

## Institutional Assessment Committee

Wednesday, December 9, 2020, 10:00 am – 11:30 pm

Join Zoom Meeting <https://cgcc.zoom.us/j/92408892157> ID: 924 0889 2157,

Phone: 1-253-215-8782

### Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Amendments to November 18 minutes <sup>1</sup>?
3. Action Items
  - November 18, 2020: Susan will send her copy [Core Theme C with edits] to the IAC members (**done**)
  - November 18, 2020: Dan will share survey results with Jarett [CT-C]
  - November 18, 2020: Kristen will check with Mike and Teresa regarding their submissions [CT-B]
  - November 18, 2020: Gerardo will update analysis and send matrix to Susan [CT-A]
4. Review of Core Theme Rubrics and Narrative Analyses <sup>2</sup>
  - Goal: Validate matrix data
  - Goal: Identify any areas of the Narrative Analysis needing clarification
  - Goal: Identify in the disaggregated data the equity gaps for report focus
5. Other / Wrap-up
6. Adjourn to Gail's retirement party at <https://cgcc.zoom.us/j/92408892157> Meeting ID: 924 0889 2157 Phone: +1 253-215-8782 US (Tacoma)

Next Meeting: December 9, 2020

Attachments: <sup>1</sup> November 18, 2020 Minutes; <sup>2</sup> 2019-20 Core Theme draft report

## Institutional Assessment Committee

Wednesday, November 18, 2020, 10:00 am – 11:30

In keeping with State mandated directive, this meeting was held via Zoom

Present: Gerardo Cifuentes, Jarett Gilbert, Gail Gilliland, Kristen Kane, Susan Lewis, Mary Martin, Justin Smith, Dan Spatz

Call to Order: 10:03 am

1. Susan welcomes members
2. Review of Core Theme Rubrics and Narrative Analyses
  - Susan starts with Core Theme C
    - Go with any additions: Susan will update table, clarifying years – Dan says correct
    - Covid effect –
      - Customized training - yes
      - SBDC numbers do not reflect Covid effect
        - Dan will check with Gregg.
        - This is just clients SBDC is supporting.
        - This number is the same as before.
      - CCP
        - Covid has effected the number of people CCP can provide service for.
        - Is this class enrollment? No, that would be the individual counselled.
    - Customized training section
      - Ed to Go
        - There needs to be a better understanding of Ed to Go. CGCC is the marketing tool. It is replacing customized training.
          - Reword to reflect the understanding
          - Insert “in lieu of providing direct customized training by enrolling students into customized career training classes.” Adequate context is needed. Dan agrees with this.
        - Procedure – Dan will work with Rose to make changes.
        - Susan will send highlighted version to Dan
      - Assessment methodology for Customized Training is effective even if it doesn't have a state reporting requirement. The measure is reporting the number of Customized Trainings offered, and this is easy to gather and provide correct data.
    - Uncomfortable with the use of averages for several measures
      - Survey – Q5:
      - We should just be using how would you rate the responsiveness of CGCC – Dan is fine with what the IAC says.
      - Statistics we are using is just the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet under Q5. Results will

- change.
  - Getting more people involved – an action for improvement – include the college more to get out and involved in the community
- Actions for improvement
  - Not how to improve assessment, but how to get improvement in the action being measured
  - Jarett will work with Dan
- C1.3 – Survey Q3
  - Industry satisfaction – Move to analysis – Dan is good with this.
  - Susan will move actions for improvement
  - Add qualitative data responses from surveys
  - Dan will share survey results with Jarett.
- C1.4 – ok except actions for improvement and effectiveness
- C2.1
  - Dan will clean up spelling
- C2.2 – Averages
  - Community survey – use results from Q2
  - In matrix we do not put descriptions, only in the narrative analysis.
  - Don't use an average, just use Q2 results
  - IAC agrees
- C2.3 – Averages
  - Targets are actually numbers
- C2.4 – missing on narrative analysis
  - Survey Q4

Action Item: Susan will send her copy to the IAC members

Action Item: Dan will share survey results with Jarett

➤ Core Theme B

- B1.1
  - Table 2 – what does the 517 represent? Kristen will check with Mike.
  - Good info from the other colleges
  - It is time to update targets by comparing with other institutions and national averages
- B2.2
  - The percentages equal more than 100% - Kristen will ask Theresa
  - Age range is okay
  - It would benefit to see raw numbers
  - Can Theresa put these numbers into tables – Kristen will check with Theresa
  - Future targets – what number?
- B2.3
  - Would be nice to have it in table
  - Race and ethnicity – strange total
    - Put this in a table with clarification across top

- Susan will be glad to help with building tables
- Different groups in “attempted” and “passed”. It would be expected that those listed as passed would be a subset of those that attempted.
- Prefer that the report use a more professional tone/voice. Susan will help with this.
- Future target – should move to effectiveness of assessment
- B2.4
  - Language and voice change needed
    - Raw numbers needed next to percentages. Kristen will get that data to Susan. Susan will make table
    - Concern over correctness of saying the college is “doing good work towards equity” based on the data presented
    - Analysis of results – need for a more professional reporting voice: encourage the use of “data seems to indicate”
    - Encourage definition of terms conversation so each Core Theme is using the same definition of term
      - Students of color
      - Low income
    - Use prior year data in the assessment to bring in contrasting data.
    - Low income data is only reported by financial aid students. Concern that this is not representative.
- B2.5
  - Dev Ed Math
    - Are percentages correct?
    - Check accuracy of saying that winter term ended abruptly
    - Susan will possibly put this in a single table
    - Clarify what a “ses achievement gap” is
- B2.6
  - “Oregon university” is no longer correct as we are gathering data for transfer to all universities
  - Clarification needed for table as it may be too technical for the lay reader
- B2.7
  - New measurement - Preparing student for university data – enroll in 2<sup>nd</sup> term – small indicator
  - Results
  - ShanShan will be sending Kristen data for comparison results
  - Almost everyone reports it as 1<sup>st</sup> term, 1<sup>st</sup> generation so we do not have comparison data.
  - Remember that if we change this data, we also have to change it in B2.1 completion.
  - Redesign in the future: discuss if we want to match national data or

stick with ours.

- B2.8
  - Kristen would like this data discussed in the future

Action Item: Kristen will check with Mike and Theresa regarding their submissions

➤ Core Theme A

- Matrix missing
  - Gerardo will send matrix to Susan
  - Add tables to Description of Results throughout. Susan can help with this if provided with the data.
  - Appears to be too much repetition from last year

Action Item: Gerardo will update analysis and send matrix to Susan

Adjourn 11:34

Next Meeting: December 9, 2020

Core Theme C: Strengthening Our Community - Partnerships								
Scale		5	4	3	2	1		
Objective	Measure	Surpasses Mission Expectation		Meets Mission Expectation		Below Mission Expectation	2019-20 Results	Score
<b>Objective C1:</b> Cultivating productive business and industry relationships	<b>C1.1</b> Number of businesses and industries assisted by CGCC <sup>1</sup>	<b>400 or more</b> Businesses demonstrating increased private investment as a result of, or are otherwise counseled or trained by, SBDC/CCP/Customized Training.		<b>200-299</b> Businesses demonstrating increased private investment as a result of, or are otherwise counseled or trained by, SBDC/CCP/Customized Training.		<b>150 or fewer</b> Businesses demonstrating increased private investment as a result of, or are otherwise counseled or trained by, SBDC/CCP/Customized Training.	425	<b>5</b>
	<b>C1.2</b> Responsiveness to business and industry (Business & Industry Survey)	<b>85% or more</b> Percentage of surveyed rating CGCC as having excellent or above average responsiveness to business and industry recommendations (Business and Industry Survey Q5)		<b>65 – 75%</b> Percentage of surveyed rating CGCC as having excellent or above average responsiveness to business and industry recommendations (Business and Industry Survey Q5)		<b>55% or fewer</b> Percentage of surveyed rating CGCC as having excellent or above average responsiveness to business and industry recommendations (Business and Industry Survey Q5)	46%	<b>1</b>
	<b>C1.3</b> Regional industry satisfaction with CGCC (Business & Industry Survey)	<b>85% or more</b> Percentage of surveyed rating CGCC excellent or above average as a community partner to business and industry (Business and Industry Survey Q3)		<b>65 – 75%</b> Percentage of surveyed rating CGCC excellent or above average as a community partner to business and industry (Business and Industry Survey Q3)		<b>55% or fewer</b> Percentage of surveyed rating CGCC excellent or above average as a community partner to business and industry (Business and Industry Survey Q3)	50%	<b>1</b>
	<b>C1.4</b> Employability and preparedness of CGCC graduates (Business & Industry Survey)	<b>a. 85% or more</b> Percentage of surveyed rating the analytical skills training of CGCC graduates as excellent or above average (Business and Industry Survey Q9)		<b>a. 65 – 75%</b> Percentage of surveyed rating the analytical skills training of CGCC graduates as excellent or above average (Business and Industry Survey Q9)		<b>a. 55% or fewer</b> Percentage of surveyed rating the analytical skills training of CGCC graduates as excellent or above average (Business and Industry Survey Q9)	62%	<b>2</b>

		b. <b>85% or more</b> Percentage of surveyed rating the job specific skills training of CGCC graduates as excellent or above average (Business and Industry Survey Q10)	b. <b>65 – 75%</b> Percentage of surveyed rating the job specific skills training of CGCC graduates as excellent or above average (Business and Industry Survey Q10)	b. <b>55% or fewer</b> Percentage of surveyed rating the job specific skills training of CGCC graduates as excellent or above average (Business and Industry Survey Q10)	50%	<b>1</b>
		c. <b>85% or more</b> Percentage of surveyed rating the interpersonal skills training of CGCC graduates as excellent or above average (Business and Industry Survey Q11)	c. <b>65 – 75%</b> Percentage of surveyed rating the interpersonal skills training of CGCC graduates as excellent or above average (Business and Industry Survey Q11)	c. <b>55% or fewer</b> Percentage of surveyed rating the interpersonal skills training of CGCC graduates as excellent or above average (Business and Industry Survey Q11)	31%	<b>1</b>
<b>Objective C2:</b> Creating, maintaining, and growing community relationships	<b>C2.1</b> CGCC’s overall responsiveness to community needs (Community Survey Q1)	<b>85% or more</b> Percentage of surveyed rating CGCC’s overall responsiveness to community needs as <i>always responsive</i> or <i>responds most of the time</i>	<b>65 – 75%</b> Percentage of surveyed rating CGCC’s overall responsiveness to community needs as <i>always responsive</i> or <i>responds most of the time</i>	<b>55% or fewer</b> Percentage of surveyed rating CGCC’s overall responsiveness to community needs as <i>always responsive</i> or <i>responds most of the time</i>	46%	<b>1</b>
	<b>C2.2</b> Overall awareness of CGCC and the services it offers (Community Survey Q2)	<b>85% or more</b> Percentage of surveyed rating public awareness of CGCC as <i>extensive awareness</i> or <i>aware of several programs and services</i>	<b>65 – 75%</b> Percentage of surveyed rating public awareness of CGCC as <i>extensive awareness</i> or <i>aware of several programs and services</i>	<b>55% or fewer</b> Percentage of surveyed rating public awareness of CGCC as <i>extensive awareness</i> or <i>aware of several programs and services</i>	95% Average of: CCP 93% CT: 90% GD: 100% Workforce training: 100% 49%	<b>5</b> <b>1</b>
	<b>C2.3</b> Utilization of CGCC community programs and services <sup>1</sup> (Community Survey Q3)	<b>&gt; 4 programs/services</b> Average number of CGCC programs/services for which survey participants report that they have either <i>used themselves</i> or <i>referred someone to</i>	<b>2-3 programs/services</b> Average number of CGCC programs/services for which survey participants report that they have either <i>used themselves</i> or <i>referred someone to</i>	<b>0 programs/services</b> Average number of CGCC programs/services for which survey participants report that they have either <i>used themselves</i> or <i>referred someone to</i>	18% Average of: CCP 28% CT: 10% GED: 17% Workforce training 20%	<b>1</b>

	<b>C2.4</b> CGGC's Overall engagement in the community (Community Survey Q4)	<b>85% or more</b> Percentage of surveyed rating the college as <i>very engaged in my community</i>		<b>65 – 75%</b> Percentage of surveyed rating the college as <i>very engaged in my community</i>		<b>55% or fewer</b> Percentage of surveyed rating the college as <i>very engaged in my community</i>	22.5%	<b>1</b>
--	--	--	--	---	--	---	-------	----------

<sup>1</sup> Disaggregated data by program available in Narrative Analysis.



# Core Theme C Narrative Analysis

## Objective C1: Cultivating productive business and industry relationships

### C1.1: Number of businesses and industries assisted by CGCC

#### Description of Results

The following data reflect direct contact with individual businesses through CGCC Small Business Development Center, Child Care Partners Resource & Referral, and Customized Training. This may take the form of employee trainings, consulting and site visits. Data from SBDC and Child Care Partners are also provided to relevant state agencies as part of annual compliance and reporting requirements. Cumulative results demonstrate an increase over the two previous review cycles (bracketed for comparison):

CGCC Service	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Small Business Development Center	268	284	310
Child Care Partners Resource & Referral	105	104	115
Customized Training	11	4	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>425</b>

#### Analysis of Results

Activity in the Small Business Development Center and Child Care Partners indicates increased demand in both programs related to the COVID-19 response. The SBDC has played a critical role in connecting local businesses with state and federal business assistance funds; Child Care Partners has seen increased demand for training, resource and referral (a service it continues to provide to CGCC students, staff and faculty) as parents search for child care amid widespread, continuing school closures. Customized Training, with no participation this past year (other than Ed2Go, noted below) reflects a lack of staffing capacity and marketing budget to promote this program.

#### *Small Business Development Center*

SBDC Director Greg Price reports that COVID-19 increased the exposure of our center and the Oregon SBDC network tremendously. “We have been called on by the federal government, the state and our regional partners to increase our support and accessibility to answer the call for assistance to small businesses,” Price said. “The SBDC is busier than ever. Staff are working to increase capacity, expand training, and respond quickly to the changing business environment in order to provide relevant and timely services to our community. Staff are still working virtually, and just recently have been able to meet in person with clients on a case-by-case basis.

“We are in a recession, and there is a strong possibility this will continue and potentially get worse before it gets better. This has placed a strain on our partners, the funding they receive, and

subsequently funding that we receive. We are being asked to do more with less across the state, as are many of our community members. This has been a challenge and will continue to be.”

As is the case with many organizations in the Columbia Gorge, SBDC struggles with human resources. Director Price hopes to hire two new team members, including a bilingual, bicultural advisor. Finding new team members has been a challenge but is also an opportunity.

In addition, the wildfires have been a huge challenge across the state, especially in southwest Oregon but also in our own region with the White River Fire and others. Director Price has been working with the state director and other centers to improve services in supporting business in crisis. Oregon SBDC has just released a new Disaster Recovery Guidebook, an important resource for business recovery from any type of disruption. SBDC is working to develop an additional guidebook on economic preparedness.

“We have plans to expand our services to underserved communities, in particular the Latino small business communities in our region as well as others,” Price reported. “We are also working with MCEDD and Business Oregon to provide a series of trainings that have recently started and will extend into next year called the Rural Opportunity Initiative. It is designed to help rural business better leverage broadband, business technology, and support them in resiliency planning.”

Lastly, SBDC’s strategy is to not only be a resource to help solve problems and support small businesses when they have a specific need, but to be a long-term partner and ally in starting, growing, and improving their business throughout the life of the business.

### ***Child Care Partners***

The challenges this year were directly related to COVID-19 and the state of emergency, reports Nancey Patten, director of Child Care Partners. Child care providers who wanted to remain open or reopen are required to be approved as Emergency Child Care and to follow stringent health and safety guidelines. The priority has been to support programs in understanding and implementing new health and safety protocols. Programs struggled financially with new guidelines, restricting total group size and the need to maintain a consistent cohort of children.

Child Care Partners continues to support programs during the state of emergency. Staff have been working with child care resource & referral programs across the state to offer a wide variety of online training opportunities. Moving forward, Child Care Providers will be developing new trainings to meet the needs of local programs.

