

CGCC Core Themes and Measures

Mission: Columbia Gorge Community College builds dreams and transforms lives by providing lifelong educational programs that strengthen our community.

| Core Theme A: Building Dreams – Opportunities | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| Planning Statement: CGCC offers multiple environments and opportunities for people to grow personal and intellectual skills by: | | | | | | |
| FOCUS | WHAT TO MEASURE | FUTURE TARGET (derived from a standard) | DATA SOURCE | WHO | CGCC RESULTS 2010-11 school year unless noted | Grade |
| Objective A1: Offering a broad array of educational programs to meet current regional needs | A1.1 Number and type of programs, degrees and certificates being offered | A1.1: 30% of students who take AED courses will participate in career or job related courses | A1.1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs assessment Academic Master Plan Advisory committees (credit and non-credit in RogueNet) Course enrollment Course offerings Course wait lists Canceled courses Articulation agreements | A1.1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Directors Departments Instructional Services Student Services | A1.1: 28% of students who took an adult education course participated in career or job related courses | A1.1: Needs Improvement |
| | | A1.2: 28% of regional high school completers will enroll in CGCC the September immediately following high school completion | | | A1.2: % of regional high school completers. Data not available at this point in time | A1.2: Data not available at this time—coming from CCWD |
| | | A1.3: Oregon 40,40,20 Goals 10% associates degrees in 2015 20% associates degrees in 2020 40% associates degrees in 2025 | | | A1.3: Of those 18 years old and older: 8.5% of Hood River and Wasco counties have associate degrees 8.4% of seven county services area have associate degrees | A1.3: Target is for 2015 |

CGCC Core Themes and Measures

Mission: Columbia Gorge Community College builds dreams and transforms lives by providing lifelong educational programs that strengthen our community.

| Core Theme A: Building Dreams – Opportunities | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------|
| Planning Statement: CGCC offers multiple environments and opportunities for people to grow personal and intellectual skills by: | | | | | | |
| FOCUS | WHAT TO MEASURE | FUTURE TARGET (derived from a standard) | DATA SOURCE | WHO | CGCC RESULTS 2010-11 unless noted | Grade |
| Objective A2: Offering diverse course delivery modes and service opportunities | A2.1: Course delivery methods | A2.1 20% of students taking distance learning courses at the postsecondary level | A2.1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Course offerings (e.g. face to face, online, lecture)-catalog, RogueNet Course enrollment Course offerings Course wait lists Canceled courses | A2.1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instructional Services Student Services | A2.1: 23% of students taking distance learning courses | A2.1: Target exceeded |
| | A2.2: Course scheduling | A2.2 87% enrollment demand satisfied | A2.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Course offerings (e.g. day, time) Course enrollment Wait lists Canceled courses | A2.2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instructional Services Student Services | A2.2: 76.6% of courses were Face to Face and had 57.5% fill 14.6% of courses were online and had 84.2% fill 8.8% of courses were hybrid and had 73% fill | A2.2: Unsatisfactory |
| | A2.3: Service delivery methods (and looking at trends) | A2.3 50% of services for students also available online ⁶ | A2.3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student Services data like CCSSE and SENSE surveys Library data | A2.3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student Services Library | A2.3: 80% of services for students also available online | A2.3: Target exceeded |

CGCC Core Themes and Measures

Mission: Columbia Gorge Community College builds dreams and transforms lives by providing lifelong educational programs that strengthen our community.

| Core Theme A: Building Dreams - Opportunity | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| Planning Statement: CGCC offers multiple environments and opportunities for people to grow personal and intellectual skills by: | | | | | | |
| FOCUS | WHAT TO MEASURE | FUTURE TARGET (derived from a standard) | DATA SOURCE | WHO | CGCC RESULTS 2010-11 unless noted | Grade |
| Objective A3: Serving the diversity of the service area | A3.1: Demographics of students | A3: Two County Taxing district Demographics 84.7% White 21.7% Hispanic 0.4% Black/African American 2.7% American Indian 1.1% Asian 2.8% Two or More Races | A3.1: Student Profile IE Report 2009-10 | A3.1: Student Services | A3.1: Students at CGCC 79.1% White 16.8% Hispanic 0.4% Black/African Amer. 1.2% American Indian 0.8% Asian 2.8% Two or More Races 0.5% Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander | A3.1: Needs improvement |
| | A3.2: Demographics of faculty | 0.4% Native Hawaiian /Pacific Islander Seven County Service Area Demographics 87.0% White 15.2% Hispanic 0.4% Black | A3.2: Human Resources | A3.2: Human Resources | A3.2: Full-time Instruction 100% White Part-Time Instruction 93% White .04% Hispanic .01% American Indian .01% Asian | A3.2: Needs improvement |
| | A3.3: Demographics of staff | 2.5% American Indian 0.8% Asian 2.5% Two or More Races 0.4% Native Hawaiian /Pacific Islander | A3.3: Human Resources | A3.3: Human Resources | A3.3: Full-time Staff 87% White .1% Hispanic .03% Asian, .02% Black Part time staff 93% White .1% Hispanic .01% American Indian .01% Asian .01% two or more races ⁴ | A3.3: Needs improvement |

CGCC Core Themes and Measures

Mission: Columbia Gorge Community College builds dreams and transforms lives by providing lifelong educational programs that strengthen our community.

| Core Theme A: Building Dreams – Opportunities | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| Planning Statement: CGCC offers multiple environments and opportunities for people to grow personal and intellectual skills by: | | | | | | |
| FOCUS | WHAT TO MEASURE | FUTURE TARGET (derived from a standard) | DATA SOURCE | WHO | CGCC RESULTS 2010-11 unless noted | Grade |
| | A3.4: Demographics of graduates | A3.4: See Above— demographics of service area | A3.4: Graduation Database | A3.4: Student Services | A3.4: 79.8% White 16.2% Hispanic 1.2% Black 0.4% American Indian 0.4% Asian 2.0% Two or More Races | A3.4: Needs improvement |
| Objective A4: Applying consistent hiring practices | A4.1: Standardize notification, application, and selection processes | A4.1: 100% compliance across all hire and selection processes | A4.1: Human Resources | A4.1: Notification checklist Application checklist Selection checklist | A4.1 28% compliance | A4.1 Unsatisfactory |
| Objective A5 Applying processes that lead to retention (of faculty, staff and students) and high morale | A5.1: Percent retention (faculty, staff, student) | A5.1: 1.2% (average quit rate) for faculty and staff 28.7% (2008 student retention) | A5.1: Human Resources (or payroll?) data (low long faculty and staff have worked at CGCC and in specific position) | A5.1 Human Resources | A5.1 10% CGCC average quit rate Fall 10 to Fall 11: 29.5% retention of all students, 40.2% retention of credit students | A5.1 Needs improvement Target exceeded |
| | A5.2: Level of morale of faculty, staff and students | A5.2 83.4 faculty morale high 75% staff morale high 78% student morale high | A5.2: HR annual survey Student Profile-CCSSE | A5.2 Human Resources Student Services | A5.2 61.9% faculty morale high 36.4% staff morale high Fall 2011 CCSSE 96.2% of students would recommend CGCC to friend or family | A5.2 Unsatisfactory |

CGCC Core Themes and Measures

Mission: Columbia Gorge Community College builds dreams and transforms lives by providing lifelong educational programs that strengthen our community.

| Core Theme B: Transforming Lives – Education | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| Planning Statement: CGCC provides learning <i>resources and</i> tools for a sustainable future for individuals by: | | | | | | |
| FOCUS | WHAT TO MEASURE | FUTURE TARGET (derived from a standard) | DATA SOURCE | WHO | CGCC RESULTS 2010-11 unless noted | GRADE |
| Objective B1: Ensuring alignment of programs with careers, industry standards and educational transfer requirements | B1.1: Percentage of programs reviewed using review process and schedule | B1.1: 100% | B1.1: Program Review Schedule | B1.1: Instructional Directors /Chairs | B1.1: 100% of the programs have been or are being reviewed as per schedule and will be completed by June. Analysis will be completed over summer to determine next steps. | B1.1: Target met |
| | B1.2: Percentage of program review recommendations that were implemented. | B1.2: 50% each year, for a three year cycle | B1.2: Program Review Analysis Reports (following either or both internal and external reporting requirements | B1.2: Instructional Directors /Chairs | B1.2: Program Review Template elements discussed at IC meeting 12/2011 to facilitate additional data collection and analysis. Data will be available by June 2012. | B1.2: Meets or exceeds target |
| | B1.3: Percentage of program review recommended implementations that were analyzed for effectiveness. | B1.3: 100% of the implemented recommendations were analyzed for effectiveness | B1.3: Program Review Analysis Reports | B1.3: Instructional Directors /Chairs | B1.3: Analysis of data and recommendations to occur for completed per schedule. | B1.3: Needs improvement |

CGCC Core Themes and Measures

Mission: Columbia Gorge Community College builds dreams and transforms lives by providing lifelong educational programs that strengthen our community.

| Core Theme B: Transforming Lives – Education | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| Planning Statement: CGCC provides learning <i>resources and</i> tools for a sustainable future for individuals by: | | | | | | |
| FOCUS | WHAT TO MEASURE | FUTURE TARGET (derived from a standard) | DATA SOURCE | WHO | CGCC RESULTS 2010-11 unless noted | GRADE |
| Objective B2: Ensuring alignment of classes and services to meet student goals and needs | B2.1: % of 2-year degree or 1-year certificate seeking students who graduated within 150% of time requirement | B2.1: 39% | B2.1 CGCC Student Data in RogueNet | B2.1: Institutional Researcher | B2.1: 15% of Fall 2007 degree seeking students completed their degree in 3 years 14% of Fall 2008 students with a goal of a certificate completed that in 2 years | B2.1: Unsatisfactory |
| | B2.2: Identify top 5 reasons for student drops and withdrawals | B2.2: No reasons where CGCC is responsible. | B2.2: Drop and Withdrawal Form Analysis (new report to be developed) | B2.2: Institutional Researcher or Registrar | B2.2: <u>Drop reasons:</u> Adjustment of schedule: 42.9% Schedule conflict: 9.2% Not enough time: 5.6% Reduce Course load: 5.3% Canceled course: 5.0% <u>Withdrawal reasons:</u> Family Obligations: 16.3% Health reasons: 14.4% Not enough time: 11.5% Employment conflict: 9.8% Very difficult: 8.2% | B2.2: Needs improvement |
| | B2.3: % of students who meet their stated goal | B2.3: 30% ³ | B2.3: Advising Survey (separate from admissions forms) | B2.3: Director of Advising or Registrar | B2.3: | B2.3: Delete Measure |
| | B2.4: % of students satisfied with CGCC | B2.4: 78% | B2.4: CCSSE | B2.4: Director of Advising and Institutional | B2.4 94% | B2.4: Meets or exceeds target |

CGCC Core Themes and Measures

Mission: Columbia Gorge Community College builds dreams and transforms lives by providing lifelong educational programs that strengthen our community.

