

Core Theme A: Building Dreams – Opportunities								
Scale		5	4	3	2	1		
Objective	Measure	Surpasses Mission Expectation		Meets Mission Expectation		Below Mission Expectation	2012-13 Results	Score
<b>Objective A1:</b> Offering a broad array of educational programs to meet current regional needs	<b>A1.1</b> FTE enrollment in programs compared to statewide average	<b>5% higher or more</b> FTE enrollment in programs compared to statewide average		<b>2% plus or minus</b> FTE enrollment in programs compared to statewide average		<b>5% fewer or less</b> FTE enrollment in programs compared to statewide average	CGCC: 51.2% Statewide: 51%	<b>3</b>
<b>Objective A2:</b> Offering diverse course delivery modes and service opportunities	<b>A2.1</b> Course delivery methods	<b>35% or more</b> students taking distance learning courses at postsecondary level		<b>20-25%</b> students taking distance learning courses at postsecondary level		<b>10% or fewer</b> students taking distance learning courses at postsecondary level	18%	<b>2</b>
	<b>A2.2</b> course scheduling	<b>30% or more</b> course offerings which were online/hybrid		<b>20-25%</b> course offerings which were online/hybrid		<b>15% or fewer</b> course offerings which were online/hybrid	21.4%	<b>3</b>
	<b>A2.3</b> Service delivery methods	<b>90% or more</b> services for students also available online		<b>70-80%</b> services for students also available online		<b>60% or fewer</b> services for students also available online	60%	<b>2</b>
<b>Objective A3:</b> Serving the diversity of the service area	<b>A3.1</b> Demographics (students, staff, faculty)	a. <b>5% or less</b> variance from regional demographics for students		a. <b>10-15%</b> variance from regional demographics for students		a. <b>20% or more</b> variance from regional demographics for students	A=0% B=0.2% H=3.7% NA= 1.4% PI=0.1% W=7.1% 2+=1.6%	<b>2</b>
		b. <b>5% or less</b> variance from regional demographics for staff		b. <b>10-15%</b> variance from regional demographics for staff		b. <b>20% or more</b> variance from regional demographics for staff	W-2.7%=5 B-.7%= 5 AI-2.7%=5 AS- .5%= 5 H- 8.3%=4 2M-1.7%=5 NHPI-.4=5	<b>4</b>
		c. <b>5% or less</b> variance from regional demographics for full-time faculty		c. <b>10-15%</b> variance from regional demographics for full-time faculty		c. <b>20% or more</b> variance from regional demographics for full-time faculty	W-15%=3 B-.4%= 5 AI-2.7%=5 AS- 1.1%= 5 H- 21.7%=1	<b>1</b>

						2M-2.8%=5 NHPI-.4=5		
		d. <b>5% or less</b> variance from regional demographics for part-time faculty		d. <b>10-15%</b> variance from regional demographics for part-time faculty		d. <b>20% or more</b> variance from regional demographics for part-time faculty	W-8%=4 B-.4%= 5 AI-1.7%=5 AS- .1%= 5 H-16.5%=2 2M-2.8%=5 NHPI-.4=5	<b>2</b>
<b>Objective A4:</b> Applying consistent hiring practices	<b>A4.1</b> Standardize notification, application, and selection processes	<b>100%</b> compliance across all hire and selection processes		<b>90-95%</b> compliance across all hire and selection processes		<b>80% or fewer</b> compliance across all hire and selection processes	52.6%	<b>1</b>
<b>Objective A5:</b> Applying processes that lead to retention (of faculty, staff and students) and high satisfaction	<b>A5.1</b> Percent retention (students, staff, faculty)	a. <b>50% or more</b> retention of credit students fall term to fall term		a. <b>40-45%</b> retention of credit students fall term to fall term		a. <b>35% or fewer</b> retention of credit students fall term to fall term	41%	<b>3</b>
		b. <b>10% or fewer</b> annual turnover for staff		b. <b>13-14%</b> annual turnover for staff		b. <b>15% or more</b> annual turnover for staff	14.9%	<b>2</b>
		c. <b>5% or fewer</b> annual turnover for faculty		c. <b>6-9%</b> annual turnover for faculty		c. <b>10% or more</b> annual turnover for faculty	6.25%	<b>3</b>
	<b>A5.2</b> level of morale (students, staff, faculty)	a. <b>90% or more</b> students who would recommend CGCC to friend or family		a. <b>80-85%</b> students who would recommend CGCC to friend or family		a. <b>70% or fewer</b> students who would recommend CGCC to friend or family	96.2% (2011 data)	<b>5</b>
		b. <b>90% or more</b> staff who rate their overall satisfaction working at CGCC as 4 or 5		b. <b>70-80%</b> staff who rate their overall satisfaction working at CGCC as 4 or 5		b. <b>60% or fewer</b> staff who rate their overall satisfaction working at CGCC as 4 or 5	73.8%	<b>3</b>
		c. <b>90% or more</b> full-time faculty who rate their overall satisfaction working at CGCC as 4 or 5		c. <b>70-80%</b> full-time faculty who rate their overall satisfaction working at CGCC as 4 or 5		c. <b>60% or fewer</b> full-time faculty who rate their overall satisfaction working at CGCC as 4 or 5	100%	<b>5</b>
		d. <b>90% or more</b> part-time faculty who rate their overall satisfaction working at CGCC as 4 or 5		d. <b>70-80%</b> part-time faculty who rate their overall satisfaction working at CGCC as 4 or 5		d. <b>60% or fewer</b> part-time faculty who rate their overall satisfaction working at CGCC as 4 or 5	71.4%	<b>3</b>

**Core Theme A**  
2012-13 Analysis

**Summary:** Core Theme A has  
For 2012-13, the results were the following:

Fives	Fours	Threes	Twos	Ones	Nulls
2	3	5	4	1	0

**Objective A1: *Offering a broad array of educational programs to meet current regional needs***

**A1.1: FTE enrolled in programs is 5% more than statewide average**

**Description of Results:** LDC=48.4, ACE= 0.9, Dev. Ed=16.0, CTE=28.3%. CGCC FTE in these programs is about equal to the statewide average 51.2% vs 51%.

**Analysis:** The target comes from CGCC’s strategic planning materials <<http://cgcc.us/strategic-planning>>, indicating a goal of 3% growth annually. Originally, we thought to compare the number of CGCC’s programs to those of other like-sized community colleges (specifically, Clatsop and Klamath Falls); however, we realized that this is not an appropriate measure to compare diverse programs for our specific region. To define diverse programs, we looked at the Community College Profile at the Oregon Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development (CCWD) <<http://egov.oregon.gov/CCWD>> showing FTE by program area of all Oregon community colleges. This definition made more sense and would indicate to us that we are meeting the diverse programmatic needs of all students in our region by comparing CGCC to the statewide FTE averages in program areas.

LDC Lower Division Collegiate	(49.6% statewide average, 48.4 CGCC)
ACE Adult Continuing Education	(2.6% statewide average, 0.9% CGCC)
Dev. Ed Education	(18.2% statewide average, 16.0 CGCC)
CTE Career and Technical Education	(28.3% statewide average, 34.1% CGCC)

The measurement comes from the same annual report produced from Oregon Community College Unified Reporting System (OCCURS) data < <http://www.odccwd.state.or.us/OCCURS/>> and published by CCWD. The most recent report is from 2010-2011.

**Actions for Improvement:** It would seem that this measure would be more meaningful if CGCC would define broad array of programs and regional needs and then set enrollment goals for those programs to measure success. This may be achieved through the upcoming SEM planning process.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Currently, this is the best way to measure this goal without further definition of broad array of programs and set target enrollment numbers.

## **Objective A2: *Offering diverse course delivery modes and service opportunities.***

### **A2.1: Course delivery methods**

**Description of Results:** In 2012-13, 18% of FTE were taking online courses at postsecondary level. The measurement comes from Oregon Community College Unified Reporting System (OCCURS).

**Analysis:** The target of 20% comes from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). It is the percentage of undergraduate students in postsecondary institutions taking distance education courses. The report, *The Condition of Education 2011* (NCES 2011-033), is from 2011 and the data is 2007-2008; however, this is the most current report found at NCES <<http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=80>>.