### ***Customized Training***

No businesses have participated in Customized Training in this review period, reports Rose Kelly, Community Education coordinator. Staff have responded to requests from Northwest Cherry Growers and Hood River County School District to provide Spanish courses but those have not happened because of time constraints, the pandemic or financial strains. Workforce training paid for two students to attend Ed2Go career training classes. Thirty-nine additional students signed up for shorter classes through Ed2Go, all related to work skills or language. Ed2Go provides a resource

to expand the reach of Customized Training, for instance by ~~allowing us to offer~~ **providing access to** specialized courses in project management or other topics of interest to external partners. One recent example is a request by Oregon Department of Human Services to enroll staff in professional development coursework offered by Ed2Go through CGCC. Typically, these courses do not draw a large enough pool of students from the local region to justify holding a class; by drawing upon a much larger, national audience, Ed2Go brings an economy of scale to make such classes feasible.

Customized Training faces several challenges at this time:

- The pandemic: Customized training classes cannot be held easily in person. Companies are reluctant to sign up their employees. Businesses are financially challenged due to the pandemic.
- Marketing: Customized Training does not have the resources to market its classes.
- Personnel: With layoffs at the college, Rose Kelly is covering Community Education, Customized Training and the bookstore. Along with this, she is helping with the implementation of the CampusNexus student information system. CGCC has also just taken on Community Education for Hood River County, leaving no time to invest in Customized Training.
- Rose is working with the director of The Mt. Hood Back Country Ski and Avalanche Institute to set up a program which will align with the college's EMT program to train and certify rescue workers. Rose will continue to try to promote customized training as her time allows.

### **Actions for Improvement**

While SBDC and Child Care Partners both report increased client contacts compared with the past two years (driven, in part, by the economic crisis), it's important to note that both of these programs are supported at least in part by external funding sources; Child Care Partners, for instance, does not rely at all on the college general fund. That is not the case with Customized Training, which could become a profit center for the institution if we were able to market and staff it appropriately. Until the college devotes the resources to supporting and promoting Customized Training, we will probably be limited to serving businesses or individuals who reach out to us. At such time as the college budget allows, we recommend a dedicated marketing and staff allocation to Customized Training.

### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

The assessment methods appear to provide accurate and consistent data for services provided by the identified programs.

- **Tools and Methodology:** With the exception of Customized Training, data from this measure are taken from annual reports prepared by the respective departments as mandatory reporting requirements to state and federal agencies. These data have been collected for many years, providing good baseline information. Customized Training data is

gathered by the Community Education director. These data collection methods are effective.

- **Future Targets:** SBDC and Child Care Partners targets are reasonable, since they’ve proven numerically consistent through time. Customized Training targets will require dedication of additional resources to the program in order to generate enough participate to develop realistic targets.

**C1.2 Responsiveness to business and industry**

**Description of Results**

There were 37 responses to the question “How would you rate CGCC’s responsiveness to your community?” Of these, 45.95% (17) said the college is always responsive; 21.62% (8), said the college responds most of the time; 13.51% (5) said the college is somewhat responsive; 10.81% (4) said CGCC responds occasionally; and 8.11% (3) said the college is not responsive.

Always responsive	Responds most of the time	Somewhat responsive	Responds occasionally	Not responsive	Total
17	8	5	4	3	37
45.95%	21.62%	13.51%	10.81%	8.11%	
Percentage of surveyed rating CGCC responsiveness as <i>always responsive</i> or <i>responds most of the time</i> – 67.57%					

In recent years we have relied upon various iterations of business and community surveys to acquire data, but response rates continue to be a challenge. In the current review we conducted direct outreach to community partners, such as city councils, county commissions and chamber of commerce boards. As was the case with our community, business and industry survey conducted in summer 2019, the response rate was low (a total of 24 responses, compared with 111 in summer 2019); on a positive note, the caliber of the responses we did receive was helpful, with people returning thoughtful comments and suggestions for college consideration.

**Analysis of Results**

As has been the case in previous years, it is problematic to draw broad conclusions from the relatively small number of people responding to any one survey question. With some 80,000 people in the college’s potential service region, the total number of responses and the subset responding to the business survey is not statistically valid.

**Actions for Improvement**

A year ago, it was suggested that the institution consider intentional outreach through focus groups, and by taking advantage of existing regional conferences and summits hosted by organizations in which CGCC is a member. These include chamber forums and, in particular, the annual Business and Industry Summit organized by Mid-Columbia Economic Development District (MCEDD).

**Effectiveness of Assessment**

Reliance on an annual survey alone has thus far not proven to be a reliable method of gathering data in sufficient quantity to provide a statistically valid indication of institutional effectiveness for C1.2, C1.3 and C1.4. While the survey should not be abandoned, it should be augmented by additional strategies discussed elsewhere in this report.

There needs to be even greater emphasis given to marketing the survey, including provision of incentives for respondents who complete the survey. Business owners and managers are busy, and simply do not have time to respond to surveys unless there is a very pressing need to do so. However, given our experience over the past three years, it is apparent that surveys alone cannot be relied upon to return statistically-valid data. The above recommended focus groups, as well as existing regional conferences and summits could also be an avenue for survey distribution and data gathering. For instance, at the MCEDD Business and Industry Summit, a printed survey could be provided to each summit participant with request that it be completed and turned in by the end of the day. Another avenue for improved data gathering is the college’s contractual relationship with East Cascades Workforce Investment Board (EC Works), as five-county provider for federal Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act funds allocated through EC Works. EC Works maintains an extensive network of business and industry contacts, and could be invited to help obtain feedback for future assessments. Regrettably, disruptions posed by the pandemic have made it difficult to implement any of these ideas this past year. For instance, the MCEDD symposium noted above, which occurred on Nov. 6, 2020, was conducted via Zoom in a condensed format that left no opportunity to engage participants in this survey. Focus groups should still be considered to augment these other vehicles, and will be discussed in greater detail below.

- **Tools and Methodology:** Data garnered from responses to Question 5 on the Business & Industry Survey.
- **Future Targets:** Review of targets should be conducted with update of assessment methodology/delivery.

**C1.3 Regional industry satisfaction with CGCC**

**Description of Results**

There were 24 responses to C1.3 (CGCC as a community partner): Twelve rated CGCC as excellent or above average, six as average and six as below average.

Excellent	Above average	Average	Below average	Poor	Total
12 (separate # for each?)		6	6	0	24
50.0%		25.0%	25.0%	0.0%	
Percentage of surveyed rating CGCC as excellent or above average as a community partner to business and industry – 50.0%					

**Analysis of Results**

There was one consistent area of concern, regarding the college's level of responsiveness to requests. Some constituents are satisfied; others less so. Responses follow:

- *I have a hard time getting responses from folks in the facilities department.*
- *My answer to this is based on my own experience. I served on the Foundation Board for two terms, I have taken many classes at CGCC and I have been a consistent donor to the scholarship program and helped with reviewing scholarship applicants for many years. I have actually been responsive to CGCC rather than having CGCC respond to me. Not a criticism, I just don't have data.*
- *I always get an email or call back when I reach out.*
- *CGCC's responsiveness has increased dramatically over the last 3 years. Districts feel supported and engaged.*
- *There is only person that I can count on to get back to me at the college and that is Kelsie Contreras at the front desk of the HR campus.*
- *It has been extremely frustrating to attempt numerous times to book a room for community partners and not have a response at all even after multiple attempts and avenues.*
- *I reached out to the Nursing program several times and never heard back. I have had a good experience with student services.*
- *I made one phone call during COVID pandemic and had to leave a message. I never received a call back.*
- *I took a community ed class last year and was often unable to reach the instructor. The class schedule changed part way through and people stopped attending, and there was no email communication about it, and no way to review the course.*

### **Actions for Improvement**

We need to develop a more consistent, reliable way of responding to inquiries.

### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

Reliance on an annual survey alone has thus far not proven to be a reliable method of gathering data in sufficient quantity to provide a statistically valid indication of institutional effectiveness for C1.2, C1.3 and C1.4. While the survey should not be abandoned, it should be augmented by additional strategies discussed elsewhere in this report.

Additional mechanisms beyond the survey are needed to assess industry satisfaction with CGCC. Direct outreach to employers, while time-consuming, has proven effective to the extent that the college has been able to conduct such outreach. As noted below, the Healthcare Occupations program reaches out to hospitals and other healthcare providers each year. In addition, the college could expand its marketing and public relations efforts to promote more regional awareness of college activities. Greater awareness should foster stronger participation in the community survey and also positively affect the ratings provided in future surveys. Finally, we recommend making Core Theme C assessment an annual agenda item for the industry advisory committees assigned to each of the college's CTE programs. While we recommend the formation of public focus groups to

help gather feedback for other sections of this report, we would not recommend this for C1.3 since the advisory committees are already in place and could be requested to offer feedback.

- **Tools and Methodology:** Data garnered from responses to Question 3 on the Business & Industry Survey.
- **Future Targets:** Review of targets should be conducted with update of assessment methodology/delivery.

#### C1.4 Employability and preparedness of CGCC graduates (a, b and c)

##### Description of Results

Although the total number of responses in the Fall Term 2020 survey was smaller than the total in the Summer Term 2019 survey, there was a slight increase in the response rate to each of these questions in 2020 compared with 2019.

Employer Rating of Skill Specific Training Received by CGCC Graduates						
	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	Total
a) Thinking/ Analytical Skills (Q 9)	0	8	4	1	0	13
b) Job Specific Skills (Q 10)	1	5	5	1	0	12
c) Interpersonal Skills (Q 11)	0	4	8	1	0	13
Total	1	17	17	3	0	38

Percentage rating CGCC graduates as having received excellent or above average skill training:

- (a) Thinking/Analytical Skills (comprehension, analysis, problem solving, etc.): 62%
- (b) Job Specific Skills (computer applications and technology, web development, bookkeeping, accounting, customer service, engineering, nursing, medical assisting, teaching, etc.): 50%
- (c) Interpersonal Skills (communication, team work, reliability, attendance and timeliness, participation, etc.): 31%

##### Analysis of Results

Although the number of survey responses was low, those who did respond and who had experience with CGCC graduates indicated above average analytical, job-specific and interpersonal skills. While keeping the small response rate in mind, the data did indicate slight improvement over the preceding year.

##### Actions for Improvement:

(??? Jarett said he would help with this)

##### Effectiveness of Assessment

Thus far, annual surveys have not demonstrated the capacity to attract a sufficiently large number of respondents to be statistically relevant. Limited staff resources, combined with the logistical challenges of the COVID pandemic this year, make it difficult to conduct a comprehensive external assessment.

While the survey should not be abandoned, it should be augmented by other measures. One example is the outreach the college's Healthcare Occupations program conducts each year, contacting hospitals and other care providers in the region to determine the number of CGCC graduates hired each year. This direct communication affords the program an opportunity to assess workplace readiness, critical thinking skills and other requirements of the nursing profession. Since this outreach occurs already, results can be incorporated into the core theme measure. Outreach to other industry partners, such as in the technology sector, does not occur with the same regularity, and instead is more of an anecdotal nature. If staff resources allow, it could be possible to conduct direct outreach to other industry partners. Last year we recommended that a focused survey be presented through the Gorge Technology Alliance, a membership organization. As a member, the college would be able to use this avenue to assess employability and preparedness of graduates entering the technology sector. This year we did send the survey to GTA members; given the survey structure we are not able to determine whether any of this year's respondents are GTA members, a point to consider in structuring future surveys. Direct outreach could also occur with other economic sectors such as agriculture and manufacturing, again provided the college has sufficient staff resources to make this attempt. Finally, as discussed above, these questions could be presented annually as an agenda item for CTE advisory committees.

- **Tools and Methodology:** Data garnered from responses to Question 9, 10 and 11 on the Business & Industry Survey.
- **Future Targets:** Review of targets should be conducted with update of assessment methodology/delivery.

## **Objective C2: Creating, maintaining and growing community relationships**

### **C2.1 Overall responsiveness to community needs**

#### **Description of Results**

Forty-six percent of respondents rated the college as always responsive or responding most of the time.

#### **Analysis of Results**

As noted above, it's difficult to draw conclusions from a small data pool. Still, given that outreach for the fall term 2020 survey focused on chamber board members and locally elected officials, all of whom are likely well-networked in their communities, the response is encouraging. In addition, many of those who responded took the time to offer suggestions and observations. We honor that by recording these responses here:

*What is the college doing well?*



- “More open to a larger variety of people in the community.”
- “Building dorms, in spite of the pandemic, to be ready for the future.”
- “This survey is a great start. Keep focusing on community outreach.”
- “Keeping up with new and developing technology like the RET program.”

*How can the college improve?*

- “Get even more involved in as many community organizations like the Chamber and various other groups.”
- “Keep up your good work, openness, communicate in ordinary people’s language, not academia speak.”
- “The college is dismayingly short on the Humanities, at the expense of other programs. It seems like the catalog of interesting classes is slimmer than it was, and there is greater emphasis on career classes. We need a better balance.”

### **Actions for Improvement**

The college has three formal on-going “bridges” to the larger community, apart from direct staff engagement in community events and organizations. Two of these are the college board and college foundation board. Elected and appointed members of these two boards are ambassadors for the institution, who also act as sounding boards for ideas and communication channels from the community back to the college. The third formal bridge comprises the various advisory committees for the college’s career-technology programs; these committees represent industries relevant to the CTE programs. Finally, the college should encourage student, staff and faculty engagement in community organizations and events. Participation in public events should include branded college materials (t-shirts, buttons) to build awareness. It is important that such outreach occur throughout the college’s service area.

### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

Recognizing the continuing challenge of garnering a larger data set for Core Theme C measures, the college may wish to consider forming a series of focus groups, the purpose of which would be to consider each of the topics posed in this report.

- **Tools and Methodology:** Data garnered from responses to Question 1 on the Community Survey.
- **Future Targets:** Review of targets should be conducted with update of assessment methodology/delivery.

### **C2.2 Overall awareness of CGCC and the services it offers**

**Description of Results** (On the matrix, you have the results as 95%, representing an average of percentages for each program. The results for this measure were to be the percentage of surveyed rating public awareness of CGCC as *extensive awareness* or *aware of several program and services* from Q2 on the community survey. It should not include data from Q3 on the survey. From what you wrote in the description, I was able to make the table below, which shows that the result is 48.78%.)

Extensive	Aware of Several Programs	Aware of 1 or 2 Programs	Very Limited	Not Aware	Total
1	19	10	10	1	41
2.44%	46.34%	24.39%	24.39%	2.44%	
Percentage of surveyed rating public awareness of CGCC as <i>extensive awareness</i> or <i>aware of several programs and services</i> – 48.78%					

**Analysis of Results**

Even with a small data set, it is apparent that the programs identified in this question are well-recognized by community decision-makers and influencers. This is positive news.

**Actions for Improvement**

The same level of awareness needs to become a goal for other college programs and services, many of which do not have as high a profile. For instance, Community Education and Customized Training are areas of potential growth, given adequate marketing and staffing levels.

As suggested above, the college may wish to consider establishing public focus groups to create an additional source of informal guidance, feedback and community ownership in the institution. Oftentimes, focus groups are only created when public institutions are preparing for a bond election or other significant request. That should not be the case here. Instead, focus groups around the questions posed in Core Theme C (“Actions for Improvement, awareness of services, use of programs and services”, etc.) could inform the institution and also help promote the institution through word of mouth. Focus group membership could be developed through recommendations from the college and foundation boards, broadly advertising public appeals and social media.

**Effectiveness of Assessment**

The issues related to having a small data set exist for this measure as well. The college may wish to consider forming a series of focus groups, the purpose of which would be to consider each of the topics posed in this report.

- **Tools and Methodology:** Data garnered from responses to Question 2 on the Community Survey.
- **Future Targets:** Review of targets should be conducted with update of assessment methodology/delivery.

**C2.3 Utilization of CGCC community programs and services**

**Description of Results** (I don’t understand how these results are being figured. Utilization should be the total number under columns 2 and 3 (Have you referred someone ..? and Have you yourself used ..?) divided by the number of surveys completed. The result should be reported as a whole number, not a percent. Note that the targets are whole numbers, not percents.)

Program Name	Are you aware of this program/service? (detailed in C2.2)	Have you referred someone to this program/service this year?	Have you yourself used this program/service this year?
Small Business Development Center (SBDC)	20 (95.24%)	7 (33.33%)	3 (14.29%)
Community Education	30 (96.77%)	5 (16.13%)	3 (9.68%)
Child Care Partners	13 (92.86%)	4 (28.57%)	3 (21.43%)
Customized Training	9 (90%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)
GED & Adult Basic Education	23 (100%)	4 (17.39%)	1 (4.35%)
Workforce Training (Adult & Youth)	15 (100%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)
<b>Total</b>		24	11
Total number of survey participants: (Need a single number of surveys turned in for figuring the overall average of utilization. Still not sure that would give us the required result.) SBDC: 21; Community Education: 31; Child Care Partners, 14; Customized Training, 10; GED & ABE, 23; Workforce training, 15.			

