shared a conversation that he had with a SBCTC staff member who helped to bolster this line of thinking. He reported her guidance as, “you wouldn't be wise to go out and crank out any new initiatives with this because there is no new money for that and if you fail, that is a double whammy.”

Furthermore, the strategies for improvement needed to produce results by the end of the 1998 Winter Quarter. Determining what was most needed institutionally to improve student success might not be considered if, as a result, the college was put at risk of not being able to demonstrate improvement by the deadline or the strategy required additional resources to implement. One participant reflected, “that first year we quite frequently struggled with coming up with something that we felt a reviewer at the State Board would say ‘yeah this is a good thing' as well as something that wasn’t setting us up for failure.” These concerns were somewhat reduced the second year since the plan was developed in May, 1998 with implementation the following Fall Quarter, resulting in two complete quarters in which to demonstrate improvement. But even after two full quarters, the participants raised concerns that the amount of time still was inadequate for “real” improvement.
As the task force brainstormed strategies to serve as the focus for the college's improvement plan, their attention was drawn to a newly funded Trio Student Support Services (SSS) Grant, which was implemented during the 1997 Fall Quarter. The grant, specifically targeted to serve 200 first-generation and low-income students, seemed to align with the parameters that task force had to deal with: expending no additional college resources, and improvement being demonstrated in a short amount of time, since the improvement strategies were already identified.

For several weeks the task force worked to draft an Accountability for Improvement Plan based upon the objectives and activities of the SSS Grant. During the third week of October, 1997, the draft plan was shared with the SBCTC staff member who was charged with system-wide implementation of PMF. Based on her assessment, she did not support the SSS Grant focus because of concerns that the number of targeted students (200) in the project was too small to have an overall affect on the college's PMF data. Therefore, she recommended that the college choose another targeted population of students.

The chair of the task force now faced a major challenge: it was the last week of October and the November 14 deadline for submission of the plan was fast approaching. After conferring with one or two task force members about the feedback from the SBCTC staff member and discussing
other alternatives, the chair decided to change the focus to the college’s existing Action Plan for Achieving Ethnic/Racial Diversity (APAERD).

In developing the APAERD (Appendix G), the college had used an inclusive process that involved both internal and external stakeholders. These efforts resulted in a comprehensive plan that addressed student needs, campus climate, and employment issues. The plan had been implemented in 1996.

The 1996-97 enrollment data of state supported students indicated 28.7% of PCCC’s students were students of color (Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, 1999). With almost 30% of the student body being students of color, it was reasoned that the targeted population would be large enough to significantly impact the college’s overall rates. The SBCTC staff member was reported to have agreed that this was a large enough population to have an overall impact. The college’s 1997-98 Accountability for Improvement Plan (Appendix H), which was approved by the SBCTC, used a selective number of activities contained in the college’s APAERD.

Several participants expressed concerns about the process for making the decision to change the PMF focus from the SSS grant to students of color. One participant expressed those concerns with the process by stating “I think that the decision to move into that area (students
of color) came somewhat in isolation with well intended people but not the entire committee...." Additionally, several participants expressed concern about the choice of making students of color the focus. Reflecting on the decision to focus on students of color, she shared,

...the strength of the diversity plan was that it was comprehensive, it dealt with employment issues on our campus, and it dealt with campus climate as well as student success, retention and recruitment. It was a very comprehensive look at diversity and now it became very segmented.

At the end of the 1998 Winter Quarter, the college reviewed the PMF data to determine if improvement had been demonstrated so that the second half of the funding could be released. After a review of PCCC's Institutional Assessment by the SBCTC staff, the determination was made that the college had made improvement in the transfer and wage goals but had not made sufficient progress related to the core course completion and student efficiency goals.

After reviewing the assessments from all 34 colleges, the SBCTC staff determined that several institutions had difficulty demonstrating improvement in all four goals. Additionally the SBCTC staff noted that the following year colleges would have both Fall and Winter quarters to demonstrate improvement. Based on this information, the SBCTC extended the 1997-98 deadline for demonstrating improvement until the end of Spring Quarter. At the end of this extension, PCCC submitted a
revised Annual Institutional Assessment (Appendix I) indicating that improvement in all four-goal areas had been made. The SBCTC agreed with the assessment and thus released the remainder of PCCC's funds.

Not all community colleges were as successful as PCCC in demonstrating improvement. In fact, the SBCTC determined that there were eight colleges who had failed to demonstrate improvements in 1997-98 in one or more goals resulting in a total loss to those campuses of $190,900. This money was reallocated to a 1998-99 Improvement Strategies Grant Fund, for which colleges could submit proposals to pilot improvement initiatives.

The 1998-99 process for development of an institutional PMF plan, assessment of college improvement efforts, and the release of funds closely mirrored the process that was used in 1997-98. Colleges were required to submit a plan, which the SBCTC reviewed and approved, followed by the release of half of the held-back money. Based on the assessment of the improvement made by the colleges, part or all of the remaining funds were then released.

After reviewing the college's first year's experience with this new funding model, the task force decided to change the focus for 1998-99. The 1998-99 Accountability for Improvement Plan (Appendix J) changed the targeted population from students of color to students enrolled in Math 90 and 99, both developmental classes.
Since PCCC had the lowest Developmental Math completion rate (52%) of any Washington community or technical college, the members of the task force felt that the best way to address this issue was by concentrating all of the 1998-99 improvement strategies on these two courses. In all, the task force identified nine Developmental Math improvement strategies, which they hoped would result in improvement in each of the four goals. The task force members realized that the plan represented an "all or nothing" scenario given the fact that the same nine strategies were used for each of the four goals but they believed that the risk was balanced by the fact all of the college's efforts would be clearly focused on just one area (developmental math). It is also important to note that this "all or nothing" scenario was essentially a repeat of the same kind of thinking that occurred during the first year when students of color were used to address improvement in all four goals.

In selecting this focus, the task force was hopeful that the college would be able to direct specific efforts toward improvement in math areas that were known to be problematic. Faculty, in particular math faculty, and other staff had been aware of the low completion rates in Developmental Math for some time but because of scarce resources the college had not addressed the problem. Most participants agreed that the Developmental Math area needing improvement was the Math Lab, which was structured as an open, self-paced lab enrolling 400 students a quarter but with a
success rate of only 20%. One participant described the Math Lab as a “death trap” due to the low success rate. Another significant Math 90 and 99 issue dealt with the fact that the college had not been adequately enforcing the course prerequisites.

To offset some of the cost of the improvement strategies, the college submitted a $47,494 proposal for SBCTC Improvement Strategies Grant, funded from PMF money that was pooled from colleges who failed to demonstrate improvement in 1997-98. PCCC was awarded $19,300, which was used winter quarter to assign tutors and graders in all sections of Math 90 and Math 99 and to pay for the cost of adding two sections of Math 90 and 99.

PCCC’s 1998-99 Annual Institution Assessment was completed after the end of the Winter Quarter. The assessment was submitted to the SBCTC for the final review. Based on the data provided, PCCC’s efforts resulted in improvement in all four goals, so the college received the last of the funds that had been held back for that year.

As the participants told of their journey serving on the task force, the sequence of events and meanings became clear. This journey was like a pilgrimage to an unfamiliar land, filled with much that was unknown but the participants met the challenges with the determination to be successful. The participants shared their feelings, thoughts, reservations, suspicions, and hopes as they recalled their two-year journey with the implementation
of this new funding model at PCCC. The descriptions that were shared have been organized into themes, which summarize the research findings. The researcher identified three major themes that describe the participant’s implementation experience: power, design flaw and lessons learned. The pages that follow in this chapter provide the findings as represented by these themes.

The Data Represented by Theme

Power

As public employees, all of the participants indicated that they understood that the legislature had the ultimate authority (power) to implement changes in Washington’s higher education system. Several participants recalled having to address other legislative mandates in prior years and referred to the legislature’s decision to invoke PMF as “here the state goes again.” Almost all of the participants viewed this funding initiative as being part of a national accountability trend. To most participants, accountability seemed to be an acceptable notion with one participant noting “I do agree that schools should be accountable, and to be able to show what they say they are, and if not, why not.”

Most participants spoke with a level of understanding and support regarding the need to be make improvements. This was especially true given the fact that Washington State had developed and funded an
assessment initiative in the early 1990's and the regional accreditation association, like those in other parts of the country, required the measurement of institutional effectiveness. One participant reflected her commitment to the improvement of student learning by stating "...how important it is to be continually in a mode of assessment and that to me is the only way in which we can make any change, to help students in anyway is to be constantly looking at what we are doing, what our purpose is here; how we can make it better, if we can."

The participants were eager to share with me the college's efforts in developing and implement strategies to improve student success in writing and reading courses since 1992, which they pointed out was self-initiated by the Department Chair and the faculty. The trend lines for almost all developmental English and Reading courses from 1992 through 1998 showed aggregate completion gains. For example English 091 went from a 74% completion rate to 94% completion during this period of time (PCCC Completion Rate Report, 1998). Given the college's efforts to address student success in these areas by implementing a variety of strategies, including the establishment and enforcement of prerequisites, a number of participants spoke with disappointment that the legislators and other decision-makers did not understand the improvement that the college had already made. One participant seemed to echo the sentiments of many of the others saying "I question the validity behind a mandate like this as
opposed to, for example, looking at our accreditation process. Looking at what we are presently doing to improve student learning and how we can perhaps use that to share with the legislators or with the public about how we are doing and what we are doing. As opposed to another process that involves lots of steps, time and a lot of resources, we didn't necessarily have." The participants were unified in their recognition that there were areas where student success could be improved, but given the mandated goals, the decision-makers seemed ill informed. Particularly troublesome to some of the participants was the fact that much of the improvement that had been made at the college was a result of programs that the legislature had established previous to the new PMF model, through the statewide Assessment Program.

The participants also viewed the mandated goals as one of the more significant issues of power. The college had no choice in determining what goals should be addressed; they were mandated by the legislature. Several of the participants postulated that perhaps the legislature did not really understand the goals for this funding model and therefore did not establish a system that yielded the intended results. They reasoned that the legislature inserted the PMF language into the budget with limited assistance from the SBCTC and no involvement from any of the colleges; therefore, this funding model did not seem to be well thought out to most of the participants.
Did the legislature understand the mission of the community college and the students served? One participant expressed, "I thought all of them (the goals) were frustrating. I thought it was pretty clear that the people who drafted this were not teachers, they certainly didn’t really have a sense of community college teaching and community college students." She went on to explain that community college students are often working adults who have families and issues that occur requiring the student to "stop in, stop out" in terms of their enrollment pattern. Another participant reflected, "they (the legislature) were way off target with micro-management and the whole notion of applying four criteria to 34 community colleges in completely different geographical areas seemed silly to me at the time."

Did the legislature intend that colleges would discontinue lower paying professional technical programs? One participant summed up the issue of program mix by stating, "....others and myself included had a little problem with the philosophy of trying to push people into certain occupations (high pay) and where are we going to get the childcare workers. Wouldn’t you rather have a childcare worker? We have a human services worker program that is fairly big and those aren’t particularly high wage jobs either, but we need those folks. We need a whole spectrum of people in society."

At PCCC the average professional technical wage rate for 1994-95 was $11.54. However, it may be nearly impossible in other areas of the
state to reach this goal simply because of the local job market conditions. Additionally, participants shared concerns that the goals did not always align with what was in the best interest of the student in terms of their abilities, skills, goals and aspirations.

Was the legislature unable to trust the community and technical colleges to provide relevant, quality education? Did they view the colleges as ineffective stewards of public resources? Some of the participants believed that the legislature implemented PMF because they did not trust colleges to provide quality educational programs and make good administrative decisions. As one participant summarized her thoughts, "I think the basic problem is the lack of trust in what we are trying to do."

Did the legislature get the desired results by implementing this new funding model? Given the timelines that were used to implement PMF, colleges had little time for research and planning. This problem coupled with the fact that improvement had to occur in a short timeframe lead many participants to question whether the legislature realized their objective in implementing PMF. As one participant observed, "If you were to review all of the performance measures for all 34 campuses, what magnitude of impact was made on the statewide system? I don't know. Did we achieve the goal (legislative) or not? Was it worth all that effort in terms of what was achieved?" Another participant indicated, "We jumped through the hoop they (the legislature) set for us. However, I don't think they intended the
hoop to be what it was. What they came up with was some off-the-wall hoops and we jumped through them."

The participants ultimately saw the issue of power as a loss of financial resources and a process that was viewed as a way of punishing the college. The legislature had withheld money from the college's base budget and redirected it through this new funding model. Additionally, the participants asserted that the legislature failed to recognize that improvement usually takes additional resources and that the funding for the CTC system was low compared to other states. Therefore, the legislature's decision to withhold funds and ask for improvements from colleges that were comparatively under-funded, resulted in the participants viewing this model as a punishment since it put PCCC at risk. One participant summarized this feeling by stating, "The problem with withholding money is that you are asking people to change something and are taking money away from them. It doesn't make sense. You cannot ask them to do something and tie one hand behind their back. It doesn't work."

The participants expressed concerns that college resources had to be used to "earn back" the money that was withheld and that the result was nothing more than erosion of the funding base. Another participant maintained that "the funding model was purely a threat of a loss of funds. I think of it as a punishment instead of a reward system."
Given the very real possibility that the improvement efforts might not be successful and that additional resources had to be expended, the pressure on the Multicultural Student Services Office (year one) and the Math Department (year two) was great. Reflecting on the pressure the departments felt, one participant indicated, “They felt like that was a lot of responsibility. That their success or failure would then affect the whole package,” while another participant echoed, “the whole burden of performance indicators was going to be on their departments. They were very unhappy about that.”

As the participants described their experiences, they frequently noted their struggle in addressing PMF by trying to choose strategies that were achievable and beneficial to students and the college versus resorting to options that resulted in just compliance behavior. The decision to focus on students of color was done as one participant shared, “...with good intentions and knowing that the college was focusing on diversity kind of took it in that direction and felt that we had a lot of work already done...” In other words the focus was selected because it was potentially beneficial to students and the college and an institutional plan already existed that could be used for the improvement efforts.

Another example of a strategy involving compliance behavior that had a direct benefit to students was the development of an administrative withdrawal policy. One participant revealed that, “...now in the Math Lab
we have a policy where students who are administratively withdrawn on the 10th class day. We can get them off the roles before they count against us for core course completion and we have a system for them to petition for reentry if they were sick the whole second week....” By implementing this administrative withdrawal policy, the college automatically improved its core course completion rate by not having those students count. One might also argue that students benefited since they did not attempt to come in after missing a substantial amount of class and were not allowed to attempt and perhaps fail, to make up the missed work.

Design Flaw

The participants pointed out that there were a number of flaws with the legislature’s design of the PMF model as well as issues related to the way PCCC developed and implemented the institutional plan. In the next several pages, the participants share their observations of both the flaws in the model as well as errors that the task force made in the development and implementation of the college’s Accountability for Improvement Plan.