**Actions for Improvement:** See Actions for Improvement for A2.2. It might be more informative to look at course enrollment and waitlist numbers to evaluate local demand. Additionally, it would be more informative to determine how CGCC would like to distribute the course delivery modes, set targets, then measure actuals to the set target yearly.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Wouldn't local demand matter more than a national average?

### **A2.2: Course delivery**

**Description of Results:** In 2012-13, 21.4% of the course offerings were online/hybrid

**Analysis:** The targets for this measure were selected based on CGCC data, from the Institutional Effectiveness Report 2009-2011 <<http://cgcc.us/institutional-assessment/reports>>, related to distance learning. The term distance learning includes courses delivered online as well as hybrid courses.

**Actions for Improvement:** The current numbers were selected as a beginning target; however, there are many variables in play at the current time, such that we think will impact the validity of the targets. This may suggest the need to reevaluate the targets once this work is complete. Additionally, it is quite plausible that a strategic enrollment plan will indicate the optimal mix of online, hybrid, and face-to-face delivery of CGCC coursework and if not, we would suggest collecting the internal data related to enrollment and success rates, establish the optimum mix of credit course delivery (online, hybrid, F2F), then measure actuals against this target annually. This work is in the beginning stages and will continue over the next academic year.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Easy to measure. Seems to give significant information.

### **A2.3: Service delivery methods**

**Description of Results:** In 2012-13, 60% services for students were also available online

**Analysis:** We chose Klamath Community College <<https://www.klamathcc.edu/>> and Clatsop Community College <<https://www.clatsopcc.edu/>> for our comparison group, because, of the other Oregon community colleges, they had FTEs closest to ours. Their FTEs are slightly higher than ours, but the next lower had a much larger gap in number, so we felt a closer number would be a better representative.

Ten services were chosen and it was counted how many of these were available to do completely online. These services are: register for classes, received advising, request and acquire financial aid, buy textbooks, pay tuition, request a library card, use research databases, ask a librarian a question, request interlibrary loans, and the use of e-reserves.

	Register	Get Advising	Financial Aid	Buy Textbooks	Pay Tuition	Library Card	Research Databases	Ask Library Questions	Interlibrary Loans	E-Reserves
<b>Clatsop</b>	y	n	y	y	n	y	y	y	n	n
<b>Klamath</b>	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n
<b>CGCC</b>	y	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	n

**Actions for Improvement:** Continue to offer all services possible as an online option

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Could be arbitrary, however it seems to be the most effective way to measure at the current time.

**Objective A3: *Serving the diversity of the service area***

**A3.1a: Demographics (students)**

**Description of Results:**

Ethnicity	Service District	CGCC	Difference
Asian	1.1%	1.1%	0%
Black/African American	0.4%	0.6%	0.2%
Hispanic	21.7%	18.0%	3.7%
Native American/Alaska Native	2.7%	1.3%	1.4%
Pacific Islander	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%
White/Caucasian	84.7%	77.6%	7.1%
Two or More	2.8%	1.2%	1.6%

**Analysis:** The target is based on demographics contained in the most current census records, US Decennial Census 2010 <<http://www.census.gov/2010census/>>, for Hood River and Wasco Counties. However, this measure is only looking at the Hispanic population. There is suggestion

that this is the target population that this measure was written for, however there are varied opinions regarding that understanding.

The measurement is from demographics reported in the annual Student Profile 2011-12 <<http://cgcc.us/institutional-assessment/reports>>. At this time, this is the most recent report.

**Actions for Improvement:** It is necessary to determine if this is an appropriate standard to compare against, or if it would be more accurate to set enrollment goals for target audiences then measure success against those goals. It is also recommended that the ethnicity of all students be broken out by category as in A3.1b and A3.1c. And if a specific population of students is intended to be measured, then that needs to be clearly reflected in the wording of the objective.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Currently, this is the best assessment we have to measure diversity.

**A3.1b, A3.1c, A3.1c: Demographics (staff and faculty)**

**Description of Results:** In 2012-2013, Staff

Ethicity	Service District	CGCC	Difference
Asian	1.1%	2.2%	+1.1%
Black/African American	0.4%	1.1%	0.7%
Hispanic	21.7%	13.4%	8.3%
Native American/Alaska Native	2.7%	0%	2.7%
Pacific Islander	0.4%	0%	.4%
White/Caucasian	84.7%	82%	2.7%
Two or More	2.8%	1.1%	1.7%

**Full-Time Faculty**

Ethicity	Service District	CGCC	Difference
Asian	1.1%	0%	1.1%
Black/African American	0.4%	0%	0.4%
Hispanic	21.7%	0%	21.7%
Native American/Alaska Native	2.7%	0%	2.7%
Pacific Islander	0.4%	0%	0.4%
White/Caucasian	84.7%	100%	15.3%
Two or More	2.8%	0%	2.8%

**Part-time Faculty**

Ethicity	Service District	CGCC	Difference
Asian	1.1%	1.0%	0.1%
Black/African American	0.4%	0%	0.4%
Hispanic	21.7%	5.2%	16.5%
Native American/Alaska Na-	2.7%	1%	1.7%

tive			
Pacific Islander	0.4%	0%	0.4%
White/Caucasian	84.7%	92.7%	8%
Two or More	2.8%	0%	2.8%

**Analysis:** The target is based on demographics contained in the most current year census records for Hood River and Wasco Counties. The measurement is from demographics reported in the current Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) survey < <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/>>. This measurement is based on information from current year Payroll reports.

The variance percentages for full-time and part-time faculty fall below current objective expectations.

**Actions for Improvement:** Current measurements have little room to effect change as the demographics for staff and faculty is not factored in the hiring. Perhaps a better measurement might be the demographics of applicants for staff and faculty positions, not current staff and faculty. This measurement would insure we are attracting a diverse applicant pool.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Needs Improvement

**Objective A4: Applying consistent hiring practices**

**A4.1:** Standardize notification, application, and selection processes

**Description of Results:** In 2012-2013, compliance across all hire and selection was 52.6%

**Analysis:** Percentage of compliance falls well below expectation. Factors contributing to these results were; the resignation of the Human Resources Administrative Assistant, and the hiring and training of the new Human Resources AA.

**Actions for Improvement:** In process. A new onboarding process was implemented for 2013-2014 to insure accurate compliance in the hiring process.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Effective

The target should be all, but 100% not realistically obtainable, 95% was chosen as “meeting mission expectation”. The percentage can be reevaluated in the future.

The measurement is based on information provided by Human Resources from the Hiring Compliance and Tracking Log, which is completed for recruitment purposes and has only been tracking data for just over two years

**Objective A5: Applying processes that lead to retention (of faculty, staff and students) and high satisfaction**

### **A5.1a: Percent retention (students)**

**Description of Results:** 41% (institutional Effectiveness Indicators 2011-12)

#### **Analysis:**

The target is based on CGCC's previous year's retention rates. This number reflects the retention rates of the first-time, full-time cohort of freshman students (as reported through IPEDS). This is typically a small population for CGCC, however consistent with national reporting.

The measurement is based on data collected from the most recent (2011-2012) Institutional Effectiveness Indicators report.

**Actions for Improvement:** Set retention goals, then compare year to year retention rates for all students against those goals using CGCC data.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** IPEDS data is not an effective assessment of this measure.

### **A5.1b, A5.1c: Percent retention (staff and full-time faculty)**

**Description of Results:** : In 2012-2013, percent of retention for staff was 14.9%, and retention for faculty was 6.25%.

**Analysis:** The percentage for faculty meets current measurement expectations and the staff percentage is only slightly below expectations. Factors outside of the control of the measurement to consider are; retirements and voluntary resignations.

**Actions for Improvement:** None at this time.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Effective

The target is based on historical results from prior year turnover averages. This includes averages for the previous four years.

The measurement is from data collected from turnover reported by the Payroll department and compiled by Human Resources. There is no A5.1d for a measurement for part-time faculty; the turnover rate cannot accurately be calculated the same for part-time faculty as for staff and full-time faculty because of the fluctuation and variability of part-time faculty positions.