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------------|--|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| | experience | | | Researcher | | |
| | B2.5: % of 1-year certificate & 2-year degree-seeking students who attend for 3 consecutive terms | B2.5: 60% | B2.5: CGCC student data in RogueNet | B2.5: Registrar or Institutional Researcher | B2.5: fall 10-spring 11: 59.3% | B2.5: Needs improvement |

CGCC Core Themes and Measures

Mission: Columbia Gorge Community College builds dreams and transforms lives by providing lifelong educational programs that strengthen our community.

| Core Theme B: Transforming Lives – Education | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Planning Statement: CGCC provides learning resources and tools for a sustainable future for individuals by: | | | | | | |
| FOCUS | WHAT TO MEASURE | FUTURE TARGET (derived from a standard) | DATA SOURCE | WHO | CGCC RESULTS 2010-11 unless noted | GRADE |
| Objective B3: Assessing attainment of course, program and degree outcomes on an annual basis. | B3.1: Percentage of instructors who implemented course evaluations in their courses. | B3.1: 95 % | B3.1: Course Evaluation responses via Survey Monkey | B3.1: Instructional Services Administrative Assistant | B3.1 Summer term 2011: 100% Fall term 2011: 100% Winter term 2012: 95% | B3.1: Meets or exceeds target |
| | B3.2: Percentage of instructors who completed the course evaluation and assessment cycle. | B3.2: Targets will be set by departments in Summer 2012 for 2012-13 | B3.2: Course evaluation and assessment processes | B3.2: Instructional Directors /Department Chairs | B3.2: Data available in 2012-13 | B3.2: Data not available |
| | B3.3: Percentage of students who meet course outcomes. | B 3.3: Targets will be set by departments in Summer 2012 for 2012-13 | B 3.3: Faculty course outcomes reviews | B 3.3: Institutional Researcher /Instructional Directors/Chairs | B 3.3: Data available in 2012-13 | B 3.3: Data not available |
| | B3.4: Percentage of students who meet degree/certificate/ program outcomes. | B3.4: Targets vary by degree, certificate and program. College-wide aggregate target will be developed Summer 2012 | B3.4: Degree and certificate program outcome assessment reports | B3.4: Instructional Coordinator and Institutional researcher | B3.4: Data available in 2012-13 | B3.4: Data not available |

CGCC Core Themes and Measures

Mission: Columbia Gorge Community College builds dreams and transforms lives by providing lifelong educational programs that strengthen our community.

| Core Theme B: Transforming Lives – Education | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Planning Statement: CGCC provides learning resources and tools for a sustainable future for individuals by: | | | | | | |
| FOCUS | WHAT TO MEASURE | FUTURE TARGET (derived from a standard) | DATA SOURCE | WHO | CGCC RESULTS 2010-11 unless noted | GRADE |
| Objective B4: Encouraging the acquisition and use of high quality teaching and support practices. | B4.1: % of faculty and staff attending professional development opportunities. | B4.1 33% participating in Professional Development activities 75% In-service | B4.1: Professional Development Request Form and Attendance rosters from faculty in-services | B4.1: Administrative Assistant to the CAO | B4.1: Faculty participating in Professional Development: 30% In-service: 60% Staff participating in Professional Development: none In-service: 56% | B4.1: Needs improvement |
| | B4.2: % of students who feel engaged with faculty. | B4.2 85% | B4.2: CCSSE | B4.2: Director of Advising and Institutional Researcher | B4.2 89.1% 2009 | B4.2 Meets or exceeds target |
| | B4.3: % of faculty and staff indicating satisfaction with their jobs. | B4.3 80% | B4.3: Annual Staff and Faculty Survey conducted by Human Resources | B4.3: Chief Talent and Strategy Officer | B4.3 Faculty 2010-11: 57.1% Staff 2010-11: 51.5% | B4.3 Unsatisfactory |
| | B4.4: % of faculty and staff demonstrating evidence-based practices. | B4.4 To be developed | B4.4: Faculty evaluation process – classroom observations | B4.4: Instructional Directors/Chairs | B4.4 Template to be developed in 2012-13 | B4.4 Data not available |
| | B4.5: Percentage of faculty and staff involved in orientation or mentoring programs | B4.5 To be developed | B4.5: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Orientation check-list Peer observations from faculty eval spreadsheet, | B4.5: Administrative Assistant to the CAO/ Instructional Directors/Chairs | B4.5 Template to be developed in 2012-13 | B4.5 Data not available |

CGCC Core Themes and Measures

Mission: Columbia Gorge Community College builds dreams and transforms lives by providing lifelong educational programs that strengthen our community.

| Core Theme C: Strengthen our Communities –Partnerships | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Planning Statement: CGCC links people and community resources by: | | | | | | |
| FOCUS | WHAT TO MEASURE | FUTURE TARGET (derived from a standard) | DATA SOURCE | WHO | CGCC RESULTS 2010-11 unless noted | GRADE |
| Objective C1: Cultivating productive business and industry relationships. | C1.1: Effectiveness of grants, funding, and in-kind donations | C1.1: 75% of grants receive a 4-5 rating using grants rubric (at completion of award period) | C1.1: Cost/benefit analysis created/used by the grants committee for grants and in-kind contributions | C1.1: CIAO | C1.1: Use DOL2 and DOE1 to test grants rubric | C1.1: Data not available |
| | C1.2 : Number of businesses and industries assisted by CGCC | C1.2: 1-35 jobs created 2-\$1 million private investment leveraged to support local business and industry 3-200 business clients assisted by SBDC 4-130 child-care providers served including 25 established | C1.2: SBDC Report Card: Jobs created Private investment leveraged Clients served Child Care Partners Report: Providers served Providers created | C1.2: SBDC Director CCP Director CIAO | C1.2: (1) 36 (2) \$693,788 (3) 248 (4) 67 providers served and 11 providers created | C1.2: 1. Meets or exceeds target 2. Needs improvement 3. Meets or exceeds target 4. Unsatisfactory |
| | C1.3 : Effectiveness of processes to assess business and industry needs | C1.3: 1 needs assessment completed annually 8 advisory committees 3 site visits annually | C1.3: Workforce Needs Assessments Number of active advisory committees* Site visits with industry | C1.3: | C1.3: (1) 4 needs assessments completed (2) 7 advisory committees in place (3) 4 site visits done | C1.3: 1. Meets or exceeds target 2. Needs improvement 3. Meets or exceeds target |
| | C1.4 : Number and effectiveness of workforce training activities. | C1.4: 9 employers using customized trainings served 89 employees 50 CTE employment placements | C1.4: Customized trainings: CTE programs & enrollments CTE employment placements College responses and/or connections to training needs | C1.4: | C1.4: (1) 5 employers using customized training served 167 employees (2) <i>Not able to track CTE employment placements at this time</i> | C1.4: 1. Unsatisfactory 2. Data not available |

CGCC Core Themes and Measures

Mission: Columbia Gorge Community College builds dreams and transforms lives by providing lifelong educational programs that strengthen our community.

| Objective C2: Creating, maintaining, and growing academic partnerships | C2.1 : % change of high school students attending CGCC (including College Now, EO/RS, Early College) | C2.1: 3% growth over historic average: High School Expanded Options, College Now, Running Start, Early College | C2.1: Outreach activities Collaborative projects Expanded Options, College Now, Running Start, Early College enrollments Articulation agreements | C2.1: CIAO Directors | C2.1: (1) 40 Running Start students (48% growth over 2009-10) (2) 12 Expanded Options students (56% decline over 2009-10) (3) 20 Early College students (na as 2010-11 is first year of this activity) (4) 231 College Now students (13% decline over 2009-10) | C2.1: Needs improvement |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| | C2.2 : Number, type and results of activities supporting community college, university and career tech relationships Student enrollment in these programs | C2.2: 8 articulation agreements 8 degree partnerships 10 number of dual-enrolled students | C2.2: Outreach activities Collaborative projects High school students who receive their diplomas through CGCC assistance Expanded Options, College Now, Running Start, Early College enrollments | C2.2: CAO CSSO Directors | C2.2: (1) 5 college articulation agreements (2) 6 degree partnerships (3) 7 dual-enrolled students | C2.2: Needs improvement |

CGCC Core Themes and Measures

Mission: Columbia Gorge Community College builds dreams and transforms lives by providing lifelong educational programs that strengthen our community.

| Core Theme C: Strengthen our Communities –Partnerships | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|----------------------|---|---|
| Planning Statement: CGCC links people and community resources by: | | | | | | |
| FOCUS | WHAT TO MEASURE | FUTURE TARGET (derived from a standard) | DATA SOURCE | WHO | CGCC RESULTS 2010-11 unless noted | GRADE |
| Objective C3. Cultivating productive relationships between governmental entities and community. | C3.1: Number of CGCC advocacy and collaborative efforts | C3.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 collaborative partnerships per year resulting in financial/other tangible benefits to both parties 150 college presentations and updates given to local groups | C3.1: Outreach team travel notes Intergovernmental agreements Presentations to local governments Presentations to service clubs | C3.1: CIAO | C3.1: (1) 4 IGAs signed (2) 150 presentations to the community | C3.1: Meets or exceeds target |
| | C3.2: Business recruitment efforts in which CGCC participated | C3.2: 3 business recruitment activities annually 25 conferences | C3.2: Number of successful business recruitments in which CGCC participated Business conferences in which CGCC helped represent the region | C3.2: CIAO | C3.2: (1) Zero recruitments (2) 20 Conferences | C3.2: Unsatisfactory |

CGCC Core Themes and Measures

Mission: Columbia Gorge Community College builds dreams and transforms lives by providing lifelong educational programs that strengthen our community.