The legislature envisioned that colleges were going to be able to identify, implement, and evaluate improvement strategies that would result in progress for each of the four goals, all within the confines of a single academic year. Clearly, the established timelines were too short for the colleges to do much assiduous research, planning, implementation and evaluation. As one participant suggested, “…we wanted something that
would affect people (students) now. Really that's the whole problem with this performance measures concept, we should all be working on long range things that would have a big effect and not on short range things that have little effect."

As a result of these timelines, PCCC felt forced to use existing plans that might be leveraged to produce the needed improvements. At first they planned on using the new Trio SSS grant but concluded the targeted population was too small. With time running out the decision was made to switch to a students of color focus, utilizing some of the elements of the college's well developed, comprehensive diversity plan. PCCC was the only college out of the CTC system that chose to focus their improvement efforts on just one population for all four goals. The other colleges targeted different student populations for individual goals, which helped to disperse the risk.

Once the PMF plan was implemented, a participant reported, "A lot of faculty were asking 'is this fair to offer incentives or target some of our strategies toward students of color?' Some of the faculty asked 'why should it be students of color to get instructional tutoring and the rest that other students can't?' or 'why are we going to send out warning letters to students of color that they might not be succeeding in class and not everyone else?" With this feedback some of the strategies that were identified exclusively for the students of color were gradually extended to all students. Another
participant reflected, “If all the folks understood how complex it (diversity work) was, I don’t think that this plan (students of color) would have been put forth the way it was. People had good intentions but to me it just emphasized where we needed to do more training on diversity.” Another participant reported, “students were upset when they received a letter from us indicating that they weren’t doing well in the class and the faculty member hadn’t said anything to the student.”

The decision to choose the student of color focus represented a design flaw in that the decision was not processed through the task force, rather it was made outside of that group. Elements of the diversity plan were selected and implemented without sufficient planning or time to gain campus support and to ensure that students were being handled appropriately. Additionally, the task force members viewed students of color as a single group, later realizing that this population was spread throughout the campus. Since the students were dispersed across the instructional programs, it was difficult to implement some of the improvement strategies. As one participant reflected, “Students of color, we often talk about them as though they were a group. Well, they are not…..but we were up against it and we didn’t have any better ideas…”

The second year, PCCC again chose to focus on just one student population: students enrolled in Math 90 and 99. In comparison, PCCC was the only college in the system to focus on a single student population
for all PMF goals in either year of the 1997-99 biennium. One participant reflected on the issue of choosing a single population by observing, “We made a complete switch and did what I thought was even crazier than the year before. We put all of our eggs in one basket and tied all four of our measures to the math completion and the theory was let’s put all your efforts on this one thing and we should be able to get good improvement then.”

In the end, PCCC was able to qualify for their PMF money both years. Were some of the improvement strategies more successful than others or was it a combination of all of the college’s efforts? Or was this a result of what one participant called “a fluke, just the way the numbers happened to come out.” One will never know since the assessment system only measured overall improvement and did not attempt to evaluate the success or failure of individual strategies. What participants knew, at the end of each cycle, was that they were able to demonstrate improvement, but they could not identify specifically why the improvement occurred. One participant reflected his frustration regarding the assessment process by observing, “We had these long lists, you saw these long reports and in the end if you meet your goals you don’t know what to attribute it to. We did seventeen different things and we got a two percent improvement, but now we have no way to know which things helped and which didn’t and so in a way it almost, you know, interferes with the legislature’s intent. I certainly feel, and I think that a lot of the task members would agree, that you know,
it could be we got the desired improvement and it may have nothing to do with any of our strategies. Not even a question of which strategies helped.”

Universally, the participants expressed frustration and disappointment in the goals that were mandated by the legislature. Each goal presented a different challenge for the task force members to address. One participant remarked, “I question the measures themselves the way they were worded out of the legislature. Unfortunately they really came from the SBCTC staff.”

As was mentioned earlier, PCCC essentially did not need to address the wage goal since the wages of their graduates was close to the $12 target and would have likely increased just with the cost of living adjustments. Other colleges in rural areas were generally at a disadvantage since there were few high wage jobs to train for in the local area. Additionally, the participants wondered if the legislature’s intent was to redirect the training programs at PCCC, as well as those at the other system colleges, to those of only high paying jobs, eliminating those fields of study that offered lower paying wages, even though there was employment demand in the local area. As one participant pointed out,

...we couldn’t see how you could really impact hourly wages of your professional-technical program graduates other than by enhancing seat space in programs that coincidentally happen to have higher and reducing programs than have low wage rates. I really don’t know what, I can’t really even speculate what their (legislature) intent was.
The wage rate was not the only area of concern for the participants. Reflecting on the transfer goal, a participant revealed

The transfer rate was another one we weren't really sure how to deal with. We have all these students who have no business in coding themselves as transfer students and our system allows them to code themselves as transfer students. That's what is on our transfer rate and again I don't know whether the legislature's intent was to clean up this coding or I don't really know what they were thinking.

Another participant expressed the concerns about the ability to collect transfer data,

....its problematic in terms of measuring because we don't always know when our students go out of state. And when do you decide who has college (transfer) intent? Do you go by what they say when they enter the college, or what they said after 60 credits? It's just a very complicated area that sounds simple, probably to the legislature and probably to others who consider that information. But when you start grappling with the practicalities of it, lots of questions come up.

Still other participants pointed to the difficulty of addressing this goal because the transfer institutions control the number of students that are accepted and the criteria for acceptance.

The core course completion goal received some mixed reviews from the participants in terms of its relevance to the needs of PCCC but overall it was recognized as a much "better fit" with regards to addressing needed institutional improvement. One participant reflected that "...performance measures did provide some impetus at this college to do some things that the math department wanted to do for a long time anyway but we couldn't
get enough institutional support for it before the performance measures existed." During 1998-99, as a direct result of the core course completion goal, the college began to enforce math prerequisites, added more math sections, provided faculty with graders and students with tutors in Math 90 and 99 courses, and six other improvement strategies.

A concern expressed by several of the participants dealt with the need to define success and improvement in some of the core courses such as math. Improvement for PMF purposes did not always equate with what was needed for the student. As one participant shared, "some of our efforts may have helped students pass the course with a D but a grade of C was needed to move to the next class level. Our performance had improved but the student still needed to take the course over again, so did we really make the improvement that was required?"

The English and Reading core course completion was less of an issue, since the department had been working on improvement strategies since 1992. The results attained over that time period were impressive. Most of the course completion rates for developmental reading had improved from a range of the low 70% to a range in the high 80% or low 90%. To ask for additional improvement in these courses got a challenging response from one participant who stated, "What do they (the legislature) want? Don't they know who our students are?"
The graduation efficiency goal presented the most significant philosophical and practical concerns to the participants. One participant observed that the college could address the efficiency goal, “to the extent of offering the right sections at the right time, offering evening sections, if the student needs evening sections and weekend section and so forth....” The college theoretically has the ability to improve the efficiency goal by addressing some of these issues but the ability of PCCC to add additional course sections had a direct relationship to the availability of space, faculty and resources. Voicing philosophical as well as practical concerns, one participant pointed out that typically community college students are in “a developmental phase when they first enter, and need to explore some options by taking some classes so that they can see what college is about and how their interests and skills fit with certain majors.” Additionally participants shared that students have “life issues” as adult students and have to adjust their schedule of classes to deal with issues related to their children and jobs. Establishing an efficiency goal that limited a student to enrolling in no more than one college-level class beyond what was required to graduate seemed to be unrealistic to most participants.

Overall, the participants did not believe the legislature understood the environment of a community college (at least PCCC) nor the students who were served. Expressing their frustration as to this lack of understanding, the participants pointed to the issues related to timelines.
The timelines did not fit with the academic calendar, nor did they support the PCCC environment in which decisions were described as normally "being made collaboratively." Additionally, improvement was expected too quickly. They also identified the goals as being problematic in not being flexible enough to be able to address the needs of the college and augment the efforts that PCCC had already initiated. Finally, there was much concern about the fact that PMF did not provide "new money" to help support improvement efforts and reward success. The way the model was established, the base funding for the college was gradually eroded since existing resources had to be spent on improvement efforts.

A flaw in the PMF mandate as well as the college's response had to do with faculty involvement. Because of the legislature's expectation that improvement would be demonstrated in very short time frames, many faculty became disengaged from the beginning. Additionally the time needed to work with the faculty, in the ways that the faculty is accustomed to, such as workshops and seminars, certainly were not possible. As one participant put it,

So I think that one thing that we did learn...that is kind of a problem with how the process worked. The time frames are just too short for the academic frame of mind. We're not use to doing anything overnight. Faculty are tenured and we can't tell them that they have to do this or do this. I think it will take a retreat of the faculty to discuss it, work it out, procedures, etc. Who gets to use it and who doesn't? How to utilize them. Why would you want to? What is in it for me? All the normal, human ways of looking at it.
PCCC ensured that faculty were represented both years on the PMF task force. Additionally, there were three instructional administrators on the task force. Even though the committee had faculty representation, the involvement of faculty in general was very limited. The participants recognized that the key to educational improvement was closely linked to the involvement and support of the faculty but because of the time frames they felt constrained. As one participant observed, "In all of these performance funding activities, you really got to get buy-in from your faculty and I'm not sure we've made any major attempt to do that."

Another faculty issue that the participants found difficult to address was identifying a way to connect part-time faculty members with PMF. As one participant pointed out,

...maybe even more than half of our developmental math classes are taught by part-time instructors. But the part-time instructors aren't necessarily, in fact in most cases, are not involved in any of that kind of discussion or in any of those kinds of workshops, or going to any seminars, or any of that sort of teacher training...

Most of the participants recognized that the task force had made an error in requiring all faculty to have graders and tutors assigned to the sections of Math 90 and 99, rather than making it optional. One participant emphasized that in-class tutors work most effectively when they are "participating in in-class activities, maybe helping students during class and then working with the students outside of class." Not all instructors have a
teaching style that works with this type of intervention; some prefer a lecture format. Additionally another participant offered a further explanation why faculty did not want to use the in-class tutors indicating that, “At times I think maybe a teacher is a little bit unsure of himself or herself, then they have this tutor in there who knows more than the students and so that might be intimidating.” The mandatory assignment of graders and tutors was changed spring quarter so that they were provided only upon receiving faculty requests.

The final design flaw the participants identified was the way the legislature established the funding model. The withholding of money was viewed as a threat (a stick) as opposed to an incentive to improve education. By withholding money from the base allocation to the community and technical colleges the process was deemed “demoralizing” and “negative” as several participants labeled it. The funding for Washington Community and Technical Colleges was the third lowest nationally in terms of expenditures per full-time equivalent student at $3863 (Center for Community College Policy, 2000). Several participants viewed PMF as a “punishment” in that they were being asked to do more with less and at the same time Washington’s funding was less than that of most other states. One participant summed up the observations of others by stating, “I think our budgets are so tight that if they want to do this, the less demoralizing approach would have been to give incentives for performance
in certain areas rather than taking away money.” Another participant became a little more direct in terms of what he would like to have shared with the legislators, “Put your (legislature's) money where your mouth is. Withholding our money is not the way to do it. There are systematic ways of doing things. One of the obvious is to bring us up to par (funding at the national average for community colleges).”

Even given these design flaws, the college’s PMF task force did what they described as “doing our best” to improve student learning and success. The system that was designed by the legislature and the plan developed by PCCC had some design flaws but the participants shared that they were committed to “doing what needed to be done.”

Lessons Learned

As the participants shared their thoughts and memories that described the events throughout this implementation journey, it became clear to me that they were also describing lessons that they had learned along the way. Insights that they had gained, experiences that provided them with meaning, and individually developing “ways of knowing” were the basis of the participants’ reflections. In both years of the implementation, the participants focused on ways to improve student learning and success. The first year utilized action items contained in the college’s diversity plan to create a central focus for the PMF Accountability for Improvement Plan. Although the decision to use this focus was certainly controversial with
some members of the task force, it was done with what was described as
"good intentions." Individuals wanted to improve opportunities for students
of color by focusing added attention on student success efforts.

The second year of PMF, the college decided to target all students in
Math 90 and 99 courses, knowing that this was an area that needed
improvement. Some Math faculty met with their Reading and English
counterparts, so that they might learn from their experiences and gain
insights into their efforts to improve student success. These discussions
resulted in the identification of proposed improvement strategies, which
were later discussed at the math department level. These math department
improvement strategies gained college support as one participant reflected,
"I would come back from these meetings and go to the math department
meeting and say because of this performance measure thing I think that we
will be able to do this......and they were just dumbfounded."

Some of the participants indicated that they had been trying to
develop enough institutional support to do something about the Math Lab
for quite some time but had not been successful. PMF provided the
impetus to address the issue. The college implemented an administrative
withdrawal policy, and added additional Math 90 and 99 sections so that
students had additional options, thus reducing the dependency on the Math
Lab. Prerequisites for all math courses became strictly enforced. In-class
tutors, and Math graders were provided to all Math 90 and 99 courses. The
tutors assisted faculty in classroom assignments and student group work as well as tutoring students after class. The graders allowed faculty to return all corrected homework more quickly so that the student and faculty member had a better understanding of the students’ learning. Although, the tutor/grader project was discontinued after the grant money expired because it had been determined that the “cost/benefit ratio wasn’t good,” several participants wanted to explore whether it could be reactivated since they believed that it had great student success potential. Perhaps PCCC discovered a good model to improve student success and with further assessment and refinement of the strategy, the tutor/grader model might prove to be very beneficial.

Another lasting impact was the development of a student success strategy known as EASE, which is an acronym for the Early Assistance for New Students Entering College program. Essentially those students, who indicated that they wanted to participate, were contacted three weeks into the quarter to determine how they were doing academically and adjusting to the college environment. If needed, students were then connected with college resources and tracked for three quarters. As one participant enthusiastically endorsed EASE she indicated, “it has been really successful.”

The final lasting improvement that was noted was the opportunity (although limited) PMF provided for faculty and staff to discuss areas in
which students had difficulty and to discuss potential student success initiatives. Clearly, as was mentioned earlier, discussions of this type had occurred on campus prior to PMF. However, PMF provided a stage for additional college discussion to take place that may not have occurred had it not been for this mandate. Relationships between faculty and faculty, and faculty and administrators were formed and strengthened. These relationships may have helped the departments expand their efforts to improve student learning.

As the participants shared their stories, it became clear that they often spoke of ways the PMF model could be improved. They reflected on their aggravation dealing with the PMF model and offered insights into how the system might be changed to align more closely with what the college was capable of doing and more closely with the college’s other planning and improvement efforts. Because of this lack of alignment with other college planning and improvement efforts, PMF was seen by some of the participants as a deterrent from what was needing to be done as one participant put it, “I think it diverted our efforts from bigger picture efforts.”