### **A5.2a: Level of satisfaction (students)**

**Description of Results:** 96.2% (CCSSE 2011 Weighted Frequency Distribution)



**Analysis:** The target is based on 2008 responses to the Community College Survey on Student Engagement (CCSSE) <<http://cgcc.us/institutional-assessment/reports>>.

The measurement is based on the response to question # 27 “*Would you recommend CGCC to your family and friends*”. The CCSSE is administered every three years. The measurement is based on the percentage of students who respond “yes” to the survey question.

**Actions for Improvement:** Develop internal survey so that there is current data available.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Effective, although the data will never be current because of the 3-year rotation of this survey.

**A5.2b, A5.2c, A5.2d: *Level of satisfaction (staff and faculty)***

**Description of Results:** In 2012-2013, percentage of staff rating satisfaction at 4 or 5 was 73.8%, full-time faculty was 100%, and part-time faculty was 71.4%.

**Analysis:** The results for staff and part-time faculty meet expectations for this measurement and the full-time faculty measurement exceeds expectations.

**Actions for Improvement:** None at this time.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Effective

The target is based on historical averages of results from the last 6 years of the CGCC Faculty and Staff surveys.

The measurement is based on the response to question “*How would you rate your overall satisfaction working at CGCC*” in the annual surveys from Human Resources. The measurement is based on percentage of employees rating their satisfaction at 4-5 from the surveys.

Core Theme B: Transforming Lives – Education								
Scale		5	4	3	2	1		
Objective	Measure	Surpasses Mission Expectation		Meets Mission Expectation		Below Mission Expectation	2012-13 Results	Score
<b>Objective B1:</b> Ensuring alignment of programs with careers, industry standards and educational transfer requirements	<b>B1.1</b> Adherence to program review process and schedule	95% or more programs reviewed using review process and schedule		76% - 85% programs reviewed using review process and schedule		66% or fewer programs reviewed using review process and schedule	100%	5
	<b>B1.2</b> Implementation of program review recommendations	37% or more program review recommendations that were implemented		21% - 28% program review recommendations that were implemented		12% or fewer program review recommendations that were implemented	6.5%	1
	<b>B1.3</b> Analysis of implemented program review recommendations	95% or more implemented program review recommendations analyzed for effectiveness		76% - 85% implemented program review recommendations analyzed for effectiveness		66% or fewer implemented program review recommendations analyzed for effectiveness	0%	1
<b>Objective B2:</b> Ensuring alignment of classes and services to meet student goals and needs	<b>B2.1</b> Student graduation	18 % or more 2-year degree or 1-year certificate seeking students graduating within 150% of time		14% 2-year degree or 1-year certificate seeking students graduating within 150% of time		10% or fewer 2-year degree or 1-year certificate seeking students graduating within 150% of time	Degrees: 10.1% Certs: 4.1%	1
	<b>B2.2</b> Student drops and withdrawals	0 number of top five reasons for student drops or withdrawals attributed to CGCC		2 number of top five reasons for student drops or withdrawals attributed to CGCC		5 number of top five reasons for student drops or withdrawals attributed to CGCC	Drops :1 Withdrawals: ?	4
	<b>B2.3</b> Student satisfaction with CGCC experience	95% or more students reporting that they are satisfied with their CGCC experience		76% - 85% students reporting that they are satisfied with their CGCC experience		66% or fewer students reporting that they are satisfied with their CGCC experience	88.9% (2011 data)	4
	<b>B2.4</b> Student retention	66% or more 1-year certificate & 2-year degree-seeking students attending for 3 consecutive terms		46 - 55% 1-year certificate & 2-year degree-seeking students attending for 3 consecutive terms		35% or fewer 1-year certificate & 2-year degree-seeking students attending for 3 consecutive terms	66.5%	5

<b>Objective B3:</b> Assessing attainment of course, program and degree outcomes on an annual basis.	<b>B3.1</b> Implementation of course evaluations	<b>95% or more</b> instructors completing the course assessment cycle per the annual course assessment schedule		<b>76% - 85%</b> instructors completing the course assessment cycle per the annual course assessment schedule		<b>66% or fewer</b> instructors completing the course assessment cycle per the annual course assessment schedule	88.4%	<b>4</b>
	<b>B3.2</b> Achievement of student learning outcomes at the course level.	<b>95% or more</b> students meeting course outcomes		<b>76% - 85%</b> students meeting course outcomes		<b>66% or fewer</b> students meeting course outcomes	93.6%	<b>4</b>
	<b>B3.3</b> Achievement of student learning outcomes at the degree/certificate/program level	<b>95% or more</b> students meeting degree/certificate/program outcomes		<b>76% - 85%</b> students meeting degree/certificate/program outcomes		<b>66% or fewer</b> students meeting degree/certificate/program outcomes	83%	<b>3</b>
<b>Objective B4:</b> Encouraging the acquisition and use of high quality teaching and support practices.	<b>B4.1</b> Professional development for faculty	<b>80% or more</b> faculty attending In-service		<b>60% - 69%</b> faculty attending In-service		<b>50% or fewer</b> faculty attending In-service	59%	<b>2</b>
		<b>80% or more</b> faculty participation in other professional development activities		<b>60% - 69%</b> faculty participation in other professional development activities		<b>50% or fewer</b> faculty participation in other professional development activities	84%	<b>5</b>
	<b>B4.2</b> Student engagement with faculty	<b>95% or more</b> students reporting feeling engaged with faculty		<b>76% - 85%</b> students reporting feeling engaged with faculty		<b>66% or fewer</b> students reporting feeling engaged with faculty	77.1% (2011 data)	<b>3</b>
	<b>B4.3</b> Faculty satisfaction with their jobs	<b>95% or more</b> faculty indicating satisfaction with their jobs		<b>76% - 85%</b> faculty indicating satisfaction with their jobs		<b>66% or fewer</b> faculty indicating satisfaction with their jobs	76%	<b>3</b>
	<b>B4.4</b> Faculty integration of instructional best-practices	<b>95% or more</b> faculty demonstrating best instructional practices		<b>76% - 85%</b> faculty demonstrating best instructional practices		<b>66% or fewer</b> faculty demonstrating best instructional practices	100%	<b>5</b>
	<b>B4.5</b> Faculty orientation and mentoring	<b>95% or more</b> new faculty receiving an orientation and/or mentoring		<b>76% - 85%</b> new faculty receiving an orientation and/or mentoring		<b>66% or fewer</b> new faculty receiving an orientation and/or mentoring	Mentoring: 64% Orientation: 7%	<b>1</b>

**Core Theme B**  
2012-13 Analysis

**Summary:** Core Theme has fifteen measures, one of which currently reports two scores. For 2012-13, the results were the following:

Fives	Fours	Threes	Twos	Ones
4	4	3	1	4

**Average Score: 3.375 = Meeting Core Theme B Mission**

**Objective B1:** Ensuring alignment of programs with careers, industry standards and educational transfer requirements

- **B1.1: Percentage of programs reviewed using review process.**

**Description of Results:** Two instructional programs were scheduled for 2012-13 and both were completed on time.

**Analysis:** Initial results suggest the new program review timeline – with increased touch points and clearer deadlines – is showing results in that there was 100% on time compliance.

**Actions for Improvement:** Break up the General Education Program into separate department reviews in order to have a more manageable and meaningful process and a product that can be implemented and analyzed more effectively and efficiently.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Straightforward and easy to monitor.

- **B1.2: Percentage of program review recommendations that were implemented.**

**Description of Results:** 6.5% of program review recommendations were implemented in 2012-13.

**Analysis:** The number of recommendations implemented in 2012-13 was below expectations. There were two primary drivers of this result: 1) The older (2009-10 and 2010-11) reviews had already implemented many or all of their recommendations prior to 2012-13; and 2) Two of the three 2011-12 reviews did not implement any recommendations.

**Actions for Improvement:** In an effort to sustain focus on program review recommendations, Instructional Services' has set a policy whereby programs/departments will review their Program Review recommendations at the fall and spring in-service

department meetings. Department Chairs will need to be reminded of this policy prior to the fall in-service meeting.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Effective.