| Core Theme C: Strengthen our Communities –Partnerships | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Planning Statement: CGCC links people and community resources by: | | | | | | |
| FOCUS | WHAT TO MEASURE | FUTURE TARGET (derived from a standard) | DATA SOURCE | WHO | CGCC RESULTS 2010-11 unless noted | GRADE |
| Objective C4. Creating, maintaining and growing community relationships | C4.1: Direct and indirect investments in the community | C4.1: 1-30 community events sponsored or participated in 2-Provide space to 16 organizations 3-90 staff/faculty represent the college through off-campus committees 4-Host 7 college-wide service activities 5-5 faculty lead service learning projects | C4.1: Sponsorship of community-based events CGCC facility space provided Participation on community boards/committees by students, faculty and staff Community service projects completed by CGCC faculty, staff, and students | C4.1: Directors Faculty director CTE Director Student life advisor | C4.1: (1) Sponsored 32 community events (2) Space provided to 29 organizations and special events (3) Provided 1,255 hours of space usage to the community (4) 92 faculty and staff represented the college on 83 unique organizations (5) 7 college-wide service activities (6) 5 faculty providing service learning projects | C4.1: Meets or exceeds target |
| | C4.2 : Number and type of educational, cultural, environmental, non-profit and civic partnerships | C4.2: 1-ACUPCC milestones 2-Host 20 outreach lunches, art shows, public workshops, and/or guest speakers 3-17 community events in which CGCC had a booth | C4.2: Public cultural and educational events Sustainability initiatives Number of community based groups supported by CGCC (space, staff, etc.) Community events in which CGCC has a promotional booths. | C4.2: CIAO Directors | C4.2 (1) “Green Team” met monthly (2) Hosted 11 outreach events: art shows, public workshops, theater, and brown bag lunches (3) 17 community events in which CGCC had a booth | C4.2: Needs improvement |

CGCC Core Themes and Measures

Mission: Columbia Gorge Community College builds dreams and transforms lives by providing lifelong educational programs that strengthen our community.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|----------------------|--|---|
| C4.3 Community awareness and perception of CGCC | C4.3 1-125 press and news releases annually 2-Grow average Facebook users by 400 annually 3-60,000 unique website visits per month 720,000 visits/yr. One community survey annually | C4.3: Media coverage, media publication of CGCC press releases Social media data: <i>Unique website visits</i> <i>Facebook friends added</i> Results from surveys Community survey results reported in narrative | C4.3: CIAO | C4:3 (1) 75 newspaper articles published and 51 press releases drafted (2) 456 Facebook “Likes” 1, 133 Facebook daily unique page views (3) 31,000 website visits | C4.3: Meets or exceeds target |
|---|---|---|----------------------|--|---|

Core Theme “A” (Opportunities)
Analysis and Actions for Improvement
(KC: July 16, 2012)

Objective A1—Offering a broad array of educational programs to meet current regional needs.

- 1. Description of results:** No description necessary for all target results. Self-explanatory.
- 2. Analysis of results:**

A.1—The target was not met by two percentage points. The target is to measure the number and types of degrees, certificates and programs being offered at CGCC. However the data speaks only to students who took an adult education course related to jobs or careers. This data does not support the target because it does not define career and job related courses, and does not measure the variety of courses. Further, “regional needs” must be defined in order to assess whether the target is an appropriate measure of the objective.

A1.2—The target measures regional high school completers who enroll immediately following graduation. This data is not available at this point in time and will not be available in the immediate future. This target is not measurable and cannot be used to measure improvement/attainment of the objective

A1.3—Targets are still in progress. Because of the scope of the targets and the number of variables out of CGCC’s control, it is difficult to know if or how CGCC can impact the results.
- 3. Actions for improvement:**

The following is recommended:

A1.1—Define “regional needs”. Once defined, evaluate whether the target is an appropriate measure of objective improvement or attainment.

A1.2—Since the target is not measureable, it is necessary to establish a different target in order to effectively measure objective.

A1.3—Evaluate whether this is a measure that CGCC can impact by meeting the needs of our region by providing appropriate programs. If not, a new target should be set that can effectively measure that need.
- 4. Effectiveness of Assessment:**

Tools and Methodology—The assessment tools seem to be appropriate, however the targets need to be revisited with the following clarifications made prior: define “broad array” and quantify if possible, define “regional needs”.

Objective A2: Offering diverse course delivery modes and service opportunities

Improvement Needed

A2.1: Course delivery methods

Meets or Exceeds Expectations

The percentage of students taking distance learning courses from CGCC in the 2010-2011 academic year was calculated from data in RogueNet. Both hybrid and web classes were counted as distance learning, as opposed to in person classes.

The target 20% of students taking distance learning courses comes from the U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics publication *The Condition of Education 2011 (NCES 2011-033)*, also found cited at the IES Institute of Education Statistics page *Fast Facts: Distance Learning* <http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=80>. The percentage at CGCC for 2010-2011 was 23%, meeting the target and exceeding it by 3%. To maintain target-level percentages, distance learning courses should continue being offered at a minimum of 20% of all courses offered, to allow the possibility of 20% students. However, because distance learning courses had a higher fill rate (see next measurement A2.2) than in person, this would seem to indicate that there is an increasing demand for distance learning courses which should be met.

The target was based on a national statistic from a reputable source, but the number might not be static. As the National Center for Education Statistics updates their data in upcoming years, so should CGCC continually update their target to match.

2010-2011

| FTE | Summer | Fall | Winter | Spring | Total | Percent |
|------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Hybrid | 10.82 | 28.46 | 30.32 | 30.45 | 100.05 | 9.6% |
| Online | 40.23 | 44.62 | 51.8 | 54.86 | 191.51 | 18.4% |
| In Person | 55.67 | 242.91 | 218.52 | 231.7 | 748.8 | 72.0% |
| Total | 106.72 | 315.99 | 300.64 | 317.01 | 1040.36 | 100.0% |

A2.2: Course scheduling

Unsatisfactory

The statistic for this measurement was taken from number of seats filled compared to number of seats available for all courses offered by CGCC during the academic year 2010-2011. This data was taken from RogueNet and separated by type of course: hybrid, online, and in person.

76.6% of courses were in person and had a 57.5% fill rate (satisfaction). 14.6% of courses were online and had 84.2% fill rate (satisfaction). 8.8% of courses were hybrid and had 73% fill rate (satisfaction). The weighted fill rate for credit courses overall was 66%. The in person courses have the lowest fill rate, albeit they are the majority of courses offered. But as the trend appears to be an increasing of distance learning, this proportion should change in favor of hybrid and online classes.

The target of 87% was taken from the University of Washington 2005 Accountability Report, http://www.washington.edu/admin/factbook/Accountability/2004-05_accountability_rpt.pdf), which does not seem to be a most decisive example, but it was the only example that could be found at that time. If a national or state standard could be found, that would be preferable to use as a target. Regardless, it seems that 66% of seats offered being filled leaves much room for improvement.

2010-2011 For Credit Courses

| Sections | Summer | Fall | Winter | Spring | Total | Percent |
|-----------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Canceled | 15 | 8 | 5 | 16 | 44 | 7.0% |
| Hybrid | 9 | 14 | 16 | 16 | 55 | 8.8% |
| Online | 18 | 23 | 24 | 26 | 91 | 14.6% |
| In Person | 54 | 139 | 129 | 157 | 479 | 76.6% |
| Total | 81 | 176 | 169 | 199 | 625 | 100% |

| FTE | Summer | Fall | Winter | Spring | Total | Percent |
|------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Hybrid | 10.82 | 28.46 | 30.32 | 30.45 | 100.05 | 9.6% |
| Online | 40.23 | 44.62 | 51.8 | 54.86 | 191.51 | 18.4% |
| In Person | 55.67 | 242.91 | 218.52 | 231.7 | 748.8 | 72.0% |
| Total | 106.72 | 315.99 | 300.64 | 317.01 | 1040.36 | 100.0% |

| Fill Rate | Summer | Fall | Winter | Spring | Total |
|------------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| Hybrid | 61.0% | 72.4% | 77.6% | 81.2% | 74.6% |
| Online | 79.4% | 99.7% | 78.4% | 79.1% | 83.5% |
| In Person | 40.4% | 67.9% | 62.1% | 59.4% | 60.6% |
| All Courses | | | | | 65.6% |

| Seats Filled | Summer | Fall | Winter | Spring | Total |
|---------------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| Hybrid | 144 | 246 | 325 | 333 | 1048 |
| Online | 429 | 578 | 575 | 620 | 2202 |
| In Person | 514 | 2338 | 2131 | 2298 | 7281 |
| All Courses | | | | | 10531 |

| Seats Available | Summer | Fall | Winter | Spring | Total |
|------------------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| Hybrid | 236 | 340 | 419 | 410 | 1405 |
| Online | 540 | 580 | 733 | 784 | 2637 |
| In Person | 1273 | 3444 | 3429 | 3868 | 12014 |
| All Courses | | | | | 16056 |

A2.3: Service delivery methods

Meets or Exceeds Expectations

This data was gathered by comparing services and information available on the websites for the other 16 community colleges of Oregon and taking an average from those results to use as a target for CGCC. Full names and homepages of the community colleges can be on the Oregon Community College Association website at <http://www.occa17.com/member-colleges>.

No formal information was requested of the colleges nor was there any form of a survey. I merely searched for the below information myself, which does not seem very scientific, but I came to the conclusion that this would perhaps better represent what a student or prospective student would be able to find, as opposed to being told what is there by the college itself. This means, of course, that the services could be in fact available, but not readily visible. But if students can't find them, they might as well be non-existent.

Because I know where all CGCC's library services are located by virtue of working on the website, the data may be skewed in favor of CGCC. However, I know nothing about student services' website. I think this measurement is meaningful, but the data collecting should be more organized and less ad hoc. The sample services picked to measure could be changed. This is certainly not an exhaustive list, nor perhaps even the best representation of services. Because of the increase in distance learning, the target should eventually be 100%, though it might a while to get there.

| Column: | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K |
|-------------|----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|----------|------------|-----------|------------|----------|
| | Register | Library Card | Get Advising | Databases Ask | Financial Aid | ILLs | E-Reserves | Textbooks | Transcript | |
| BMCC | y | y | y | y | n | y | y | y | n | n |
| COCC | y | n | y | n | y | n | y | y | n | y |
| Chemeketa | | y | n | n | n | n | n | y | y | n n |
| Clackamas | y | n | y | y | y | n | y | y | n | n |
| Clatsop | y | n | y | n | n | n | y | y | n | n |
| KCC | n | n | n | n | n | n | y | n | n | n |
| LCC | y | n | y | y | y | n | y | y | n | n |
| LBCC | y | n | n | y | y | n | y | y | n | n |
| MHCC | y | n | n | y | y | n | y | y | y | n |
| OCCC | y | n | y | n | n | y | y | y | n | n |
| PCC | y | n | y | y | y | n | y | y | n | n |
| RCC | y | n | y | y | y | n | y | y | n | n |
| SOCC | y | n | y | y | y | n | y | y | n | n |
| TBCC | y | n | y | n | n | n | y | y | n | n |
| TVCC | y | n | y | n | n | n | y | y | n | n |
| UCC | y | y | y | y | y | n | y | y | n | n |
| CGCC | y | n | y | y | y | y | y | y | y | n |

Explanatory Notes

B: Can you register online?