From the beginning, the participants would have liked to have had a more collaborative process with the legislature. Understanding what issues the legislature was attempting to address and helping the legislative members understand more what the college had been doing to improve student learning were concerns communicated by the participants.
Creating an understanding of “who the community college serves” as one participant pointed out and “what some of the issues that our students face” was also a consistent participant message. It was the belief of many of the participants that the legislature did not have a clear understanding of the diversity of community college students and that the decision makers were confusing “our students with the university (traditional-age).” The participants also believed that the goals should be more institutionally- as opposed to system- based to make them much more meaningful and have a direct correlation to the needs of the community college service district.

The issue of timelines was consistently mentioned by the participants as a major problem. The process lacked sufficient time to accomplish the necessary steps for the successful implementation of such a new funding model: research, planning, implementation and evaluation. If student success is going to be improved “faculty have to have-buy in,” as one participant noted. Time to work with faculty was certainly needed. If there had been more time to work with faculty, perhaps mistakes could have been avoided, such as requiring Math faculty to use tutors and graders. The participants also noted that a longer timeline to realize improvement was needed as one member reflected, “two or more biennia is required for systemic change, maybe more.”

Clearly another important way to make needed improvement in the PM funding model was to make it an incentive-based reward approach.
Budgets were described as being “tight,” with “little flexibility” so taking away resources that were already in short supply and assuming that the colleges could make real improvement became very problematic. One participant compared the situation to “having your hands tied behind your back.” As noted earlier, Washington’s funding of community colleges is low in comparison with other community colleges nationally. This lead the participants to often wonder why the legislature was “punishing” them (the colleges) and that they did not “trust” them to do the job that they were suppose to be doing. The actions of the legislature, funding PMF out of the existing CTC base funding, caused the participants to view this model as a “stick.”

By choosing to focus on just one population of students, participants shared that it “was like putting all of your eggs in one basket.” After selecting students of color for the focus of the plan in the first year, it became clear that they had made a mistake in that they had “assumed that the students of color were a group when in fact they are not. They are spread throughout the campus.” Because, in fact, they were not a single group made it very difficult for some of the strategies to impact students of color. Again, the second year, the college elected to focus on just one student population: students enrolled in Math 90 and 99. By having the improvement strategies focused on just a single targeted group of students for each year, most participants felt the “college was at a greater risk.”
Assessment was another area that the participants identified that could have been improved. The PMF Annual Institutional Assessment was designed to determine success from a macro perspective. Requests for information about the success or failure of individual improvement strategies meet with responses such as “we weren’t set up to look at that because we were dealing with this squishy group I couldn’t see anyway to correlate it.” Yet, a number of participants expressed the need to understand relationships between specific strategies and results, so that better planning could occur. Several of the participants expressed interest in being more involved in the assessment. While that may have been more of a communication problem since it was months before some of them learned whether or not they had demonstrated improvement.

The final lesson learned with regards to assessment dealt with the evaluation of the process both internally (PCCC) as well as externally (statewide system). As one participant indicated her desire to know the costs of implementing this new funding model, “I’d like to take a look at the exact costs of our performance measures activities for the state. Was it more than we got back? I would bet that people who were serious about performance activities did put in a lot of time and a lot of dollars just to make it work.” Aside from the financial implications, participants felt that an evaluation at the state level might provide meaningful information to the
legislature. Echoing that call for a system-wide evaluation were suggestions from participants for a review of the PCCC process.

Conclusion

Through the voices of the participants, they described their nearly two-year journey planning, implementing and evaluating efforts to address the state's newly mandated budget model—Performance Measures Funding. They shared their challenges, frustrations, concerns and successes. The data represents their collective and individual experiences through their separate perceptions of those experiences, the process and the people with whom they worked.

As their stories unfolded they shared experiences and perceptions that left them powerless to change but committed to do the best they could for their college and the students they served. They knew that they had a job that they had to do and, therefore, did what they thought was best to improve student learning and what would expose the college to the least amount of risk.

They made mistakes along the way but they learned and grew as a result. Their knowledge was reflected in their sharing the lessons they learned. Some of these lessons helped guide them on their journey as they planned for the second year of PMF, helping to ensure that they did not make some of the same mistakes. This knowledge may also prove useful in other college planning and institutional effectiveness efforts. The
participants shared how the state legislation might be improved to better reflect the culture of PCCC, the needs of community and technical colleges and, most importantly, take into consideration the students who are served.

At times, they rejoiced in the positive changes that were made. They were able to make changes that in some participants' opinion were "long overdue" but made a significant difference in the success of students. Although, much of what the participants experienced was difficult, they did make some improvements in student learning.
Chapter V: SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

As I began this research project, it was my goal to provide the reader with an understanding of what occurred at PCCC, as told by the participants, both in terms of the structural and textural aspects of their experience of implementing Performance Measures Funding. Providing the reader with an understanding of the essence of the experience is the intended outcome of a research project, such as this, as indicated by Polkinghorne (1989):

Produce a research report that gives an accurate, clear and articulate description of an experience. The reader of the report should come away with the feeling that "I understand better what it is like for someone to experience that (p.46).

In Chapter 4, the reader learned of the challenges, successes and failures from those chosen to implement Performance Measures Funding at PCCC. The description of this two-year journey is the essence of their collective implementation experience. It tells the story of what it was like to implement this state mandate at one community college in Washington State. The description of this journey may be useful to policymakers, educational coordinating boards, college administrators and others who
wish to understand the impact that such legislation had on at least one community college.

In this chapter, I will provide the reader with a summary of the findings and my observations as they relate to the themes identified in Chapter 4, recommendations for further study, and conclusions. The three themes—power, design flaw and lessons learned—will be viewed through the theoretical construct of policy formulation, implementation and reformulation as identified by Mazmanian and Sabatier (1981).

**Policy Formulation**

During the policy formulation of Performance Measures Funding in Washington State, the stakeholders in the community and technical colleges were not included, except for a brief interaction by the policymakers with some State Board staff members. This legislative mandate was included as a budget proviso and did not include public hearings, as would have normally been the case in implementing such a fundamental funding change. This lack of collaboration, through the use of the legislature’s power, was seen by the implementers, who were clearly subordinate, as a mandate by those in control. Brown and Wildvasky (1983) identified this issue of power in observing, “accountability seeks to preserve existing relationships by holding the actors at the bottom responsible for the expectations at the top” (pp. 255-256). However,
mandates as exercised through the use of power does not necessarily result in the policymakers’ desired outcomes. Brown and Wildvasky (1983) further noted “where coercion may subdue political obstructions to the implemented process, rarely can it compensate for the misshapen plan of action, for a misdiagnosis of the problem to be treated, or for a lack of foresight” (p. 254).

The PCCC task force members recognized that the legislature had the power to implement legislation such as Performance Measures Funding but because of the lack of collaboration between the legislature and the community and technical colleges, they often felt angry, devalued, unsupported and misunderstood. Although most participants viewed this mandate as Washington State’s effort to join a national accountability movement, they clearly felt that because of this mandate, the legislature did not trust the community and technical college system to provide a quality education. This mandate had the financial “teeth” written into it since colleges would (and did) lose part of their base funding if improvement in each of the goals was not realized. Again, the participants recognized the issue of power that was exercised by the legislature by the mandated threat to reduce PCCC’s budget if improvement was not demonstrated. This was particularly troublesome given the overall funding of the community and technical college system.
In their research, Majone and Wildavsky (1979) identify the concepts of policy development and implementation as essentially the relationship of thought and action observing that "...program implementation thus becomes a seamless web...the separation of policy design from implementation is fatal" (164). The legislature did little to involve the community and technical college system and essentially prevented any individual college faculty or administration from participating in the development of the program, including the identification of the statewide performance goals. This is particularly troublesome as researchers have noted that "...the implementation of innovative educational policies is much more difficult because of the widespread lack of confidence in the underlying cognitive theories" (Majone and Wildavsky, 1979, p.174). Had the college stakeholders been involved in the program development and the implementation plan, the issue of power may have been lessened and perhaps a number of issues related to the successful implementation of educational change may have been identified. Baldridge and Deal (1975) identified a number of critical issues when considering educational change including the identification of what needs to be changed (problem diagnosis), consideration of the proposed change in the context of both the history and environment of the organization, participation of decision-makers and faculty, and recognition that change must be both economically
and politically feasible, directed at manipulable factors and effective in solving identified problems.

The issue of power also has been directly linked to the stability of performance funding programs. In researching the initiation (formulation) process of performance funding programs, Burke and Serban (1998) identified three methods of establishing programs and identification of indicators: Mandated/Prescribed, Mandated/Not Prescribed, and Not Mandated/Not Prescribed. In a later study comparing stable performance funding programs—Missouri and Tennessee—with states with less stable programs, it was noted that "clearly the method of initiation affects the prospects of success and stability of these programs. Legislation mandated four of the five programs that later dropped performance funding" (Burke and Modarresi, 2001, p.54). They further noted that both Missouri and Tennessee "...initiated performance funding voluntarily without legislation and with considerable collaboration between coordinating and campus officials" (p.55).

**Implementation**

Majone and Wildavsky (1979) assert that "policy content shapes implementation by defining the arena in which the process takes place, the identity and role of the principal actors, the range of permissible tools for action, and, of course, by supplying resources" (p. 174). The
Implementation of public policies is an evolutionary process with the actors not knowing what lies ahead and plans being altered by the knowledge gained as the process unfolds. Policy design and implementation should be clearly connected through the language that binds them together. Because the legislature did not provide any additional resources to implement this mandate, the PCCC implementers were frustrated by this mandate and felt that the legislature was exhorting a type of punishment on the community and technical colleges.

As the implementers (actors) assume their role in the process, knowledge is produced by a progression of planning, executing and evaluating various strategies intended to produce the desired results. Browne and Wildvasky (1983) observed that implementation ceases being static; it becomes dynamic by virtue of incorporating learning of what to prefer as well as how to achieve it. It isn't about getting what you want, rather it is getting what you prefer given what you have learned. What is learned results in change but does not necessarily guarantee success since organizations are always changing, never static (234).

During the course of implementation, members of the PCCC task force identified a number of design flaws in the legislature's mandate, which were dealt with in a variety of ways. The short timelines clearly presented a number of obstacles, which had to be addressed. Identifying existing college plans or institutional efforts was the first coping strategy that the committee used to address the fact that there was little time to plan. First,
the new Trio Grant was viewed as a means of addressing Performance Measures but later they discovered that too few students were targeted in the grant to have an overall impact on enrollment. Subsequently, the decision was made to use elements of the college's diversity plan as the focus for this state mandate. Collaboration between the college's task force and those who were directly involved with the development and implementation of the diversity plan should have taken place. If such collaboration had taken place, the task force would have had a better understanding of the needs of diverse students and how to effectively improve their success. While the decision to focus on students of color did not follow the collaborative process that the college normally used in making such decisions, efforts were made to be more collaborative later in other decision-making processes.

The task force implemented a series of efforts to improve learning for students of color but made modifications in an effort to address design flaws that they discovered. Intervention efforts were extended to all students, when some faculty objected to having such strategies just focused on one student population. Students having difficulty were initially contacted by an intervention resource staff member, only to learn that the students were often upset because the faculty member had not indicated those concerns. The plan was adjusted to have faculty to be the first contact, followed up by the intervention staff member. Students of color
were initially viewed as a single population, but the task force soon discovered that the students were disbursed throughout the college making it exceedingly difficult to implement some of the intervention strategies. The following year, the task force’s focus on math students fit their need to work with a single population.

During the two-year implementation process, the members of the task force implemented change in a dynamic college environment. New students enrolled. College policies and processes changed. The task force implemented various strategies to improve student success but there was virtually no assessment done to determine the success or failure of specific strategies. Therefore the knowledge that the implementers gained from their experience was limited to what they individually and collectively discovered in this two-year process.

Reformulation

On a state policy basis, reformulation is that act of making modifications to the policy based upon the implementation experience and success and failures of the original policy legislation (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1983). Since this study did not focus on how the experience of either PCCC or that of the Community and Technical College system affected subsequent legislative policy, the conclusions in this section are limited to the lessons learned by members of the task force.
By modeling the grass-roots efforts that the Reading and English faculty had used in the early 1990’s to improve students success, the Math faculty were able to develop a number of student success initiatives. Prerequisites were implemented and enforced for math courses. Additional sections of math courses were added to decrease the dependency on the Math Lab, which had a low success rate. By focusing discussion on student success, relationships between faculty members, and those between faculty and administrators were developed and strengthened. The need to improve student success and intervention strategies was identified.

Clearly, the task force members would have liked to have known the effect that individual strategies had on overall improvement. Had an institutional assessment process been conducted, the effects of the individual strategies could have been determined and this knowledge may have proven useful in determining future improvement efforts. This information would have also been valuable in determining the cost/benefit ratio of individual strategies. Additionally, task force members suggested that an assessment of PCCC’s process would have been useful.

If an assessment of the Performance Measures Funding process had been conducted system-wide, the task force members felt that a great deal of good information could have been derived. Determining the effectiveness of this mandate in accomplishing the legislature’s intent could have proven to be valuable. The cost to implement this mandate statewide
compared with the identified benefits from PMF might also have provided
the policymakers with insights as to overall effectiveness of the program. It
also might have answered a basic concern that was raised by some task
force members as to what the cost/benefit ratio of Performance Measures
Funding was on a statewide basis.

Certainly, the PCCC task force members would have been able to
offer the policymakers some insights based on their experience. They felt
that a collaborative process involving the stakeholders in the policy
development would have helped to ensure that the legislation was more
reflective of the community college environment, the students served, and
the time needed to improve student learning. Some of the goals were
viewed as flawed, not having relevance and being too rigid for a 34-
community and technical college system. The task force members gained
insight into how the goals might have had better application to their
individual campus as well as the college system.

Suggestions for Further Research

The suggestions for further study are as follows:

1. Determine what the legislature's intent was in implementing

   Washington's model of Performance Measures Funding. Compare
what gaps exists between the programs and services provided by Community and Technical Colleges versus what the legislature views as state needs.

2. Determine if the new Performance Reporting (outlined in the Coda) process is meeting the expectations and needs of legislators and what if any gaps exist.

3. Determine how Washington's Performance Measures Funding experience compares with other states that have implemented similar funding legislation. Examine the results to determine what specific strategies are both cost effective and help to improve student success.

4. Determine the commonality and differences in experiences in implementing Washington's Performance Measures Funding in the community college, technical college and university environments.

5. Determine the "best practices" for improving student success at community colleges that have a long, successful history of performance-based funding.

6. Determine the effects of incentive versus non-incentive performance-based budgeting on institutional change in community colleges.

7. Determine what institutional characteristics of community colleges influence the implementation of performance-based funding.
8. Determine the degree and the manner in which faculty are involved in the design and implementation of successful models of performance-based funding.

9. Determine what strategies might be best employed to work effectively with legislators and other policymakers so that an accurate understanding of community and technical colleges might be realized and that the needs of the state are clearly addressed. Identify strategies that might be used at the system and campus levels to help critical policymakers be fully informed.