- **B1.3: Percentage of program review recommended implementations that were analyzed for effectiveness**

**Description of Results:** Zero percent of implemented program reviews were analyzed for effectiveness in 2012-13.

**Analysis:** As with B1.2, this measure suffered because the older program reviews had analyzed their effectiveness prior to 2012-13 and the newer reviews did not implement nor analyze their recommendations.

**Actions for Improvement:** This measure warrants additional consideration to ensure the target is aligned with the way results are collected and recorded. That is, perhaps the ranges should be more in line with the ranges used for B1.2.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Needs improvement.

**Objective B2:** Ensuring alignment of classes and services to meet student goals and needs.

- **B2.1 Student graduation rates within 150% of time**

**Description of Results:** Degrees: 10.1% and Certificates: 4.1%

**Analysis:** student graduation rates appear to have been substantially lower in 2012-13 than for the previous cohort. At this stage it is unclear why that might be the case. It is conceivable that the variables used to arrive at the rate were different, although at this point that is speculation.

**Actions for Improvement:** More information about our historic graduation rates needs to be collected in an attempt to put this number in context as well as to understand why our completion rates have decreased recently and consider what could be done to improve this rate.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Effective.

- **B2.2 Reasons for student drops and withdrawals**

**Description of Results:** One drop attributed to CGCC. Withdrawals information is unavailable as of 7/15/13

**Analysis:** one of the top five reasons for student drops is attributed to CGCC (canceled class). This reason was also cited 2011-12, although it was cited more frequently in 2012-13. Also noteworthy is that 'financial obligations' is new to the top five list of reasons.

**Actions for Improvement:** As noted last year, the list of reasons available to students needs work in terms of defining the categories and perhaps consolidating them as there appears to be overlap.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Effective.

- **B2.3 Student satisfaction with CGCC experience**

**Description of Results:** The most recent data available is the 2011 Center for Community College Student Engagement survey. On the question, "How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this college?" 52.7% of the student said 'good' and 36.2% of the students said excellent. The combination of the two is 88.9%.

**Analysis:** The positive response score of 88.9% exceeds our goal of 85%, so this is an encouraging measure. In addition, the measure for this question on the CCSSE for the national cohort in 2011 was 85.1%, indicating that we are well above the average.

**Actions for Improvement:** none

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Effective

- **B2.4 Student retention**

**Description of Results:** 66.5% of students attended for three consecutive terms.

**Analysis:** Student retention for 2012-13 showed a 7% improvement over 2011-12 and surpassed expectations.

**Actions for Improvement:** Student retention at CGCC is on target. Efforts should be made to ensure this level of retention is sustained.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Effective.

**Objective B3:** Assessing attainment of course, program and degree outcomes on an annual basis.

- **B3.1 Course Assessment**

**Description of Results:** 88.4% implementation

**Analysis:** Implementation of course evaluations achieves a high overall score (88.4%), due to a well-organized scheduling (of courses to be evaluated) through Instructional office staff (currently Jensi Smith). Continued success in this area will require that the current process be maintained and regularly monitored by the CAO.

**Actions for Improvement:** None needed at this time.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Effective

- **B3.2 Course Outcomes Achievement**

**Description of Results:** 93.6% based on student self-reported data from spring term course evaluations.

**Analysis:** The achievement of student learning outcomes (course level) has been evaluated at ‘surpasses’ level (93.6%). However, the assumption that student’s self-reports are an accurate means to evaluate this measure is an open question. The suggestion to add another tool to this measure (such as faculty evaluation) needs further review.

**Actions for Improvement:** The current course assessment process is creating a process wherein each year each course and faculty member are required to assess how well their students have met three of the course outcomes in a particular class. The faculty compare their assessment to the students’ assessment and consider any changes they need to make in order to assist their students in meeting these outcomes. As each of CGCC’s courses is reviewed by the curriculum committee in the coming three years, the outcomes will be deliberately created and considered. Once this process is complete, the faculty should be more confident about the validity of their course outcomes and more willing to fully invest themselves in the course assessment process.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Incomplete without faculty contribution to outcomes assessment, but this is in the process of being created and implemented.

- **B3.3 Degree/Program/Certificate Outcome Achievement**

Courses that meet each degree program or certificate outcome were identified by faculty. A grade of C or above indicates that the student has met each of the outcomes in the course. The grades from the identified courses were aggregated to produce the percentage of students in those courses meeting the program or certificate outcomes. Programs that do not used grade-based outcome measures such as CAOS, RET, Nursing, MA, EEFS were not included in this data collection.

**Description of Results:**

BA Accounting: 76%

BA Acct. Clerk: 70%

BA Management: 83%  
BA Marketing: 85%  
BA Retail: 85%  
AAOT: 87%  
AGS: 88%  
AS: 87%  
ASOT-Bus: 87%  
Average: 83%

**Analysis:** Achievement of student learning outcomes (degree/certificate/program level) while at a lower level than for B3.2, still indicates a 'Meets Mission Expectation' for all of the degrees/certificates measured. The amount of variation between all is roughly 10%, which seems to indicate consistency. An issue remains regarding the fact that learning outcomes are aggregated for each degree, etc., and the relative importance of each factor may be diluted.

**Actions for Improvement:** This assessment is premised on the idea that aggregated course grades are an accurate reflection of program-level outcomes attainment. Confidence in the validity of this premise would increase if outcomes-based grading was widely understood and practiced. Towards that end, professional development activities – including one tentatively scheduled during the fall in-service – are planned for faculty that will provide training on this grading philosophy.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Effective

**Objective B4:** Encouraging the acquisition and use of high quality teaching and support practices.

- **B4.1: Professional Development for Faculty**

**Description of Results:** For both the fall and spring in-services, 59% of the current faculty attended the mandatory in-service. There was also an optional in-service offered on Feb. 28 that was attended by 45% of the faculty. In addition, 83.9% of the 62 faculty who completed a professional development survey during the spring quarter indicated that they already had or would participate in an in-service opportunity not including the CGCC in-services during the academic year. 73% of these positive responders regularly read a professional journal, 61.5% attended a conference paid for by the college, 38.5% took classes that related to their discipline, 36.5% participated in webinars, 3.8% completed a degree or credential, and 21.2% completed other professional development activities.

**Analysis:** The target of 60% was just missed for the faculty in-service, but the other half of the measure exceeded the target range. While it is important to improve on the in-service attendance, it is also important to make sure that the time spent at in-service is well worth the faculty's time. It would also be beneficial if there were more



opportunities for faculty to share information and skills gained during the other professional development activities with other faculty members.

**Actions for Improvement:** In order to make the in-services more relevant to the faculty, their input should be solicited prior to scheduling in-service sessions and their feedback considered by the organizing committee. If the in-service is mandatory, why are expectations for attendance so low? Currently, there are not consequences for not attending the in-service, a situation which could be changed. Also, it would be helpful to create a faculty moodle site where faculty professional development suggestions and content could be circulated and considered by interested faculty. Currently, there is a form for faculty to fill out after they have completed a professional development activity that was funded by the college, but it is not clear how many faculty are completing this process.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** The assessment is effective.

- **B4.2: Student Engagement with Faculty**

**Description of Results:** This is no longer a simple measure to attain. Now there are six questions regarding student-faculty interaction on the CCSSE. Our results from the 2011 survey are the following:

Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor: 94.5%

Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor: 92.9%

Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with instructors outside of class: 62.5%

Received prompt feedback (written or oral) from instructors on your performance: 95.8%

Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations: 89.4%

Worked with instructors on activities other than coursework: 27.5%

The mean for these six averages is: 77.1%

**Analysis:** While this mean does meet our goal of 76%, what these answers reveal is that while students are well engaged with faculty the classroom, there is less of a culture of interaction outside of the classroom. This is probably common to commuter community colleges like CGCC. The comparable results for the national 2011 CCSSE cohort were 74.7%, indicating that we are above the average.