C: Can you get academic advising online?

D: Can you register for financial aid online?

E: Can you request and receive textbooks online?

F: Can you request a transcript (official) online?

G: Can you get a library card online?

H: Can you use databases online (from home)?

I: Can you ask a librarian a question online?

J: Can you request and receive ILLs online?

K: Can you look up e-reserves online (from home)?

| | % Student Services Online | % Library Online | % All Online |
|----------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| BMCC | 80% | 60% | 70% |
| COCC | 60% | 60% | 60% |
| Chemeketa | 20% | 40% | 30% |
| Clackamas | 80% | 40% | 60% |
| Clatsop | 40% | 40% | 40% |
| KCC | 0% | 20% | 10% |
| LCC | 80% | 40% | 60% |
| LBCC | 60% | 40% | 50% |
| MHCC | 60% | 60% | 60% |
| OCCC | 40% | 60% | 50% |
| PCC | 80% | 40% | 60% |
| RCC | 80% | 40% | 60% |
| SOCC | 80% | 40% | 60% |
| TBCC | 40% | 40% | 40% |
| TVCC | 40% | 40% | 40% |
| UCC | 100% | 40% | 70% |
| Average | 59% | 44% | 51% |
| CGCC | 80% | 80% | 80% |

Objective A3: Serving the diversity of the service area

A3.1: Demographics of students—close but probably does not meet target.

While CGCC is close to the ethnic diversity of the region, the targets need to be clarified with further work, especially in the overlapping of Hispanic and other minorities designations. This measure could also be broken down by county/campus to ensure that both campuses are serving the demographics of each area and I would recommend separating students by programs (for example, is the diversity of degree seeking students similar to the region).

A3.2: Demographics of faculty. Needs improvement.

All full time faculty are white so this measure does not replicate the diversity of the region. The part-time faculty are a bit more diverse but again not as diverse as the region.

A3.3: Demographics of staff. Needs improvement

Less diverse than the region, especially in part-time staff.

A3.4: Demographics of graduates. Close but does not meet target

More closely representative of the demographics of the region.

Overall—I would say this objective needs improvement in all areas as well as refining the objectives a bit more to clearly identify the specific outcomes desired. Improvement needed.

Objective A4: Applying consistent hiring practices

To create consistent hiring practices, The Human Resources department has created a series of checklists that cover all aspects of the hire process to assure a standard process is in place at the college. From these checklists, twenty key data points are tracked to assure compliance with all new applicant/hire situations and evaluate compliance.

These twenty points are compiled and analyzed for the following years:

- 2010 a 31% compliance rate is noted
- 2011 a 28% compliance rate is noted

Both of these years fall short of the initial goal of 100% and this shortfall can be mainly attributed to the following three factors:

- “Electronic copy of the paper screen document sent to HR”
- “Screening committee pledge forms completed and sent back”
- “Electronic copy of interview questions sent to HR”

We are on the right track but the removal of the word “electronic” from two of these three points better captures that compliance has been met and significantly changes the success percentage. In addition, the creation of a hiring package that clearly outlines a step by step process to a supervisor that they must undertake during the hiring process assures all the correct documentation is completed. Perhaps another look at the specific data points is prudent as well to assure that the tracked data points used for tracked are salient to assuring consistent hiring practices.

Objective A5 Applying Processes that lead to retention – What to Measure

5.1 Percent retention (faculty & staff)

– Description of Results - Based on data from Human Resources for the period 2010 -2011 CGCC experienced a 10% average quit rate for faculty/staff).

- Analysis of Results – Target was set at 1.2% average quit rate. The standard was based on US Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Job Openings and Labor Turnover Survey data extracted 8/26/11

for Education and Health Service Total Separations which is the category coming closest to the criteria of Objective 5.1. Unfortunately this author misinterpreted the data by using monthly data rather than annual which is the comparison result reported by Human Resources. Adjusting the Future Target for BLS annual data for the period 2010-2011 the target would have been 10.6%.

-Actions for Improvement – With the limited data available the recommended next step is to continue to gather turnover data and review annually. At this time we appear to be meeting the goal of matching national averages

-Effectiveness of Assessment

- Tools & Methodology - It may be possible to get turnover statistics that are closer to community college faculty/staff when other like institutions publish their results.

- Future Targets - Without further data no change in policy should be recommended

5.1 Percent retention (student) –

- Description of Results – Based on data from Human Resources for the period Fall 2010 to Fall 2011 CGCC experienced a student retention rate of 29.5% for all students. (Retention of credit students was 40.2% for the same period).

- Analysis of Results – Target was set at 28.7% which was based on the 2008 student retention rate.

-Actions for Improvement – Based on the limited data, it appears we have exceeded our goal by approximately 10%. More data should be accumulated and future goals adjusted.

-Effectiveness of Assessment

- Tools & Methodology - Segregating this goal between credit and non-credit students may be useful. The goal of retention of non-credit students should be re-evaluated in light of area demographics. Retention of credit students should be re-evaluated to include those students who matriculate or transfer to another institution.

- Future Targets - Without further data no change in policy should be recommended

5.2 Level of morale (faculty & staff)

- Description of results – Based on HR annual survey for the period 2010-2011 faculty and staff morale was significantly lower than target.

- Analysis of results -At this time is it not possible to analyze the significant change in the survey.

- Actions for improvement – Before recommending next steps, a review of the data and methodology should be undertaken.

- Effectiveness of Assessment

-Tools & Methodology - Given the significant drop in survey results from the 2009 survey a review of the survey and methodology should be undertaken to determine causes.

- Future Targets – Using a prior year survey as a benchmark seems a reasonable approach to measuring morale. Consistency of data and methodology needs to be insured.

5.2 Level of morale (students)

- Description of results – Student morale measured in terms of percent of students who would recommend CGCC to friend or family increased by over 18% during the period 2009 to 2010-2011.

- Analysis of results – This rather large increase in student morale calls into question the consistency of the survey. A review of the survey and methodology should be undertaken to determine if the change is due to actual level of morale, to changes in the reporting system, or to faulty data in the base survey.

- Actions for improvement - Before recommending next steps, a review of the data and methodology should be undertaken.

- Effectiveness of Assessment

-Tools & Methodology - - Given the significant increase in survey results from the 2009 survey, a review of the survey and methodology should be undertaken to determine if the change is due to actual level of morale, to changes in the reporting system, or to faulty data in the base survey.

- Future targets - Using a prior year survey as a benchmark seems a reasonable approach to measuring morale. Consistency of data and methodology needs to be insured.

SUMMARY:

As this was the first year for setting targets and analyzing the data, it would appear that more work needs to be done in clearly stating the desired outcomes of each measure. What populations are we specifically looking at? What data is accurately and consistently available to us? To give this a “grade” I would say Core Theme A “Needs Improvement” in some areas and “Meets Expectations” in Others. The needs improvement areas probably outweigh the meets expectations so would summarize by saying that **Core Theme A overall Needs Improvement.**

Report of Core Theme Analysis and Actions for Improvement

Core Theme B

Susan Wolff, Dave Mason, Julie Belmore, Brian Greene, Dan Ropek & Richard Parker (June 2012)

Grade Summary:

Meets or Exceeds Target: 5

Needs Improvement: 4

Unsatisfactory: 2

NA/to be developed: 5

Planning Statement

CGCC provides learning resources for a sustainable future for individuals.

Objective B1

Ensuring alignment of programs with careers, industry standards, and education transfer requirements

Measure B1.1 Percentage of programs reviewed using review process and schedule

Description of Results:

Six programs were reviewed using the CGCC review process and one program was reviewed using CCWD's process and schedule.

Analysis of Results:

100% of programs scheduled for review were reviewed.

Actions for Improvement:

No improvement is needed.

Effectiveness of Analysis:

Analysis was effective.

Objective Grade:

| Target | Actual | Grade |
|----------------------------|--------|-------------------------|
| 100% | 100% | Meets or Exceeds Target |
| Total Average Score | | |

Measure B1.2 Percentage of program review recommendations that were implemented

Description of Results:

- The Adult Basic Ed/ESOL program review was conducted in 3/09. There were five recommendations. As of May, 2012, 3.5 have been implemented. This program review is on a seven year cycle.

- The Early Education & Family Studies program review was conducted 12/09. There were six recommendations; four were implemented in 2010-11.
- The Computer Applications Systems program review was conducted 3/12. There were eight recommendations; one has already been implemented in 2012.
- The Emergency Medical Services, Nursing Assistant, Medical Assisting and American Heart Association Certified Training Centers programs were reviewed, and each had recommendations

Analysis of Results:

The ABE/ESOL recommendations appear to be “on track” given the seven year cycle. Sixty-seven per cent of the Early Education & Family Studies recommendations have been implemented. It is too early to do an analysis of the Computer Applications Systems review as it was just recently completed. The Emergency Medical Services, Nursing Assistant, Medical Assisting and American Heart Association Certified Training Centers program review recommendations were all implemented.

Actions for Improvement:

We seem to be “on track” with the percentage of recommendations that were implemented given the review cycles.

Effectiveness of Analysis:

We may consider revising this target, i.e. if the review cycle is three years, expect 33% of the recommendations be completed each year.

Objective Grade:

| Target | Actual | Grade |
|----------------------------|--------|-------------------------|
| 50% | 100% | Meets or Exceeds Target |
| Total Average Score | | |

Measure B1.3 Percentage of program review recommendation implementations that were analyzed for effectiveness

Description of Results:

- 100% of the ABE/ESOL recommendations have been analyzed for effectiveness, as this is a component of an annual reporting process.
- None of the Early Education & Family Studies recommendations have been analyzed for effectiveness
- 100% of the Emergency Medical Services, Nursing Assistant, Medical Assisting and American Heart Association Certified Training Centers program review recommendations implemented have been analyzed for effectiveness.