10. Determine the policymakers' (governor, state legislators, coordinating boards) level of understanding and support for accreditation processes and standards. Make recommendations as to how accrediting bodies might be better able to respond to the needs of such policymakers.

11. Determine what improvements might be made to the Washington Assessment Program so that policymakers concerns for accountability might be better addressed.

12. Determine the need for policymakers to have an inclusive, collaborative process in developing key educational initiatives. Has there been a change over time in the way policymakers approach educational reform and policy development?
Conclusion

The concept of linking performance to funding will no doubt continue to be a topic of discussion in the accountability and budget deliberations of legislatures, regents, trustees and other key policymakers for the foreseeable future. Issues of accountability, revenue shortfalls, and meeting the needs of the state will all help to ensure the topic remains a topic of legislative deliberations. Strategies will need to be identified which address and strengthen the relationship between regional accrediting agencies and key policymakers and their concern for accountability.

Community college leaders need to be better equipped to respond to such accountability initiatives in the future. Working with such initiatives from a standpoint that policymakers are indicating their support for education, by asking for improvements, is an important first step that educational leaders need to take. Engaging policymakers in a thorough examination of how educational improvements might be made, is a needed, time-consuming and critical strategy in addressing accountability and building support for education. The higher education community needs to help policymakers understand the importance of evaluating the effectiveness of accountability initiatives, such as Performance Measures Funding, so that an understanding of the costs and effectiveness of such programs can be determined.
As far as the experience with this new funding model in Washington State, one participant summed it up quite eloquently in stating, "Personally, my impression of the two years of frenzied performance activities is that it nudged the ship but did not change the course."
Chapter VI: THE CODA

When the Washington legislature convened the 1999 session, the political power in the House had shifted from being controlled by the Republicans to being shared by both parties with a 49 - 49 split. As the legislature attempted to address the PMF legislation from the previous session, the program received mixed reviews as reported by Zumeta (2001):

Although the continuation of the established performance-funding program had influential legislative supporters (as well as opponents), and even the institutions were reluctantly supporting a modified approach linking some funding to the indicators, inter-party brinkmanship bargaining near the end of the session's legally mandated deadline left no time for resolving differences over what was seen as a relatively minor issue. The hasty compromise on performance funding provided for continuation of institutional reporting on performance targets...but no funds were tied to performance (183).

When the Washington legislature adjourned, it had abandoned performance-funding, implementing in its place performance-budgeting. As stated in the 1999-01 budget provisions, the legislature focused on three long-term performance goals for the CTC system:

The State Board for Community and Technical Colleges shall develop a biennial plan to achieve measurable and specific improvements each academic year as a part of a continuing effort to make meaningful and substantial progress to achieve the following long-term performance goals:
(a) Academic students prepared to transfer to baccalaureate institutions based on minimum transferable credit hours and minimum required grade point average. Long-term goal: 50,000 students prepared to transfer per year.

(b) Basic skills students who demonstrate substantive skill gain as a result of their adult basic education (ABE), English as a second language (ESL), and general education diploma (GED) instruction. Long-term goal: 80 percent demonstrate substantive skill gain.

(c) Students prepared for work as measured by vocational degrees and related certificates awarded, including achievement of industry skill standards. Long-term goal: 25,000 prepared for work each year.

The board shall set biennial performance targets for each college or district...” (Washington State Appropriations Act, 1999).

In response to this legislative direction, the State Board, at its January 2000 meeting, approved a 1999-2000 Performance Reporting Plan, which set system targets that addressed these three goals.

Subsequently at the June 2000 meeting, the SBCTC Board approved targets for each district, which, if reached, would ensure achievement of the system targets. The district targets were created in a manner that allowed for the individual districts to consider local factors such as economic, social and demographic circumstances in addition to the flexibility of placing a differential emphasis among the three goals (Seppanen, 2000).

What will the Washington legislature's level of satisfaction be with the new model of performance budgeting in the long run? Will the performance budgeting remain? Will performance funding be reenacted? Or as Burke, et. al. (2000) noted, will Washington follow a new trend in
performance-based programs by adopting a hybrid of the two, gleaning the strengths of both models and abandoning the respective weaknesses? The answer to these questions may or may not be the subject of future dissertations, but the legislature will undoubtedly continue to ask for accountability for the community and technical colleges.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

Performance Activities by State as of Fall 1997

Updated 9/17/97

**Performance Reporting**

Such reports provide a status check on the health of the college or system. These reports tend to be similar to inputs and outputs type data (student and staff FTE, counts of numbers of transfers) SBCTC historically published in the Academic Year Report. Most states report more than a dozen indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach &amp; States</th>
<th>Requirement of</th>
<th>Types of Indicators</th>
<th>Statewide Approach?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Being developed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Legislature to use results in setting budget policy (performance budgeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Outcomes/Inputs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Staff regard the effort as existing to stimulate improvement. This year Georgia implemented peer review of college self-reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Like our Academic Year Report - mostly inputs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Legislature to use results in setting budget policy (performance budgeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Legislature to use results in setting budget policy (performance budgeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>NGA related, like our Goals and Indicators, but mandated at college-level</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Outcomes/Inputs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Governor/Board</td>
<td>Outcomes/Inputs</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Outcomes/Inputs</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Agency/Board</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Initial Use</td>
<td>Additional Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Community College Association</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Report card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Coordinating Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Used for setting budget policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Outcomes/Inputs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Discussing performance funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Dept of Ed</td>
<td>Outcomes/Inputs</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Moving toward more outcomes and discussing performance funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Regents</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Moving toward assessment cohorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Related to state's goals and targets efforts in all areas, not just education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Inputs mainly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Adopted in 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Outcomes/Inputs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Similar to outcomes assessment in Washington, Legislature to use results in setting budget policy (performance budgeting).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Outcomes/Inputs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Colleges discussing performance funding in hopes of plan before legislature sets performance funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Outcomes/Inputs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Similar to outcomes assessment in Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Outcomes/Inputs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Similar to outcomes assessment in Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Performance Funding for Improvement

The goal is to see outcomes improvements in areas where colleges identify need for improvement or state wants improvements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach &amp; States</th>
<th>Requirement of</th>
<th>Types of Indicators</th>
<th>Statewide Approach?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>37 process, input indicators (appears to be providing incentives to be near the norm)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Colleges get only the share of their defined need level that their performance merits – rest of funds are distributed differently - some RFP - some based on more to those with best performance, less to those with poor performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Performance Funding for Inputs

Unofficially called a "bounty" system. This approach distributes the most funds to the colleges in the state with the largest numbers of outputs of the kind measured.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach &amp; States</th>
<th>Requirement of</th>
<th>Types of Indicators</th>
<th>Statewide Approach?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Coordinating Agency</td>
<td>Student of color enrollment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>May apply only to 4-year institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Performance Funding for Outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach &amp; States</th>
<th>Requirement of</th>
<th>Types of Indicators</th>
<th>Statewide Approach?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Degrees, certificates, transfers and placements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Note that Missouri has two types of performance funding – see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Governor/ Legislation</td>
<td>Degrees and certificates</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach &amp; States</td>
<td>Requirement of</td>
<td>Types of Indicators</td>
<td>Statewide Approach?</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas (no longer uses, however)</td>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>Rising Junior Test</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Abandoned program shortly after beginning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Outcomes/Inputs</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Implementing changes this year, 9 system indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky (not using this year due to massive changes in governance)</td>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>Outcomes/Inputs</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Minimum targets are set in areas where improvement is not expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Being implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1997 legislation being implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>Outcomes/Inputs</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Uncertain yet about SS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Incentive Funding for Performance Improvement

These are activities that provide incentives for improvements without penalties for failure to improve; goal is to see outcomes improvements in areas where colleges identify need for improvement or state wants improvements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach &amp; States</th>
<th>Requirement of</th>
<th>Types of Statewide</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>State Board</td>
<td>Outcomes/inputs</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>College identified long-term outcomes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(formally funding to assure minimum standards)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Statewide Performance Efforts

Colleges may have institutional effectiveness efforts, however.

Alaska Iowa Montana New Hampshire New Mexico North Dakota South Dakota Pennsylvania Vermont

Sources:

Personal communication with state office responsible for community and technical college reporting.


http://rockinst.org/higheduc.htm


July 12, 1999

Dr. Thomas Unknown
President
Pacific Coast Community College
Any Street
Anywhere, WA 98466

Dear Dr. Unknown:

As a means of introducing myself again, I am enclosing a summary resume. As a doctoral student at Oregon State University in the Community College Leadership Program, I completed an internship with the SBCTC assisting with the implementation of Performance Measures Funding. This is an area that I found both extremely interesting and challenging.

As the Community and Technical College System implemented this legislative mandate, it was interesting to note the different approaches individual colleges used in developing their institutional plans. Tacoma Community College took a very different approach than many other colleges by developing strategies targeted to improvement with one specific group of students.

As a focus of my dissertation research, I would like to study PCCC's approach to the implementation of performance measures. I would propose doing a qualitative study composed primarily of interviews with the members of the PCCC Performance Measures Task Force and a few other key members of the campus who acted as resources. This proposed research project would be accomplished in a manner that would ensure complete anonymity of both the participants and the institution. I have already talked with Anita Fairchild and Eric Chappman, both of whom support my proposed research project. In gathering my research data, I would hope to complete my interviews over the course of the next four months, depending on the schedules of the participants.
As President, I am asking for your approval to conduct this research project. In working with the individual participants, I will carefully conduct my research in a manner that is sensitive to the demands of individual schedules while maintaining high standards of confidentiality. I view this as an exciting project that will yield many insights into the actual planning and implementation processes of performance measures funding.

If you would like to meet with me to discuss this proposed project further, I am available to meet with you in the near future. Please advise me at your earliest convenience as to how you would like to proceed.

Sincerely,

Blaine Nisson
3436 Overhulse Road NW
Olympia, Washington 98502
Phone: (W) 692-4411
(H) (360) 866-2461
Email:
(W)
(H)
APPENDIX C

Oregon State University
Performance Measures Funding Research Project
Participant Data Sheet

Location: ____________________  Researcher: Blaine Nisson  Fall 1999

1. Participant's Name ____________________ Building ________ Room __________

2. How long have you worked at __________

3. Current Title ____________________
   How long have you been in this position? ________
   List 1997-98 Title, if different from current ____________________
   Length of time in this position ________

4. What is the highest degree that you have? ____________________

5. How long have you worked in higher education? ________

6. Have you worked at other higher educational institutions besides? Yes___ No___ if yes, please list:
   Name of institution ____________________ position(s) held

7. Are you currently or have you ever been a classroom instructor? Yes___ No___ if yes, please indicate the general area in which you taught
APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Why do you think that you were selected to serve on the PMF Task Force?

2. What were your perceptions of the legislature's intent in enacting PMF as it relates to the community and technical college system?

3. Describe your experience in developing the 1997-98 Improvement Plan? The 1998-99 plan? What did you learn from these experiences? What, if anything would you do differently?

4. Describe your involvement in the evaluation/assessment of your college's Improvement Plan. What did you learn? How did what you learned, impact the college?

5. What impact did PMF have on student learning? On the delivery of instruction? On college programs and services?

6. What are the relationships between the PMF mandates and what your college was attempting to achieve?

7. How do you think the results of the PMF plan at PCCC compare with the legislature's intent?

8. Is PMF something that should be retained? Expanded? Why?
### APPENDIX E

#### Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Participants:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability trend</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't understand accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't trust CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't understand CC/CC student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase productivity/efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't value some programs efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't understand their PMF goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did they get what they wanted?</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process put college at risk</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure to perform</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play game to keep $</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demoralizing</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBCTC resentment for their role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure affects other efforts (diversity)</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion of base budget's improvement cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punished/negative process</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of CC involvement (done to you)</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainable/not what is needed/hoop jumping</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Participants:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another state mandate - here we go again</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cost/low cost strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low risk strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grab existing plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need quick results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal with student success groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Design Flaw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Participants:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness too short for real planning &amp; results</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What's the cost benefit rates statewide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What's the local cost benefit ration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a campus collaboration process</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacked faculty support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals didn't match CC mission - flawed</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leg didn't understand CC, students &amp; learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation should have been used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resented SBCTC control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear process - &quot;learning as we go&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals should be different at campus</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimized existing efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No eval of PMF process</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students of color - not single group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burden</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention not faculty role</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct faculty difficult to reach</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated grader/tutors - didn't always work</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty evaluated by tutors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resist - leg held back $</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Participants:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMF made little sense</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/core course aligned with PCCC efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity didn't connect</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leg didn't understand FAC academics</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives - better option</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports innovation risk taking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn't trust incentive to be four ???</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring funding to par 1st</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lessons Learned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Participants:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isolated macro approach used</td>
<td>* * * * * * * *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math gains/lab/prereq/assessment scores</td>
<td>* * * * * * *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little if any improvement, overall no system improvement</td>
<td>* *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing center outreach/workshops</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and improvement reviewed as critical</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction/SS dialog partner</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS role in student success established</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on student success</td>
<td>* * * *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASE developed and retained</td>
<td>* * * *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/experiment</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math student success model</td>
<td>* * * * * * * *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors/graders model successful</td>
<td>* * *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors intimidating to some faculty</td>
<td>* *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors skill level varied = different results</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve the CTC</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive funding = reduced risk increased innovation</td>
<td>* * * *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share best, innovative practices w/CTC</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min 2+ biennieums for improvement</td>
<td>* * *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High wage programs - high start up $ needed</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Lessons Learned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Participants:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty may refuse to do some things (Tenure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training workshops - faculty/adjuncts/staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, training, collaboration, evaluation, time need</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize continued improvement/non-sustainable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus teaching, learning student success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program review process needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMF need statewide &amp; local assessment of process</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand/use accreditation process</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address our base funding to national average</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate PMF</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look at trends not just snapshot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity efforts not just one population</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't mandate efforts for faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus and college leaders need diversity training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant information not shared</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/benefit data not shared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No minutes/communication lacking</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not able to deal with issues - discussions made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty not available (summer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Lessons Learned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Participants:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement and accountability is a good thing</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals with absolute values = bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature doesn't know our improvement efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training faculty/staff assessment/effectiveness needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always focus on learning/student success</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (not state or SBCTC) campus efforts needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing on diversity had negative implications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look for improvement over longer time</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better planning at all levels needed</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of strategies needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMF needs to be integrated into existing efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of process needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMF drove diversity then institutional effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Participants:** 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 indicate the level of agreement or importance.
APPENDIX F

Judgment on Performance
Extent of Improvement Shown in Evidence Provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Between a little &amp; a lot</th>
<th>A Lot</th>
<th>Substantial*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Recognizing the short period for implementation of improvement strategies

Timeline

August 10-12 State Board Retreat, review Task Force efforts, set system priorities.