**Analysis of Results**

Results indicated good awareness of SBDC, Community Education and GED/Adult Basic Education.

**Actions for Improvement**

As discussed above, the college needs to broaden public awareness of all services and programs through an expanded marketing program. Strategies are identified in a marketing study completed in 2020 by Weinstein Associates.

**Effectiveness of Assessment**

The issues related to having a small data set exist for this measure as well. The college may wish to consider forming a series of focus groups, the purpose of which would be to consider each of the topics posed in this report.

- **Tools and Methodology:** Data garnered from responses to Question 3 on the Community Survey.
- **Future Targets:** Review of targets should be conducted with update of assessment methodology.

## **C2.4 CGCC's overall engagement in the community**

### **Description of Results**

There were 40 responses to this question. Nine respondents (22.5%) said the college is very engaged in the community; 22 (55%) said somewhat engaged, and 9 (22.5%) said not engaged in the community.

### **Analysis of Results**

Responses indicated support for the survey itself, the student residential project, the college's embrace of new technologies (citing, specifically, renewable energy), the seasonal schedule as a good communications tool, and the college's academic standards. Here are several representative comments:

- *I appreciate the focused expansion of Technical Skills programs. This will help local school district develop meaningful partnerships with CGCC. The housing addition is great. Next need is to bring athletics to CGCC... This will expand enrollment, and increase opportunities for local, gorge athletes, to stay in the gorge and enroll in low-cost college programming.*
- *They are helping my 18-year-old daughter transition quite easily into college.*
- *Including the entire community in ways that reflect the local needs and possibilities*
- *Communication has improved dramatically and I hope it continues to get the word out about all of the exciting things going on.*
- *Sending out the class schedule, which is how I learned about the community college.*
- *I think the college has good professors and good academic standards. I have had good experience with the classes I have taken.*
- *The college does a good job of partnering with HRVHS to give students dual enrollment opportunities.*
- *Trying to fill needs and gap for the Gorge community with regard to professional and continuing education.*
- *Keep up your good work, openness, communicate in ordinary people's language, not academia speak.*

### **Actions for Improvement**

There were several helpful comments here, ranging from improved marketing and community outreach to student health services. Several constituents have commented, both through this survey and in other ways, that the college does not always return phone calls, especially from The Dalles Campus. But the range of areas of improvement covered diverse topics. Several examples follow:

- *Ask what students and community members want to see offered at CGCC and in CE. The school should look at historical trends around attendance and local demographics/occupations need to see which courses and topics were most popular. Seek out instructors who can deliver specific topics, versus asking what they want to teach. It can be a mix, but I see courses being advertised that never get filled and end up being canceled. There is always an opportunity to better market*

CGCC and course / CE offerings. The paper catalog is helpful and should remain, but are there other ways to reach the community about courses they'd want to know about? Lastly, I find CGCC's rate for paying local instructors is well behind the market. It is a balance to keep tuition affordable, but I would encourage the college to look at this structure based on what they want to achieve for students, instructors, and the community overall.

- *Improve communication with business community about support services offered and collaborate with local school districts on for- credit apprenticeship opportunities.*
- *Phone App Class, the local high school offers an extremely limited programming classes. I coached robotics for YEARS and builders were easy to find, "good" programmers were very rare. In this day and age, kids should learn how to program and I bet writing a simple phone app would be a hit.*
- *Maybe people don't read the schedule because it's called a class schedule. There's really a lot more in it than just a class schedule. Maybe it could be mailed out as more of a promotional piece that also includes the schedule. A new title? The Fall one has a great picture and article about Miriam.*
- *The college is dismayingly short on the "Humanities," at the expense of other programs. It seems like the catalog of interesting classes is slimmer than it was and there is greater emphasis on career classes. We need a better balance.*
- *Volunteer participation from the community to better enhance marketing in a communal way.*
- *Culinary training programs to fill restaurant/service industry gaps - Sustainable agriculture training programs*
- *It would be helpful for the community to be able to easily register for a general interest class or two, like for instance, Film and Creative Writing and Literature without having to schedule and meet with an advisor...Also why aren't these types of classes advertised to the community?*
- *Retain the talented staff that are well known and respected in the community, acknowledging their worth and abilities. Protect the safety of all who enter the facilities whether virtually or in person.*
- *Can I sign up for classes on the internet or do I have to contact the college? Best way to improve is responsiveness. Ability to answer calls and ability to return calls.*

### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

The issues related to having a small data set exist for this measure as well. The college may wish to consider forming a series of focus groups, the purpose of which would be to consider each of the topics posed in this report.

- **Tools and Methodology:** Data garnered from responses to Question 4 on the Community Survey.
- **Future Targets:** Review of targets should be conducted with update of assessment methodology.



2019-20

---

# Core Theme B

---

*... transforming lives ...*

**Core Theme B: Transforming Lives – Education**

Scale		5	4	3	2	1		
Objective	Measure	Surpasses Mission Expectation		Meets Mission Expectation		Below Mission Expectation	2019-20 Results	Score
<b>Objective B1:</b> Applying processes that lead to student retention	<b>B1.1</b> Student retention over 3 consecutive terms <sup>1</sup>	<b>66% or more</b> 1-year certificate & 2-year degree-seeking students attending for 3 consecutive terms		<b>46 - 55%</b> 1-year certificate & 2-year degree-seeking students attending for 3 consecutive terms		<b>35% or fewer</b> 1-year certificate & 2-year degree-seeking students attending for 3 consecutive terms	61%	4
	<b>B1.2</b> Percent retention fall term to fall term <sup>1</sup>	<b>50% or more</b> retention of credit students fall term to fall term		<b>40-45%</b> retention of credit students fall term to fall term		<b>35% or fewer</b> retention of credit students fall term to fall term	35%	1
<b>Objective B2:</b> Applying processes that lead to student progress, certificate/degree completion, and/or employment	<b>B2.1</b> Student graduation <sup>1</sup>	<b>18% or more</b> 2-year degree or 1-year certificate seeking students graduating within 150% of time		<b>13% - 15%</b> 2-year degree or 1-year certificate seeking students graduating within 150% of time		<b>10% or fewer</b> 2-year degree or 1-year certificate seeking students graduating within 150% of time	34%	5
	<b>B2.2</b> Student completion – GEDs awarded compared to annual GED enrollment <sup>1</sup>	<b>30% or more</b> GEDs awarded compared to annual enrollment of GED seekers		<b>18-22%</b> GEDs awarded compared to annual enrollment of GED seekers <sup>1</sup>		<b>12% or fewer</b> GEDs awarded compared to annual enrollment of GED seekers	12%	1
	<b>B2.3</b> Student completion – GED sections passed compared to GED sections attempted <sup>1</sup>	<b>91% or more</b> GED sections passed compared to GED sections attempted		<b>80-85%</b> GED sections passed compared to sections attempted		<b>69% or fewer</b> GED sections passed compared to sections attempted	81%	3
	<b>B2.4</b> Student completion- Enrolled in Dev. Ed. Writing who complete <sup>1</sup>	<b>95% or more</b> of students enrolled in Dev. Ed. Writing complete with a “C” or better		<b>75% - 84%</b> of students enrolled in Dev. Ed. Writing complete with a “C” or better		<b>64% or less</b> of students enrolled in Dev. Ed. Writing complete with a “C” or better	77%	3
	<b>B2.5</b> Student completion- Enrolled in Dev. Ed. Math who complete <sup>1</sup>	<b>98% or more</b> of students enrolled in Dev. Ed. Math complete with a “C” or better		<b>78 – 87%</b> of students enrolled in Dev. Ed. Math complete with a “C” or better		<b>67% or less</b> of students enrolled in Dev. Ed. Math complete with a “C” or better	<b>75%</b>	2

	<b>B2.6</b> Students who transfer to upper division institutions. <sup>1</sup>	<b>12% or more</b> of students transfer to upper division institutions		<b>10%</b> of students transfer to upper division institutions		<b>8% or less</b> of students transfer to upper division institutions	14.33%	<b>5</b>
	<b>B2.7</b> Enrollment in second term following transfer to 4-year university <sup>1</sup>	<b>66% or higher</b> Percentage of students enrolling in second term following transfer to 4-year university		<b>46 - 55%</b> Percentage of students enrolling in second term following transfer to 4-year university		<b>35% or lower</b> Percentage of students enrolling in second term following transfer to 4-year university	93%	
	<b>B2.8</b> CTE employment placements <sup>2</sup>	<b>100 or more</b> CTE employment placements		<b>50-79</b> CTE employment placements		<b>30 or fewer</b> CTE employment placements	66	<b>3</b>
<b>Objective B3:</b> Ensuring student proficiency in course, program and institutional student learning outcomes	<b>B3.1</b> Achievement of student learning outcomes at the course level	<b>95% or more</b> students meeting course outcomes		<b>80% - 89%</b> students meeting course outcomes		<b>69% or fewer</b> students meeting course outcomes	<b>90%</b>	<b>4</b>
	<b>B3.2</b> Achievement of student learning outcomes at the degree/certificate/program level	<b>95% or more</b> students meeting degree/certificate/program outcomes		<b>80% - 89%</b> students meeting degree/certificate/program outcomes		<b>69% or fewer</b> students meeting degree/certificate/program outcomes	89%	<b>3</b>
	<b>B3.3</b> Achievement of student learning outcome at the institutional level (Core Learning Outcomes)	<b>95% or more</b> students meeting institutional Core Learning Outcomes		<b>80% - 89%</b> students meeting institutional Core Learning Outcomes		<b>69% or fewer</b> students meeting institutional Core Learning Outcomes	<b>60.97%</b>	<b>1</b>

<sup>1</sup> Disaggregated data for measures available in Narrative Analysis.

<sup>2</sup> Disaggregated data by program available in Narrative Analysis.

Core Theme B Work Group for 2019-20

Academic Assessment – Kristen Kane

GED – Teresa Cummings

Math Department – Pam Morse

Student Services – Mike Taphouse

Writing Department –Jenn Kamrar



# Core Theme B Narrative Analysis

## Objective B1: Applying processes that lead to student retention.

### B1.1 Student retention over 3 consecutive terms

#### Description of results

Data for student retention over 3 consecutive terms for 2019-20 academic year is listed in the table below. This includes all students who enrolled in fall 2017 as a degree-seeking college student and took credit courses in each term.

	Fall, 2019 1 <sup>st</sup> Term	Winter, 2020 2 <sup>nd</sup> Term	Spring, 2020 3 <sup>rd</sup> Term	Fall-to-Spring Retention
Enrolled Headcount	755	580 77%	464 80%	61 %

Current data indicates a 61% rate of retention from fall 2019 to spring 2020. This number demonstrates that CGCC is meeting mission expectations with a score of 4. The data includes all degree seeking students who were enrolled in fall, 2019. (Do we have disaggregated data for this measure Because we are not limiting our cohort to first time, degree seeking students, LBCC is unable to get disaggregate data for our data group.

#### Analysis of Results

Data collected over three consecutive terms indicates a 61.46% rate of retention from fall term to spring term. These numbers indicate that CGCC is meeting mission expectations, with a score of 4. This in an increase from last reporting year's score of 3. The 2019-20 academic year data show a notable increase in retention between fall and winter terms (77%, 2019-20 v. 70%, 2018-19), and from fall to spring retention (61%, 2019-20 v. 55%, 2018-19). Historically, lowest retention rates have occurred between fall and winter terms.

#### Actions for Improvement

CGCC has increased the amount of time and energy toward promotion of student success and retention efforts. One example is the change to a cohort advising model for the CGCC advising team. This allows for a caseload type approach in how advisors provide information to their advisees, and a consistent individual for students to interact with throughout their academic career at CGCC. In addition, the Student Services team created a communication campaign that targeted certain student cohorts at strategic points in each term, to provide them reminders of upcoming events and information in regard to resources available to them. The campaigns included text messages, emails, phone calls, social media, and website announcements. (Is the recommendation that these actions continue?) It is recommended that this plan of action continue in future practices.

## Effectiveness of Assessment

The assessment methods seem to be accurate indicators of retention over three consecutive terms. The data includes all degree seeking students and is an accurate indicator of our student enrollment patterns.

- **Tools and Methodology:** Data provided by contracted resource associated with Linn Benton Community College.
- **Future Targets:** Targets are realistic and should remain the same.

### B1.2 Percent retention fall term to fall term

#### Description of Results

Data for student retention from fall 2019 through fall 2020 includes all students who enrolled in fall 2019 as a degree-seeking college student and returned to enroll in fall 2020.

Table 1	Fall, 2019 1 <sup>st</sup> Term	Fall, 2020 4 <sup>th</sup> Term	Fall-to-Fall Retention
Enrolled Headcount	755	262	35%

Current data indicates a 35% rate of retention from fall 2019 to fall 2020. This number demonstrates that CGCC is not meeting mission expectations, with a score of “1”. These data include all degree seeking students who were enrolled in fall 2019 and fall 2020. Included are students who may not have taken courses winter, spring or summer term(s), but returned in the fall. (Do we have disaggregated data for this measure?) Because we are not limiting our cohort to first time, degree seeking students, LBCC is unable to get disaggregate data for our data group. We could look at going back to featuring that group in the future.

#### Analysis of Results

The current fall-to-fall retention rate of 35% is a slight decrease over last year’s finding of 37%. The findings indicate that we are still not meeting our mission expectation. What the findings don’t reveal is why a majority of CGCC students are not returning for a second year. We still do not have informative data that indicates why a majority of our students are not progressing onto their second year. Further exploration would be recommended.

Looking at data for retention over 5 consecutive terms, Table 2 shows students who were enrolled all 5 terms (fall 2019, winter 2020, spring 2020, summer 2020, fall 2020):

Table 2				
1st Fall, 2019	2nd Winter, 2020	3rd Spring, 2020	4th Summer, 2020	5th Fall, 2020
755	580 (77%)	464 (80%)	121 (26%)	85 (70%)

It should be noted that students who enrolled every term, including summer 2020 (meaning that they did not take a term off) made up 16.44% (85/517) of the fall 2019 cohort, or 32.44% (85/262) of the 2019 cohort that was retained through fall 2020. 67.56% (177/262) of the returning cohort took at least one term off between fall 2019 and fall 2020.

### **Actions for Improvement**

As we move closer to developing and implementing the Guided Pathways (GP) initiative, it is likely that that our completion and retention rates could both see an increase in the future. The GP model emphasizes the importance of the First Year Experience (FYE). As such, admission staff and academic advisors will be developing a strategic onboarding process that will focus on preparing students for navigating their higher education experience. In addition, the CGCC advising team recently implemented a cohort advising model designed to promote more intentional communication campaigns and strategic contact points with students. Lastly, early discussions are currently underway in regard to a proposed milestone recognition initiative that will celebrate/highlight student progression throughout completion of their program of study.

Academic support is being developed to assist students in the completion of gateway courses and accelerating developmental pathways in math and writing. Math faculty are developing co-requisite courses for MTH 105, MTH 111 and MTH 243, taking the place of under 100 level math courses.

### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

As stated above, the assessment methods seem to be accurate indicators of retention over four consecutive terms. The data includes all degree seeking students and is an accurate indicator of our student enrollment patterns.

- **Tools and Methodology:** Data provided by contracted resource associated with Linn Benton Community College.
- **Future Targets:** It has been suggested to adjust the data pool to only include credential seeking students who are enrolled in at least six credits each term of enrollment. Data provided by LBCC indicates that by using this cohort our fall to fall retention rate is currently 60%. What should be discussed is whether this is a better representation of our student population and what should be reflected in our report.

## **Objective B2: Applying processes that lead to student progress, certificate/degree completion, and/or employment**

### **B2.1 Student graduation**

#### **Description of Results**

Of 886 degree-seeking students who enrolled full-time or part-time in CGCC in fall 2016, 297 (33.5%) students were awarded with at least one 2-year degree (AAOT, AAS, AGS, AS, ASOT, 2-year Certificate) or 1-year certificate on or before 12/31/2019. (Do we have disaggregated data?)

Because we are not limiting our cohort to first time, degree seeking students, LBCC is unable to get disaggregate data for our data group. We could look at going back to featuring that group in the future.