**Actions for Improvement:** In order to encourage more student-faculty interaction outside of class, the college could consider more community service projects, interest groups, etc., that would involve faculty as well as students.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Effective

- **B4.3: Faculty Job Satisfaction**

**Description of Results:** According to the 2012 CGCC Faculty Survey Results, 75.7% of the faculty who completed the survey (29 of 114, or 25%) indicated that they were *satisfied or extremely satisfied with working at CGCC*. Of these respondents, 75.9% indicated that *increased salaries/ bigger increases; improved benefits* would make CGCC a better place. 27.6% saw positive changes taking place in *better training for employees* while 27.6% saw positive changes taking place in *improvements in flexible scheduling/ telecommuting*. The two predominant areas where faculty saw negative changes taking place were: 17.2% in *increased salaries/ bigger increases/ improved benefits* as well as 17.2% in *improved communication / listening from management*.

**Analysis:** Although the percentage of satisfied faculty was higher than the average of the previous five years (72%) there continues to be discontent with pay and benefits as well as with communication with management.

**Actions for Improvement:** It would be helpful to compare faculty compensation at CGCC with other similar colleges. While the survey showed that increasing salaries is the number one choice to make CGCC a better place for faculty, it is unclear whether or not this is a typical response for all community college faculty or if this response is more particular to CGCC. In addition, it would be helpful to develop more opportunity for communication between faculty and management than currently exists at CGCC.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** With only 25% of faculty taking the time to complete the faculty survey, it is hard to know if the results are representative. Perhaps the faculty survey could be scheduled during one of the in-service programs so that part-time faculty would be compensated for the time that is required to complete the survey.

- **B4.4: Best Instructional Practices**

**Description of Results:** A best practices survey was distributed to all faculty members at the fall in-service. A list of evidence-based teaching practices was included. 100% of the faculty indicated that they regularly use at least one of these practices in their teaching situation, whether it be face-to-face or online. Most indicated that they use many of the proscribed practices.

**Analysis:** Because 100% of the faculty indicated that they practice at least one of the best practice listed, it would seem that this measure was too generous to get meaningful data. It was helpful that the survey also asked each respondent to indicate any practices in which they would like to receive professional development. In addition, they were required to give an example of exactly how they use one of the best practices that they currently use. As a result of this survey, an optional winter professional development

event was held on Feb. 23, 2013 in order to address “Problem-Based Learning,” one of the practices that many faculty had indicated an interest in learning more about.

**Actions for Improvement:** It would be helpful to compile the faculty-generated list of specific ways that they implement one of these practices and share this information with the faculty members. There is a proposal to include a poster session in the fall in-service where faculty members could share teaching practices that they feel are effective and well-received by students.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** This measure needs to be changed to make success more difficult to attain. The fall 2013 survey will have a 5 point scale, asking the faculty member to consider how often they use the 11 best practices. This change will require investigation into an appropriate benchmark number for this measure.

- **B4.5: Faculty Orientation and Mentoring**

**Description of Results:**

**Orientation:** Only 2 of the 30 (=7%) new faculty members hired since fall 2012 have completed the entire new orientation checklist. Undoubtedly this does not indicate that these faculty have not been oriented, but we do not have evidence of these orientation activities.

**Mentoring:** Of the 11 faculty members who completed the professional development survey and indicated that they had been hired since July 2010, 63.6% indicated that they had received some mentoring. 81.8% of the new faculty surveyed felt that they had received enough mentoring from their peer or instructional director.

**Analysis:** There is a clear need to fully document the orientation process for new instructors. In addition, more new faculty need to receive mentoring as nearly 20% felt that they did not receive enough. In the new data collection, it would be helpful to divide these two components of B4.5 into separate measures.

**Actions for Improvement:** Orientation: Create a committee to analyze the orientation process at CGCC. Department chairmen may not be aware of the orientation checklist, or the checklist may not be a sufficient orientation document and should be revised. Mentoring: Consider the creation of a more formal mentoring system at CGCC. Because there are so many part-time faculty members, at times they need to serve as mentors to new faculty, but currently they are not always compensated for this time, perhaps this expense could be added to the budget. Another possibility is to provide training in how to be a mentor and how to be an objective instructor observer. In addition, the department chairmen may need to review the current instructor observation form and consider revision if necessary, especially to include evidence of outcomes-based instruction, assessment and grading.

**Effectiveness of Assessment:** Assessment is effective.

**Future Targets:** These two distinct topics should be split into two separate measures.

Core Theme C: Strengthening Our Community - Partnerships								
Scale		5	4	3	2	1		
Objective	Measure	Surpasses Mission Expectation		Meets Mission Expectation		Below Mission Expectation	2012-13 Results	Score
<b>Objective C1:</b> Cultivating productive business and industry relationships	<b>C1.1</b> Effectiveness of grants, funding and in-kind donations	<b>85% or more</b> grants receiving a 4-5 rating on rubric upon award completion.		<b>60-74%</b> grants receiving a 4-5 rating on rubric upon award completion.		<b>50% or fewer</b> grants receiving a 4-5 rating on rubric upon award completion.	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>
	<b>C1.2</b> Number of businesses and industries assisted by CGCC	<b>400 or more</b> businesses demonstrating increased private investment as a result of, or are otherwise counseled or trained by, SBDC/CCP.		<b>200-299</b> businesses demonstrating increased private investment as a result of, or are otherwise counseled or trained by, SBDC/CCP.		<b>150 or fewer</b> businesses demonstrating increased private investment as a result of, or are otherwise counseled or trained by, SBDC/CCP.	<b>555</b> businesses	<b>5</b>
	<b>C1.3</b> Effectiveness of processes to assess business and industry needs	<b>100%</b> Mid-Columbia employment sectors assessed for emerging skill sets through site visits, surveys or CGCC advisory committee participation.		<b>60-89%</b> Mid-Columbia employment sectors assessed for emerging skill sets through site visits, surveys or CGCC advisory committee participation.		<b>40% or fewer</b> Mid-Columbia employment sectors assessed for emerging skill sets through site visits, surveys or CGCC advisory committee participation.	<b>67%</b> of sectors	<b>3</b>
	<b>C1.4</b> Number and effectiveness of workforce training activities	a. <b>10 or more</b> employers using customized trainings serving <b>90 or more</b> employees		a. <b>5-8</b> employers using customized trainings serving <b>75-84</b> employees		a. <b>2 or fewer</b> employers using customized trainings serving <b>60 or fewer</b> employees	<b>3</b> employers used customized trainings serving <b>175</b> employees	<b>4</b>
		b. <b>100 or more</b> CTE employment placements		b. <b>50-79</b> CTE employment placements		b. <b>30 or fewer</b> CTE employment placements	<b>45</b> placements	<b>2</b>
<b>Objective C2:</b> Creating, Maintaining, and growing academic partnerships	<b>C2.1</b> % change of high school students attending CGCC (including College Now, EO/RS, Early College)	<b>5% growth or more</b> enrollment in dual credit programs as compared to historic average		<b>1 to 3% growth</b> enrollment in dual credit programs as compared to historic average		<b>Decline</b> enrollment in dual credit programs as compared to historic average	<b>6%</b> growth	<b>5</b>
	<b>C2.2</b> Number, type and results of activities supporting community college, university and career tech relationships	a. <b>8 or more</b> articulation agreements		a. <b>4-6</b> articulation agreements		a. <b>3 or fewer</b> articulation agreements	<b>1</b> articulation agreement	<b>1</b>
		b. <b>8 or more</b> degree partnerships		b. <b>4-6</b> degree partnerships		b. <b>3 or fewer</b> degree partnerships	<b>7</b> degree partnerships	<b>4</b>
		c. <b>10 or more</b>		c. <b>6-8</b>		c. <b>4 or fewer</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>