August 25 Task Force meeting to learn of State Board response, prepares proposal for planning guidelines for district Accountability for Improvement Plan for 1997-98, reviews System Implementation Plan, finalize menu of indicators (no doubt this will need to be updated as districts work on their plans and think up better indicators than are on the list).

September 10 SBCTC distributes State Board agenda item with draft guidelines for district Accountability for Improvement Plan for 1997-98.

Sept/Oct
- Districts develop Accountability for Improvement Plan for 1997-98 which includes areas of focus and indicators that will help district and SBCTC determine the extent of improvements. SBCTC staff will provide feedback on draft goal statement and indicator picks if requested during this time.
- SBCTC will provide colleges with historical trend data for most indicators.
- Task Force likely will need to meet by conference call to review changes that might be needed.

Sept 18
- State Board approves System Implementation Plan that was developed by Task Force.
- SBCTC submits System Implementation Plan to legislature and OFM.
Sept 19  SBCTC sends final guidelines for plans to colleges

October 31  First day for districts to submit Accountability for Improvement Plan for 1997-98.  
(SBCTC will review plans in order received, so submitting early has benefits, however districts have until November 14 to submit the plans.)

November 14  Last day to submit Accountability for Improvement Plans.  
(Districts cannot receive 1997-98 held back funds unless a plan is submitted and approved.)

November  SBCTC staff reviews Accountability for Improvement Plan for 1997-98, requests rewrites if needed.

December 1  Staff review of Accountability for Improvement Plan for 1997-98 summarized for State Board agenda packet including resolution to release funds.

December 11  State Board approves district Accountability for Improvement Plan for 1997-98 and releases funds.  If not approved at this time, districts can continue to work on plans (however it will be difficult to successfully implement for 98-99 performance funding any plan that does not have a positive review by first of December)

November-March  
- Districts implement strategies in Accountability for Improvement Plan in their areas of focus.
- SBCTC staff work to coordinate the various plans due to SBCTC each spring - including the Accountability for Improvement Plan for 1998-99 - such that they are consistent with each other and, if possible, merged together.

March/April, 1998  
- SBCTC provides 1998 update for indicators in the SBCTC data system.
- Districts update indicators for 1998 data as supplied by SBCTC or using own data based and protocols established by the Task Force.
- Districts review the evidence of these indicators and make a judgment about whether there is evidence of improvement consistent with the implementation plan.
- Districts use these findings to establish improvement goals for 98-99 based on the district focus for the priority areas established by the State Board. Districts use these to prepare an implementation plan for 98-99 to be measured in Spring 1999
May 1, 1998  
Districts submit first *Annual Institutional Assessment* report on data from indicators and self-judgment about 97-98 improvement related to implementation plan and the *Accountability for Improvement Plan for 1998-99*.

May/June, 1998  
SBCTC staff reviews all district reports and implementation plans and determines whether funding can be released.

Summer, 1998  
- State Board approves release of funds for 1998-99 if review group finds evidence of improvement.
- System Task Force meets to review process, change approach as needed, finalize changes to be requested during 99 session.
- SBCTC staff works with HECB staff on changes for 99-01 budget period.

March/April, 1999  
- Districts updates data on indicators for 1999.
- Districts review the evidence of these indicators and make a judgment about whether improvement has been evidenced consistent with the implementation plan.
- Districts use these findings & direction from other district efforts to establish improvement goals for 99-00 based on the district focus for the priority areas established by the State Board. Districts use these to prepare an *Accountability for Improvement Plan for 1999-00* to be measured in Spring 2000.

May 1, 1999  
Districts submit the *1999 Annual Institutional Assessment* with data from indicators and self-judgment about improvement related to implementation plan and *Accountability for Improvement Plan for 1999-00*.

May/June, 1999  
SBCTC staff reviews all district reports and implementation plans and determines whether funding can be released.

Summer, 1999  
- State Board approves release of funds for 1999-00 if review group finds evidence of improvement.
- System Task Force meets to review process, change approach as needed.
COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ACTION PLAN FOR ACHIEVING ETHNIC/RACIAL DIVERSITY GOALS

will strive to achieve the following goals:

1. **Enrollment**

   By fall quarter 2001, will achieve a participation rate, based on headcount, for each ethnic group which is equal to or greater than their representation in our community college service district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PROJECTED TARGET DATE</th>
<th>PRIMARY RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>STATUS AS OF 1998-99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Key administrators will participate in the Multicultural Efforts Project and link this project with the college's strategic plan and diversity goals, obtaining endorsement of the Multicultural Efforts Project from Exec Staff and the Board of Trustees.</td>
<td>November 1996 - May 1997</td>
<td>Multicultural Efforts Project Team</td>
<td>Accomplished. 1. Training of four key administrators: November 1996. 2. Development of plan to disseminate information and initiate change: November/December 1996. 3. Approved by Exec Staff: December 1996. 4. Presented to Board of Trustees: February 1997. 5. Board Resolution adopted: March 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) A viewbook geared toward 17-25-year-old students will be developed for recruitment purposes and represent the diversity of our community.</td>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accomplished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Through a U.S. West grant the college will implement a distance learning class for Running Start students at a targeted high school with high ethnic diversity in an effort to take the learning opportunity to the students and diversify our Running Start population.</td>
<td>Spring quarter 1998</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accomplished. Course was taught spring quarter 1998, linking with High School. This resulted in a slight increase in the diversity of Running Start students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Multicultural Student Services will host parent/student information nights targeting students of color from local high schools who are participating in the college's ACP program.</td>
<td>Fall and spring quarters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Information for parents/students about was incorporated into the program &quot;Graduation ceremony&quot; invited families to the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Seek community support and input from Board of Trustees' Advisory Council on Multicultural Affairs.</td>
<td>Beginning fall quarter 1997 and ongoing thereafter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accomplished (ongoing). Meetings are held quarterly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>PROJECTED TARGET DATE</td>
<td>PRIMARY RESPONSIBLE PARTY</td>
<td>STATUS AS OF 1998-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Connect representatives with community organizations to create greater awareness of opportunities at and to receive input from our diverse communities that could assist in improving outreach and retention efforts for students of color.</td>
<td>Connections initiated fall quarter each year and maintained throughout the year</td>
<td>Multicultural Efforts Project Team</td>
<td>Connected with community organizations via person-to-person visits. Four administrators will be meeting with community organizations to form partnerships on community outreach during spring 1999. Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) A special transfer information event will be scheduled with institutions encouraging students of color to attend.</td>
<td>Quarterly beginning winter quarter 1998</td>
<td></td>
<td>In planning stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) A career information event targeting students of color will be conducted fall and winter quarters, helping students identify career goals and high-paying career paths.</td>
<td>Implemented fall 1999</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accomplished (ongoing). High school visits will reflect inclusion of Centro Latino, Chief Leschi, ethnic clubs on high school campuses and/or visits to by high school students. The addition of a part-time high school recruiter has been extremely beneficial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) High school recruitment will develop outreach activities and materials that will reach target populations.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accomplished (ongoing). In fall 1998 120 students enrolled. Spring quarter enrollment is in process. Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Multicultural Student Services will continue to sponsor the Academic Career Preparation (ACP) Saturday College Program for students of color in grades 8 through 12.</td>
<td>Fall and spring quarters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Andy led a team of staff who did outreach to over 200 attendees from our diverse community (winter 1999). Follow-up will include feedback about image. Four administrators are planning community outreach which will include feedback on image for summer/fall 1999. In process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Market the new computerized/electronic FAFSA process to diverse community populations.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accomplished. has been reinstated to the Commission by Governor Locke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Community meetings and visits to populations currently under-served by to learn what image is to those communities. While activity #6 connects employees with community organizations reflective of our diverse population, activity #12 connects employees with citizens and citizen groups, i.e., meeting with the people.</td>
<td>Fall 1997 – June 1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Obtain faculty feedback throughout the year on activities they are engaged in that support recruitment.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Support activities and initiatives of the Washington State Commission on African American Affairs.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As one of nine pilot sites, will continue work with welfare transition clients as they seek self-sufficiency. Special focus will continue on populations of color and ESL students.

Seek additional resources for Multicultural Student Services’ ACP program for middle and high school-age students.

Ongoing

Achieved 1997 goals. 1998 contracts successfully negotiated with DSHS. Workfirst under way with designated site.

We are also partnering with Schools on a Gear Up Grant proposal.

Ongoing

Accomplishments for 1998-99:

$4000—

2. Retention

A. On an annual basis, students who are African American, American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander and Hispanic students will show an increasing rate of substantial progress by attending four or more quarters over a two-year period.

B. From quarter to quarter, excluding summer, the retention rate of degree-seeking students will be substantially equal among all ethnic groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PROJECTED TARGET DATE</th>
<th>PRIMARY RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>STATUS AS OF 1998-99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Initiate contact with new students of color three weeks into the</td>
<td>Fall quarter 1997 and each</td>
<td>TRIO Student Support Services</td>
<td>In process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quarter to determine needs (EASE program) and connect students with</td>
<td>quarter thereafter</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources accordingly. Track students through this process for three</td>
<td></td>
<td>and Allied Health</td>
<td>In process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quarters.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Counseling Department</td>
<td>All clubs have sponsors and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) MECA “Students Towards Academic Rewards” (STAR) Peer Mentoring</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>are operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program will provide learning support services and referrals for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) First quarter college students with academic need and who are</td>
<td>commenced fall quarter 1997 and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people of color will be given high priority into the college’s new TRIO</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support Services program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Support student clubs that reflect diversity.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Implement the Allied Health Department’s Recruitment and Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for Students of Color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) MECA will sponsor College Success Seminars prior to fall quarter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>PROJECTED TARGET DATE</td>
<td>PRIMARY RESPONSIBLE PARTY</td>
<td>STATUS AS OF 1998-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Student Activities will provide co-sponsorship of ethnic events with the President’s Council on Diversity to support involvement of students of color on campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accomplished. Quarterly calendar reflects co-sponsored events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) MECA will sponsor a “What's Up Gathering” to introduce new students of color to the STAR Mentoring Program, upcoming academic success activities and the MSS program, students and director</td>
<td>Beginning fall quarter 1997 and quarterly thereafter</td>
<td>MECA Staff</td>
<td>Accomplished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) MECA has begun a scholarship search service to assist students in finding additional financial resources.</td>
<td>Summer quarter 1997 and updated</td>
<td>MECA Staff</td>
<td>Accomplished. Scholarship list is available in the MECA office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) MECA will provide emergency book loans for students.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>MECA Staff</td>
<td>Accomplished. Loans are contingent on funds available through fund-raising events held throughout the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Students of color clubs will sponsor social and educational enrichment activities including field trips to other colleges and meetings with university representatives.</td>
<td>Fall, winter, spring quarters</td>
<td>Club advisors</td>
<td>Accomplished (ongoing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Schedule meetings with students of color on academic warning and register them for STAR Mentoring Program and develop a plan for success.</td>
<td>Fall quarter 1997 and ongoing each quarter thereafter</td>
<td>MECA Staff</td>
<td>Accomplished for 1997-98. Reorganizing for fall 1999.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Obtain faculty feedback throughout the year on activities they are engaged in that support retention.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>MECA Staff</td>
<td>In process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Continued support of the Teaching/Learning Forums and other professional development activities for faculty and staff around issues of race and diversity.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>MECA Staff</td>
<td>In process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>PROJECTED TARGET DATE</td>
<td>PRIMARY RESPONSIBLE PARTY</td>
<td>STATUS AS OF 1998-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) Seek opportunities to enhance curriculum and expand partnerships with other institutions in order to increase the infusion of diversity into the curriculum.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Examples of successful activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Most recently, the addition of a new course offering, African American History.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) The Bridge program with has provided a faculty who specializes in ethnic dance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Exchange faculty is teaching an interdisciplinary class combining Spanish language and Latin American society and a separate class on the government and political issues of Latin America.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) A rant from Civil Liberties has been received to examine the Japanese American experience from a historical perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) Support activities and initiatives of the Washington State Commission on African American Affairs.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accomplished. has been reinstated to the Commission by Governor Locke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) Proceed with the process of implementing a multicultural degree requirement.</td>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accomplished. Course listing is growing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(3) Initiate contact with new students of color three weeks into the quarter to determine needs (EASE program) and connect students with resources accordingly. Track students through this process for three quarters.

(4) Connect eligible students of color to the TRIO Student Support Services program to promote retention and completion and to the mentoring program in MECA.

4. **Employment**
   
   A. Will make every effort to meet or exceed the college's affirmative action requirements.
   
   B. By the year 2009, will achieve parity in the number of African American, American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander and Hispanic faculty and staff consistent with the diversity of our student body.
   
   C. Through the year 2001, will demonstrate increased effort in faculty recruitment, promotion and tenure with the intent of achieving parity in employment, and retention rates of African American, American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander and Hispanic faculty.
   
   D. Through the year 2001, will demonstrate increased staff hiring and promotion and retention with the intent of achieving parity in employment and promotion rates of African American, American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander and Hispanic staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PROJECTED TARGET DATE</th>
<th>PRIMARY RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>STATUS AS OF 1998-99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Implemented Affirmative Action Plan Executive Summary.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Update conducted annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Establishment of a people of color group to support and promote faculty and staff of color retention, professional development and unity.</td>
<td>Initiated November 30, 1997 and then on-going as interest permits.</td>
<td>Multicultural Efforts Project Team Human Resources</td>
<td>In process. Meetings have fluctuated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Require Affirmative Action representatives to discuss with the committee and committee chair the differences between Affirmative Action goals and diversity goals and their importance to the hiring process at the beginning of every hiring/screening process.</td>
<td>Fall 1997</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Accomplished and ongoing. Dr. Transue reinforced this with the hiring committees in March 1999.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Institutional Climate

A. Student survey results will show positive evaluation of the experience by all ethnic groups.
B. Through the year 2001 will demonstrate efforts to provide a campus environment that is free of ethnic/racial discrimination and harassment.
C. Through the year 2001 will demonstrate inclusion of material on cultural pluralism, ethnic diversity, and race and racism in American society across a broad array of courses.
D. Through the year 2001 the President, Board of Trustees, administrators, and faculty and classified staff leaders will demonstrate leadership in their efforts to combat racism and model behavior which promotes cultural pluralism and ethnic/racial diversity initiatives.
E. Through the year 2001 students, faculty and staff will model behavior that combats racism and promotes cultural pluralism and ethnic/racial diversity.

**ACTIVITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PROJECTED TARGET DATE</th>
<th>PRIMARY RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>STATUS AS OF 1998-99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Diversity training using the &quot;Color of Fear&quot; video and outside facilitator for (a) Exec Staff and Management, (b) faculty and staff.</td>
<td>Spring 1997, Fall 1997</td>
<td>President's Council on Diversity</td>
<td>Accomplished. Training opportunities occurred during spring 1997 and during pre-instructional week. Video purchased for ongoing use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Training for classified staff on the college's Affirmative Action goals and the college's Diversity goals.</td>
<td>Fall 1997</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Accomplished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Student Services will include diversity training that values, models and promotes a greater understanding and appreciation of diversity in its &quot;New Employee Connection.&quot;</td>
<td>Fall 1997 and ongoing</td>
<td>Student Services Task Force for &quot;New Employee Connection&quot; Orientation Program</td>
<td>The training program was developed during summer quarter 1997, and implemented beginning fall quarter 1997.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Promote inclusion of diversity in developing events sponsored by Student Programs and Activities for students, faculty and staff.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accomplished. Artist &amp; Lecture Series and Student Programs Calendar of Events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Student Programs will provide lectures, entertainment and educational events that promote appreciation and understanding among different cultures.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accomplished. Quarterly calendar reflects a variety of learning and leisure activities for students and staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Student Programs will provide training for STAGE and student government in issues of cultural sensitivity and understanding.</td>
<td>Fall each year</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accomplished. Annual training reflects multiple training sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Submit articles to the Challenge student newspaper on culturally diverse traditions highlighting American and non-American cultures in an effort to share experiences.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>MECA International Student Services</td>
<td>Periodic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Plan and provide year-long professional and personal development activities to assist all employees to identify prejudices, biases, cultural identity, heritage, sensitivity to cultural differences and mores, models/theories of ethnic development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under discussion</td>
<td>Team Effort</td>
<td>Pending results of an upcoming survey of campus climate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9) Obtain faculty feedback throughout the year on activities they are engaged in that support the institutional climate.

(10) Proceed with the process of implementing a multicultural degree requirement.
ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IMPROVEMENT PLAN, 1997-98

Relationship of this Plan to Existing Related College Activities

College/District: _________________________________
Date: November 12, 1997

Signature of President/Chancellor: _________________________________

Contact Person: _________________________________ Phone: _________________________________ Email: _________________________________

Describe how the strategies described here relate to the larger context of College/District activities for improvement in 1997-98.

In general, the goals of the legislative mandate are not new to us. We are committed to continuous quality improvement. Our current strategic plan, approved by our Board in July 1996, specifically addresses learner-centered, outcomes-based curriculum improvements as well as effectiveness, efficiency, outreach and retention goals.

The strategic plan also incorporates our institutional effectiveness efforts. With the exception of the graduation efficiency index, the core indicators predate the legislature's performance goals. The indicators that parallel the performance goals include: persistence, degree completion, campus climate, placement rates, assessment of student skills, transfer number and rate, performance upon transfer, success in subsequent/related course work, demonstration of essential knowledge and skills, and client assessment of programs and services.

The college has consistently demonstrated a commitment to diversity. In addition to many of the strategies presented in this plan, the Action Plan for Achieving Ethnic/Racial Diversity Goals includes activities related to recruitment, faculty and staff employment and training, and institutional climate.
ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IMPROVEMENT PLAN, 1997-98
Core Course Completion Focus, Strategies and Indicators

Legislative Goal for the System: Increase the percentage of students who successfully complete English and math (at college and developmental level).

What is your district's focus regarding core course completion? Why did you select this focus?

...will focus on the area with the most room for improvement - developmental math for students of color. However, the strategies will also have a beneficial impact on developmental English, and college level math and English. While each strategy may impact a limited number of students, we believe that the aggregate will result in improved developmental math completion for all students of color.

Describe the strategy(ies) that will be implemented/expanded in the fall 1997 or winter 1998 designed to improve in this area.

As soon as possible, but no later than mid-quarter, faculty will identify students of color experiencing difficulty in developmental math and refer them to Multicultural Student Services (MSS). MSS and the faculty will assist the students in developing a plan for success and obtaining tutoring and other support services.

At least once each quarter the math faculty will meet to discuss and share ideas, strategies and best practices that support developmental math completion for students of color. Each quarter a Teaching-Learning Forum (open to all faculty) will be devoted to increasing the success rate for students of color, particularly in developmental math and English.

Initiate contact with new students of color three weeks into the quarter to determine needs (Early Assistance for New Students Entering College "EASE" program) and connect students with resources accordingly. Track students through this process for three quarters. Started Fall 1997 and contacted about 200 students.

Enhance the Multicultural Student Services "Students Towards Academic Rewards" (STAR) Peer Mentoring program, re-instituted Summer '97, to increase the support services and referrals for students of color. Target of 100 students per quarter.

Multicultural Student Services will promote the College Success seminars (2 credit) held prior to fall quarter and spring quarter and evenings during winter quarter. In addition, MSS will sponsor at least two academic success workshops each quarter.

The third week of each quarter the Multicultural Student Services will sponsor a "What's Up Gathering" to introduce new students of color to the STAR Mentoring Program, upcoming academic success activities and the MSS program, students and director.

Describe the subgroup that applies for this Indicator. Evidence for this subgroup will be used to make a judgment about improvement by the end of winter 1998. The comparison will be made between the winter data for the last several years and winter data for 1998.

Indicator # and Title  | Historical Data: | Desired Range for: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Math</td>
<td>94 95 96 97 98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Core Course Completion</td>
<td>Subject area of focus (CIP code) or subgroup: 1b Developmental Math - Winter, Students of Color (Ethnicity 0-4, CIPs 32.0104 or 33.0101)</td>
<td>51% 55% 62% 61% 63-65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excludes
ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IMPROVEMENT PLAN, 1997-98

Workforce Focus, Strategies and Indicators

Legislative Goal for the System: Increase the average wage of job preparatory students to $12 an hour.

What is your district's focus regarding the workforce issue? Why did you select this focus?

The focus will be on improving retention, completion and job placement rates in the high wage programs for students of color, specifically, health professions, computers and data processing and business management. While each strategy may impact a limited number of students, we believe that the aggregate will result in improvement for all students of color.

Describe the strategy(ies) that will be implemented/expanded in the fall 1997 or winter 1998 designed to improve in this area.

As soon as possible, but no later than mid-quarter, faculty will identify students of color experiencing difficulty in high wage programs and refer them to Multicultural Student Services (MSS). MSS and the faculty will assist the students in developing a plan for success and obtaining tutoring and other support services.

Advertise the services and facilities provided by the Job Service Center in activities/publications targeted for students of color, e.g., multicultural student services newsletter, at workshops for students of color, etc.

At least once each quarter the high wage program faculty will meet to discuss and share ideas, strategies and best practices that increase the success rate for students of color in the high wage programs.

Allied Health Department's Recruitment and Retention Plan for students of color, fully implemented by Winter quarter, will include study skills and student success courses for AH students, progress report forms, and feedback from pre-program course (e.g., anatomy) faculty on struggling students. (Fall '96 - about 91 students of color in AH programs.) AH will conduct focus groups with students and faculty in the Health Information Management, Radiologic Sciences and Respiratory Care programs during Fall and early Winter quarters.

Faculty and administrators from high wage divisions and departments will meet with their counterparts at colleges with successful retention and support programs. Allied Health is planning at least 3 visits to other community/technical colleges this year.

A career information event targeting students of color will be conducted Fall and Winter quarters to help students identify career goals and high-paying career paths. The INROADS Internship Program will address approximately 20 students of color each quarter.

Enhance the Multicultural Student Services “Students Towards Academic Rewards” (STAR) Peer Mentoring program, re-instituted Summer '97, to increase the support services and referrals for students of color. Target of 100 students per quarter.

Multicultural Student Services will promote the College Success seminars (2 credit) held prior to fall quarter and spring quarter and evenings during winter quarter. In addition, MSS will sponsor at least two academic success workshops each quarter.

The third week of each quarter the Multicultural Student Services will sponsor a “What’s Up Gathering” to introduce new students of color to the STAR Mentoring Program, upcoming academic success activities and the MSS program, students and director.

Multicultural Student Services will maintain a scholarship search service to assist students in finding additional financial resources.

List multiple indicators (2 or more from menu) which will be used as evidence of improvement resulting from the implementation of the strategies listed above. The comparison will be made between the last several years and 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator # and Title</th>
<th>Subgroup, if any</th>
<th>Historical Data:</th>
<th>Desired Range for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Job Prep Winter to Spring Retention</td>
<td>Students of Color in high wage CIPs*</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Math Compl for Job Related - Winter</td>
<td>Students of Color in high wage CIPs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*51.1601, 51.0904, 51.0907, 51.0707, 51.0908, 15.0303, 15.0403, 15.0402, 15.0694, 11.0301, 11.0401, 11.9998, 52.0201, 52.1098

**Statistical fluke
ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IMPROVEMENT PLAN, 1997-98

Student Efficiency Focus, Strategies and Indicators

Legislative Goal for the System: **Increase the efficiency of student’s educational goal achievement.**

What is your district’s focus regarding student efficiency? Why did you select this focus?

The strategies, e.g., improvements to advising and retention efforts, employed to improve core completion, transfer and workforce prep will certainly have an impact on efficiency for students of color. While each strategy may impact a limited number of students, we believe that the aggregate will result in improvement for all students of color.

Describe the strategy(ies) that will be implemented/expanded in the fall 1997 or winter 1998 designed to improve in this area.

As soon as possible, but no later than mid-quarter, faculty will identify students of color experiencing difficulty in developmental math and English and refer them to Multicultural Student Services (MSS). MSS and the faculty will assist the students in developing a plan for success and obtaining tutoring and other support services.

Each quarter a Teaching-Learning Forum (open to all faculty) will be devoted to increasing the success rate for students of color, particularly in developmental math and English.

Enhance the Multicultural Student Services “Students Towards Academic Rewards” (STAR) Peer Mentoring program, re-instituted Summer ’97, to increase the support services and referrals for students of color. Target of 100 students per quarter.

Initiate contact with new students of color three weeks into the quarter to determine needs (Early Assistance for New Students Entering College “EASE” program) and connect students with resources accordingly. Track students through this process for three quarters. Started Fall 1997 and contacted about 200 students.

Multicultural Student Services will promote the College Success seminars (2 credit) held prior to fall quarter and spring quarter and evenings during winter quarter. In addition, MSS will sponsor at least two academic success workshops each quarter.

The third week of each quarter the Multicultural Student Services will sponsor a “What’s Up Gathering” to introduce new students of color to the STAR Mentoring Program, upcoming academic success activities and the MSS program, students and director.

Make up-to-date advising information easily accessible to advisors, e.g., Web page.

Provide a feedback mechanism to academic administrators from advisors on schedule conflicts/problems.

List multiple indicators (2 or more from menu) which will be used as evidence of improvement resulting from the implementation of the strategies listed above. The comparison will be made between the last several years and 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator # and Title</th>
<th>Subgroup, if any</th>
<th>Historical Data:</th>
<th>Desired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 4b - Developmental math completion - winter</td>
<td>Students of Color</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 5b - Developmental English Completion - winter</td>
<td>Students of Color</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IMPROVEMENT PLAN, 1997-98

Transfer Focus, Strategies and Indicators

Legislative Goal for the System: Improve the rate at which transfer oriented students successfully prepare for and successfully transfer.

What is your district’s focus regarding the transfer issue? Why did you select this focus?

The primary focus will be goal clarification, commitment and completion for transfer students of color. While each strategy may impact a limited number of students, we believe that the aggregate will result in improvement for all students of color.

Describe the strategy(ies) that will be implemented/expanded in the fall 1997 or winter 1998 designed to improve in this area.

As soon as possible, but no later than mid-quarter, faculty will identify students of color experiencing difficulty in math and refer them to Multicultural Student Services (MSS). MSS and the faculty will assist the students in developing a plan for success and obtaining tutoring and other support services.

At least once each quarter the math faculty will meet to discuss and share ideas, strategies and best practices that support math completion for students of color. Each quarter a Teaching-Learning Forum (open to all faculty) will be devoted to increasing the success rate for students of color, particularly in math and English.

Student activities will coordinate with the President’s Council on Diversity to support involvement of students of color on campus.

Initiate contact with new students of color three weeks into the quarter to determine needs (Early Assistance for New Students Entering College “EASE” program) and connect students with resources accordingly. Track students through this process for three quarters. Started Fall 1997 and contacted about 200 students.

Enhance the Multicultural Student Services “Students Towards Academic Rewards” (STAR) Peer Mentoring program, re-instituted Summer ’97, to increase the support services and referrals for students of color. Target of 100 students per quarter.

Multicultural Student Services will promote the College Success seminars (2 credit) held prior to fall quarter and spring quarter and evenings during winter quarter. In addition, MSS will sponsor at least two academic success workshops each quarter.

The third week of each quarter the Multicultural Student Services will sponsor a “What’s Up Gathering” to introduce new students of color to the STAR Mentoring Program, upcoming academic success activities and the MSS program, students and director.

Multicultural Student Services will maintain a scholarship search service to assist students in finding additional financial resources.

Students of color clubs will sponsor social and educational enrichment activities including field trips to other colleges and meetings with university representatives. Current plans are for three to five activities per quarter.

List multiple indicators (2 or more from menu) which will be used as evidence of improvement resulting from the implementation of the strategies listed above. The comparison will be made between the last several years and 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator # and Title</th>
<th>Subgroup, if any</th>
<th>Historical Data:</th>
<th>Desired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1 - Transfer Winter to Spring Retention</td>
<td>Students of Color</td>
<td>94 95 96 97 98</td>
<td>78% 77% 75% 76% 78-80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 3 - Math Comp for Transfer Stu - Winter</td>
<td>Students of Color</td>
<td>N/A N/A 55% 53%</td>
<td>56-58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTRUCTIONS

ANNUAL INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT, 1997-98 (Revised)
ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IMPROVEMENT

Your district has the option of completing this form in May 1998 or August 1998. Completion in May will result in allocation of performance funds at the June 18 Board meeting. Completion in August will result in allocation of performance funds at the September 10 Board meeting.

This assessment is due at the SBCTC office (319 7th Avenue, P.O. Box 42495, Olympia Washington, 98504-2495 or Fax 360 586-4610 or email MKennedy@sbctc.ctc.edu) not later than 5 p.m. May 13 or August 14, 1998.

Districts may elect the August date if they prefer to use spring to spring data rather than winter or fall data as submitted in the original plan. They may also elect the August date to provide more time for evaluation of winter or fall data.

May 13 or August 14  District Assessments due to SBCTC
May 14-29  SBCTC staff review of annual institutional assessments, recommend funding level
August 14 - 28
June 18  State Board allocates performance funds (up to 50% of the 1998-99 funding withheld for performance purposes)
September 10

College/District:  Date: June 9, 1998

Signature of President/Chancellor:

Contact Person:  Phone:  Email:
Legislative Goal for the System: Increase the percentage of students who successfully complete English and math (at college and developmental level).