### Analysis of Results

Current results indicate that we are far exceeding our mission expectation with regard to graduation rates. The data pool included all degree and certificate seeking students who were awarded within the 150% timeframe. This current approach provides a more accurate and inclusive indication of completion rates for our students.

In comparing CGCC completion rates with other similarly sized Oregon community colleges, our numbers appear to be right in line with comparable institutions.

Institution	% of New Students who Complete an Associate Degree of Certificate, or Transfer to a University Within 4 Years	Average Time to Complete an Associate Degree
CGCC	50%	2.9 years
BMCC	54%	2.7 years
Clatsop CC	47%	3.5 years
KCC	53%	2.8 years

\*Oregon Higher Education Community College Snapshot 2018-2019

### Actions for Improvement

As mentioned previously, CGCC is implementing two new initiatives that have the potential to impact completion rates. The Guided Pathways program emphasizes an aggressive student onboarding process, coupled with more intentional program development and structure. Secondly, the Campus Management SIS that will be implemented in early 2021, is designed to limit students to only enroll in classes that are designated as a requirement for their program of study. This approach can potentially decrease the number of excess credits students complete by limiting their choices to program related courses.

### Effectiveness of Assessment

The method of assessment is an accurate indicator of degree and certificate seeking student graduation/completion rates. It is recommended to view the current data as a baseline for future research. Further research should include comparisons with similar FTE institutions.

- **Tools and Methodology:** Data provided by contracted resource associated with Linn Benton Community College as well as HECC.
- **Future Targets:** Current results indicate that we have been exceeding our mission expectation in this area by a significant amount for the last three years. As such, this group recommends that we raise our mission expectation to an amount that reflects a more meaningful measure of student graduation/completion rates.

## B2.2 Student completion – GEDs awarded compared to annual GED enrollment

### Description of Results:

13 out of 108 federally reportable students complete their GEDs (12%). Disaggregated data of the GED completers:

	GED Student Enrollment (identified as federally reportable)		GED Completions	
<b>Total Cohort</b>	111		13	12.04%
	Number of students in cohort by disaggregated group	Percentage of students by disaggregated group	Number of completions by disaggregated group	Percentage of completions by disaggregated group
<b>Age</b>				
18-24	63	57%	6	46%
25-35	25	22%	4	31%
36+	23	21%	3	3%
<b>Gender</b>				
Female	70	63%	9	69%
Male	40	36%	4	31%
Non-Binary	1	1%		
<b>Low Income <sup>1</sup></b>	40	36%	4	31%
<b>Race / Ethnicity</b>				
American Indian	5	45%		
Hispanic / Latino	46	41%	3*	23%
Mixed Race	4	4%		
Pacific Islander	3	3%		
White	77	69%	12*	92%
Asain	2	2%		
Black or African American	2	2%		
No Race Selected	17	15%		

<sup>1</sup> Low income students are identified as ????. Students are shown a slide that contains the federal poverty table. They self-select low income if their monthly income falls below the federal poverty line for their family size.

(I was uncertain of what these numbers represent, and therefore, was unable to know where/how they fit into the table above or if not.) \* This adds up to more than 100% because of the difference between Race and Ethnicity. The Hispanic/Latino population also sometimes choose White or Native American as their race depending on how much Spanish or Indigenous they have in their familial history. In our system, students have the option of choosing 1 ethnicity, either Hispanic or Latino, or Not Hispanic or Latino. After that, they can choose as many races as they want. The data shows 3 people who chose Hispanic or Latino and 2 of those people also said White as a race. With these 13 people, there were no other races chosen other than white.

Age:—

18-24: 46%

— 25-35: 31%

— 36+: 23%

Low Income Status:

31% low income

Race/Ethnicity:

Hispanic or Latino: 23%

White = 92%

Gender:

— Female: 69%

— Male: 31%

## Analysis of Results

The steep drop in GED completers can be directly linked to the COVID-19 pandemic. Most of the GED completion comes at the end of the program year and due to the pandemic, the majority of testing centers in the state, including ours, were closed. This adversely affected our numbers this year.

## Actions for Improvement

The department has decided to institute rewards for attendance. In addition, there is a plan to set aside funding to help pay for students to travel to distant, but open, testing sites.

## Effectiveness of Assessment

- **Tools and Methodology:** We use the TOPs Pro Enterprise system to track GED completers and to gather demographics information. This is an information system the Title 2 Grant requires us to use. It is extremely effective but does rely on the student accurately answering the questions, so data has a small probability of being skewed. Also, this data only takes into account the students who are federally countable in the 19/20 program year. We had several students who have had contact with our program over the years

receive their GED this year but could not be included in this number because they weren't federally reportable.

- **Future Targets:** We would like this number to increase to 34% in the 20/21 program year.

### B2.3 Student completion – GED sections passed compared to GED sections attempted

#### Description of Results

There were 88 total GED sections attempted **by 37 individual students**. 71 GED sections **passed by 25 individuals** and 17 GED sections **failed by 12 individuals**. Here is the disaggregated data for **the 37 individual students in both groups**.

**GED Section Results including Disaggregated Groups:** (disaggregated numbers don't add up or make sense) This adds up to more than 100% because of the difference between Race and Ethnicity. The Hispanic/Latino population also sometimes choose White or Native American as their race depending on how much Spanish or Indigenous they have in their familial history. In our system, students have the option of choosing 1 ethnicity, either Hispanic or Latino, or Not Hispanic or Latino. After that, they can choose as many races as they want. The data shows 3 people who chose Hispanic or Latino and 2 of those people also said White as a race. With these 13 people, there were no other races chosen other than white.

	GED Sections Passed		GED Sections attempted <i>but Failed</i>		Total GED Sections Attempted	
<b>Total Cohort</b>	71 (25 individual students)		17 (12 individual students)		88 (37 individual students)	
	Number of students in disaggregated group who passed	Percentage of disaggregated group who passed	Number of students in disaggregated group who failed	Percentage of disaggregated group who failed	Number of students in disaggregated group who attempted a test	Percentage of overall students attempting tests
<b>Age</b>						
18-24	16	64%	9	75%	25	68%
25-35	5	20%	2	17%	7	19%
36+	4	16%	1	1%	5	13%
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	16	64%	6	50%	22	59%
Male	9	36%	5	42%	14	38%
Non-Binary	0	0	1	8%	1	3%
<b>Low</b>	9	36%	4	33%	13	35%

<b>Income</b> <sup>1</sup>						
<b>Race / Ethnicity</b> (does ethnicity not add up because people identify in multiple groups?) YES!! Race and ethnicity are 2 different things.						
American Indian	1	4%	1	8%	2	5%
Hispanic / Latino	6	24%	5	42%	11	44%
Mixed Race	1	4%	0	0	1	3%
Pacific Islander	1	4%	1	8%	2	5%
White	21	84%	8	70%	29	78%
<sup>1</sup> Low income students are identified as ??? Students are shown a slide that contains the federal poverty table so they self select low income if they fall below the federal poverty line.						

Age: 18-24: 58%

25-35: 25%

36+: 17%

Low Income Status:

33% low income

Race/Ethnicity:

Hispanic or Latino: 25%

White: 79%

Pacific Islander: 5%

Mixed Race: 5%

Gender: \_\_\_\_\_

Female: 69%

Male: 31%

**GED Sections Attempted:**

Age: 18-24: 75%

25-35: 17%

36+: 8%

Low Income Status:

33% low income

Race/Ethnicity:

Hispanic or Latino: 42%

White: 67%

Pacific Islander: 8%

American Indian: 8%



Gender: \_\_\_\_\_

Female: 50%

\_\_\_\_\_ Male: 42%

\_\_\_\_\_ Non-Binary: 8%

### Analysis of Results

The data clearly shows that the majority of our students who attempt a test, actually pass the test (81%). The disaggregated data shows that our Hispanic or Latino population has a low rate of passing the GED sections vs. their overall share of our student population (they make up 44% of our total population). This was mostly likely exacerbated by the pandemic happening during the end of the school year.

### Actions for Improvement

Look for ways to engage our Hispanic and Latino populations more effectively.

### Effectiveness of Assessment

It is recommended that this section be changed to a similar way that the GED program is evaluated by the Title 2 called Measurable Skills Gains which are evaluated through standardized pre and post testing. This would provide a way to be able to evaluate the entire student population, not just the GED seeking students.

- **Tools and Methodology**

GED Manager website was used to look up each of our student’s attempted test and passed test rates. This tool alone does not give an accurate view of the effectiveness of the GED program because it completely leaves out a subset of students. Those students are the pre-college students who are coming to us to brush up on their skills and NOT to test for the GED.

- **Future Targets:**

If the above recommendation to change the method of assessment is adopted, then the future target the state has set is 45%.

## B2.4 Student completion- Enrolled in Dev. Ed. Writing who complete

### Description of Results

Of last year’s Writing 90 cohort (35 total students), only 8 did not pass (D or lower) – resulting in a 77% pass rate overall, and thus meeting the mission’s expectation for “75-84% of students in Dev Ed writing” completing with a “C” or better. **We only received data on Dev Ed Writing (WR 90). We did not consider asking for data on WR 115 or WR 121 since the criteria is only looking at completion rates for Dev Ed Writing. Incompletes and Passes were not included in the data**

Academic Year	Grade Code	WR 90	WR 115	WR 121	Grand Total
2019-20	A	11			11
	B	8			8
	C	6			6

	D	3			3
	F	5			5
	I				
	P				
	W	2			2
<b>Grand Total</b>		35			35
<b>Students with "C" or Better</b>		25			25

### Analysis of Results

While the overall success of Writing 90 students looks stable (2018-19 had an 82% pass rate), the 2019-2020 cohort was less than half the size of 2018-2019's – allowing for one student's failure to more greatly skew the overall success rate.

It's also clear, through this data, that age plays a significant role in who is successful: our older students. Indeed, students under the age of 20 passed a rate of only 68% – which clearly does not uphold the college's mission statement. Students over the age of 20 passed at a rate of 93%.

Academic Year	Age (group)	Grade Code		%
2019-20	1. Under 20	A-C	13	65%
		Total	22	
	2. 20-24	A-C	6	100%
		Total	6	
3. 25 or Older	A-C	6	86%	
	Total	7		

When you disaggregate who did well and who needed more support, it becomes clear that our students who identify as female need greater support. While 90% of our male-identifying students passed this course, only 57% of our female-identifying students passed – turning the greater trend of female college achievement nationally on its head.

Academic Year	Gender Code	Grade Code		%
2019-20	Female	A-C	9	60
		Total	15	
	Male	A-C	16	89%

		Total	18	
--	--	-------	----	--

??? Since first generation actually did better, she wasn't going to say anything about this group.

Academic Year	First Generation Flag	Grade Code		%
2019-20	N	A-C	9	60%
		Total	15	
	Y	A-C	16	80%
		Total	20	

For low-income students, the disparity – while not as stark as gender – continues: 74% of low-income students pass versus 83% of their peers. (Jenn mixed up the groups so not sure if you want to address the fact that low income students actually did better than their counterparts?) I suggest that as I think Justin mentioned, if there isn't anything problematic or in need of intervention we don't include it.

Academic Year	Low Income Flag	Grade Code		%
2019-20	N	A-C	15	71%
		Total	21	
	Y	A-C	10	83%
		Total	12	

We are, however, doing good work towards equity in race. Data seems to indicate equity in race: 81% of our students of color passed (21 students total), while 71% of our white students passed (14 students total). (Do we have a breakdown for race/ethnicity?) Please see below:

Race/Ethnicity Code	Grade Code	WR 90
American Indian or Alaskan Native	A	1
	Total	1
Asian	A	2
	Total	2
Hispanic/Latino	A	5
	B	3
	C	4
	D	2
	F	1
	Total	15
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	C	1
	Total	1

Two or more races	A	1
	D	1
	Total	2
White	A	2
	B	5
	C	1
	F	4
	W	2
	Total	14
Total		35

### Actions for Improvement

While the 77% overall pass rate does uphold our mission’s definition of success – and far exceeds the 62% pass rate of the national average – it would still be beneficial for students to have more time with their faculty. Writing 90 students could benefit from a number of interventions, but it’s clear from that data that our young, female students need the greatest support. These students – and all of course students, really – could benefit from having a four credit class instead of a three credit class. As they are the most vulnerable writers, giving these students more time to work with their faculty would ideally achieve gains in pass rates. An action for improvement could simply be to to increase the course from three to four credits.

### Effectiveness of Assessment

The effectiveness of the assessment would be improved with more information on which path the student takes to get to Dev. Ed. Writing such as placement testing or moving in from Pre-College writing.

- **Tools and Methodology:** Completion rates for WR 90 are pulled from RogueNet by the institutional researcher at LBCC.
- **Future Targets:** The target of a 75-84% success rate seems appropriate in that it is attainable and at least ten points higher than the national average.

### B2.5 Student completion- Enrolled in Dev. Ed. Math who complete

#### Description of Results

Examining the table below, a total of 249 students were enrolled in Dev Ed math (Math 60, 65, 95, 98) with 187 completing one or more of these courses with a “C” or better. The results indicate a pass rate of 75% in 2019 – 2020 which is 1% lower than the previous academic year and still does not meet mission expectations.

Academic Year	Grade Code	MTH 60	MTH 65	MTH 95	MTH 98	Grand Total
2019-20	A	21	32	38	10	101

	B	8	18	25	1	52
	C	4	9	20	1	34
	D		1	5		6
	F	6	10	11	4	31
	I	1	1			2
	P		3			3
	W	6	5	8	1	20
<b>Grand Total</b>		46	79	107	17	249
<b>Students with "C" or Better</b>		33 (71.74%)	59 (74.68%)	83 (77.57%)	12 (70.59%)	187 (75.10%)

### Analysis of Results

This past academic year saw Covid-19 shut down on-campus classes for Spring term and abruptly ended many courses Winter term. This may have had an impact on the overall passing rate and the number of students taking classes. There were more withdrawals and non-completions Spring term than in previous terms. Numerous students indicated that the synchronous form of instruction made learning difficult. They were not prepared for that form of instruction and many had issues with computers and internet access.

Delving deeper into the data and looking at different sectors of the student population showed some interesting figures. Older students (25 and older) had an 83% success rate while in comparison to the other groups (under 20, 20-24). Each had a success rate of 70% and 68% respectively.

Academic Year	Age (group)	Grade Code		%
2019-20	1. Under 20	A-C	67	70%
		Total	95	
	2. 20-24	A-C	34	68%
		Total	50	
	3. 25 or Older	A-C	86	83%
		Total	104	

Comparing gender 77% of the females passed compared to 74% of the male population. There were almost twice as many females as males, (163 to 86) who took Math 60 through 98, the difference in passing rate was not significant.

Academic Year	Gender Code	Grade Code		%
2019-20	Female	A-C	123	75%
		Total	163	
	Male	A-C	64	74%
		Total	86	

Looking at the difference between students who were and were not first-generation college students, non-first generation had a 5% higher passing rate. In review other than income there is not a significant difference in passing rates.

Academic Year	First Generation Flag	Grade Code		%
2019-20	N	A-C	115	77%
		Total	150	
	Y	A-C	72	73%
		Total	99	

The largest disparity in passing rates came when analyzing the inequality in income. Those who identified as low income only had a passing rate of 68% compared to 79% of those who would be considered in the higher bracket.