		dual enrolled students		dual enrolled students		dual enrolled students		
<b>Objective C3:</b> Cultivating relationships with governmental entities to promote economic growth and community development	<b>C3.1</b> Effectiveness of grants, funding and in-kind donations	<b>85% or more</b> grants receiving a 4-5 rating on rubric upon award completion.		<b>60-74%</b> grants receiving a 4-5 rating on rubric upon award completion.		<b>50% or fewer</b> grants receiving a 4-5 rating on rubric upon award completion.		<b>NA</b>
	<b>C3.2</b> Number of CGCC advocacy and collaborative efforts	<b>10 or more</b> Partnerships, including business recruitment, public agency collaboration and joint grant proposals.		<b>4-8</b> Partnerships, including business recruitment, public agency collaboration and joint grant proposals		<b>1 or none</b> Partnerships, including business recruitment, public agency collaboration and joint grant proposals		<b>12</b> partnerships
<b>Objective C4:</b> Creating, maintaining, and growing community relationships	<b>C4.1</b> Direct and indirect investments in the community	a. <b>35 or more</b> community events sponsored by CGCC, or in which CGCC participated		a. <b>25 - 30</b> community events sponsored by CGCC, or in which CGCC participated		a. <b>20 or fewer</b> community events sponsored by CGCC, or in which CGCC participated		<b>40</b> community events
		b. <b>100%</b> space requests accommodated		b. <b>80 - 90%</b> space requests accommodated		b. <b>70% or fewer</b> space requests accommodated		<b>93%</b> of requests accommodated
		c. <b>95 or more</b> faculty/staff representing the college through off-campus committees		c. <b>80 - 90</b> faculty/staff representing the college through off-campus committees		c. <b>70 or fewer</b> faculty/staff representing the college through off-campus committees		<b>43</b> faculty/staff
		d. <b>14 or more</b> college-wide service activities and faculty-led service learning projects		d. <b>10 - 12</b> college-wide service activities and faculty-led service learning projects		d. <b>7 or fewer</b> college-wide service activities and faculty-led service learning projects		<b>36</b> service activities
	<b>C4.2</b> Engagement of the broader community in the exploration of art, science, culture, and the humanities	a. <b>22 or more</b> co-curricular educational events/programs offered by CGCC		a. <b>18 - 20</b> co-curricular educational events/programs offered by CGCC		a. <b>14 or fewer</b> co-curricular educational events/programs offered by CGCC		<b>43</b> co-curricular events
		b. <b>190 or more</b> community education courses offered with an <b>16% or lower</b> cancel rate and <b>900 or more</b> enrolled		b. <b>160 - 175</b> community education courses offered with an <b>19 - 21%</b> cancel rate and <b>750 - 850</b> enrolled		b. <b>145 or fewer</b> community education courses offered with an <b>24% or higher</b> cancel rate and <b>700 or fewer</b> enrolled		<b>183</b> community education courses offered with an <b>26%</b> cancel rate and <b>655</b> enrolled
	<b>C4.3</b> Community awareness of CGCC	a. <b>135 or more</b> news and press releases annually		a. <b>110 - 130</b> news and press releases annually		a. <b>100 or fewer</b> news and press releases annually		<b>161</b> news & press releases
		b. <b>500 or more</b> Increase in annual		b. <b>400 - 450</b> Increase in annual		b. <b>300 or fewer</b> Increase in annual		<b>596</b> additional

		Facebook users		Facebook users		Facebook users	Facebook users	
		c. <b>50,000 or more</b> unique website visits/month		c. <b>35,000 - 40,000</b> unique website visits/month		c. <b>30,000 or fewer</b> unique website visits/month	<b>18,595</b> unique website visits per month	<b>1</b>
	<b>C4.4</b> Community perception of CGCC	<b>85% or more</b> Percentage of surveyed identifying themselves as very or somewhat satisfied with the quality of education and services offered by CGCC		<b>65 – 75%</b> Percentage of surveyed identifying themselves as very or somewhat satisfied with the quality of education and services offered by CGCC		<b>55% or fewer</b> Percentage of surveyed identifying themselves as very or somewhat satisfied with the quality of education and services offered by CGCC	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>

## Core Theme C Narrative

### Objective C1 – Cultivating productive business and industry relationships

#### C1.1 – Effectiveness of grants, funding and in-kind donations

##### Description of Results

N/A

##### Analysis of Results

N/A

##### Actions for Improvement

N/A

##### Effectiveness of Assessment

More work needed to make the grants rubric review process effective. As the process currently occurs, there isn't enough time and people don't have enough information to offer informed responses on grant opportunities. Also, we haven't followed any grants through to completion, so no grants that began the rubric review process have yet been completed.

- Process improvement:
  - Bring RFPs to the Grants Committee first, consider possible ideas for CGCC projects that might respond to a given RFP, and only then circulate the grants rubric to the committee for review and comment, once an idea has been identified.
  - Assign department lead to the project, if we decide to continue toward and RFP.
  - Don't start this process unless an RFP involves multiple departments or significant expenditures, such as hiring permanent staff.

#### C1.2 – Number of businesses and industries assisted by CGCC

##### Description of Results

Small Business Development Center: 295 businesses

Child Care Partners: 260 businesses

##### Analysis of Results

Exceeded numbers for both SBDC and Child Care Partners, the two data sources for this measure. This reflects expanded economic activity and continuing regional outreach by both departments.



### **Actions for Improvement**

Continue as currently designed.

### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

No changes recommended. SBDC and Child Care Partners are longstanding departments, and have been compiling these data annually for many years in order to meet state and federal reporting requirements. This provides a strong historical reference point, and a proven methodology, for assessment of performance.

## **C1.3 – Effectiveness of processes to assess business and industry needs**

### **Description of Results**

11 of 18 industry sectors had one or more of the following: needs assessment, site visit, survey, or CGCC advisory board.

Sectors hit: educational; farming, fishing, and forestry; financial services and other business services; healthcare; information services; manufacturing; installation, maintenance, and repair; office and administrative support; production; professional; trade, sales and related; utilities

Sectors not hit: Construction and extraction; government; leisure and hospitality; natural resources and mining; transportation and material moving; non-classifiable.

### **Analysis of Results**

Industry sector analysis is extensive, but still falls short of providing a comprehensive, systematic overview of all relevant sectors. For instance, the Columbia Gorge is a national scenic area, so it is important for the college to assess skill needs in leisure and hospitality. Likewise, government is a major employer at all levels (local, state and federal). What skills are required in this sector, and how can the college help meet these needs? Other sectors are also represented in the region but are assessed only infrequently, if at all. A strategic assessment of all sectors is necessary in order for the institution to truly understand its region's workforce needs.

### **Actions for Improvement**

The college is developing a seamless education and training model with industry, K-12, workforce training and university partners; this is called the "Regional Center of Innovation." One strategy currently under review is an annual, three-part survey: 1) survey of educators to identify current education and training opportunities in the region; 2) survey of parents and students to identify career goals and unmet education and training needs; 3) survey of industry sectors to identify skill sets. This third survey, if properly designed and executed, and if conducted routinely on an annual or semi-annual basis, should provide the college with data for all industry sectors.

## **Effectiveness of Assessment**

Consensus is to proceed with employment sector matrix as annual tracking mechanism. This seems to provide a sufficient overview of activities. The matrix works as follows: We count a score if we have conducted a needs assessment, a site visit or survey, or if a sector is represented on a standing advisory committee (nursing, STEM, SBDC, Child Care Partners, etc.) over the past year. (Major employment sectors are derived from the Oregon Employment Department, and are representative of our region.) We establish a participation by comparing the total number of sectors (18, including non-classifiable) with the number of sectors participating in college outreach. In this first review, we had a score of 56%.

- Process improvement: Ensure that everyone with a stake in this has a chance to review the matrix. For instance, Suzanne Burd will likely have additional information from customized training.

### **C1.4 – Number and effectiveness of workforce training activities**

#### **C1.4a – customized training**

##### **Description of results**

Organization	# of trainings	Types of trainings	# of employees trained
Duckwall-Pooley Fruit Company	1	Computer basics	10
Insitu – engineering staff	2	Kepner-Tragoie project management/problem solving	40
Insitu – middle managers	75	Leadership development skills	112
The Dalles Public Works	1	Flagger certification	13
TOTAL	79		175

##### **Analysis of results**

Target achievement for this measure is mixed. In the first component, the target of 5-8 employers using customized training was not achieved. However, Insitu, the largest employer in area, is like working with several employers. And, since the college worked with two separate Insitu departments, with minimal crossover of employees, each department was counted as an individual “organization.” As a result the college reported that it provided training to four organizations and scored a “2” for the first component of the measure. In the second component, number of employees trained, the college far exceeded the target of 75, more than doubling that number and earning a score of “5+.” The question was then posed whether one component has more weight than the other or if it is an even split and the two scores should be averaged. It was determined that the overall intent of the measure was exceeded in that significantly more individuals received training than planned.

