



Legislative Report for HB 2152 (2013) Oregon Community College Report

Section 3 of HB 2152 (2013) requires the Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development (CCWD) to conduct an annual review of all employee groups at each community college. The department was charged with using data available from a national post-secondary data collection system within the United States Department of Education to report the results. In accordance with that, CCWD used the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), maintained by the National Center on Educational Statistics (NCES) which is within the U.S. Department of Education, to complete this report.

The bill outlined the following areas to be reviewed in the annual report: the ratio of instruction provided by full-time faculty, by part-time faculty and by graduate assistants; pay differential for each faculty category; average contracted wages for each employee group; the ratio of the number of employees in each employee group to the number of students enrolled; and, the health care and other benefits provided for each faculty category. The bill also tasked CCWD with recommending a different method of data tracking that would provide relevant data on staffing ratios without placing undue financial burdens on public community colleges.

In November 2013, CCWD convened a work group to discuss the data available in IPEDS and alternative methods for collecting and reporting the requested data without placing undue burden on the colleges. The group consisted of representatives from the Oregon Council of Community College Institutional Researchers (OCCCIR), Council of Instructional Administrators (CIA), Community College Business Officers, and Community College Human Resource Directors. The group agreed that there were several impediments to collecting and utilizing data other than IPEDS for this report. A summary of the challenges/impediments include:

1. Each institution has different - sometimes radically different - definitions of "full-time" and "part-time" employees at least across the faculty and classified (support staff) units.
2. The varying definitions of full-time and part-time employees across the respective institutions also significantly complicate wage and benefit comparisons across the institutions such that "apples to apples" comparisons are very difficult to

capture and report. One substantive example concerning how difficult it may become to compare even the "supervisory" or management employment levels in the respective institutions involves the question of "who counts in the management group?"

For example, many/most of the 17 institutions have a category of "confidential" employees (sometimes in relatively significant numbers per institution) who are not members of a collective bargaining unit. Do we count, or not count, "confidential" employees as "management?" Other institutions (Lane among them) have few or even zero designated "confidential" employees. This difference alone, and how to account for it, could lead to misinterpretations of the employee data concerning the management/administrative or "supervisory" employee group for all of the institutions.

3. Given the differing employee definitions and categories, efforts to norm the employee head count, FTE and wage and benefit data across the respective institutions could and would quickly become excessively labor intensive for each institution. In addition, even after good faith norming efforts, and significant investments in time/labor to produce the normed employee data analyses, the comparisons would still be less than "apples to apples."

For the above reasons, the work group decided that the IPEDs data are as good or better than anything colleges could produce even after considerable time and efforts to reanalyze and report the employee head count as well as wage and benefit data.

Data on the following pages were extracted from information the colleges submitted to IPEDS for the 2011-12 academic year.

Ratios of numbers of students enrolled to numbers of college employees

College	Faculty	Administrators	Other Professionals
Blue Mountain	37.0	209.3	3069.7
Central Oregon	63.0	398.5	366.6
Chemeketa	59.7	764.9	809.1
Clackamas	69.3	1035.0	541.4
Clatsop	44.3	349.4	204.8
Columbia Gorge	39.8	352.9	190.0
Klamath	47.7	598.3	99.7
Lane	53.7	585.9	415.8
Linn-Benton	46.7	795.2	1113.3
Mt. Hood	52.9	637.8	381.0
Oregon Coast	39.4	123.8	433.3
Portland	45.1	1022.2	289.8
Rogue	31.8	398.8	577.6
Southwestern	169.0	362.1	220.4
Tillamook Bay	46.9	293.0	195.3
Treasure Valley	54.6	472.3	94.5
Umpqua	60.5	508.4	1479.0
Statewide	51.1	609.2	363.4

Average salary equated to 9- month contracts for full-time instructional staff

Blue Mountain Community College	\$61,305
Central Oregon Community College	\$58,818
Chemeketa Community College	\$60,424
Clackamas Community College	\$69,354
Clatsop Community College	\$53,942
Columbia Gorge Community College	\$54,619
Klamath Community College	\$46,893
Lane Community College	\$65,670
Linn-Benton Community College	\$72,652
Mt Hood Community College	\$76,265
Oregon Coast Community College	\$55,940
Portland Community College	\$65,207
Rogue Community College	\$62,745
Southwestern Oregon Community College	\$53,478
Tillamook Bay Community College	\$52,724
Treasure Valley Community College	\$57,560
Umpqua Community College	\$54,088