Academic Year	Low Income Flag	Grade Code		%
2019-20	N	A-C	123	79%
		Total	154	
	Y	A-C	65	68%
		Total	95	

*(Do we have any data for race/ethnicity?) Yes, please see below: When I asked Pam about it, she said that she didn't have not much to say. "25% of white students either got a D,F, or withdrew... as for the others, how do you do anything when you have 1 student or just a couple that identify as 2 or more. I don't think this particular data tells us much, other than whites can afford to drop".*

Academic Year	Race/Ethnicity Code	Grade Code	MTH 60	MTH 65	MTH 95	MTH 98	Grand Total	
2019-20	American Indian or Alaskan Native	A		1			1	17%
		B		1	1		2	33%
		C			1		1	17%
		F			2		2	33%
		Total		2	4		6	100%

	Pass	#DIV/0			#DIV/0		
		!	100%	50%	!		
	Fail	#DIV/0			#DIV/0		
		!	0%	50%	!		
	I/W						
		#DIV/0			#DIV/0		
		!	100%	100%	!	0%	
Asian	A			1	1	100%	
	Total			1	1		
	Pass	#DIV/0	#DIV/0		#DIV/0		
		!	!	100%	!	100%	
	Fail						
	I/W						
		#DIV/0	#DIV/0		#DIV/0		
		!	!	100%	!	100%	
Black or African American	A			1	1	100%	
	Total			1	1		
	Pass			100%			
	Fail						
	I/W						
Hispanic/Latino	A	10	14	13	2	39	39%
	B	5	8	8		21	21%
	C	2	6	10	1	19	19%
	D		1	2		3	3%
	F	4	4	3	1	12	12%
	I		1			1	1%
	W	2	1	2	1	6	6%
	Total	23	35	38	5	101	100%
	Pass	74%	80%	82%	60%	78%	
	Fail	17%	14%	13%	20%	15%	
	I/W	9%	6%	5%	20%	7%	
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	A			1	1	1	25%
	C	1				1	25%
	F		1			1	25%
	I	1				1	25%
	Total	2	1	1		4	100%
	Pass				#DIV/0		
		50%	0%	100%	!	50%	
	Fail				#DIV/0		
		0%	100%	0%	!	25%	
	I/W				#DIV/0		
		50%	0%	0%	!	25%	

		100%	100%	100%	#DIV/O !	100%	
Two or more races	A		2	1		3	20%
	B		2	2		4	27%
	C			3		3	20%
	D			1		1	7%
	F	1			1	2	13%
	W	1		1		2	13%
	Total	2	4	8	1	15	100%
	Pass	0%	100%	75%	0%	67%	
	Fail	50%	0%	13%	100%	20%	
	I/W	50%	0%	13%	0%	13%	
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Unknown	A	1				1	25%
	B		1			1	25%
	C			1		1	25%
	F			1		1	25%
	Total	1	1	2		4	100%
	Pass				#DIV/O !		
Fail	100%	100%	50%	#DIV/O !	75%		
I/W	0%	0%	50%	#DIV/O !	25%		
		100%	100%	100%	#DIV/O !	100%	
White	A	10	15	21	8	54	46%
	B	3	6	14	1	24	21%
	C	1	3	5		9	8%
	D			2		2	2%
	F	1	5	5	2	13	11%
	P		3			3	3%
	W	3	4	5		12	10%
	Total	18	36	52	11	117	100%
	Total	46	79	107	17	249	
	Pass	78%	75%	77%	82%	77%	
Fail	6%	14%	13%	18%	13%		
I/W	17%	11%	10%	0%	10%		
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Grand Total	46	79	107	17	249		



## Actions for Improvement

While economic disparity may be out of the control of the math department, the fact that this disparity seems to exist may be important in how the department approaches dev ed and the move to corequisites. There is currently a state initiative to create co-requisite classes (Math 105 Math in Society, Math 111 College Algebra, and Math 243 Statistics) to be implemented fall term 2021. These co-req courses should give students the tools to be successful in college level courses in lieu of taking dev ed math. There will also be a program review during the 20-21 academic year. This will give the department an opportunity to review outcomes and assessment strategies that may need to be updated. Ideally, these new approaches should be aimed, in part, at narrowing a possible ses-achievement gap.

## Effectiveness of Assessment

As stated in past years, the effectiveness of the assessment would be improved with more information on which path the student takes to get to Dev. Ed. Math such as placement testing or moving in from Pre-College math. In order to further focus actions for improvement, it may be helpful to see income levels within each age range.

- **Tools and Methodology:** Completion rates for Dev Ed Math are pulled from RogueNet by the institutional researcher at LBCC.
- **Future Targets:** The cut-off target of 78% for meeting mission expectations should remain the same. As recommended last year, the cut-off target of 98% for Surpassing Mission may want to be re-evaluated as that pass rate seems high. A 95% cut-off rate is more realistic for Surpassing Mission.

## B2.6 Students who transfer to Oregon University System

### Description of Results

Within 886 degree-seeking students who enrolled in CGCC in Fall 2016, 14.33% students had at least one transfer record to a 4-year Oregon university on or before 12/31/2019 (completed within 150% timeframe of enrolling Fall 2016).

### Analysis of Results

Current findings (14.33%) indicate that CGCC has surpassed mission expectations. Though currently this percentage appears high, it is recommended that CGCC re-evaluate whether this percentage is an acceptable target or if the ranges should be adjusted to reflect a more ambitious objective. The table below further breaks down the number of CGCC students who transfer with or without a degree, and how many transfer out of state.

Transfer / College State (group)				
	Y		N	Grand Total
Degree Awarded	Oregon	Out of State	Null	
Y	70	31	196	297

	7.90%	3.50%	22.12%	33.52%
N	57 6.43%	52 5.87%	480 54.18%	589 66.48%
Grand Total	127 14.33%	83 9.37%	676 76.30%	886 100.00%

### Actions for Improvement

Based on results, no actions for improvement are recommended at this time.

### Effectiveness of Assessment

The method of assessment is an accurate indicator of the percentage of CGCC degree seeking students who transferred on to a four-year Oregon university.

- **Tools and Methodology:** Data provided by contracted resource associated with Linn Benton Community College.
- **Future Targets:** Future reports could include a comparison with other Oregon community colleges with regard to transfer patterns and whether our numbers are acceptable, or are we aiming to low with our targets. It could also include information about where our students are transferring to and how we could strengthen our partnerships with institutions where a high number of CGCC students are transferring to.

## B2.7 Enrollment in second term following transfer to 4-year university

### Description of Results

Following the 894 degree-seeking students who enrolled in CGCC in Fall 2015 (enrolled at least one credit hour, no Dropped, no Audit, and no Withdraw) as reported from 2019-20 Core Theme B2.6, the data was cleaned up by the IR to remove IDs that have only high school program records, leaving 856 degree seeking students. Within these 856 students, 100 of them have received at least one CGCC degree/certificate within 150% timeframe of enrolling Fall 2015 and have at least one transfer record to a 4-year institution as of 12/31/2018; 114 of the students did not receive any degrees/certificates from CGCC within 150% timeframe but did have at least one transfer record as of 12/31/2018. Of these 214 students with transfer records, 199 (93%) are reported as continuing to the second term. Students who have an enrollment record at any 4-year institution, before they have been awarded by CGCC, are counted in this calculation.

Breaking down the data by First Generation, we see that 33% (5/15) of students who didn't continue to the second term were reported as first generation.

CGCC First Generation			
First Generation College Student	Continue to Second Term	Not Continue to Second Term	Grand Total

Y	43	5	48
N	156	10	166
Grand Total	199	15	214

20% (3/15) of students who did not continue during the second term were reported as low income.

CGCC Low Income			
Low Income	Continue to Second Term	Not Continue to Second Term	Grand Total
Y	35	3	38
N	164	12	176
Grand Total	199	15	214

Disaggregating the data by gender, 87% (13/15) of students who are reported as not continuing the second term were female. Looking at the data by ethnicity, Hispanic, Asian, Multirace, and Native American/American Indian each have 1 student (or .07%) who did not continue to the second term, with Whites making up 73% (11/15) students who did not return. Age seemed to have some significance with students who were 18-24 making up the majority of students who did not return for a second term at 60% (9/15), followed by 25-39 year olds at 27% (4/15) and 40 and above at 13% (2/15). Delving down deeper white females between the ages of 18-24 seem to be the students struggling to make it to the second term, at 33% (5/15).

CGCC Age, Gender, Race/Ethnicity						
Age Group	Race/Ethnicity	Continue to Second Term		Not Continue to Second Term		Grand Total
		Female	Male	Female	Male	
18-24	Hispanic	14 (11.20%)	7 (9.46%)	1 (7.96%)		22 (10.28%)
	American Indian / Native American	1 (0.80%)				1 (0.47%)
	Asian	1 (0.80%)	2 (2.70%)	1 (7.69%)		4 (1.87%)
	Multirace	8 (6.40%)	7 (9.46%)	1 (7.69%)		16 (7.48%)
	White	54 (43.20%)	32 (43.24%)	5 (38.46%)	1 (50.00%)	92 (42.99%)
	Unknown/Not		1			1

	Reported		(1.35%)			(0.47%)
25-39	Hispanic		3 (4.05%)			3 (1.40%)
	American Indian / Native American	2 (1.60%)	2 (2.70%)	1 (7.69%)		5 (2.34%)
	Asian	1 (0.80%)				1 (0.47%)
	African American		1 (1.35%)			1 (0.47%)
	Pacific Islander/ Native Hawaiian	1 (0.80%)				1 (0.47%)
	Multirace	4 (3.20%)	1 (1.35%)			5 (2.34%)
	White	33 (26.40%)	13 (17.57%)	2 (15.38%)	1 (50.00%)	49 (22.90%)
	Unknown/Not Reported	1 (0.80%)	1 (1.35%)			2 (0.93%)
40 and above	Multirace	1 (0.80%)				1 (0.47%)
	White	4 (3.20%)	3 (4.05%)	2 (15.38%)		9 (4.21%)
	Unknown/Not Reported		1 (1.35%)			1 (0.47%)
Grand Total		125 (100.00%)	74 (100.00%)	13 (100.00%)	2 (100.00%)	214 (100.00%)

### Analysis of Results

Although targets have yet to be set for B2.7, with 93% of CGCC's students reported as enrolled in second term following transfer to 4-year university it appears that CGCC is most likely exceeding any targets set for meeting mission. Looking at a comparison with Clatsop Community College, an Oregon school of a similar size we see that CGCC exceeds Clatsop's reported enrollment in a second term following transfer to a 4-year university (171/197 or 87%) by 6%.

In disaggregating the data, it's important to consider the number of students when looking at the percentage. For example when looking at income levels, although those low-income students who

did not progress to the second term at a university represented 20% of the students who did not progress, the actual number is quite small, 3 out of 15 students who did not progress. First generation and veteran status did not seem to have an impact on student retention into the second term either. Perhaps the population that stands out the most in the challenge of progressing to the second term when transferring to a 4 year institution are white females between the ages of 18-24 at 33% (5/15).

### **Actions for Improvement**

No actions for improvement are recommended at this time. A 93% rate of retention to the second term after transferring to a 4 year institution seems to be an acceptable rate. With 15 out of 214 students not succeeding to the second term, it's difficult to determine what actions CGCC should be taking. So many factors affect student retention, that 7% of students not enrolling for a second term may have nothing to do with how well CGCC prepared them for university. If any actions might be considered it would be to focus on white females between the ages of 18-24, since this population makes up 33% of those students who do succeed to the second term. One thing to consider is that the data for "age" is the age they first enrolled in any 4-year institution, so these females are fairly young when transferring to university. There may be some programs at universities that are specific to this population, and these students might benefit from encouragement to make connections with these programs.

### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

Looking at student retention up to the second term of transferring to a 4 year institution is an effective way to measure whether CGCC is preparing its students to progress to the next level of education. Although so many factors affect retention, looking at retention to the second term enables CGCC to know that they at least have good standing after their first term of transferring to a university. Any time frame beyond the second term may be more indicative of their success under the new university system.

- **Tools and Methodology:** The data was provided by the Institutional Researchers contracted from Linn Benton Community College.
- **Future Targets:** Since this methodology is still new, targets for retention rates of students who transferred to a 4 year university have not been previously made. Similar data from Fall 2012-2014 should be reviewed as well as comparing CGCC's data with a similarly sized school (Clatsop Community College) in setting targets.

## **B2.8 CTE employment placements**

### **Description of Results**

CGCC cannot currently obtain data for CTE employment placements, as neither the institution nor the state have a reliable system to track employment placements of students.

The numbers below come from the Health Occupations dean and lead instructors for the Medical Assisting, EM-Tech and Early Childhood Education programs. All of the data is anecdotal, and as a result, some of the numbers such as EM-Tech may be incomplete. Missing from the list are student employment rates for the following CTE programs: Business and Computer Applications/Web Technology (CAWT). A variety of issues make it difficult to track student employment data: for some programs, such as Business, faculty have difficulty identifying which students are in the program, since courses linked to the program are open to all students. When a program doesn't have a lead instructor, such as CAWT, no one tracks employment rates for program graduates. There is often a disconnect between faculty teaching program courses, identifying students with declared majors and identifying those students who may be graduating and seeking employment.

2018-19 numbers are used to measure CTE employment rates, giving students a year after graduation to take licensing exams and find employment. By spring of 2018-19 a total of 81 students graduated from Nursing, MA, EM-Tech, ECE, Business and CA/WT programs. No students are reported as graduating from the Manufacturing program.

26 out of 27 Nursing graduates passed their licensing exam and are reported as employed. The one graduate who did not pass the licensing exam is reported as currently employed as an LPN and is included in the percentage of graduates employed from the Nursing program, bringing the rate of employment for graduates of this program to 100%

14 out of 15 Medical Assisting graduates have passed their licensing exam and are reported as employed, bringing the employment percentage to 93% for that program. Disaggregated data does not point to any outstanding issues. All students in the program were female, and there does not seem to be any discrepancy with regards to ethnicity. Age may have played a factor with the one student, since she was the only student in the 40 and above category among a cohort with an average age of 26.

EM-Tech had a total of 19 graduates, with 5 returning to CGCC (most likely to complete their degree after graduating with a certificate) and 3 transferring to another 2-year or 4-year school. The rate of 100% employment for EM-Tech graduates is based on the assumption that the 8 who returned to school after earning their certificate should not be counted as "unemployed", leaving 11 graduates, all of whom are employed\*

The 9 ECE students who did return to CGCC or transferred to another 2-year school were included in the total employed since, according to the lead faculty for that program, most ECE students attend part-time, often working in the field after completing their certificate and working on their degree. All 14 graduates (including those who returned to complete their degree) are reported as working, providing for a 100% employment rate for that program.

BA and CAWT had 4 and 2 graduates respectively. As mentioned above faculty cannot currently track employment of their graduates for a variety of reasons. Those 6 students were not included in the total of graduates when the percentage of graduates employed was calculated.

Of the 81 graduating students, 67 were counted in the percentage for employment (27 Nursing + 15 MA + 11 EM-Tech (returning/transferring students not included) + 14 ECE). Of those students 66

found employment, meeting CGCC mission expectations for B2.8. The percentage of CTE graduates who found employment is 98.5%.

**Table B2.8**

Program	2018-19 Graduates	Reported as Passing Licensing Exam	Reported as Employed	Reported as Returned to CGCC	Reported as Transferred to 2 or 4-year college	% of Graduates Employed
Nursing	27	26	27	0	8	100%
Medical Assisting	15	14	14	0	0	93%
Electro-Mechanical Technology	19	N/A	11	5	3	100% *
Early Childhood Education	14	N/A	14	8 (employed)	1 (employed)	100%
Accounting / Entrepreneurship	4	N/A	Not Available	2	0	N/A
Computer Apps / Web Technologies	2	N/A	Not Available	0	0	N/A
Manufacturing	0	N/A	N/A	0	0	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>81 **</b>	<b>40/42</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>98.5% 66/67</b>

\* ??? See paragraph about EM-Tech calculations

\*\* 67 included in calculation of employment percentage

### Analysis of Results

Sixty-six CTE graduates reported employment, placing CGCC at mission fulfillment. Considering that employment rates are not tracked for 2 out of 6 programs, it's probable that more students from one of the CTE programs not gathering student employment rate data have found employment and that CGCC is actually exceeding its mission. As in the past, it's difficult to provide an analysis of what this number means because the numbers are incomplete and anecdotal. Also, using a number to determine whether we are meeting mission expectation seems random. It might be better to use a percentage, as this puts that number in context with the number of graduates. Stating that 98.5% of our graduates found employment seems to carry more significance than stating that sixty-six graduates found employment.

Some students for programs such as ECE, EM-Tech and Accounting were reported twice for graduation because they graduated with both a certificate and a degree. They were only counted once in the above table. As stated under Description of Results, there was difficulty in sorting some of the data, due to the fact that some students graduate with certificates and return to obtain degrees. Some of these students (EM-Tech) are not included in the totals considered “unemployed” because their educational goals had yet to be met. Other students (ECE) are included since the nature of their program allows for part-time studies combined with employment. Some students, such as the Nursing student who did not pass the licensure exam, still found employment, however as an LPN instead of an RN, which may not have fulfilled her educational and career goal.

### **Actions for Improvement**

Without some kind of alumni tracking system, we will not be able to obtain CTE employment placements. As a result, it is difficult to make recommendations for improvements based on tenuous data.

### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

While it's obvious that CGCC does not currently have a method of tracking CTE student employment, a few questions continue to arise. It's unclear whether CGCC would like to track student employment in general or employment in a career connected to a student's degree/certificate. If a student finds employment, even if they are considered underemployed, would this be considered moving towards meeting mission expectations? When a student graduates from a program with a certificate, but returns to school to pursue a degree either in a related field or unrelated field, how should these students be reflected in the data? Lastly, one of the difficulties with these criteria is that student employment may be impacted by so many factors such as lack of employment in this region in higher end careers.

- **Tools and Methodology:** The data for graduates who returned to CGCC was provided by the Institutional Researchers contracted from Linn Benton Community College. Health Occupations and CTE department reported student employment numbers, which are anecdotal and incomplete.
- **Future Targets:** It is difficult to determine whether targets are realistic or whether future targets need to be reconsidered since data for CTE student employment placements is anecdotal, incomplete or questionable. At the very least, it is recommended that CGCC consider a percentage of employed graduates as a measure of whether we are meeting our mission of applying the processes that lead to student success and employment, as employment numbers when not compared to number of graduates do not provide context.



## **Objective B3: Ensuring student proficiency in course, program and institutional student learning outcomes**

### **B3.1 Achievement of student learning outcomes at the course level**

#### **Description of Results**

Results from course level outcomes assessment indicate that 90.6% of CGCC students are achieving instructor-identified levels of accomplishment of their student learning outcomes. A total of 49 assessments of course outcomes were completed with 799 students (may be duplicated) assessed over the academic year (three outcomes per course). The results from course outcomes assessment indicate that CGCC is surpassing its mission with a score of 4 on the rubric.

#### **Analysis of Results**

All instructors are required to complete a course outcomes assessment each year. With an 86% completion rate of course outcomes assessment by instructors in 2019-20, these numbers provide a broad range of student achievement of course level SLOs, as these results incorporate all departments. With the majority of instructors indicating that they are using direct measures to determine whether students are achieving course level outcomes, an average of 90.6% of students achieving course learning outcomes indicates that CGCC is surpassing its mission for B3.1. Data indicates that 2019-20 had the highest rate of student achievement of course outcomes compared over five years, with data showing that student achievement of course outcomes while always relatively high, has previously stayed within the 87% to 89% range.

One difference in 2019-20 from past years, is the relatively few courses that were assessed in spring term. During spring term CGCC campuses were closed to students and faculty as a result of the coronavirus (Covid-19) pandemic. All spring term courses moved to remote delivery. Spring term was reduced to 10 weeks to provide instructors an extra week prior to the start of term to prepare and adjust courses for remote learning. The director of curriculum, assessment, strategic planning & accreditation, and the academic assessment coordinator decided that the assessment of course outcomes for spring term would be optional in an effort to allow instructors to focus on delivery of their courses and supporting students. As a result, only one instructor completed course outcomes assessment in spring term. The option to opt out of course outcomes assessment in spring term may explain the reduced numbers of courses assessed (ranging from 75 to 97 between fall of 2015 and spring of 2019) and the decrease in numbers of students typically assessed over the year (ranging from 1105 to 1667 between fall of 2015 and spring of 2019)

#### **Actions for Improvement**

Instructors suggested the following actions for improvement in their course outcomes assessment reports:

- Changes to improve instruction ([EC 201](#), [ECE 221](#), [ESR 171](#), [FN 225](#), [GS 108](#), [PC - Math I & II](#), [PC - Reading & Writing I](#), [PC - Reading & Writing I & II](#), [NRS 222](#), [PSY 201A](#), [SPA 101](#)),
- Changes to curriculum ([MTH 243](#), [OS 131](#)),
- Improving instructional materials, resources and/or activities for students ([ATH 103](#), [BA 226](#), [CG 209](#), [ENG 202](#), [ESOL - Level 1-2\\*](#), [PC - Reading & Writing II](#), [MP 111](#), [PSY 201A](#), [SAF 188](#), [SOC 205](#), [WR 227](#))
- Improving student activities ([PSY 214](#))
- Improving instructor-student and/or student-student interaction to better support student achievement of outcomes ([MTH 65](#), [MTH 65](#), [ENG 253](#), [PSY 201A](#), [RD 90](#)),
- Changes in format of course (delivery)([ECE 224](#), [WR 241](#))
- Changes in assessment methods (or clarifying methods of assessment) ([ECE 224](#), [ESOL - Level 1-2](#) , [HPE 295](#), [MTH 251](#), [NRS 221](#), [PSY 202A](#)),
- Clarifying expectations: ([ENG 253](#)),
- Changes/improvements to course design ([CAS 104\\*](#), [COMM 140](#), [MTH 251](#), [OS 280G](#), [OS 131](#), [PC - Math I](#), [SAF 188](#), [WR 115](#), [WR 227](#))

\*COA is not available on the web due to less than 7 students (per Administrative Rule 010.030.000 – Data Publishing) – please contact [kkane@cgcc.edu](mailto:kkane@cgcc.edu) for more information about this COA

### Effectiveness of Assessment

Results from course outcomes assessment provide an accurate measure of student achievement of SLOs at the course level. One issue with the method of assessment is the inability to disaggregate the data to show any disparities in achievement of course level outcomes. As a result, there may be some populations of students who are not achieving course level outcomes at the rate expected to meet CGCC’s mission.

- **Tools and Methodology:** Instructors reported student achievement of instructor-identified levels of accomplishment of SLOs using direct measures of assessment.
- **Future Targets:** The targets are realistic and it is recommended that they stay the same. It may be unrealistic to expect larger numbers of students to achieve SLO without questioning the inflation of grading.

### B3.2 Achievement of student learning outcomes at the degree/ certificate/program level

#### Description of Results

Assessment of student achievement of outcomes were completed separately for each degree, certificate and program, then combined to reach the one number of 89.3% for all degrees, certificates and programs, meeting mission expectations. This percentage reflects a total of 55,438

student assessments at the degree, certificate and program level, with a total of 49,517 successfully achieving those outcomes.

Three different assessment models were used to determine whether students achieved degree, certificate or program outcomes: 1) end of term grades for courses that have been mapped to specific degree and certificate outcomes and are aggregated and measured against set targets; 2) specific course assignments that were mapped to given degree/certificate outcomes, with targets set for grade achievement and 3) external evaluators assessed student performance using a rubric that aligns with outcomes, then compared to set targets.

Of the 113 degree, certificate, program outcomes assessed, 109 or 96% of those had a student achievement rate 80% or higher for the outcome (meeting or exceeding mission expectations).

Results for each degree, certificate and program can be found on the [Completed Degree, Certificate and Program Outcomes Assessments](#) webpage.

Table 1. Achievement of student learning outcomes by degree, certificate and program

Degree/Certificate/Program	Number of Students Assessed	Number of Students Achieving Outcomes	Percentage of Students who Achieved Outcomes	Measurement of Student Achievement of Outcomes
Total from all Degrees/Certificates/ Programs	55,438	49,517	89.3%	
Transfer and General Degrees	52,041	46,853	90.0%	
Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer	17,899	15,946	89.1%	End of Term Grades
AAOT Outcome 1A	167	160	95.8%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AAOT Outcome 1B	956	851	89.0%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AAOT Outcome 2A	245	233	95.1%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AAOT Outcome 3A	656	585	89.2%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AAOT Outcome 3B	547	483	88.3%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AAOT Outcome 4A	876	776	88.6%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AAOT Outcome 4B	532	467	87.8%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AAOT Outcome 4C	261	231	88.5%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AAOT Outcome 5A	468	443	94.7%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AAOT Outcome 5B	824	769	93.3%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AAOT Outcome 6A	1,377	1,237	89.8%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AAOT Outcome 6B	965	869	90.1%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AAOT Outcome 6C	382	339	88.7%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AAOT Outcome 7A	1,572	1,418	90.2%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AAOT Outcome 7B	712	632	88.8%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AAOT Outcome 7C	1,267	1,112	87.8%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AAOT Outcome 8A	1,441	1,263	87.6%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AAOT Outcome 8B	1,264	1,105	87.4%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AAOT Outcome 8C	1,290	1,128	87.4%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AAOT Outcome 8D	1,376	1,208	87.8%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AAOT Outcome 8E	721	637	88.3%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
Associate of Science Oregon Transfer - Business	11,046	10,002	90.5%	End of Term Grades
ASOT - BUS Outcome 1	3,332	3,014	90.5%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
ASOT - BUS Outcome 2	3,446	3,112	90.3%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
ASOT - BUS Outcome 3	890	798	89.7%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
ASOT - BUS Outcome 4	1,658	1,522	91.8%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
ASOT - BUS Outcome 5	1,672	1,516	90.7%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
Associate of Science Oregon Transfer - Computer Science	24	20	83.3%	Assignments
ASOT - CS Outcome 1	5	5	100.0%	CS161 Final Project
ASOT - CS Outcome 2	5	4	80.0%	CS260 Linear Data Assignment
ASOT - CS Outcome 3	11	9	81.8%	CS160 Midterm Research Paper
ASOT - CS Outcome 4	3	2	67%	CS162 Final Project
Associate of Science	10,996	9,962	90.6%	End of Term Grades
AS Outcome 1	3,332	3,014	90.5%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AS Outcome 2	3,446	3,112	90.3%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AS Outcome 3	890	798	89.7%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AS Outcome 4	1,658	1,522	91.8%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AS Outcome 5	1,670	1,516	90.8%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
Associate of General Studies	12,124	10,963	90.4%	End of Term Grades
AGS Outcome 1	3,332	3,014	90.5%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AGS Outcome 2	3,446	3,112	90.3%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AGS Outcome 3	890	798	89.7%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AGS Outcome 4	1,658	1,522	91.8%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AGS Outcome 5	1,672	1,516	90.7%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades
AGS Outcome 6	1,126	1,001	88.9%	Students earning a C or better from end of term grades

Business	628	565	90%	
<b>Associate of Applied Science in Accounting</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>91.2%</b>	<b>End of Term Grades</b>
Outcome 1	18	18	100.0%	End of Term Grades
Outcome 2	26	24	92.3%	End of Term Grades
Outcome 3	29	25	86.2%	End of Term Grades
Outcome 4	38	35	92.1%	End of Term Grades
Outcome 5	14	12	85.7%	End of Term Grades
<b>Associate of Applied Science in Entrepreneurship-S</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>89.6%</b>	<b>End of Term Grades</b>
Outcome 1	47	42	89.4%	End of Term Grades
Outcome 2	41	36	87.8%	End of Term Grades
Outcome 3	45	40	88.9%	End of Term Grades
Outcome 4	31	28	90.3%	End of Term Grades
Outcome 5	16	15	93.8%	End of Term Grades
Outcome 6	51	46	90.2%	
<b>Accounting/Bookkeeping Certificate</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>88.5%</b>	<b>End of Term Grades</b>
Outcome 1	18	18	100.0%	End of Term Grades
Outcome 2	21	19	90.5%	End of Term Grades
Outcome 3	15	13	86.7%	End of Term Grades
Outcome 4	36	30	83.3%	End of Term Grades
Outcome 5	6	5	83.3%	End of Term Grades
<b>Entrepreneurship Certificate</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>90.3%</b>	<b>End of Term Grades</b>
Outcome 1	49	43	87.8%	End of Term Grades
Outcome 2	51	46	90.2%	End of Term Grades
Outcome 3	27	24	88.9%	End of Term Grades
Outcome 4	22	22	100.0%	End of Term Grades
Outcome 5	27	24	88.9%	End of Term Grades
<b>Computer Applications and Office Systems</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>99.2%</b>	
<b>Associate of Applied Science Administrative Assista</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>98.4%</b>	<b>Assignments</b>
Outcome 1	22	21	95.5%	Assignments
Outcome 2	5	5	100.0%	Assignments
Outcome 3	9	9	100.0%	Assignments
Outcome 4	3	3	100.0%	Assignments
Outcome 5	8	8	100.0%	Assignments
Outcome 6	5	5	100.0%	Assignments
Outcome 7	3	3	100.0%	Assignments
Outcome 8	3	3	100.0%	Assignments
Outcome 9	5	5	100.0%	Assignments
<b>Associate of Applied Science Administrative Office</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>Assignments</b>
Outcome 1	17	17	100.0%	Assignments
Outcome 2	3	3	100.0%	Assignments
Outcome 3	3	3	100.0%	Assignments
Outcome 4	3	3	100.0%	Assignments
Outcome 5	3	3	100.0%	Assignments
Outcome 6	12	12	100.0%	Assignments
<b>Administrative Assistant Certificate</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>Assignments</b>
Outcome 1	9	9	100.0%	Assignments
Outcome 2	7	7	100.0%	Assignments
Outcome 3	5	5	100.0%	Assignments

Early Childhood Education and Family Studies	28	28	100.0%	
Early Childhood Education and Family Studies Degree				
Outcome 1	4	4	100.0%	Practicum Portfolio
Outcome 2	4	4	100.0%	Practicum Portfolio
Outcome 3	4	4	100.0%	Practicum Portfolio
Outcome 4	4	4	100.0%	Practicum Portfolio
Outcome 5	4	4	100.0%	Practicum Portfolio
Outcomes 6	4	4	100.0%	Practicum Portfolio
Outcome 7	4	4	100.0%	Practicum Portfolio
Nursing and Health Occupations	1,720	1,500	87.2%	
Associate of Applied Science in Nursing (RN)	1,320	1,310	99.2%	Competency-Based Outcomes (NRS 221, NRS 222, NRS224), NCLEX Performance, Casctone/Casa Study, Portfolio
Outcome 1	132	131	99.2%	Competency-Based Outcomes (NRS 221, NRS 222, NRS224), NCLEX Performance, Casctone/Casa Study, Portfolio
Outcome 2	132	131	99.2%	Competency-Based Outcomes (NRS 221, NRS 222, NRS224), NCLEX Performance, Casctone/Casa Study, Portfolio
Outcome 3	132	131	99.2%	Competency-Based Outcomes (NRS 221, NRS 222, NRS224), NCLEX Performance, Casctone/Casa Study, Portfolio
Outcome 4	132	131	99.2%	Competency-Based Outcomes (NRS 221, NRS 222, NRS224), NCLEX Performance, Casctone/Casa Study, Portfolio
Outcome 5	132	131	99.2%	Competency-Based Outcomes (NRS 221, NRS 222, NRS224), NCLEX Performance, Casctone/Casa Study, Portfolio
Outcome 6	132	131	99.2%	Competency-Based Outcomes (NRS 221, NRS 222, NRS224), NCLEX Performance, Casctone/Casa Study, Portfolio
Outcome 7	132	131	99.2%	Competency-Based Outcomes (NRS 221, NRS 222, NRS224), NCLEX Performance, Casctone/Casa Study, Portfolio
Outcome 8	132	131	99.2%	Competency-Based Outcomes (NRS 221, NRS 222, NRS224), NCLEX Performance, Casctone/Casa Study, Portfolio
Outcome 9	132	131	99.2%	Competency-Based Outcomes (NRS 221, NRS 222, NRS224), NCLEX Performance, Casctone/Casa Study, Portfolio
Outcome 10	132	131	99.2%	Competency-Based Outcomes (NRS 221, NRS 222, NRS224), NCLEX Performance, Casctone/Casa Study, Portfolio
Medical Assisting Certificate	210	190	90.5%	MA270 Administrative Evaluation Student Tool (Clinical Evaluation and Administrative Evaluation); Externship Rating
Outcome 1	42	38	90.5%	MA270 Administrative Evaluation Student Tool (Clinical Evaluation and Administrative Evaluation); Externship Rating
Outcome 2	42	38	90.5%	MA270 Administrative Evaluation Student Tool (Clinical Evaluation and Administrative Evaluation); Externship Rating
Outcome 3	42	38	90.5%	MA270 Administrative Evaluation Student Tool (Clinical Evaluation and Administrative Evaluation); Externship Rating
Outcome 4	42	38	90.5%	MA270 Administrative Evaluation Student Tool (Clinical Evaluation and Administrative Evaluation); Externship Rating
Outcome 5	42	38	90.5%	MA270 Administrative Evaluation Student Tool (Clinical Evaluation and Administrative Evaluation); Externship Rating
Electro-Mechanical Technology	244	235	91.6%	
Associate of Applied Science in Electro-Mechanical	107	98	91.6%	EET 122 and RET 223 Final Performance Assessments and Labs
Outcome 1	11	11	100.0%	EET 273 Final Performance Assessments and Labs
Outcome 2	36	36	100.0%	EET 273 and MEC 123 Final Performance Assessments and Labs
Outcome 3	23	20	87.0%	MEC 124 Final Performance Assessments and Labs
Outcome 4	37	31	83.8%	EET 170 and EET 242 Final Performance Assessments and Labs
Electro-Mechanical Technology Certificate	137	137	85.0%	EET 113 Final Performance Assessments and Labs + MEC 123
Outcome 1	28	28	100.0%	EET 113 Final Performance Assessments and Labs
Outcome 2	28	28	100.0%	EET 113 Final Performance Assessments and Labs
Outcome 3	53	53	100.0%	EET 113 and MEC 123 -final performance assessment and labs
Outcome 4	28	28	100.0%	EET 113 Final Performance Assessments and Labs
Pre-College	652	212	32.5%	CASAS score correlated with Accuplacer scores; TOPS report entry/exit goals; Passer report comparison of students receiving a "Likely to Pass" on practice GED assessment
Outcome 1	232	86	37.1%	CASAS score correlated with Accuplacer score of RD 90 or above; Students will have a 5-point gain on the CASAS score during their tenure; Passer report comparison of students receiving a "Likely to Pass" on practice GED after 10 weeks of instruction
Outcome 2	188	49	26.1%	CASAS score correlated with Accuplacer score of MTH20; Students will have a 5-point gain on the CASAS score during their tenure; Passer report comparison of students receiving a "Likely to Pass" on practice GED after 10 weeks of instruction
Outcome 3	232	77	33.2%	CASAS score correlated with Accuplacer score of WR90; Passer report comparison of students receiving a "Likely to Pass" on practice GED after 10 weeks of instruction

## Analysis of Results

While this one number of 89.3% indicates that CGCC meets mission expectations for B3.2, caution should be used in reading too much into these results. These results are taken from a total of 18 degrees, certificates and programs with varying numbers of outcomes, students and methods of assessments. Programs that may be struggling could easily get lost in this one number. For example, of the 55,438 students assessed, 52,017 are from the AAOT, AS, ASOT-BUS and AGS outcomes assessment, meaning that over 94% of the results come from four degrees, with fourteen

degrees, certificates and programs making up the remaining 6%. The vice president of instruction, deans and department chairs should look at individual results for degrees, certificates and programs when determining actions for improvement and where budget is needed.