Additional benefit –CGCC was the lead college in a Tri-College Consortium (a collaboration between CGCC, Mt Hood CC, and Clark College) serving Insitu training needs. Each institution delivered 5 courses 5 times (total 25 for each institution).

Customized training activity is largely dependent on the health of the local, regional and national economy. Employers are more willing to invest in trainings when the economy is strong. This year was relatively good economically with industry able to invest in employee training. However, Insitu laid off 30 engineers in June and there is potential for additional downsizing. As a result there will likely be less demand for training in the coming year, and CGCC will likely repeat the same series of courses but on a smaller scale.

**Actions for improvement:**

Seek additional companies/employers that will engage in contracted customized training.

**Effectiveness of assessment:**

Appears to be an effective gauge of workforce training activities.

**C1.4b – CTE employment placements**

**Description of Results**

CGCC had a total of 45 CTE employment placements: 19 Nursing, 16 Renewable Energy Technology, 10 Medical Assisting. This data is anecdotal and only includes those students willing to report. Currently, CGCC has no system in place to track students' employment placement for Early Education & Family Studies, Computer Applications, or Business Administration degree and certificate completers.

**Analysis of Results**

This results in a score of 2, while not below mission expectations, it does not reaching the 50 to meet mission expectations. Anecdotally, it is felt that RET, Nursing, and Medical Assisting graduates are successful in finding employment. The precise percentage is not available. Since the data are incomplete, it is not possible to score this measure accurately. The score of "2" is based solely on the employment placements in two areas, but the target is based on five areas.

**Actions for Improvement**

Action recommendations cannot be developed until complete data are available.

**Effectiveness of Assessment**

CGCC should initiate a system for tracking employment placement and/or transfer of all students. This is valuable information that validates the effectiveness of our training programs. Consideration should also be given to implementing employer satisfaction surveys that are conducted during the first 6 months of a student's employment and/or tracking the progress of transferring students during their first year following transfer. In addition, consideration should be given to determining success by percentage of graduates finding employment.

**Objective C2 – Creating, maintaining, and growing academic partnerships**

## **C2.1 - % change of high school students attending CGCC(including College Now, EO/RS, Early College)**

### **Description of Results**

In 2012-13, 322 high school students attended CGCC as part of College Now, Extended Options/Running Start, and Early College. This is a 6% increase over 2011-12 when 303 students participated.

### **Analysis of Results**

Enrollment seems to be gradually increasing in dual credit opportunities, which may be the result of several factors: 1) dual credit is an element of achievement compacts for both K-12 and community colleges, 2) CGCC has key staff in the high schools encouraging enrollment in these programs, 3) additional rural high schools are showing interest in Early College.

### **Actions for Improvement**

As dual credit opportunities grow and more high school students participate, there is a need to have a dedicated staff person responsible for dual credit at CGCC. The program is currently fragmented with a few individuals in Student Services and Instructional Services involved in different capacities, but no single person coordinating the effort.

### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

Acquiring the data necessary to do this analysis has been difficult. It is important that the College designate specific individuals – or possibly the new Institutional Researcher position - to be responsible for collecting and housing the data for all Core Theme objectives.

In addition, the College should ask the question – does knowing how many students participated in dual credit tell us anything? Should the College be looking at the success of students in dual credit courses and whether they enroll at this institution, or any institution, following graduation from high school?

## **C2.2 – Number, type and results of activities supporting community college, university and career tech relationships**

### **Description of Results**

Articulation agreements: OHSU – Articulation and Transfer Agreement for Baccalaureate Completion Program for RNs (RNBS)

Degree partnerships: Concordia University, Eastern Oregon University, Linfield College, Marylhurst College, Oregon Institute of Technology, Oregon State University, Portland State University

Data not available for last year as these students were PCC students and CGCC did not track them. Data should be available next year. We have no estimation of dual enrolled students for 2012-13.

### **Analysis of Results**

Instructional Services reviewed existing articulation agreements fall of 2012. The CAO at that time questioned the purpose and value of the agreements given few of the agreements had been kept current. The CAO asked what value the agreements held for students – was the transition to the partnering institution any easier as the result of the agreements?

Discussions are under way (August 2013) with Oregon State University (Open Campus initiative), Oregon Institute of Technology, Oregon Health Sciences University and Portland State University with a goal of creating or expanding existing degree partnerships. Washington State University is also included in this outreach. These agreements will help address a longstanding request from industry partners to expand four-year opportunities in the Columbia River Gorge. CGCC is brokering these discussions through the Regional Center of Innovation model, in coordination with Clark College and Yakima Valley Community Colleges in Klickitat and Skamania counties. This would be a 2+2 model, emphasizing seamless transition from two-year associate degree to upper-division coursework. The model also incorporates K-12 and early learning. In August the Oregon Education Investment Board formally recognized this model, through designation of CGCC and its partners in the Regional Center of Innovation as a Regional Achievement Collaborative. State funding for a start-up pilot project is pending.

### **Actions for Improvement**

The College should consider the purpose of both articulation agreements and degree partnerships. Are our students benefiting from these agreements? If so, should we promote them more deliberately? If not, why are we doing them?

### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

CGCC should question whether counting the number of articulation agreements and degree partnerships really tell us anything. What do we want to know about these agreements? Do we want to know if students are benefiting? How would we know that? What information do we need to determine that?

## **Objective C3 – Cultivating relationships with governmental entities to promote economic growth and community development**

### **C3.1 – Effectiveness of grants, funding and in-kind donations**

#### **Description of Results**

NA

#### **Analysis of Results**

NA

#### **Actions for Improvement**

NA

### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

More work needed to make the grants rubric review process effective. As the process currently occurs, there isn't enough time and people don't have enough information to offer informed responses on grant opportunities. Also, we haven't followed any grants through to completion, so no grants that began the rubric review process have yet been completed.

- Process improvement:
  - Bring RFPs to the Grants Committee first, consider possible ideas for CGCC projects that might respond to a given RFP, and only then circulate the grants rubric to the committee for review and comment, once an idea has been identified.
  - Assign department lead to the project, if we decide to continue toward and RFP.
  - Don't start this process unless an RFP involves multiple departments or significant expenditures, such as hiring permanent staff.

### **C3.2 – Number of CGCC advocacy and collaborative efforts.**

#### **Description of Results**

The college places great pride on its partnerships within the community and with other governmental entities. During the 2012-13 academic year, the college partnered **12 times** with governmental entities to promote economic growth and community development, on a wide variety of subjects, benefitting all counties within our service district.

1. Letter of Support to Senator Hill and Representative Hunter for Gorge Commission Funding, May 23, 2013
2. Regional Center of Innovation Letter of Support from Columbia River Gorge Commission, May 10, 2013
3. Mid-Columbia Economic Development District Letter of Support for the Klickitat-Skamania Broadband Project, April 25, 2013
4. Regional Center of Innovation Letter of Support from Columbia Gorge Educational Services District, March 27, 2013
5. The Dalles Community Outreach Team Trip to Washington, D.C., March 3-8, 2013
6. Letter of Support to US Department of Education for North Wasco School District Magnet School, February 12, 2013
7. Regional Center of Innovation Letter of Support from Oregon Health Sciences University, January 31, 2013
8. Regional Center of Innovation Letter of Support from Oregon State University, January 24, 2013
9. Letter of Support for City of The Dalles to National Endowment for the Arts for the Lewis & Clark Fountain, December 21, 2012
10. Letter of Support from Indian Creek Stewards for Indian Creek Greenway Project, November 15, 2012
11. The Dalles Community Outreach Team Trip to Washington, D.C., September 16-20, 2012
12. Business Recruitment – Project G

## **Analysis of Results**

Collaboration and advocacy for and by the college occurred at many different levels and on different topics benefitting the college's stakeholders. The Community Outreach Team trips are counted as two occurrences because of the diverse purposes in the two trips and the different agendas being presented to each agency/legislator during the two different trips. There are several collaborative efforts regarding the Regional Center of Innovation which are counted separately because they are partnerships with different agencies/organizations.