Analysis of Results:

Some areas are analyzing program review recommendations that had been implementing, but the survey responses indicate a lack of common understanding of this measure and thereby cast doubt on the data.

Actions for Improvement:

Suggest that we review this objective and its intent, i.e. what is meant by “analyzed for effectiveness.”

Effectiveness of Analysis:

This is a more difficult target to measure as it is open to a wide range of interpretation from the respondents.

Objective Grade:

| Target | Actual | Grade |
|---------------------|--------|-------------------|
| 100% | 66% | Needs improvement |
| Total Average Score | | |

Objective B.2 Ensuring alignment of classes and services to meet student goals and needs

Measure B.2.1 Percentage of 2-year degree or 1-year certificate seeking students who graduated within 150% of time requirement

Description of Results:

15% of fall 2007 degree seeking students completed their degree in 3 years and 14% of fall 2008 students with a goal of a certificate completed that in 2 years.

Analysis of Results:

Our initial target of 39% was based on level seen in our region. While the results are substantially below that level, they are remarkably consistent with numbers for public 2-year institutions in Oregon (14%). Why Oregon would show levels lower than the region as a whole is unclear.

Actions for Improvement:

[Complete College America](#) suggests a few interesting approaches:

- Reduce time to degree and accelerate success
- Transform remediation
- Restructure delivery for today’s students

Effectiveness of Analysis:

Analysis was effective.

Objective Grade:

| Target | Actual | Grade |
|--------|--------|-------|
|--------|--------|-------|

| | | |
|----------------------------|-----|----------------|
| 39% | 15% | Unsatisfactory |
| Total Average Score | | |

Measure B.2.2 Identify top 5 reasons for student drops and withdrawals

Description of Results

Drop reasons:

Adjustment of schedule: 42.9%

Schedule conflict: 9.2%

Not enough time: 5.6%

Reduce Course load: 5.3%

Canceled course: 5.0%

Withdrawal reasons:

Family Obligations: 16.3%

Health reasons: 14.4%

Not enough time: 11.5%

Employment conflict: 9.8%

Very difficult: 8.2%

Analysis of Results:

It would be helpful to know more about the big (42.9%) adjustment of schedule number to see if proactive actions could be taken to mitigate it. Other reasons that CGCC might be able to influence change would be 'schedule conflict' and 'canceled courses'. Finally, 'very difficult' may indicate courses where expectations could be better communicated prior to or during registration, perhaps via placement exams or the advising process.

Actions for Improvement:

Get more details about the 42.9% adjustment of schedule line. Then look for patterns within the details of the data and utilize SEM results to see if: 1) courses are being scheduled properly (especially courses likely to be taken in simultaneously); and 2) see if some courses are more likely than others to have students withdraw because the course is 'very difficult'. In addition, the college should continue to look for ways to reduce the number of courses it needs to cancel each term.

Effectiveness of Analysis:

In retrospect a 100% target (i.e. no reasons where CGCC is responsible) was an overly optimistic goal. In the future we recommend revising it to a more realistic 80%.

Objective Grade:

| Target | Actual | Grade |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| No reasons where CGCC is responsible. | 1 (canceled course) | Needs Improvement |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Total Average Score | |
|----------------------------|--|

Measure B.2.4 Percentage of students satisfied with CGCC experience

Description of Results:

2008 CCSSE data: 94% of respondents said they would recommend CGCC to their friends or family members. We then use recommendations as a proxy for satisfaction.

Analysis of Results:

Our findings indicate that an overwhelming majority of CGCC students are satisfied with their experience at the college.

Actions for Improvement:

Given that we're currently exceeding our target for this measure no actions are necessary at this time.

Effectiveness of Analysis:

Analysis was effective.

Objective Grade:

| Target | Actual | Grade |
|----------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| 78% | 94% | Meets or exceeds target |
| Total Average Score | | |

Measure B.2.5 Percentage of 1-year certificate and 2-year degree-seeking students who attend 3 consecutive terms

Description of Results:

59.3% of fall 2010 students attended the subsequent two terms.

Analysis of Results:

Our results match our target almost perfectly and are in line with overall national numbers. Notably, the national number for 2-year institutions is roughly 51%, suggesting CGCC is over-performing in this metric. Still, given that we did not technically meet our target we should consider revising the target or addressing the .7% improvement needed to reach 60%.

Actions for Improvement:

Given that CGCC is essentially meeting our goals for this metric our improvement efforts should first be focused elsewhere before we try to improve our continuous enrollment numbers.

Effectiveness of Analysis:

Analysis was effective.

Objective Grade:

| Target | Actual | Grade |
|----------------------------|--------|-------------------|
| 60% | 59.3% | Needs Improvement |
| Total Average Score | | |

Objective 3: Assessing attainment of course, program, and degree outcomes on an annual basis**Measure B.3.1 Percentage of instructors who implemented course evaluations in their courses**Description of Results:

Data from three consecutive terms were collected to measure B.3.1.

Analysis of Results:

All three terms met or exceeded the target.

Actions for Improvement:

None at this time.

Effectiveness of Analysis:

The objective and the data collected to analyze were unambiguous, showing course evaluations are routinely administered at CGCC.

Objective Grade:

| Target | Actual | Grade |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| 95% | Summer 2010: 100% | Meets or Exceeds Target |
| | Fall 2011: 100% | Meets or Exceeds Target |
| | Winter 2012: 95% | Meets or Exceeds Target |
| Total Average Score 98.3 % | | |

Measure B.3.2 Percentage of instructors who completed the course evaluation and assessment cycle

On hold pending development of targets by departments in summer 2012 for the 2012-13 year. This item will be discussed at the July Instructional Council meeting as part of the broader outcomes assessment conversation.

Description of ResultsAnalysis of ResultsActions for ImprovementEffectiveness of AnalysisObjective Grade

| Target | Actual | Grade |
|----------------------------|--------|-------|
| To be developed | | NA |
| Total Average Score | | |

Measure B.3.3. Percentage of students who meet course outcomes

On hold pending development of targets by departments in summer 2012 for the 2012-13 year. This item will be discussed at the July Instructional Council meeting as part of the broader outcomes assessment conversation.

Description of Results

Analysis of Results

Actions for Improvement

Effectiveness of Analysis

Objective Grade

| Target | Actual | Grade |
|---------------------|--------|-------|
| To be developed | | NA |
| Total Average Score | | |

Measure B.3.4 Percentage of students who meet degree/certificate/program outcomes

On hold pending development in summer 2012. This item will be discussed at the July Instructional Council meeting as part of the broader outcomes assessment conversation.

Description of Results

Analysis of Results

Actions for Improvement

Effectiveness of Analysis

Objective Grade

| Target | Actual | Grade |
|---------------------|--------|-------|
| To be developed | | NA |
| Total Average Score | | |

Objective B 4: Encouraging the acquisition and use of high quality teaching and support practices

Measure B.4.1 Percentage of faculty and staff attending professional development opportunities

Description of Results:

For the 2010-2011 academic year, professional development participation was measured as follows: For the professional development component, the names of faculty who had participated in outside professional development activities that were paid for through professional development funds was obtained. The number of faculty who participated was found to be 30% of all faculty. This method neglected to collect activities such as webinars that are free to faculty or for credits earned that were not paid for by CGCC.

While there are funds set aside for professional development for each faculty member, there is no similar appropriation for staff. Without this straightforward way of collecting this data, it was not possible to collect the names of staff who had completed professional development during 2010-2011 either by way of free opportunities or activities that were paid for through other cost centers. For this reason, this measurement was not taken.

In order to collect more complete professional development data for the 2011 – 2012 academic year, a survey was created and e-mailed to all faculty and staff in May, 2012. A more thorough list of professional development opportunities that faculty or staff may be availing themselves of, including reading professional journals, earning college credits, attaining a professional degree, etc. was developed. Based on the 48 faculty responses and the 34 staff responses and this enlarged definition of professional development, a sizable majority of both faculty and staff self-reported to be involved in professional development outside of the CGCC in-services.

The CGCC in-service participation levels were obtained as follows:

For each of the mandatory in-services, the number of attendees was compared to the number of staff or faculty employed by the college at the time of that particular in-service.

For the staff, there were two in-services, with 63% participation at the 10/20/10 in-service and 49% participation at the 4/20/11 in-service. Included as staff were classified, confidential, special projects and management personnel, but no faculty or students.

For the faculty, there were two in-services with a 56% participation rate at the 9/18/10 in-service (based on 17 full-time and 96 part-time faculty on 10/29/10- this date was used as opposed to 9/30/10 when only 58 part-time faculty were listed, a carryover from summer faculty numbers) and a 60% participation rate at the April 2 in-service (based on 17 full-time and 93 part-time faculty on 3/31/11) for an average participation rate of 58%.

For 2011-2012, staff in-service participation was 61% on 10/2/11, 62% on 2/7/12 and 62% on 5/11/12 for an average of 62%. Faculty in-service participation was 66% on 9/24/11, 39% on 11/5/11 and 57% on 4/7/12 for an average of 54%.

Analysis of Results:

Although CGCC does offer in-service and professional development opportunities to the staff and faculty of the college, for 2010-2011 only incomplete data regarding other professional development was available. For the 2011-2012 academic year, survey results indicate that a much larger percentage of both staff and faculty were availing themselves of professional development opportunities. Based on this survey, an adjustment should be made to the 33% goal, which has proven to be too low.

For the in-services, the results indicate that CGCC does not appear to be meeting the goal of 75% participation at mandatory in-services.

Actions for Improvement:

Efforts should be made to determine if the topics offered at the in-service are not of interest to the faculty and staff or whether the scheduling of the in-services does not allow for full participation.

Effectiveness of Analysis:

Analysis was effective.

Objective Grade: Improvement Needed

| Target | Actual | Grade |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 2010-2011 Professional development: 33% | Faculty: 30% Staff: not available | Needs Improvement |
| 2011-2012 Professional development: 33% | Faculty: 83.3% Staff: 66.7% | Meets or exceeds target |
| 2010-2011 In-service attendance: 75% | Faculty: 58% Staff: 56% | Needs Improvement |
| 2011-2012 In-service attendance: 75% | Faculty: 54% Staff: 62% | Needs Improvement |
| Total Average Score | | |

Measure B.4.2 Percentage of students who feel engaged with facultyDescription of Results:

The most recent data that specifically addresses student engagement was found in the 2008 CCSSE survey. In Key Topic 3: Relationships, 89.1% of the surveyed students indicated that they rated their relations with instructors as “More Favorable.”