### **Actions for Improvement**

Since CGCC is meeting mission expectations for degree, certificate and program outcomes, no actions for improvement are suggested from this broad analysis of all degrees, certificates and programs. As stated under Future Targets, 89.3% is a reasonable result and higher results might be questionable with regards to grading inflation. Instead, the vice president of instruction, deans and department chairs should look to the results of the individual degree, certificate and program outcomes assessment to gain a clearer perspective of where resources are needed to bolster student achievement of outcomes.

### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

Admittedly, this is not the best assessment strategy because while it gives us a broad idea of how our students are doing, some programs carry far more weight in the 89.3% than other programs. For example, the AAOT weighs heavily into this number with twenty-one outcomes and its 17,899 students assessed when compared to smaller CTE programs that have four or five outcomes and twenty or forty-one students assessed. The achievement of outcomes for these smaller degrees, certificates and programs get lost when compared to the Transfer and General Studies degrees. When consulting with the Institutional Researcher, however, it was determined that this was the best means of getting one number from 118 degree, certificate and program outcomes.

- **Tools and methodology:** Results of student achievement of outcomes compared to total number of students assessed were gathered from individual degree, certificate and program outcomes assessment. Number of successful student achievement of outcomes for all degree, certificate and program outcomes assessment were then added and divided by the total number of students who had been assessed for all degree, certificate and programs.
- **Future Targets:** It is recommended that targets remain the same. 80% to 89% seems realistic for meeting mission expectations. It seems that if 95% (the target for exceeding mission expectations) or more students were achieving degree, certificate and program outcomes, grade inflation might be suspected.

## **B3.3 Achievement of student learning outcome at the institutional level (Core Learning Outcomes)**

### **Description of Results**

A total of 385 students were enrolled in the courses that participated in the assessment of the CLO Quantitative Literacy. Of those students, 321 completed the assignments and were scored using the [Quantitative Literacy rubric](#). A total of 60.97% of those students scored into the levels of 3 and 4 (accomplished or better). 19.88% of students scored into the category of 2 (developing) and 12% of students scored into the category of 1 (beginning). 7.14% scored into “not demonstrated” and 1.85% were scored into the “not applicable” category.

### Analysis of Results

With an expectation for mission accomplishment at 80%, 60.97% of students achieving

Institutional Core Learning Outcome #3: Through their respective disciplines, COCC students who earn a degree can: Extract, interpret, evaluate, communicate, and apply quantitative information and methods to solve problems, evaluate claims, and support decisions in their academic, professional and private lives. (Quantitative Literacy)									
Quantitative Literacy Total Number of students enrolled 385 Total # of students who completed scored assignment: 321	Mastery	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated	Not Applicable	Total numbers for Accomplished or better	Total Percentage for Accomplished or better	
CLO: Quantitative Literacy: Interpretation: TOTALS	124	113	51	27	6	0	257	73.83%	
CLO: Quantitative Literacy: Representation: TOTALS	120	87	78	13	25	0	207	64.49%	
CLO: Quantitative Literacy: Calculation: TOTALS	131	83	42	16	27	22	214	71.57%	
CLO: Quantitative Literacy: Application/Analysis: TOTALS	83	88	94	43	13	0	171	53.27%	
CLO: Quantitative Literacy: Assumptions: TOTALS	97	62	62	55	32	13	159	51.62%	
CLO: Quantitative Literacy: Communication: TOTALS	105	60	51	79	52	0	165	51.40%	
Total number of students scored into category using Quantitative Literacy Rubric	560	493	176	227	135	35	1153	60.97%	
Total percentage of students scored into category using Quantitative Literacy Rubric	34.90%	26.07%	19.88%	12.00%	7.14%	1.85%			
Total Percentage of students who scored into Accomplished or Better with Quantitative Literacy Rubric* * Students who were scored into "Not/Applicable" are not included in total.								60.97%	

accomplished or better in the area of Quantitative Literacy is below mission expectations. It's important to note that this overall percentage derived from the total number of students who scored into “Accomplished” or better on six different criteria from the Quantitative Literacy rubric, while providing a percentage for fulfillment of Core Themes, is not used to inform faculty where or if improvements to instruction need to be made. Instead, faculty use the rubric and student scores to better understand where to focus intentional instruction as a means to move students closer to accomplished or mastery in the categories where scores indicate their skills and knowledge are lacking. Results indicate that students scored lowest in the areas of “Application and Analysis”



(53.27%) and “Assumptions” (51.62%). The category of “Communication” also had a low percentage of students scoring into accomplished or better (51.40%). The Core Learning Outcome Assessment Committee, however, when completing the analysis of the results, reasoned that the ability to identify and explain “Assumptions” as well as conduct “Application and Analysis” needed to be improved prior to “Communication” in order that the student would have something to communicate. The committee also thought that the skill of communicating results could be addressed by the activities faculty are already integrating into their teaching to support CLO#1: Communication.

### **Actions for Improvement**

Faculty will increase instruction and assessment in the two areas of “Application and Analysis” and “Assumptions” in an effort to move more students from beginning/developing levels to the level of accomplished. During 2020 fall in-service, faculty collaborated to create a list of instructional resources and ideas to support these efforts. The academic assessment coordinator will track strategies faculty implement to support student achievement. This CLO will be assessed again in 2024-25, and faculty efforts towards increasing student achievement of this CLO will be analyzed.

Continuing to educate instructors and students about the purpose and importance of CLOs is also recommended. One strategy to help educate instructors was implemented during fall 2020 in-service. A workshop was provided to help instructors design assignments that can be assessed using the rubrics for CLO#1 “Communication. It is recommended that a similar workshop be provided each year, with a focus on designing appropriate assignments for the CLO to be assessed that year.

Although General Education instructors are now required to include the CLOs that their courses address, it is recommended that instructors begin to more intentionally provide students with explanations of which assignments are being used to assess students for CLO achievement. This move would better support those students who are required to include artifacts and reflections demonstrating their achievement of the CLOs in their e-portfolios.

### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

Student artifacts from 200-level courses are used in the assessment of student achievement of the CLO, with the assumption that students could potentially be taking these courses towards the end of their degree, and therefore could have received sufficient instruction in the skills and knowledge required for assessment of the institutional core learning outcomes. In reality, however, the college does not have a way to identify which students are close to graduation in the 200-level General Education courses used for CLO assessment. As such, there is no means to ensure that the assessment is taking place during a student’s final term. The adapted LEAP rubrics used for scoring student artifacts are accurate indicators of student achievement. The rubrics, developed by the AACU, have been tested and widely adopted by post-secondary institutions across the US. The rubrics, as used by CGCC , are also effective indicators of where faculty can collaborate and focus increased instruction in an effort to help more students achieve specific criteria for each CLO.

Admittedly, instructors scoring their own student artifacts may be somewhat subjective and inflate scores. CGCC will continue with this method, however, now that a baseline has been gathered for each Core Learning Outcome. Faculty will re-assess students over the next 5 years to determine whether the college's efforts have been effective in helping students improve in achievement for the specific areas noted for each CLO.

- **Tools and Methodology:** Student artifacts were scored by instructors using a [rubric adapted](#) from [AACU's LEAP Value](#) Rubrics: [Quantitative Literacy](#). Results were gathered by the Academic Assessment Coordinator and analyzed by the CLO Assessment Committee.

Now that this initial cycle of gathering student achievement data for each CLO is complete, the following cycle will include a comparison of results for each CLO. Including a comparison of results for each Core Learning Outcome will not only provide data of student achievement for B2.3 but will also help determine the effectiveness of teaching strategies implemented by faculty in the five years between the assessment of individual CLOs.

- **Future Targets:** It should be recognized that student achievement at the community college level will differ for each Core Learning Outcome, as each requires different levels of skills that are dependent on time, education and practice in order to mature beyond the level of “developing” to the level of “accomplishment. As the CLO Committee continues to provide recommendations for appropriate targets for each CLO, these achievement target levels should be used to guide the targets for student achievement for Core Theme B3.2:

Core Learning Outcome	Level of Achievement Target Established by CLO Committee
1. Communication	Accomplished
2. Critical Thinking/Problem Solving	Developing
3. Quantitative Literacy	Accomplished
4. Cultural Awareness	Accomplished
5. Community and Environmental Responsibility	Accomplished

Core Theme A: Building Dreams – Access								
Scale		5	4	3	2	1		
Objective	Measure	Surpasses Mission Expectation		Meets Mission Expectation		Below Mission Expectation	2019-20 Results	Score
<b>Objective A1:</b> Providing a local option for obtaining quality education at an affordable price	<b>A1.1</b> Enrollment in credit courses (LDC and CTE) <sup>1</sup>	<b>797 or more</b> FTE enrolled in credit courses (LDC and CTE)		<b>725 – 761</b> FTE enrolled in credit courses (LDC and CTE)		<b>689 or fewer</b> FTE enrolled in credit courses (LDC and CTE)	697	<b>2</b>
	<b>A1.2</b> Enrollment in noncredit courses (Pre-College and ESOL) <sup>1</sup>	<b>85 or more</b> FTE enrolled in noncredit courses (Pre-College and ESOL)		<b>81 – 83</b> FTE enrolled in noncredit courses (Pre-College and ESOL)		<b>79 or fewer</b> FTE enrolled in noncredit courses (Pre-College and ESOL)	57.8	<b>1</b>
	<b>A1.3</b> Enrollment in noncredit courses (Community Ed, SBDC, CCP, Customized Training) <sup>1</sup>	<b>24 or more</b> <b>Total</b> enrolled in noncredit courses (Community Ed, SBDC, CCP, Customized Training)		<b>20 - 22</b> <b>Total</b> enrolled in noncredit courses (Community Ed, SBDC, CCP, Customized Training)		<b>18 or fewer</b> <b>Total</b> enrolled in noncredit courses (Community Ed, SBDC, CCP, Customized Training)	<b>22.1</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Objective A2:</b> Providing college credit opportunities for high school students	<b>A2.1</b> High school student enrollment in accelerated learning opportunities <sup>1</sup>	<b>79 or more</b> FTE enrolled in accelerated learning opportunities		<b>67 – 73</b> FTE enrolled in accelerated learning opportunities		<b>61 or fewer</b> FTE enrolled in accelerated learning opportunities	140.93	<b>5</b>
	<b>A2.2</b> Enrollment of transitioning high school students <sup>1</sup>	<b>270 or more</b> FTE of students 17-19 years of age		<b>247 – 262</b> FTE of students 17-19 years of age		<b>235 or fewer</b> FTE of students 17-19 years of age	265.70	<b>5</b>
<b>Objective A3:</b> Serving the diversity of the college's service area	<b>A3.1</b> General enrollment Demographics <sup>1</sup>	<b>5% or less</b> difference from regional demographics for students		<b>10 – 15%</b> difference from regional demographics for students		<b>20% or higher</b> difference from regional demographics for students	1.12%	<b>5</b>
	<b>A3.2</b> Credit enrollment of underserved populations <sup>1</sup>	<b>&lt;10% ?? or more</b> FTE of students identified as underserved.		<b>&lt; 10% ? - ?</b> FTE of students identified as underserved.		<b>&lt; 10% ? or fewer</b> FTE of students identified as underserved.	<b>-1.49%</b>	<b>1</b>
	<b>A3.3</b> Credit enrollment of Hispanic students	<b>35% or higher</b> Percentage FTE of Hispanic students		<b>28 – 32%</b> Percentage FTE of Hispanic students		<b>25% or less</b> Percentage FTE of Hispanic students	31%	<b>3</b>
<b>Objective A4:</b> Meeting the expectations of CGCC's student body	<b>A4.1</b> Student satisfaction with CGCC experience	<b>95% or higher</b> students reporting that they are satisfied with their CGCC experience		<b>76% - 85%</b> students reporting that they are satisfied with their CGCC experience		<b>66% or less</b> students reporting that they are satisfied with their CGCC experience	<b>80%</b> (2016-17)	<b>3</b>

<sup>1</sup> Disaggregated data for measures available in Narrative Analysis.



AA = African American, AI/NA = American Indian/Native American, A = Asian, H = Hispanic, PI/NH = Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian, M = Multirace, W = White, U/NR = Unknown/Not Reported, F = Female, M = Male, NB = Non Binary, LI = Low Income, FG = First Generation College

### **Analysis of Results**

The target mission expectation was extremely close to being achieved. With a multi-year trend of declining enrollment, the Core Theme A committee agreed that the goal of the institution should be to stop this trend. With a score of 697, CGCC was incredibly close to meeting the goal. It is important to note that 11.0FTE of LDC from 2019-2020 was recorded until Summer term 2021-2022 due to the COVID-19 disruption. Also, the loss of 15 FTE from CTE supplementary was a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, the score of a two is appropriate for representing the college's performance related to enrollment on this measure especially considering the disruption that COVID-19 created during this academic year.

### **Actions for Improvement**

A great deal of work is being done to support improvement at the College in this area. The 2018-2019 fiscal year represented the second year that CGCC operated with a department solely focused on student outreach and recruitment. Several operational changes included: the establishment of a student ambassador program, a marketing and publications department, the Gorge Educators Collaborative Summit, and a prospective student communication plan that has been implemented with a CRM software. While all of these new services and activities were implemented during the academic year, their impact will not be seen in the 2020-2021 year, but rather in the following year.

### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

A growth model has been adopted because the College is on the tail end of a multi-year trend of declining enrollment. For this reason, such a model is acceptable. In the future as enrollment trends reverse, it will be critical for the college to establish benchmarks that are based upon the ideal service targets of the college. Such a target would be established by creating an enrollment management plan.

- Tools and Methodology: Enrollment seems to be an appropriate measure to assess mission expectation in this area, and a growth model is appropriate considering the years of previous enrollment declines.
- Future Targets: Once enrollment trends are reversed and the College has had year over year enrollment gains, the College will need to determine what is a healthy and ideal enrollment level to maintain. Growth models are not viable long-term models unless the community being served is also experiencing ongoing growth or a decrease in competitive service providers. Continuation of targets representing growth for mission fulfillment is appropriate.

### **A1.2 Enrollment in noncredit courses (Pre-College and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL))**

**Description of Results** (Please enter 2019-20 data in table.)

FTE Type D	FTE Type Description	FTE Type Code	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
CT Measure A1.2	ABE, HS, PSR	3.2 ABE	1.3	.8	1.4	1.8	
	ESOL	3.1 ESOL	37.0	25.2	29.0	32.2	
	GED	3.3 GED	43.6	38.9	31.2	35	
	<b>TOTAL</b>		81.9	64.9	61.5	69.0	

courses of both pre-college and English for speakers of other languages, scored a one with a raw score of 57.8 – well below the lower end threshold of meeting mission expectation that was set at 81.