1. Description of Implementation: Describe the strategies that were most central to improved performance. Include the number of students served, hours of tutoring added, etc. In cases of multiple strategies for a single indicator, provide detail only for the strategies that had the most impact on that indicator. SBCTC will combine and share a summary of information reported in this section from all districts regarding successful strategies and contact individuals for those strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Description of Implementation Steps</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Email / phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refer students experiencing difficulty in developmental math to Multicultural Student Services.</td>
<td>The process was developed and implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Students Towards Academic Rewards&quot; (STAR) mentoring program.</td>
<td>Program activities including providing formal and informal, on-time and quarter-long mentoring relationships, accepting and acting on scholarship search requests, providing interventions with other campus departments, assisting students in completing financial aid forms, providing math tutoring services, telephoning students of color who have been given academic warning, and offering learning resource workshops. The target of 100 students was achieved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Success Seminars</td>
<td>The College Success Seminar for Special Populations was canceled due to low enrollment. One section, open to all students, was held. Multicultural Student Services offered Learning Styles and Test Taking Workshops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Early Assistance for New Students Entering College&quot; Program</td>
<td>New students were invited to participate in the EASE program during each orientation session. The admissions staff coordinated with the Multicultural Student Services staff and all students participating in the program, including students of color, were contacted by phone, received information about support services on campus, received a follow-up letter and resource sheet. The students of color are being contacted for two additional quarters beginning with spring quarter, 1998.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Performance on Indicators: Based on your plan, show the historical and target data and provide the 98 (in some cases fall 97) data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator # and Title</th>
<th>Historical Data*</th>
<th>Target Range for 98**</th>
<th>Actual for 98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Core Course Completion</td>
<td>94 95 96 97</td>
<td>51-53%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject area of focus (CIP code) or subgroup: 1b Developmental Math - Spring, Students of Color (Ethnicity 0-4, CIPs 32.0104 or 33.0101, excluding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *Recalculation for historical and current data resulted in somewhat different values than those submitted on the original plan. **The target range is based on a four-year average of 50%.

3. Analysis and Judgment: What is the district’s conclusion about the extent of improved performance in this area, as measured by the indicators. Provide a rational for your judgment based on analysis of the quantitative evidence. Also describe findings from any qualitative data collection your district used to help understand the impact of the selected strategies.

Based on the evidence provided by the core course completion indicator for students of color, we conclude that we have demonstrated improved performance in this area. Our indicators for Spring 1998 exceeded our historical trends and our target goals.

4. Learning from This Year: What has your district learned about students or about the implementation of your strategies as a result of this effort. If your efforts have changed since originally planned, describe these changes. How will what your district learned influenced your plans for next year? Based on your experience are there any strategies you would advise other colleges to avoid?

The STAR mentoring program, success seminars and “What’s Up Gatherings” are good strategies to increase the contact and involvement with students. Unfortunately, it is difficult to involve large numbers of students in these intensive efforts.

The intervention and referral strategies also have the potential for impacting success rates. This year, we were not able to put the processes in place prior to the start of Winter quarter. It appears that our late Winter efforts that continued into Spring did have a positive impact on students in the Spring quarter. Also, we need to give some thought as to methods for identifying and reaching “at risk” students before they are experiencing difficulties in developmental courses.

We are also working to reduce our dependence on the Math Lab as a delivery method for developmental math. However, this will take time and a reallocation of resources. The math faculty are also more rigorously checking prerequisites to insure that students are in the appropriate classes. One area of concern is students transferring in with the required prerequisites who may not actually be prepared for our courses.

Analysis and faculty feedback indicate that we may have been overly ambitious in focusing solely on students of color in all the indicator courses. For next year’s plan, the campus task force is recommending narrowing the number of affected courses (e.g., just Math 90 and 99) for all students.
Legislative Goal for the System: *Increase the percentage of former job preparatory students who make high wages.*

1. **Description of Implementation:** Describe the strategies that were most central to improved performance. Include the number of students served, number of advising opportunities added, etc. In cases of multiple strategies for a single indicator, provide detail only for the strategies that had the most impact on that indicator. SBCTC will combine and share a summary of information reported in this section from all districts regarding successful strategies and contact individuals for those strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Description of Implementation Steps</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Email / phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refer students experiencing difficulty in high wage programs to Multicultural Student Services.</td>
<td>The process was developed and implemented.</td>
<td>April West-Baker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Students Towards Academic Rewards&quot; (STAR) mentoring program.</td>
<td>Program activities including providing formal and informal, on-time and quarter-long mentoring relationships, accepting and acting on scholarship search requests, providing interventions with other campus departments, assisting students in completing financial aid forms, providing math tutoring services, telephoning students of color who have been given academic warning, and offering learning resource workshops. The target of 100 students was achieved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Success Seminars</td>
<td>The College Success Seminar for Special Populations was canceled due to low enrollment. One section, open to all students, was held. Multicultural Student Services offered Learning Styles and Test Taking Workshops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer students to the Job Service Center.</td>
<td>Multicultural Student Services regularly refers students to the Job Assistance Center.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Workforce Assessment, Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allied Health Recruitment and Retention Plan for students of color.</th>
<th>Allied Health Faculty continued to use the AH Student Progress Reports, meeting and developing improvement plans for 38 students. The Nursing Program Chair met with representatives from five other schools to discuss student retention and progress. The Radiologic Sciences faculty also met with three other schools to discuss student retention and progress. The Applied Allied Health Study Skills course was offered during Winter quarter for at-risk students. The Director of Allied Health and the professional/technical counselor held three focus group sessions with students to get feedback on program contributions, as well as barriers, to student success.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Student Services scholarship services.</td>
<td>Over twenty-five scholarship opportunities were found for students who requested assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career information for students of color.</td>
<td>Multicultural Student Services maintains a job announcement board and announces internship and other career opportunities at staff meetings and to all student of color clubs. MSS also held a Job Fair Primer prior to the Winter Quarter Job Fair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. Performance on Indicators:** Based on your plan, show each indicator, the historical and target data and provide the 98 (in some cases fall 97) data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator # and Title</th>
<th>Historical Data*:</th>
<th>Target Range</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job Prep Winter to Spring Retention, Stu of Color in high wage CIPs**</td>
<td>74% 75% 88% 73%</td>
<td>76-77%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Math Compl for Job Related - Winter, Stu of Color in high wage CIPs</td>
<td>22% 21% 23%</td>
<td>23-24%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Recalculation for historical and current data resulted in somewhat different values than those submitted on the original plan.

**51.1601, 51.0904, 51.0907, 51.0907, 51.0908, 15.0303, 15.0403, 15.0402, 15.0694, 11.0301, 11.0401, 11.9998, 52.0201, 52.1098 (CIPs 52.xxxx are now considered medium-wage but a recalculation showed that it would not have impacted actuals.)
3. Analysis and Judgment: What is the district’s conclusion about the extent of improved performance in this area, as measured by the combined evidence of the multiple indicators. Provide a rational for your judgment based on analysis of the quantitative evidence. Also describe findings from any qualitative data collection your district used to help understand the impact of the selected strategies.

Based on the evidence provided by the indicators Winter to Spring retention for Job Prep students of color in high wage programs, and the Math completion for students of color in high wage programs, we conclude that we have demonstrated improved performance in this area. Our indicators for Winter 1998 exceeded our historical trends and our target goals.

4. Learning from This Year: What has your district learned about students or about the implementation of your strategies as a result of this effort. If your efforts have changed since originally planned, describe these changes. How will what your district learned influenced your plans for next year? Based on your experience are there any strategies you would advise other colleges to avoid?

The STAR mentoring program, success seminars and “What’s Up Gatherings” are good strategies to increase the contact and involvement with students. Unfortunately, it is difficult to involve large numbers of students in these intensive efforts.

The intervention and referral strategies also have the potential for impacting success rates. This year, we were not able to put the processes in place prior to the start of Winter quarter. It appears that our late Winter efforts that continued into Spring did have a positive impact on students in the Spring quarter. Also, we need to give some thought as to methods for identifying and reaching “at risk” students before they are experiencing difficulties in developmental courses.

We believe our greatest success can be attributed to the intensive efforts of the Allied Health division. We would like to use the Allied Health processes as a model for the other high wage programs. However, this will take time and a possible re-allocation of resources.

Analysis and faculty feedback indicate that we may have been overly ambitious in focusing solely on students of color in all the indicator courses. For next year’s plan, the campus task force is recommending narrowing the number of affected courses (e.g., just Math 90 and 99) for all students.
ANNUAL INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT, 1997-98

Student Efficiency Assessment

Legislative Goal for the System: Increase the efficiency of student's educational goal achievement.

1. Description of Implementation: Describe the strategies that were most central to improved performance. Include the number of students served, number of advising opportunities added, etc. In cases of multiple strategies for a single indicator, provide detail only for the strategies that had the most impact on that indicator. SBCTC will combine and share a summary of information reported in this section from all districts regarding successful strategies and contact individuals for those strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Description of Implementation Steps</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Email / phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Early Assistance for New Students Entering College&quot; Program</td>
<td>New students were invited to participate in the EASE program during each orientation session. The admissions staff coordinated with the Multicultural Student Services staff and all students participating in the program, including students of color, were contacted by phone, received information about support services on campus, received a follow-up letter and resource sheet. The students of color are being contacted for two additional quarters beginning with spring quarter, 1998.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer students experiencing difficulty in developmental math and English to Multicultural Student Services.</td>
<td>The process was developed and implemented. For developmental English, students were identified in the 3rd week (attendance and study habits, i.e., work not turned in) and were referred to MSS. A second round occurred after the mid-term exam.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Students Towards Academic Rewards&quot; (STAR) mentoring program.</td>
<td>Program activities including providing formal and informal, on-time and quarter-long mentoring relationships, accepting and acting on scholarship search requests, providing interventions with other campus departments, assisting students in completing financial aid forms, providing math tutoring services, telephoning students of color who have been given academic warning, and offering learning resource workshops. The target of 100 students was achieved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Success Seminars</td>
<td>The College Success Seminar for Special Populations was canceled due to low enrollment. One section, open to all students, was held. Multicultural Student Services offered Learning Styles and Test Taking Workshops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Colloquium The Development English faculty met to discuss the common syllabus, text, evaluation processes and the assessment/placement of students in developmental studies. The group will meet again in May.

Web Page Access Students now have easy access to information such as the catalog at several kiosks, the library and all student labs.

Schedule conflicts/problems feedback mechanism. We provide this type of feedback on an ongoing basis when a concern comes to the attention of advising. For example, when we need more developmental classes because the ones we have are getting full, advising notifies the appropriate department and they work on adding new sections. Another example would be a report that the Registrar recently sent to the Vice-President for Instruction comparing the success rate of students in various courses.

2. Performance on Indicators: Based on your plan, show each indicator, the historical and target data and provide the 98 (in some cases fall 97) data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator # and Title</th>
<th>Historical Data*</th>
<th>Target Range for 98**</th>
<th>Actual for 98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 4b - Developmental math completion - Spring, Students of Color</td>
<td>43% 56% 52% 48%</td>
<td>51-53%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 5b - Developmental English Completion - Spring, Students of Color</td>
<td>69% 79% 79% 77%</td>
<td>78-80%</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Recalculation for historical and current data resulted in somewhat different values than those submitted on the original plan.

**Target ranges are based on a historical average of 50% for math and 76% for English.
Student Efficiency Assessment, Continued

3. Analysis and Judgment: What is the district's conclusion about the extent of improved performance in this area, as measured by the combined evidence of the multiple indicators. Provide a rational for your judgment based on analysis of the quantitative evidence. Also describe findings from any qualitative data collection your district used to help understand the impact of the selected strategies.

Based on the evidence provided by the indicators developmental math completion for students of color, and developmental English completion for students of color, we conclude that we have demonstrated improved performance in this area. Our indicators for Spring 1998 exceeded our historical trends and our target goals.

4. Learning from This Year: What has your district learned about students or about the implementation of your strategies as a result of this effort. If your efforts have changed since originally planned, describe these changes. How will what your district learned influenced your plans for next year? Based on your experience are there any strategies you would advise other colleges to avoid?

The STAR mentoring program, success seminars and "What's Up Gatherings" are good strategies to increase the contact and involvement with students. Unfortunately, it is difficult to involve large numbers of students in these intensive efforts.

The intervention and referral strategies also have the potential for impacting success rates. This year, we were not able to put the processes in place prior to the start of Winter quarter. It appears that our late Winter efforts that continued into Spring did have a positive impact on students in the Spring quarter. Also, we need to give some thought as to methods for identifying and reaching "at risk" students before they are experiencing difficulties in developmental courses.

We are also working to reduce our dependence on the Math Lab as a delivery method for developmental math. However, this will take time and a reallocation of resources. The math faculty are also more rigorously checking prerequisites to insure that students are in the appropriate classes. One area of concern is students transferring in with the required prerequisites who may not actually be prepared for our courses.

Analysis and faculty feedback indicate that we may have been overly ambitious in focusing solely on students of color in all the indicator courses. For next year's plan, the campus task force is recommending narrowing the number of affected courses (e.g., just Math 90 and 99) for all students.
ANNUAL INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT, 1997-98

Transfer Assessment

Legislative Goal for the System: Increase the rate at which transfer oriented students successfully prepare for and successfully transfer.

1. Description of Implementation: Describe the strategies that were most central to improved performance. Include the number of students served, number of advising opportunities added, etc. In cases of multiple strategies for a single indicator, provide detail only for the strategies that had the most impact on that indicator. SBCTC will combine and share a summary of information reported in this section from all districts regarding successful strategies and contact individuals for those strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Description of Implementation Steps</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Email / phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refer students experiencing difficulty in math to Multicultural Student Services.</td>
<td>The process was developed and implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Early Assistance for New Students Entering College&quot; Program</td>
<td>New students were invited to participate in the EASE program during each orientation session. The admissions staff coordinated with the Multicultural Student Services staff and all students participating in the program, including students of color, were contacted by phone, received information about support services on campus, received a follow-up letter and resource sheet. The students of color are being contacted for two additional quarters beginning with spring quarter, 1998.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Students Towards Academic Rewards&quot; (STAR) mentoring program.</td>
<td>Program activities including providing formal and informal, on-time and quarter-long mentoring relationships, accepting and acting on scholarship search requests, providing interventions with other campus departments, assisting students in completing financial aid forms, providing math tutoring services, telephoning students of color who have been given academic warning, and offering learning resource workshops. The target of 100 students was achieved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Success Seminars</td>
<td>The College Success Seminar for Special Populations was canceled due to low enrollment. One section, open to all students, was held. Multicultural Student Services offered Learning Styles and Test Taking Workshops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transfer Assessment, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multicultural Student Services scholarship services.</th>
<th>Over twenty-five scholarship opportunities were found for students who requested assistance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students of Color Clubs</td>
<td>Students went on field trips to and campuses from the Minority Affairs Office at visited the campus to meet with students of color.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation agreements</td>
<td>Brochures have been developed detailing the articulation of programs with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty exchanges.</td>
<td>The college has a faculty exchange program with and talks have been initiated with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Performance on Indicators: Based on your plan, show each indicator, the historical and target data and provide the 98 (in some cases fall 97) data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator # and Title</th>
<th>Historical Data*:</th>
<th>Target Range for 98</th>
<th>Actual for 98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1 - Transfer Winter to Spring Retention, Students of Color</td>
<td>78% 77% 76% 77%</td>
<td>78-80%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 3 - Math Compl for Transfer Stu - Winter, Students of Color</td>
<td>26% 46% 49%</td>
<td>50-52%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Recalculation for historical and current data resulted in somewhat different values than those submitted on the original plan.
3. **Analysis and Judgment:** What is the district's conclusion about the extent of improved performance in this area, as measured by the combined evidence of the multiple indicators. Provide a rationale for your judgment based on analysis of the quantitative evidence. Also describe findings from any qualitative data collection your district used to help understand the impact of the selected strategies.