The 2011 CCSSE has a new format and the data that most closely related to the question about engagement with faculty was: “Worked with instructors on activities other than coursework.”

Only 6.1% of surveyed students responded ‘Often’ or ‘Very often’ to this questions, as compared to 9.3% of respondents in the 2011 CCSSE Cohort, indicating that this is one of our lowest student engagement scores in the 2011 survey. Also, CGCC’s standardized score on “Student-Faculty Interaction” was 52.1 compared to a mean of 50. The score for top-performing colleges was 58.1.

Analysis of Results:

Because of the change in the presentation of the CCSSE reports from 2008 to 2011, it is difficult to know if student perception of engagement with faculty has increased or decreased.

Actions for Improvement:

Responding only to the 2008 data, no actions would seem to be necessary.

Effectiveness of Analysis:

Analysis was effective.

Objective Grade:

| Target | Actual | Grade |
|----------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| 85% | 89.1% (2008) | Meets or Exceeds Target |
| Total Average Score | | |

Measure B.4.3 Percentage of faculty and staff indicating satisfaction with their jobs

Description of Results:

These results for the 2010-2011 academic year are from the annual Staff and Faculty Survey, which is conducted by Human Resources. The measured results were the responses to the question: "Taking everything into account, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with working at CGCC?"

Analysis of Results:

In an attempt to analyze this data more fully, the top three statements that faculty and staff 'Disagree or 'Strongly Disagreed' with were collected.

Results for Faculty: "I am aware of the accomplishments of my colleagues" 47.7%

"I feel the benefits package I get at CGCC is fair and competitive" 40%

"My total compensation package (salary and benefits) is fair and competitive" 40%

When asked to suggest two things that would most make CGCC a better place, 61.9% of the faculty indicated "Increased salaries/ bigger increases; improved benefits." This is a decrease from 2010 (68.8%) as well as 2009 (72.4%).

Results for Staff: "In comparison with people in similar jobs at other organizations, I feel my pay is fair" 77.2%

"My salary/ pay is fair compensation" 65.7%

"CGCC has sufficient opportunities for promotion" 60.7%

The percentage of staff who indicated that they see negative changes taking place in "Increased salaries/ bigger increases; improved benefits" was 78.8%. This was only 42.1% in 2010 and 24.4% in 2009.

Both faculty and staff were loud and clear that many of them were not satisfied with working at CGCC. For the faculty, the main components could be considered to be their "disconnect" from knowledge about the accomplishments of their colleagues and their low compensation packages. Both of these issues are directly related to the dominance of part-time faculty at CGCC. With only 17 full-time faculty, 85% of the faculty is part-time, most likely one of the largest percentages in community colleges. According to the 2010 American Academic National Survey of Part-time/Adjunct Faculty, 70% of community college instructors hold part-time positions.

The majority of the staff also does not feel that compensation is adequate or that they have opportunities for advancement at CGCC. Both of these problems are likely contributing to the increasing perception that salaries are heading in a negative direction and these factors are likely affecting morale.

Actions for Improvement:

Dedicate more college resources toward hiring full-time faculty and to more fairly compensate staff.

Effectiveness of Analysis:

Analysis was effective.

Objective Grade:

| Target | Actual | Grade |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 80% | Faculty: 57.1% Staff: 51.5% | Unsatisfactory |
| Total Average Score | | |

Measure B.4.4 Percentage of faculty and staff demonstrating evidence-based practices

To be developed.

Description of Results:

Analysis of Results:

Actions for Improvement:

Effectiveness of Analysis:

Objective Grade:

| Target | Actual | Grade |
|----------------------------|--------|-------|
| To be developed | | NA |
| Total Average Score | | |

Measure B.4.5 Percentage of faculty and staff involved in orientation or mentoring programs

To be developed.

Description of Results:

Analysis of Results:

Actions for Improvement:

In May 2012 a survey was sent to all faculty and staff asking if they have been involved in a mentoring relationship during the 2011-2012 academic year. The number of hours that they estimated they spent on this work was also requested. There were 48 faculty responses and 34 staff responses. Of the faculty that answered that they were involved in a mentoring relationship at the college, 41.7% said they spent 1 – 5 hours, 29.2% spent 5 – 10 hours, 12.5% spent 10 – 15 hours and 16.7% spent 15 or more hours. For the staff, 60% spent 1 – 5 hours, 20% spent 5 – 10 and 20% spent 15 or more.

Effectiveness of Analysis:

For this measure, the first data has been collected before a target was determined. For this reason, analysis is not yet appropriate.

Objective Grade

| Target | Actual | Grade |
|----------------------------|---|-------|
| In development | 2011-2012: Faculty- 51.1%; Staff- 14.7% | NA |
| Total Average Score | | |

Core Theme C Narrative

(7-9-12: KC combined all parts into one document)

C1.1

Description of results:

Four grant opportunities reviewed using rubric (target = 75% of grants receive a 4-5 rating using grants rubric)

1. Rubric applied to Dept. of Labor II and Dept. of Energy I grants as test of completed grants.
 - a. Dept. of Labor II: 4.36
 - b. Dept. of Energy I: 4.14
2. Rubric has also been applied to OVAE, TAACCT II and HCIC grant opportunities.
 - a. OVAE: 0.94 (College ineligible to apply)
 - b. TAACCT II: 5.0 (One reviewer; needs WIA-led consortium)
 - c. HCIC: 1.91 (College partnering with Gorge Health Connect)

Analysis of results:

The grants rubric is designed for two purposes: to assess, in advance, the advisability of applying for a grant opportunity and to assess, after the fact, whether a grant obtained was worth the effort associated with that grant. In this first cycle of analysis, there has not been the opportunity to assess any grant at both stages – prior to application and post-completion. Instead, we tested the rubric on two grants post-completion (both of which originated as Congressionally-directed funding, or “earmarks,” and thus involved non-competitive but still time-consuming grant applications). We have also initiated prior review of grant opportunities. However, not all grant committee members returned their rubrics, and of those returned not everyone had the time to conduct a thorough analysis. Even with limited returns, this opportunity for prior analysis did reveal a fundamental problem with one of the grants under consideration (TAACCT II), in that the college did not qualify as grant lead. Instead, we elected to serve as partner in two related proposals (submitted by MCCOG and South Central Workforce Council). We also partnered with Gorge Health Connect in the HCIC proposal. None of these three partnership proposals has yet been awarded. If these are awarded, we will apply the grants rubric upon grant completion. In the meantime, we will continue to apply the rubric to new grant opportunities as a baseline reference for the next cycle of analysis.

Actions for improvement:

1. The grants rubric needs to clearly identify the grant opportunity at the top of the Excel spreadsheet. A new version of the rubric (051812) has been created with this identification field. This also identifies whether the college is lead or partner to another organization.
2. Systematic use of the grants rubric is necessary to maintain statistical consistency over time and to help ensure validity of averaged ratings. To achieve this, the lead for each grant should report to the grants committee, which should then complete the rubric through group review and consensus. This can be achieved through as an agenda item during grant committee meetings.
3. In some instances, grants rubric responses are limited to e-mail comments but do not include a return copy of the rubric. It will be difficult to track two sets of comments (e-mail and rubric). Since the rubric contains a field for comments, this is where comments should be noted so that completed rubrics can be compiled for later review.

4. We discovered that two versions of the grants rubric were in circulation, one of which did not provide fields for comment after grant award. The revised rubric (version 051812) has the correct fields and will be used going forward.

Effectiveness of assessment:

1. Since there has not been opportunity in the current analysis cycle to follow a grant all the way through the process from pre-application review to post-award analysis, we cannot yet determine the effectiveness of the grants assessment.

C1.2

Description of results

| | Target: |
|--|-------------------------|
| ■ Jobs created: 36 | 35 |
| ■ Private investment leveraged: \$693,788 | \$1 million |
| ■ Business clients assisted by SBDC: 248 | 200 |
| ■ Providers served by CCP: 67, with 11 established | 130 with 25 established |

Analysis of results

C.1.2 measures (Number of businesses and industries assisted by CGCC) derive primarily from operational experience gained through the Small Business Development Center and Child Care Partners. Thus, associated targets are based upon many previous years of data collection; data gathered for these measures are also used in the SBDC and CCP annual reports submitted to respective state networks. SBDC targets related to job creation and clients served are realistic, reflecting real-world experience gained over many years. Targets should not be increased unless there is a corresponding increase in staffing capacity at SBDC to handle additional caseload. In reality, budgetary constraints impose continuing challenges in this regard. Private investment leveraged, while close to target for the period analyzed, reflects continuing effects of the regional and national recession. In fact, we anticipate a much lower level of private investment in the next analysis cycle, falling well short of target. Nevertheless, we should maintain the \$1 million target, since this is based upon operational experience over many years and should serve as a long-term baseline reference. Child Care Partners target reflects recent expansion of the CCP Service Delivery Area to include Sherman, Gilliam and Wheeler counties. The targets represent an extrapolation based upon the previous, smaller service area (Hood River and Wasco counties alone). While results fell short of target in this initial analysis year, we should maintain the targets and continue current efforts to reach current providers, and help establish new providers, over the expanded service area of Hood River, Gilliam, Sherman, Wasco and Wheeler counties.

Actions for improvement:

- Continue to explore community partnership opportunities for SBDC to leverage additional capacity (as in the current contract with Mid-Columbia Economic Development District for service to Klickitat and Skamania counties).
- Continue to use the recently-redesigned Child Care Partners website for outreach and delivery of selected services to the five-county service delivery area.
- Expand outreach to Latino child care providers.

- In keeping with recommendation C.3.2, consider moving business recruitment measure from C.3 to C.1.

Effectiveness of assessment:

- Relevant data are readily and routinely collected as part of required statewide reporting by SBDC and CCP. Data pertaining to job creation, capital formation and providers served/established are objective and quantifiable.

C1.3

Description of results:

4 needs assessments completed (target = 1 needs assessment completed annually)

3. Oregon Green Technician Certificate labor market survey and analysis conducted to support reasoning for offering new statewide OGT Certificate beginning fall term 2011.
4. Cardinal Glass – worked with company to determine needs which lead to the development of the customized training course on Leadership
5. Assessment conducted of regional needs, as reported initially by STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math) advisory committee, that led to the development of the Industrial Electrical Basics & Troubleshooting training.
6. Hood River Juice Company – working with company to determine customized training needs.