## **Actions for Improvement**

The college is doing well in this area but should continue to search for areas to collaborate and advocate with agencies to promote economic growth and community development. The college should continue to be responsive to these opportunities and to lend its support to other agencies as requested.

## **Effectiveness of Assessment**

This information is easy to quantify and is considered to be effective; however, a better mechanism should be developed to track these collaborative efforts with governmental entities. Even though the college exceeded expectations for this target, the target is thought to be appropriate.

## **Objective C4 – Creating, maintaining, and growing community relationships**

### **C4.1 – Direct and indirect investments in the community**

#### **Description of Results**

C4.1a. The college sponsored and participated in **43** community events: Starlight Parade; Gorge Gravity Games; Hood River Hops Fest; Early Childhood and Family Discovery Day; Founders Cup Golf Tournament; Delta Energy Club Film Festival; etc.

C4.1b. The college provided space to a variety of organizations (The Dalles Area Chamber of Commerce, Sen. Jeff Merkley Town Hall, Indian Creek Stewards, Toastmasters, The Dalles Theater Company, Oregon Child Development Coalition, etc.) during the year. Fifty-three (53) events were held at The Dalles campus and forty-four (44) at the Hood River campus with only 7 of the space requests made by the community not being accommodated.

C4.1c. The college was not able to effectively survey staff and faculty this year regarding their service on community committees and groups. A survey was sent out in July, after many faculty are gone for the summer and staff members are on vacation. 43 staff and faculty responded to the survey, indicating association with 107 unique non-CGCC community organizations and groups, with an additional 7 groups having more than one CGCC employee serving on it (for a total of 114 representations on community organizations/groups).

C4.1d. 24 Faculty led service learning projects included: native plant restoration along Indian Creek with the Indian Creek Stewards and SOLV; water quality analysis with DEQ, EPA, and Columbia Riverkeepers;

solid waste audit for CGCC with SOLV; Consumer surveys with Gorge Grown Thursday Market; hazardous waste collection and support with Tri-County Waste Disposal; educational garden with Trout Lake School; after school classes on recycling education at Chenoweth Elementary School; research assistance collecting lamprey in the Columbia River drainages with the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs; Harvest Festival; etc. 12 Student Life service projects included: American Red Cross Blood Drive; canned food drive; Sorosis Park clean-up; Salvation Army Adopt-a-Family; American Cancer Society Relay for Life; etc.

### **Analysis of Results**

C4 data shows that the college is surpassing mission expectations in three of the 4 sub-measures: community event sponsorship and participation, accommodation of space requests, and service activities. And while the number of faculty and staff representing the college through off-campus committees (43) was below mission expectation (80-90), it is noted that 114 representations on community organizations/groups by CGCC staff is significant and should be considered in the overall score. Many CGCC staff and faculty represent the college on multiple off-campus committees. On the whole, this measure appears to be well met.

### **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 Marketing Coordinator is developing an integrated marketing strategy that will include communications plans for better informing the public about the amount of direct and indirect investments provided to the service-district communities, including a streamlined method of tracking these investments.

### **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 recommended that the [Marketing Coordinator](#) and/or Institutional Researcher assist in developing a methodology for tracking and reporting this data. Further, a yearly reporting calendar should be issued by the IAC with deadlines and deliverables.

The timing of the survey regarding non-CGCC committee memberships resulted in a poor response rate and it is recommended that the core theme champions determine the best timing for an overall core theme survey that can be coordinated across the core themes and sent to staff, faculty, students and the public. In addition, the college should look at revising the measure to include the number of hours that CGCC staff and faculty spend serving on outside committees and groups. This is perhaps a better measure for investments in the community than the number of staff serving on committees and the number of committees being served on.

## **C4.2 – Engagement of the broader community in the exploration of art, science, culture, and the humanities**

### **Description of Results**



C4.2a. The college hosted 43 co-curricular events including 12 art shows, 8 public workshops and speaker series (guest authors and Humanities Series), 14 theater performances, and 6 other workshops and community engagement events.

C4.2b. Mission expectation for this measure is a compilation of three scores including number of courses offered, cancellation rate of courses, and total students enrolled. CGCC offered 183 community education courses (computer, healthcare, childcare, photography, languages, etc.). The 2012-13 cancellation rate was 26%. 655 students enrolled in these courses.

### **Analysis of Results**

C4.2a. Co-curricular events were varied and the number exceeded the mission expectation for this measure. Four to five individuals were responsible for making these events happen, each working on his or her own. There is no coordinated schedule for co-curricular events of this nature. Achievement of this measure relies on the interest and motivation of these four to five individuals.

C4.2b. A significant contributing factor to low enrollment and cancellation rates is marketing of community education programs. The community education program needs a focused marketing effort. However it should be noted that the number of courses offered fell just short of the target.

### **Actions for Improvement**

Increase marketing efforts. With the launch of the Community Education department's new webpage this summer, this could be one way to increase visibility. The new marketing department may also have a positive influence.

### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

Determination of what constitutes a co-curricular "event" may have changed from when the targets were set and when the data collected were analyzed. Events such as the Spring Humanities Series may have been considered as one event initially, but counted as four events when reporting. The same has occurred with the reporting of theater productions. It seems to be best to count each performance as a separate event as it engages a different group of people each time. However, if this line of reasoning continues, then the target numbers should be increased to reflect these broader counting parameters. The schedule of activities for last year was reasonable and doable. It was not overly ambitious nor was it particularly lacking. It is recommended that the college raise the bar and challenge itself to meet its policy to engage the broader community in the exploration of art, science, culture, and the humanities. Suggested targets for next year: (1) Below Mission Expectation – 25 or fewer; (3) Meets Mission Expectations – 35-55; (5) Exceeds Mission Expectations – 65-80.

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 recommended that the Marketing Coordinator and/or Institutional Researcher assist in developing a methodology for tracking and reporting this data. Further, a yearly reporting calendar should be issued by the IAC with deadlines and deliverables.

Enrollment and cancellation rates are affected by the program's goal to offer new classes each term, and eliminate classes no longer popular. New classes need time to grow (in some cases one academic year); worn out classes need to be weeded out soon so as not to skew the data. As core theme data tracking becomes more of our culture, this will be very useful data to use to inform future community

education programming. The number of classes offered goal is easily within reach, but the college should consider not only the number of classes offered but the quality and content. This was a baseline year. Ideally the data is collected and analyzed for another year or two before making any changes to the targets.

### **C4.3 – Community awareness of CGCC**

#### **Description of Results**

#### **Analysis of Results**

The average of 18,595 unique website visits per month was far below the expected outcome for this measure. Migration of the website from the old Contribute-based site to the Drupal site has not been completely finished and both sites are tracked to compile the aggregate data. Starting in 2015 there will be only one source for the data as the old site will be completely shut down.

#### **Actions for Improvement**

#### **Effectiveness of Assessment**

It should be clarified as to what constitutes a press release and what is counted in the tracking of the measure. The President's Office scans and archives any news article related to CGCC but further clarification is needed on what articles and press releases should be tracked for this purpose.

It is recommended that the Marketing Coordinator and Institutional Researcher explore a better way of capturing community awareness through Facebook than by measuring an increase in "likes" because at some point, the market will be saturated and we won't be growing our "likes" as constantly.

Work with Informational Technology and Marketing staff to access the website measure applicability and revise based on expected new visitors per month.

Because two of the targets exceeded mission expectation, the targets should be analyzed and revised to accurately reflect the intent of the measure if necessary.

The target for the number of unique website visits per month may need to be revised since we were significantly below the expected target.

### **C4.4 – Community perception of CGCC**

#### **Description of Results**

No survey occurred in the period measured. A survey is planned for fall 2013.

#### **Analysis of Results**

N/A

**Actions for Improvement**

N/A

**Effectiveness of Assessment**

An annual community survey needs to be conducted. The college will be conducting a survey in August 2013 in preparation for a bond election; one of the questions on this survey will address community perception of the institution.