A more detailed analysis of the quantitative evidence (see below) shows that the math completion indicator is reflective of a relatively small group of students. Therefore, we feel that the retention indicator is the more appropriate measure. In addition, the math completion percentage for Winter 98 declined only about 3%, while the retention percentage increased about 7%. Based on this evidence, we conclude that we have improved performance in this area.

### 1 Transfer Winter to Spring Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Data</th>
<th>Winter 94</th>
<th>Winter 95</th>
<th>Winter 96</th>
<th>Winter 97</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Winter 98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>502</td>
<td></td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained or Graduated</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>384</td>
<td></td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>78-80%</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3 Math Completion - Winter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Data</th>
<th>Winter 94</th>
<th>Winter 95</th>
<th>Winter 96</th>
<th>Winter 97</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Winter 98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL Math Completed</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>50-52%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transfer Assessment, Continued

4. Learning from This Year: What has your district learned about students or about the implementation of your strategies as a result of this effort? If your efforts have changed since originally planned, describe these changes. How will what your district learned influence your plans for next year? Based on your experience are there any strategies you would advise other colleges to avoid?

The STAR mentoring program, success seminars and “What’s Up Gatherings” are good strategies to increase the contact and involvement with students. Unfortunately, it is difficult to involve large numbers of students in these intensive efforts.

The intervention and referral strategies also have the potential for impacting success rates. This year, we were not able to put the processes in place prior to the start of Winter quarter. It appears that our late Winter efforts that continued into Spring did have a positive impact on students in the Spring quarter. Also, we need to give some thought as to methods for identifying and reaching “at risk” students before they are experiencing difficulties in developmental courses.

We are also working to reduce our dependence on the Math Lab as a delivery method for developmental math. However, this will take time and a reallocation of resources. The math faculty are also more rigorously checking prerequisites to insure that students are in the appropriate classes. One area of concern is students transferring in with the required prerequisites who may not actually be prepared for our courses.

We attribute our retention success in this area primarily to development of closer relationships with the efforts of the Multicultural Student Services office in providing exposure to the also contributed to student retention.

Analysis and faculty feedback indicate that we may have been overly ambitious in focusing solely on students of color in all the indicator courses. For next year’s plan, the campus task force is recommending narrowing the number of affected courses (e.g., just Math 90 and 99) for all students.
ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IMPROVEMENT PLAN, 1998-99

Relationship of this Plan to Existing Related College Activities

College/District: Date: October 20, 1998

Signature of President/Chancellor: __________________________

Contact Person: Phone:

Describe how the strategies described here relate to the larger context of College/District activities for improvement in 1997-98.

In general, the goals of the legislative mandate are not new to Community College. We are committed to continuous quality improvement. Our current strategic plan, approved by our Board in July 1996, specifically addresses learner-centered, outcomes-based curriculum improvements as well as effectiveness, efficiency, outreach and retention goals.

The strategic plan also incorporates our institutional effectiveness efforts. With the exception of the graduation efficiency index, the core indicators predate the legislature's performance goals. The indicators that parallel the performance goals include: persistence, degree completion, campus climate, placement rates, assessment of student skills, transfer number and rate, performance upon transfer, success in subsequent/related course work, demonstration of essential knowledge and skills, and client assessment of programs and services.
ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IMPROVEMENT PLAN, 1998-99
Core Course Completion Focus, Strategies and Indicators

Legislative Goal for the System: Increase the percentage of students who successfully complete English and math (at college and developmental level).

What is your district’s focus regarding core course completion? Why did you select this focus?

We will focus on the area that we believe to be a significant hurdle and bottleneck, and one with the most room for improvement - developmental math. Over the past five years only about 20-25% of Fall quarter cohorts have assessed at college level math. The largest number, about 46%, assess at the Math 90 level. In order to have the largest possible impact with our limited resources we will focus on improving the success rate for these 90 level math students.

Describe the strategy(ies) that will be implemented/expanded in the fall 1998 or winter 1999 designed to improve in this area.

1. Place tutors in sections of Math 90 and Math 99. This will allow the students to become familiar with a designated tutor and allow the tutor to be more familiar with the class content and pace. The tutor will, whenever possible, conduct study sessions immediately after the class session.
2. Encourage the faculty to provide incentives to students to participate in structured study groups for sections of Math 90 and Math 99.
3. Offer at least one additional classroom section of Math 90 and Math 99 (instead of math lab) during Winter quarter.
4. By the second or third week of the quarter, Instructors in Math 90 and Math 99 sections, with the assistance of Student Services staff, will mail an "early warning letter" to students who do not appear to be attending or performing satisfactorily in class.
5. Instructors in Math 90 and Math 99 will provide students with a "progress report" by week four.
6. Student Services staff will attend sessions of Math 90 and Math 99 during the first two weeks to solicit students who are willing to be contacted about three weeks into the quarter. Student Services staff will call students who agreed to receive these calls to ask if they need information or are having any problems at the college. The callers refer students who are experiencing problems to the appropriate college or external resources.
7. On the first or second day of the quarter, require that students enrolled in Math 90 or Math 99 provide evidence that they have met the course prerequisites.
8. Offer at least two study skills workshops during Winter quarter with content tailored to success in math classes.
9. Pilot test readers in at least two Math 90 or Math 99 sections. This will allow more homework assignments and constant feedback to the students.

Describe the subgroup that applies for this Indicator. Evidence for this subgroup will be used to make a judgment about improvement by the end of winter 1999. The comparison will be made between the winter data for the last several years and fall or winter data for 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator # and Title</th>
<th>Historical Data:</th>
<th>Desired range for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Core Course Completion</td>
<td>93-4 94-5 95-6 96-7 97-8</td>
<td>98-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject area of focus (CIP code) or subgroup: Winter - Math 90 and Math 99</td>
<td>58% 63%</td>
<td>68%* 62% 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total student headcount</td>
<td>(n=611)</td>
<td>(n=512)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The 95-96 completion rate is a fluke.
**This would represent an increased success rate of about 9 students, or about 45 credits.
(Note: Math 099 had a CIP of 27.0101 in Winter 94 but is included in the historical data.)
ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IMPROVEMENT PLAN, 1998-99

Workforce Focus, Strategies and Indicators

Legislative Goal for the System: Increase the average wage of job preparatory students to $12 an hour.

What is your district’s focus regarding the workforce issue? Why did you select this focus?

We will focus on the area that we believe to be a significant hurdle and bottleneck, and one with the most room for improvement - developmental math. Over the past five years only about 20-25% of Fall quarter cohorts have assessed at college level math. The largest number, about 46%, assess at the Math 90 level. In order to have the largest possible impact with our limited resources we will focus on improving the success rate for these 90 level math students.

Describe the strategies that will be implemented/expanded in the fall 1998 or winter 1999 designed to improve in this area.

1. Place tutors in sections of Math 90 and Math 99. This will allow the students to become familiar with a designated tutor and allow the tutor to be more familiar with the class content and pace. The tutor will, whenever possible, conduct study sessions immediately after the class session.
2. Encourage the faculty to provide incentives to students to participate in structured study groups for sections of Math 90 and Math 99.
3. Offer at least one additional classroom section of Math 90 and Math 99 (instead of math lab) during Winter quarter.
4. By the second or third week of the quarter, Instructors in Math 90 and Math 99 sections, with the assistance of Student Services staff, will mail an "early warning letter" to students who do not appear to be attending or performing satisfactorily in class.
5. Instructors in Math 90 and Math 99 will provide students with a "progress report" by week four.
6. Student Services staff will attend sessions of Math 90 and Math 99 during the first two weeks to solicit students who are willing to be contacted about three weeks into the quarter. Student Services staff will call students who agreed to receive these calls to ask if they need information or are having any problems at the college. The callers refer students who are experiencing problems to the appropriate college or external resources.
7. On the first or second day of the quarter, require that students enrolled in Math 90 or Math 99 provide evidence that they have met the course prerequisites.
8. Offer at least two study skills workshops during Winter quarter with content tailored to success in math classes.
9. Pilot test readers in at least two Math 90 or Math 99 sections. This will allow more homework assignments and constant feedback to the students.

List multiple indicators (2 or more from menu) which will be used as evidence of improvement resulting from the implementation of the strategies listed above. The comparison will be made between the last several years and 1998-99 (fall or winter quarter).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator # and Title</th>
<th>Historical Data:</th>
<th>Desired Range for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Math completion - Winter*</td>
<td>91-4 94-5 95-6 96-7 97-8 98-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject area of focus (CIP code) or subgroup: Winter - Math 90 and Math 99 for W students</td>
<td>56% 65% 72%** 65% 66% 71%***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total student headcount)</td>
<td>(n=167) (n=144) (n=131) (n=148) (n=132)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Same parameters as Core Completion Indicator
**The 95-96 completion rate is a fluke.
***This would represent an increased success rate of about 7 students, or about 35 credits.
(Note: Math 099 had a CIP of 27.0101 in Winter 94 but is included in the historical data.)
ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IMPROVEMENT PLAN, 1998-99
Student Efficiency Focus, Strategies and Indicators

Legislative Goal for the System: Increase the efficiency of student's educational goal achievement.

What is your district's focus regarding student efficiency? Why did you select this focus?
will focus on the area that we believe to be a significant hurdle and bottleneck, and one with the most room for improvement - developmental math. Over the past five years only about 20-25% of Fall quarter cohorts have assessed at college level math. The largest number, about 46%, assess at the Math 90 level. In order to have the largest possible impact with our limited resources we will focus on improving the success rate for these 90 level math students.

Describe the strategy(ies) that will be implemented/expanded in the fall 1998 or winter 1999 designed to improve in this area.
1. Place tutors in sections of Math 90 and Math 99. This will allow the students to become familiar with a designated tutor and allow the tutor to be more familiar with the class content and pace. The tutor will, whenever possible, conduct study sessions immediately after the class session.
2. Encourage the faculty to provide incentives to students to participate in structured study groups for sections of Math 90 and Math 99.
3. Offer at least one additional classroom section of Math 90 and Math 99 (instead of math lab) during Winter quarter.
4. By the second or third week of the quarter, Instructors in Math 90 and Math 99 sections, with the assistance of Student Services staff, will mail an "early warning letter" to students who do not appear to be attending or performing satisfactorily in class.
5. Instructors in Math 90 and Math 99 will provide students with a "progress report" by week four.
6. Student Services staff will attend sessions of Math 90 and Math 99 during the first two weeks to solicit students who are willing to be contacted about three weeks into the quarter. Student Services staff will call students who agreed to receive these calls to ask if they need information or are having any problems at the college. The callers refer students who are experiencing problems to the appropriate college or external resources.
7. On the first or second day of the quarter, require that students enrolled in Math 90 or Math 99 provide evidence that they have met the course prerequisites.
8. Offer at least two study skills workshops during Winter quarter with content tailored to success in math classes.
9. Pilot test readers in at least two Math 90 or Math 99 sections. This will allow more homework assignments and constant feedback to the students.

List multiple indicators (2 or more from menu) which will be used as evidence of improvement resulting from the implementation of the strategies listed above. The comparison will be made between the last several years and 1998-99 (fall or winter).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator # and Title</th>
<th>Historical Data</th>
<th>Desired Range for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4b. Developmental Math completion - Winter</td>
<td>93-4 94-5 95-6 96-7 97-8</td>
<td>98-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject area of focus (CIP code) or subgroup: Winter - Math 90 and Math 99</td>
<td>58% 63% 68%* 62% 65%</td>
<td>67%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total student headcount)</td>
<td>(n=511) (n=512) (n=548) (n=544) (n=554)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The 95-96 completion rate is a fluke.
**This would represent an increased success rate of about 9 students, or about 45 credits.
(Note: Math 099 had a CIP of 27.0101 in Winter 94 but is included in the historical data.)
ACCOUNTABILITY FOR IMPROVEMENT PLAN, 1998-99
Transfer Focus, Strategies and Indicators

Legislative Goal for the System: Improve the rate at which transfer oriented students successfully prepare for and successfully transfer.

What is your district's focus regarding the transfer issue? Why did you select this focus?

We will focus on the area that we believe to be a significant hurdle and bottleneck, and one with the most room for improvement - developmental math. Over the past five years only about 20-25% of Fall quarter cohorts have assessed at college level math. The largest number, about 46%, assess at the Math 90 level. In order to have the largest possible impact with our limited resources we will focus on improving the success rate for these 90 level math students.

Describe the strategy(ies) that will be implemented/expanded in the fall 1998 or winter 1999 designed to improve in this area.

1. Place tutors in sections of Math 90 and Math 99. This will allow the students to become familiar with a designated tutor and allow the tutor to be more familiar with the class content and pace. The tutor will, whenever possible, conduct study sessions immediately after the class session.
2. Encourage the faculty to provide incentives to students to participate in structured study groups for sections of Math 90 and Math 99.
3. Offer at least one additional classroom section of Math 90 and Math 99 (instead of math lab) during Winter quarter.
4. By the second or third week of the quarter, Instructors in Math 90 and Math 99 sections, with the assistance of Student Services staff, will mail an "early warning letter" to students who do not appear to be attending or performing satisfactorily in class.
5. Instructors in Math 90 and Math 99 will provide students with a "progress report" by week four.
6. Student Services staff will attend sessions of Math 90 and Math 99 during the first two weeks to solicit students who are willing to be contacted about three weeks into the quarter. Student Services staff will call students who agreed to receive these calls to ask if they need information or are having any problems at the college. The callers refer students who are experiencing problems to the appropriate college or external resources.
7. On the first or second day of the quarter, require that students enrolled in Math 90 or Math 99 provide evidence that they have met the course prerequisites.
8. Offer at least two study skills workshops during Winter quarter with content tailored to success in math classes.
9. Pilot test readers in at least two Math 90 or Math 99 sections. This will allow more homework assignments and constant feedback to the students.

List multiple indicators (2 or more from menu) which will be used as evidence of improvement resulting from the implementation of the strategies listed above. The comparison will be made between the last several years and 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator # and Title</th>
<th>Historical Data:</th>
<th>Desired Range for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Math completion - Winter*</td>
<td>93-4</td>
<td>94-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject area of focus (CIP code) or subgroup: Winter - Math 90 and Math 99 for T students</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total student headcount)</td>
<td>(n=430)</td>
<td>(n=355)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Same parameters as Core Completion Indicator
**The 95-96 completion rate is a fluke.
***This would represent an increased success rate of about 9 students, or about 45 credits.