7 advisory committees (target = 8 advisory committees)

1. STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering & Math)
2. Early Childhood Education
3. Child Care Partners
4. Small Business Development Center
5. Nursing
6. Medical Assisting
7. Emergency Medical Services

4 site visits (target = 3 site visits annually)

1. Cardinal Glass
2. Insitu
3. Hood River Juice Company
4. Iberdrola

Analysis of results:

Target goals were surpassed in two categories (400% and 133.3%) and 87.5% was earned in the third category.

Advisory committees are required for all CTE degree and certificate departments. Departments currently lacking advisory boards include: Business Administration and Computer Applications and Office Systems. In addition, CCWD has recommended that the Pre-College department create an advisory board. As a result of these needs, 3 advisory committees are in planning stages and are expected to come on line in

2012-13, including: Business Administration, Computer Applications and Office Systems, and Pre-College.

The economy has shown some improvement for some businesses within the college service area. As a result, these businesses are more likely to be seeking training opportunities for their employees. In response, the college conducted more than the targeted number of site visits; however, it is not expected that this trend will create a significant increase in demand every year.

Actions for improvement:

Follow through on plans to form the 3 proposed advisory committees. Revise target for 2012-13 to 10 advisory committees.

Effectiveness of assessment:

It appears that the benchmark for needs assessments was under estimated due to a misinterpretation of what level of needs assessment was being referred to. Rather than limiting results to larger institutional/community needs assessment (i.e. the Academic Master Plan), it was determined that smaller assessments about or in collaboration with individual employers, industry sectors, and/or public agencies would qualify as relevant needs assessments. Based on 2010-11 results and projected results for 2011-12, target should be increased to 5 needs assessments.

Site visit target for 2011-12 should be increased to 5 site visits.

C1.4

Description of results

5 employers (Cardinal Glass, Insitu, Hood River Juice Company, Mt Hood Meadows, City of The Dalles) using customized trainings served 167 employees (target = 9 employers using customized trainings served 89 employees)

of CTE employment placements (target = 50 CTE employment placements) placement statistics not available currently.

Analysis of results

Regarding customized trainings, the college achieved 56% of its target for employers served; however, because of multiple trainings at some of the sites, the number of employees served was 188%, surpassing the target of 89 employees served significantly. Again this reflects that some employers are experiencing some economic improvement and investing in employee training.

The college is unable to track employment of CTE students at this time. Some informal tracking is done of RET student placements and the Nursing and Medical Assisting programs survey employers of graduates, but the data is inexact and the numbers are small. There is no tracking of business, EEFS, or computer applications graduates. State and federal limitations based on confidentiality and availability

exist for the collection of employment records. Records for students who become employed outside of Oregon are not available.

Actions for improvement:

Develop graduate survey to track CTE employment placements. Build on surveys currently in place for Nursing and RET to also address Business Administration, Computer Applications, and Early Education and Family Studies graduates. Assessment tool should differentiate between degree and certificate completers reporting that they are unemployed, employed in any position, or employed in the area of their degree or certificate.

Effectiveness of assessment:

Although there are difficulties with implementing the assessment of CTE employment placements, it is recommended that this remain as an assessment goal. It is recognized that a graduate employment survey has certain limitations: time commitment involved in implementation, statistically small numbers, and reliability of self-reported data.

C2.1 – Percentage of high school student attending CGCC

Description of Results

Future Targets were calculated using the average of four years of historic data for students participating in College Now (college credit courses taught in the high schools), Expanded Options (OR)/Running Start (WA) (high schools students take college credit courses from the College), and Early College (College contracts with high schools to provide hybrid college credit courses with student support services). The historic data indicates the number of Running Start students has increased over the last four years, while the number of Expanded Options students has significantly dropped. Early College is a new program the College started winter 2011. Results data are actual student counts for the 2010-11 year.

Analysis of Results

| Target | Actual | Percent Grade | Final Description |
|----------------------------|--|----------------------|--------------------------|
| 29 Running Start | 40 Running Start students | 138% | Exceeds target |
| 37 Expanded Options | 12 Expanded Options students | 32% | Unsatisfactory |
| 20 Early College | 20 Early College students | 100% | Meets target |
| 265 College Now | 231 College Now students (College Now reflects data from eleven qualified high school instructors offering 26 college credit courses in five regional high schools.) | 87% | Needs Improvement |
| Total Average Score | | 89% | Needs Improvement |

Actions for Improvement

There is no evidence to indicate why Expanded Options participation has dropped so significantly over the target – or why Running Start has increased. Possibly a survey to high school students in our service area to determine why they are or are not participating in these college credit opportunities would be helpful.

It is anticipated that College Now will remain stagnant due to the fact that so few high school teachers qualify to teach college credit courses. The college may want to consider exploring the Eastern Promise model (EUO, TVCC, and BMCC) as a way to grow College Now opportunities in our service area. CGCC has made significant progress in outreach to area high schools over the last two years. We are not capturing the number and types of outreach activities and collaborative projects conducted with our high schools. It's important that we do so in order to determine if these activities are making a difference - are more area high schools students enrolling at CGCC than prior to the outreach?

Effectiveness of Assessment

- **Tools & Methodology** – The assessment tool is meaningful, however more information is needed to identify factors influencing the basic data.
- **Future Targets**-Future targets are reasonable under current conditions

C2.2 – Number of activities supporting community college, university, career tech relationships and number of students enrolled in programs.

Description of Results

Descriptions below are self-explanatory.

Analysis of Results

| Target | Actual | Percent Grade | Final Description |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| 8 articulation agreements | 5 college articulation agreements | 62.5% | Needs improvement |
| 8 degree partnerships | 6 degree partnerships | 75% | Needs improvement |
| 10 dual-enrolled students | 7 students who are dual-enrolled | 70% | Needs improvement |
| Total Average Score | | 69% | Needs improvement |

Actions for Improvement

While these data sources provide a glimpse of the types of partnerships that exist with community colleges and universities, it does not capture the grant and initiative partnerships that are in place, nor does it address advisory committee activities that support career tech relationships.

Considering the number of degree partnerships that currently exist, one would think the number of students dual enrolled would be higher. What steps could the College take to better promote and grow student degree partnership participation? Will this be important data piece under Achievement Compacts?

Effectiveness of Assessment

- **Tools & Methodology** – Note comments above under Actions for Improvement
- **Future Targets**-Future targets are reasonable under current conditions

C3.1 – Number of CGCC advocacy and collaborative efforts

Description of Results

The College signed **4** intergovernmental agreements (IGAs) resulting in financial/other tangible benefits to both parties during the 2010-11 school year. These were:

- IGA with Hood River Valley Parks and Recreation District to construct a pedestrian bridge over Indian Creek.
- IGA with the State of Oregon acting by and through the Department of Veterans' Affairs to have a Regional Veterans Services Officer on campus every month.
- IGA with Wasco County regarding the development of the National Guard Armory on College property.
- IGA to form the Region Nine Network (NineNet) to acquire and distribute access to a communications network for the public educational sites in Hood River and Wasco Counties, by providing access to the Internet.

The College gave **175** presentations and updates to local groups during 2010-11 (26 – Child Care Partners, 24 – Dave Mason, 10 – Mary Kramer, 75 – Dan Spatz, 12 – SBDC, 4 – Dr. Wolff, 24 – Dr. Toda). This consisted of “around the table” updates and actual time on the agenda for groups such as the local Chambers of Commerce, Community Outreach Team, and service clubs/organizations.

Analysis of Results

Overall, target goals were surpassed based on the two measures, for a total average score of over 158%.

Measure C3.1 Grade: Number of CGCC advocacy and collaborative efforts

| Target | Actual | Percent Grade | Final Description |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| 2 collaborative partnerships per year resulting in financial/other tangible benefits to both parties | 4 intergovernmental agreements | 200% | Meets or Exceeds Target |
| 150 college presentations and updates to local groups | 175 community presentations | 117% | Meets or Exceeds Target |
| Total Average Score | | 158.5% | Meet or Exceeds Target |

Actions for Improvement

The College is doing well in this area but the significant total average score of 158.35% indicates the need to revise the targets significantly. One area of improvement to note would be in the redefinition of “presentations” to the community. These presentations should be targeted presentations that include local governments, visits by congressional delegation, etc. Presentations to local service clubs

should not be counted in this section, and may be more applicable to Core Theme C4: Creating, maintaining, and growing community relationships.

Effectiveness of Assessment

Tools and Methodology/Future Targets

The number of collaborative partnerships is low and should be revised upward, based upon the definition of “resulting in financial/other tangible benefits to both parties” and the anticipated regional emphasis upon inter-governmental partnerships in response to budget constraints. It was noted that future consideration should include grant partnerships. It was also noted that these efforts extend beyond the College’s service district, to include regional and even national collaborative efforts.

The number of college presentations is very large and indicates that the definition of “presentations” needs to be further defined. The current target includes routine updates at recurring civic meetings; these may be incidental to other discussions at civic functions. The target should be revised downward to reflect targeted presentations. A new target of 75 presentations is suggested.

C3.2 – Business recruitment efforts in which CGCC participated.

Description of Results

The College did not participate in any business recruitment activities during the 2010-11 academic year and participated in 20 business conferences (such as the National Small Business Development Center Conference, Energy Career Pathways, etc.) representing CGCC and/or the Columbia Gorge region.

Analysis of Results

Overall, the College performed poorly with regard to the established targets (0% and 80%, respectively), for a total average score of 40%.

Measure C3.2 Grade: Business recruitment efforts in which CGCC participated

| Target | Actual | Percent Grade | Final Description |
|--|----------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 3 business recruitment activities annually | 0 recruitments | 0.0% | Poor |
| 25 conferences | 20 conferences | 80.0% | Needs Improvement |
| Total Average Score | | 40.0% | Poor |

Actions for Improvement

It is recommended that the College continue to support community partnership efforts to recruit employers, including a business development specialist in The Dalles and economic development strategy in Hood River.

Effectiveness of Assessment

Tools and Methodology/Future Targets

It was noted that successful business recruitments depend upon a variety of factors, many of which are beyond the control of the College. For instance, visual appearance of downtown, access to capital, quality of the K-12 educational system, and a lack of affordable workforce housing are all factors cited in recent, unsuccessful recruitment efforts. (Please see note below regarding C3 as a whole).