(Disaggregated data?)

2019-20 Noncredit Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, Gender, Age, Low Income, First Generation College															
FTE Type	Race / Ethnicity							Gender			Age			LI	FG
	AA	AI/NA	A	H	M	PI/NH	W	U/NR	F	M	NB	18-24	25-39		
2.1 CTE Prep															
1.0 LDC															
2.1 Prof/Tech Prep															
2.2 Prof/Tech Supp															
3.5 PSR Elective															
3.5 PSR Math (below 100)															
3.5 PSR RD or WR															
<b>Total</b>															

AA = African American, AI/NA = American Indian/Native American, A = Asian, H = Hispanic, PI/NH = Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian, M = Multirace, W = White, U/NR = Unknown/Not Reported, F = Female, M = Male, NB = Non Binary, LI = Low Income, FG = First Generation College

**Analysis of Results**

The target for mission expectation was set based upon continuation of recent performance. As per last year’s score of 62, this year’s raw score of 57.8 was well below the minimum threshold set for mission expectation. COVID-19 has been a strong factor affecting this outcome.

**Actions for Improvement**

Both the pre-college and ESOL programs are taking important steps to address declining enrollment. Pre-college began offering synchronous distance learning on both campuses, started a 6-week orientation process, created new marketing materials and recorded radio ads to promote the program. Title I B Youth and Adult/Dislocated Worker funding was added to the pre-college

program in 2017-18 to increase services offered to pre-college students. The program does outreach to the local high schools and partners with the Department of Human Services to teach their Realizing Your Potential class.

ESOL has done outreach through the LatinX Advisory Council, the Organization of Latino Advocates, Radio Tierra, Mercado del Valle in Odell, and the spring Culture Festival. They've hired two bilingual/bicultural instructional assistants for the program, started a Saturday ESOL class in Odell and offered summer classes in Odell and Parkdale. This action of improvement was interrupted by the disruption of COVID-19 during our 2019-2020 academic year.

**Effectiveness of Assessment**

The assessment is measuring enrollment numbers of each of the programs, but in a lump sum. It is not breaking the programs apart to be assessed separately to better understand each program.

- **Tools and Methodology:** Enrollment figures seem appropriate for continued assessment in these programs related to mission expectations.
- **Future Targets:** The enrollment results should be separated to capture enrollment of each program and to track changes.

**A1.3 Enrollment in noncredit courses (Community Ed, SBDC, CCP, Customized Training)**

**Description of Results** (Please fill in table. Note that we are now measuring A1.3 by actual/total enrollment, not FTE.)

Enrollment in Noncredit Courses		2019-20
CT Measure A1.3	Small Business Development Center	
	Child Care Partners	
	Community Education	
	Customized Training	0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	

SBDC provided 0.14 FTE (not measuring using FTE anymore, please revise and adjust response to reflect total enrollment numbers rather than FTE) through participation of students in their Small Business Management Program. Partial scholarships were offered during the 2019-2020 year as compared to full scholarships that were offered in the past. This program was not economically viable and there were not enough clients interested in further participation to continue this program. It will be reevaluated moving forward as the center grows its programming. (So we won't be having SBDC any longer? I'm guessing that is not what you mean; however, that is how it reads. Also, this sounds more like information for either the analysis section or the actions for improvement, probably actions for improvement as it is speaking to future plans.)

Child Care Partners provided 2.33 FTE (revise from FTE) in noncredit courses to meet the needs of the Early Learning Workforce in Gilliam, Hood River, Sherman, Wasco and Wheeler Counties.

(Community Ed and Customized Training?)

**Analysis or Results**

### ***Small Business Development Center***

In addition to developing and delivering customized training programs and courses, the primary SBDC focus is on individualized, one-on-one counseling, which does contribute to overall FTE at CGCC. The SBDC is in the process of reorganizing the current SBM program to better serve the needs of our clients, which will, over time, have a positive impact on the overall FTEs. The SBDC along with CGCC are determining ways to capture significantly more FTE from the hundreds of class hours through the numerous course offering provided by the SBDC outside of the SBM program. This model has been proven possible at other colleges and should be a priority for CGCC and SBDC to develop a system that will allow us to capture the many hundreds of course hours delivered by the center.

### ***Child Care Partners***

A significant drop in training attendance in customized trainings and community education courses due to moving all training to in-person live classes and the Covid-19 guidance. Enrollment in training held in Spanish is higher than the classes offered in English. Although data is not available to explain this difference, anecdotally it appears that the strong relationship between staff and these students contributes to their desire to participate.

### **Actions for Improvement**

#### ***Small Business Development Center***

SBDC will analyze the needs of our business community to help develop a more desirable Small Business Management program, thus increasing enrollment and FTE. SBDC will partner with the Entrepreneur program at CGCC to develop a referral plan to help increase enrollment in the Entrepreneur program. SBDC will also provide additional course material and rosters as needed to CGCC that can potentially allow them to capture FTE outside of the traditional SBM program along with working with continual education and student services to help determine the requirements from the state, college and SBDC in order to best facilitate and deliver the information needed to the state to capture that FTE.

#### ***Child Care Partners***

Improvement to the attendance at Child Care Partners' classes, will likely occur once face-to-face classes are allowed. The population served by Child Care Partners has not been comfortable in taking online classes and many have access issues. Child Care Partners trainings in early education are continue to serve as a pathway to the Early Childhood Education certificates and degree. This connection between the community, the College's short-term offerings, and long-term programs of study is proving to be a successful relationship and arrangement of services that we should hope to continue.

(Community Ed and Customized Training?)

### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

At this time, SBDC and CCP is poorly described by looking at FTE enrollment. Separate and unique measures should be used for determining the effectiveness of that program. (The decision continues to be that these noncredit courses will be combined in one measure with separate data described in the Narrative Analysis. Also, it was decided to change the measure to reflect total



participant enrollment rather than FTE; therefore, this problem was to be and should be addressed this year.)

- **Tools and Methodology:** ~~SBDC is best measured by # of clients, long term counseling hours (clients that engage in 5 or more hours of counseling per year,) capital formation (loans/equity investments made by clients) and increase in annual payrolls of clients, sales increase, number of new businesses started, number of underserved clients served (women, disabled, bi-poc, veterans, etc.) number of new hires, number of jobs retained, number of training programs provided and number of attendees.~~ (However, the purpose of this measure is to review noncredit enrollment; therefore, we need enrollment numbers in SBDC courses as well as CCP, Community Ed, and Customized Training courses. If we do that, we have like numbers being combined into an overall number. Businesses assisted is addressed in Core Theme C.) Community education, customized training, and CCP are appropriately measured in terms of enrollment numbers.
- **Future Targets:** Future targets should be established with significant input from departmental managers in each of these areas. (Targets were to be set this year to reflect the change from FTE to total enrollment numbers.)

## **Objective A2: Providing college credit opportunities for high school students.**

### **A2.1 High school enrollment in accelerated learning opportunities**

#### **Description of Results**

High school students enrolling in accelerated learning opportunities rated well with a raw score of 140.93, well above the minimum range for surpassing mission expectation. (Is this FTE? Please include in the description what comprises “accelerated learning opportunities.” Since you mention CLEP, AP and CPL in the Effectiveness of Assessment section, it would make sense to show these numbers here in a table. Then we can see how low they are. What about Running Start?)

#### **Analysis of Results**

To meet the service demands of our local secondary partners, the College began offering Sponsored Dual Credit. With support from instructional leadership, this new framework for dual credit allowed for new course articulations. For the upcoming 2020-2021 year, as many new courses have been requested as were offered in the previous year. It is anticipated that significant growth will continue in this area for a minimum of two to three years as the College works to meet the service needs in our area.

#### **Actions for Improvement**

Continued support from instructional leadership and collaboration with Student Services will be critical to maintain program direction, growth, and integrity. Quality, value, and credits with a purpose are at the core of this program’s success.

#### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

The assessment for this measure seems appropriate at this time, especially due to the low numbers of enrollment coming from CLEP, AP, and CPL. If these numbers had been higher, then disaggregation of goals would be appropriate.

- Tools and Methodology: Continuation with existing methods is recommended in this area without change.
- Future Targets: Continuation of measures of performance that demand significant growth in this area is appropriate due to potential in the local community compared to national trends in accelerated learning. (If these numbers are correct and we are achieving almost double our “surpasses mission expectation” target, shouldn’t we be reviewing these targets to reflect what is our current reality? We have had two years in a row in which we reported 140+ for this measure and three years reporting as surpassing mission fulfillment (5). The measurement is not a growth measurement as it doesn’t calculate rate of change. We need to determine an appropriate number of Dual Credit FTE for a college our size in our location. Do you expect that we will offer fewer Dual Credit courses in the future?)

## A2.2 Enrollment of transitioning high school students

### Description of Results

Exceeded mission expectation with a raw score of 265.70.

FTE Type	AA	AI/NA	A	H	M	PI/NH	W	U/NR	F	M	NB	LI	FG	TOTAL
Credit														
Noncredit (ABE/GED/ESOL)														
<b>Total</b>														

AA = African American, AI/NA = American Indian/Native American, A = Asian, H = Hispanic, PI/NH = Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian, M = Multirace, W = White, U/NR = Unknown/Not Reported, F = Female, M = Male, NB = Non Binary, LI = Low Income, FG = First Generation College

### Analysis of Results

With the COVID-19 disruption, it is important to mention that the College continues to increase its connection with traditional age students from our service area by providing virtual services. A significant amount of work has been put into connecting with local secondary partners, identifying areas of concern as perceived by these community members, and working collaboratively to improve connections. Central to this effort is the ongoing communication with Gorge Educators Collaborative Summit, where the College has improved connections and communications with nearly all secondary partners in the seven county service area. (Did GECS actually meet as much this year, or was it disrupted by COVID as well? And if not, was it really “central” or were actions taken by the Student Services team more pertinent.)

### Actions for Improvement

Improvement to impact this target has been previously discussed in this report (where, please identify the measure), and includes the development of processes to maintain communications with our students during our recruitment cycle, and the transitioning of our accelerated learning programs from Instructional to Student Services. Pipeline programs and new program development will be critical for the sustainability of this trend.

**Effectiveness of Assessment**

The assessment is effective, but the measures may need to be adjusted. It would be appropriate to consider our enrollment management plan timeline. (I don't understand what the recommendation is here. Is the assessment effective or does it need to be revised? And if you are recommending that the measure be changed ... to what?)

- **Tools and Methodology:** Continue with the existing tools and methodology.
- **Future Targets:** An overall and in-depth assessment is recommended to determine how the College's enrollment breaks out by specific age brackets, comparing these enrollment levels to sister institutions within the state, and determining whether targets specific to this measure need to move away from a growth model to a sustainability model.

**Objective A3: Serving the diversity of the college's service area.**

**A3.1 General enrollment demographics**

**Description of Results**

Ethnicity	Service District	CGCC	Variance
Asian			
Black / African American			
Hispanic			
Native American / Alaska Native			
Pacific Islander			
White / Caucasian			
Two or More			
2019-20 Average Variance			

by race scored well with a difference of only 1.12% in variation from the regional demographics, well within the range of 5% or less.

**Analysis of Results**

This measure shows that the population by race of our college students is proportionally similar to that of the population levels within our community, according to the demographics of Wasco and Hood River. The largest variation showed that the census population that identifies as American

Indian or Native Alaskan (2.53%) is significantly larger than that of CGCC's American Indian or Native Alaskan student population (1.00%).

### **Actions for Improvement**

One recommendation is to look at the race and ethnicity information that the college requests from students while the college is switching over to the new Student Information System, CampusNexus. 2% of students did not report their race identity, perhaps because they do not identify with the labels provided.

Continuation of work on equity and inclusion is also important for such results to remain. The college has an Access and Diversity Committee that brings recommendations on these issues and holds speakers and events to increase a campus culture of inclusion. Our Student Outreach and Recruitment Office (SOAR) has started partnerships with the Native American Home-School Liaison through the Education Service District to increase connections and access for this student population. In addition to this particular outreach effort, the college could look at creating other presentations for specific underrepresented populations.

### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

The assessment measure is appropriate to meet the college's objective of "serving the diversity of the college's service area."

- **Tools and Methodology:** Race of enrolled students was compared to the race of our local population by combining averages of Hood River and Wasco Counties. The calculation uses the 2010 Census data, which is the most recent available.
- **Future Targets:** It was recommended that in addition to looking at race as a metric for demographics, the college may also want to look at gender identity and/or age to get a more inclusive report.

## **A3.2 Credit enrollment of underserved populations**

### **Description of Results**

fell within the range of below mission expectation with a 1.5% decrease. (Can we include a table that would reflect the concerns described in the analysis section, a table that shows the numbers for each category of underserved students? Also, we agreed to change the result from a percent change to an absolute number as once we reach the desired balance, we wouldn't be having the requisite "change" that the targets demand and we would always be below mission expectations.)

### **Analysis of Results**

The measure was highly unrepresentative of success in this area. The primary driver for the drop in underserved students did not come from first-generation numbers, but rather from a change in our number of low-income students. With unemployment rates continuing to drop and remaining low, many families are increasing their estimated family contributions. This results in fewer students being eligible for grants, and thus falling outside this category. Unfortunately, this does not mean

that these students while ineligible for grants are not the same students who had previously fallen within this category.

### **Actions for Improvement**

Continued efforts are underway to assess and improve on equity and inclusion, including first-generation and low-income students. However, the largest concern in this area is in our measure of effectiveness that will be discussed in the section below.

### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

It is highly recommended that in the future this measure be broken down by low-income and separately by first-generation. Additionally, having a measure that is based upon a growth model is not a strong measure of effectiveness for the institution as the populations being measured may not be increasing but rather are likely decreasing within the communities we serve. (As said above, this was supposed to be changed this year.)

- **Tools and methodology:** Significant changes are requested based upon how this year's performance was assessed. This work will be discussed as part of the ongoing meetings of the Core Theme A workgroup.
- **Future Targets:** Local poverty and low-income rates should inform future targets.

## **A3.3 Credit enrollment of Hispanic students**

### **Description of Results**

Met mission expectation with 31% of students enrolled declaring Hispanic ethnicity.

### **Analysis of Results**

The percentage of Hispanic-identifying students at CGCC did go down about 1% from the previous academic year. However, the 31% of Hispanic-identifying students is still about 5% higher than the percentage of our county demographics (24.46%).

### **Actions for Improvement**

Continued actions are being taken to improve and retain enrollment of Hispanic-identifying students, including: collaboration with the LatinX Advisory Council and the CGCC Juntos Club, promotion of the CLEP initiative, and the provision of Discover! CGCC events in Spanish through the SOAR office, among others.

### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

This assessment measure is strong and appropriate, reflecting how CGCC is serving the Hispanic-identifying community. However, there are two components of being a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) that are not reflected in the measure as it is written – student outcomes (academic performance, completion rates, engagement on campus), and campus culture and climate (Hispanic-identifying faculty/staff, sense of belonging, perceptions on campus, support programming, advising practices). In the future, CGCC may want to assess these two different areas to see how the college is serving these students once they enroll. It may be appropriate to add a section A3.4

for assessing whether the demographics of the area are reflected in the college's faculty and staff, to ensure the college serves the diversity of the community as an employer.

- **Tools and Methodology:** The measurement is the percentage of Hispanic-identifying students based on Total FTE. In the past, this measure has been calculated just based on credit-bearing students, excluding ESOL and Pre-college students, in order to meet the reporting requirements for the HACU and HSI designations. (The measure is still calculated based on credit enrollment of Hispanic students, noncredit are not included.)
- **Future Targets:** Pending changes to the assessment tool being used for this measure, similarly changes may be necessary to the benchmarks.

## **Objective A4 Meeting the expectations of CGCC's student body**

### **A4.1 Student satisfaction with CGCC experience**

#### **Description of Results**

Results are from the most recent CCSSE report, spring 2017.

#### **Analysis of Results**

Because of dated data, analysis is not relevant to this year's report.

#### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

Identification of assessment to be used between CCSSE years should be considered. SENSE was originally thought to be available in these off years; however, this has not been the case.

- **Tools and Methodology:** The CCSSE should be available for annual assessment during Spring 2021.
- **Future Targets:** No recommendation for change in targets.