The number of business conferences attended is relevant, provided the content and opportunities for engagement at these conferences accurately reflects the measure. It has been determined that the current target is unrealistic, given anticipated fiscal constraints and the expected effect on travel budgets. The target should be revised downward to 5 conferences in which CGCC had a booth or featured speaker at the event. It is believed that the current “results” of 20 conferences indicates conferences attended, and not conferences in which CGCC played a key role as either a vendor or by providing a speaker.

Overall Score for Objective C3:

95% - Meets or Exceeds Target

Note Regarding Objective C3 as a Whole

Objective C3 is intended to measure the College’s relationships with governmental agencies and the community; however, the measures reflect the College’s collaborative relationships with governmental agencies (local, state, and federal), rather than the “community” as a whole. Community relationships are covered under Objective C4. More specifically, the efforts of the College under C3 are intended to measure collaborative and advocacy efforts with regard to economic and community development. (Community development, in this sense, means activities to improve the lives of residents in the community.)

For next year, it is recommended that Objective C3 be changed to be more reflective of its actual intent: “Objective C3 – Cultivating relationships with governmental entities to promote economic growth and community development.”

Upon more thorough review of Measurement C3.2, it seems appropriate that this measure be included under Object C1.2 – Number of businesses and industries assisted by CGCC. Therefore, it is recommended that C3.2 be removed, leaving Objective C3 with only one measure. It may be appropriate to add an additional measure under C3, at the discretion of the Core Theme C Committee and/or Institutional Assessment Committee

Measure C4.1 - Direct and Indirect Investments in the Community

Description of Results

The college offered a number of direct and indirect investments in the community by providing space for community organizations, serving on committees within the community, and supporting service-learning activities inside and outside of the classroom. The college sponsored and participated in **32** community events (Tech Day, Clean Energy Forum, Health Occupations Discovery Day, Early Childhood and Family Studies Discovery Day, Latino Family Night, Transfer Days, Golf Tournament, Foundation

Donor Recognition, Cherry Festival, 4th of July Parade, Voter Registration, Safe Halloween Party HR, Hood River Valley High School Play, Wasco County Fair, Hood River County Fair, Tutor Trainings, Humanities Series, and Shared Voices Book Signings).

The college provided repetitive space to **22** organizations each year in The Dalles and Hood River (Toastmasters, Amateur Radio Association, Native Plant Society, local piano teachers, District 21, Junior Miss, CG-BREZ, Chamber of Commerce, Outreach Team, OSU Extension, Columbia Gorge Educational Service District, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, La Clinica del Carino, HR Business Association, Heart Centered Communication, Gorge Literacy, Gorge Photography Club, HR Fire Department, Indian Creek Stewards, ARES Short Wave Radio, and HR Valley High School). The college provided space for **7** on-campus special events (Senator Wyden Visit, PGE Hearing, American Legion Essay Judging (2), Oregon Energy Trust Speaker, Senator Mark Johnson, and Commission Karen Joplin).

There were **92** staff and faculty members at the college on **83** unique community, state, and national committees. More information about these statistics may be found in the Accreditation folder on the college's shared computer drive. The college hosted **7** college-wide service activities (Blood Drive, Canned Food Drive, Schoolbook Collection, Meals on Wheels, Salvation Army Adopt-A-Family, Elks Christmas Baskets, and FISH Christmas Wreath Fundraiser) and **5** faculty members were involved in service learning with **12** placements and **700** hours of service.

Analysis of Results

The college meets or exceeds all targets in this objective. The college greatly exceeded the amount of space that was provided to community groups and events. The college provided space to 29 organizations and events, whereas the goal was only to provide space to 16 organizations and events. Results of this objective are not surprising given the college's dedication to involvement in the local community, but it is unclear if such involvement is adequately conveyed to campus staff and faculty, students at the college, or local community members. Even the college's mission, "building dreams, transforming lives, and strengthening the community" is often shortened to "building dreams, transforming lives". The college needs to continue to surpass these targets given the direct link to the mission statement of the institution, but more public information should be shared about the college's great success in contributing to direct and indirect investments into the community.

Actions for Improvement

The college should continue to offer a number of direct and indirect investments in the community by providing space for community organizations, serving on committees within the community, and supporting service-learning activities inside and outside of the classroom. The college's Marketing Committee should investigate communications plans for bettering informing the public at-large about the amount of direct and indirect investments provided to the service-district communities.

Effectiveness of Assessment

Information included in this objective is very important to quantify, but often difficult to obtain because it is necessary to contact a multitude of people across the college for this information. It is suggested

that the President's Office at Columbia Gorge Community College collect some of this information in their annual Faculty and Staff survey. If they could add questions about sponsoring community events sponsored, committees of service, and service activities – it would expedite the data collection process. In the same vein, Facilities Departments at both campuses should create databases to track space offered to community groups. No changes to the future targets are suggested at this time, but revisions should be considered next year if future targets continue to be met or exceeded.

Objective Grade

| Target | Actual | Percent Grade | Final Description |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| 30 events | 32 events | 106.6% | Meet or Exceeds Target |
| 16 organizations and events | 29 organizations and events | 181.25% | Meet or Exceeds Target |
| 90 faculty and staff | 92 faculty and staff | 102.2% | Meet or Exceeds Target |
| 7 college service activities | 7 service activities | 100% | Meet or Exceeds Target |
| 5 faculty in service learning | 5 faculty in service learning | 100% | Meet or Exceeds Target |
| Total Average Score | | 118.01% | Meet or Exceeds Target |

Measure C4.2 - Educational, Cultural, Environmental, Non-Profit and Civic Partnerships

Description of Results

The college offered a variety of educational/cultural events, supported environmental initiatives, and participated in non-profit/civic partnerships in accordance with this objective. The college hosted **2** art shows, **3** public workshops and speaker series (Writers Conference, Science Summit, and Humanities Series), **2** theater events, and **4** brown-bag environmental outreach lunches. The college also worked hard to meet the milestones of the American College and University President's Climate Commitment (ACUPCC) signed by Dr. Toda on December 2009 and formed **1** Green Team that began to meet on a monthly basis. The college also had a booth at **17** different community events. The following programs at the college had promotional booths at events: Renewable Energy Technology Program at 6 events, Student Services at 5 events, Child Care Partners at 5 events, and Nursing Program at 1 event.

Analysis of Results

The college meets or exceeds the environmental initiatives component of this objective, but the college needs improvement related to the educational/cultural events and non-profit/civic partnerships components of this objective. The college had a set a target to host at least 20 educational/cultural events and only hosted 11 such events. There is no central person assigned to conduct such activities, and – therefore – there is not always a consistent number of activities each year. It has also been mentioned that there are sometimes problems related to attendance at these events. This might be associated with the fact that there is not a central Marketing Department at the college to assist with these endeavors.

Actions for Improvement

The college should spend more time and energy in promoting and supporting educational/cultural events. One barrier to implementing more events is a lack of college funding available for educational/cultural events. This funding used to be available, but it has since been removed from the annual budget. The addition of such a minimal budget for such events would allow these events to be implemented on a more frequent basis. To currently implement an event, donors and sponsors must be found which is a time consuming task. Likewise, there is not a central policy that says the college endorses such educational/cultural events. The creation of such a policy could help ensure the college has strong administrative and planning backing to foster such events into perpetuity. Finally, the Marketing Committee at the college – formed of representatives from across the college – should be more active in raising awareness about these events using traditional and social media outlets.

Effectiveness of Assessment

Information included in this objective is very important to quantify, but often difficult to obtain because it is necessary to contact a multitude of people across the college for this information. The following departments across the college were contacted to glean information for this section: Renewable Energy Technology, Small Business Development Center, Student Services, Foundation, PTK/SC, Marketing Department, Child Care Partners, Gorge Literacy, and Nursing. A centralized email was sent to these departments to ask them questions about outreach events. The college is currently not meeting the targets, but the low number of 20 public events seems achievable in the near future. It is not suggested that targets are revised at this time.

Objective Grade

| Target | Actual | Percent Grade | Final Description |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| 20 outreach events | 11 outreach events | 55% | Poor |
| ACUPCC milestones | Green Team meets monthly | 100% | Meet or Exceeds Target |
| Total Average Score | | 77.5% | Needs Improvement |

Measure C4.3 - Community Awareness and Perception of CGCC**Description of Results**

The college attempted to analyze community awareness and perception of the institution by analyzing the publication of press releases and news articles, visits to the college website, the reach of college social media, and implementation of a community-based survey. The college compiled statistics for the press release and news articles by contacting departments across the college, and the college analyzed the website and social media by contacting the Information Technology Department at the college.

Analysis of Results

The college meets or exceeds most targets in this objective, but the college fails to perform in the number of website visits to the main college webpage each month. The college likely had difficulty gaining enough visitors to the main college webpage because the current webpage is an older version is

not particularly easy to navigate. The college had 31,000 unique website visitors compared to the suggested 60,000 unique website visitors. The current webpage does not use cutting-edge Search Engine Optimization (SEO) tools to drive traffic to the website. The college is currently under contract with a private company to develop and build a new webpage. This new webpage will be easy to navigate and include SEO tools. The new college website will have more content, and the content will be re-structured for easy discovery.

Actions for Improvement

The college should continue public outreach efforts with press reports drafted and published in newspapers, but more energy needs to be given to the website outreach that occurs at the college. Website visits are only half of the intended target, but this problem will most likely be resolved after the college's new website will be deployed over the next year. In addition, this report suggests an updated revision of the target for annual unique website visitors to 40,000 to address this discrepancy for next year's report.

Effectiveness of Assessment

This analysis was somewhat effective, and the results give some representation of community members' awareness and ability to receive information from the college through the newspaper, the internet, and through social media channels. However, this report does not adequately evaluate the perception of the college through the eyes of community members. To better understand what the community thinks of the college, it is suggested that a survey is conducted annually with the community to ask them such questions. The actual survey tool should contain questions on topics such as: campus culture, family/support network inclusion, campus location, available coursework, media materials, etc. A target should be added to this section to implement one community survey on an annual basis. The results from the community survey can be detailed in the narrative that accompanies next year's report.

Objective Grade

| Target | Actual | Percent Grade | Final Description |
|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| 125 press reports annually | 126 press reports and newspaper articles | 100.8% | Meet or Exceeds Target |
| 60,000 visits per month at website or 720,000 visits per year | 31,000 visits a month at website. | 51.6% | Poor |
| 400 Facebook users | 456 new "likes" on Facebook | 114% | Meet or Exceeds Target |
| Total Average Score | | 88.8% | Meet or Exceeds Target |