

Institutional Assessment Committee

Wednesday, October 16, 2019, 10:00 am – 11:30 pm

Board Room, building 1, The Dalles Campus

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Amendments to October 2 minutes ¹?
3. Core Theme Review ² – continued (begin with Core Theme C) (10:05 – 10:10 am)
 - a. Goal: Provide feedback and guidance in completion of Core Themes.
4. Department Review review (10:50 – 11:25 am)
<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1vVWvtWDYEzfkLxBsgLJfR60y9oN9hwPM>
 - a. Goal: Determine common themes to include in Department Review Summary
5. November 13 IAC meeting date and content
6. Wrap-up: Summarize Action Items, Next Steps, Other (11:25 am – 11:30 pm)

Next meeting: November 13, 2019

Attachments: ¹October 2, 2019 Minutes; ² Core Theme Reports

Institutional Assessment Committee

Minutes for Wednesday, October 2, 2019, 10:00 am – 11:30 pm

Board Room, Building 1, The Dalles Campus

Present: Gerardo Cifuentes, Courtney Cunningham, Gail Gilliland, Kristen Kane, Susan Lewis, Mary Martin.

Call to Order: 10:05 am

1. Susan welcomes members
2. August 21, 2019 minutes approved.
3. Core Theme A, B & C Review
 - Goal: Provide feedback and guidance in completion of Core Theme.
 - Core Theme A: Extensive discussion ensued regarding Core Theme A, as this is Gerardo's first time completing it. Susan hands out Core Theme A data she received from Justin.
 - Gerardo informs the IAC that he has spoken with Justin regarding last year's data from Core Theme A. The data appears different than last year's documentation. Susan explains the reason for the discrepancy. Justin informed her that the cohort is included in this year's data. We can roll over some old analysis and change to relevant info and rewrite for this year. Goals do not get accomplished in some departments, in others they do. See President's Office webpage planning goals. Discussion continues with explanation of various descriptions on the Analysis; Actions for Improvement, Effectiveness of Assessment.
 - Review of new data from Justin.
 - A1.1 Prof/Tech Supp should be removed
 - A2.1 How did we get these numbers?
 - A2.2 good
 - Gerardo has question about underserved population
 - ❖ Underserved (below poverty level answer see Financial Aid)
 - A4. Used CCSSE, done every other or every 3 years. Use CCSSE from 2018 year. See if SENSE from 2019 has a question that would correlate to this question.
 - A3. 3 Look at past report and see how it is defined.
 - ❖ Justin's data should work for A3.3.
 - Susan will be glad to assist Gerardo.
Gerardo's next step is sorting through Justin's info.
 - Core Theme B – Kristen
 - Kristen presented Core Theme B
 - Core Theme B is including all students last year and this year, as opposed to using 1st year student numbers

- Questioning if the numbers are coming from different reports. Core Theme A and B numbers have big differences for the same populations.
 - ❖ Susan suggests this difference is due to 2018-19 numbers include cohort numbers.
- Things to consider:
 - ❖ Kristen is not seeing differences in numbers between years
 - ❖ **Gerardo's numbers are specifically for high school numbers – Fall to Fall**
 - ❖ Good comparison and analysis between HS and degree seeking.
 - ❖ Students could be graduating or transferring and not returning.
 - ❖ We do have transfer numbers, those leaving and actually transferring
 - ❖ Be cautious about making sweeping changes with small numbers, yet if the small numbers are consistent over the years, we can use it.
- Suggestions:
 - B2.1 Kristen would like more/higher aspirational indicators (graduation rates)
 - Degrees awarded
 - ❖ Who is providing these numbers, Justin (reported from CGCC to Justin, back to CGCC) or Dawn (directly from CGCC)?
 - ❖ Clarify the count; it does not represent the number of students awarded, but the number of degrees and certificates awarded.
 - ❖ Would it be more meaningful to use a headcount of students awarded (not actual degrees and certificates awarded)?
 - ✓ Include this suggestion in the Analysis. We will look at it for next year.
 - Consider including student transfer information outside OUS system
- Changes will be reviewed in December after all Core Themes are completed
- Ashley arrives 11:00 am
- Core Theme C –
 - Will review between now and next meeting
 - Please cc Susan and Gail if you are sending e-mails to Dan.

Action Item: Gerardo and Core Theme A team to complete Core Theme A, Susan will be glad to help.

4. ECEFS Survey presented by Ashley Mickels (Ashley arrives at 11:00 am)
 - The ECEFS survey will be one survey this term using the Qualtrics survey tool with the objective to gather information to help ECEFS improve the ECEFS program, motivated by the current ECEFS Program Review.
 - Ashley will work with Gerardo and/or Dan Spatz for help with Qualtrics

- The survey will use Qualtrics skip logic to directed participants to self-identify with specific groups
 - CGCC ECEFS Graduates
 - IAC suggestion: above Q5 add “Did you feel prepared upon graduation?”
 - CGCC ECEFS Current Students
 - IAC suggestion: Q#2 – change to “Are there barriers that you have had or foresee preventing you from completing the program?”
 - CGCC ECEFS Inactive Students
 - Current Early Childhood Professionals NOT Enrolled at CGCC
 - IAC suggestion: remove “NOT enrolled at CGCC” and use “graduate at CGCC or elsewhere”
 - Current ECEFS Employers
- To be distributed to the ECE advisory, Child Care Partners, social media
 - See Jessica Griffin-Conner for social media instructions, Facebook page
 - IAC suggestion: post to CGCC webpage
- IAC feedback on questions
 - Use present tense where possible
 - Include an option for participants to opt out if they have previously taken the survey. “Have you already taken this survey?”
 - Clarify any questions that may seem vague.
 - Add a question about location preference, TDC or HR campus.
 - Employers: specify CGCC ECE
 - Brief discussion ensued around:
 - Projected earnings: Head Start and OCDC start around \$16 per hour, options for advanced positions available for individuals with ECEFS AAS and/or ECEFS certificate.
 - Soft skills
- IAC agrees this will be a good survey for Ashley to go ahead with.

5. Department Review review

- Goal: Determine common themes to include in Department Review Summary (Submitted: Business CCP, CAD, Facilities, HR, SS)
- Suggestions:
 - Facilities needs to redo bottom portion
 - IAC agrees this should not be included in department review
 - Child Care Partners: the strategic goals do not appear to align with current Strategic Plan goals
 - Susan will check into this
- Many department reviews are missing:
 - Per Susan’s conversation with President Cronin, the following departments need to submit a department review
 - Bookstore: Susan met with Jack

- ❖ This year a pass is given on function area, however feel free to write on function areas where there is a concern
- Community Ed and Customized Training: Susan met with Rose
 - ❖ This year a pass is given on function area, however feel free to write on function areas where there is a concern
- SBDC: Rick is no longer with CGCC, who will complete this department review is still in question.
- Instructional Services: Lori has contacted Dr. Cronin and Susan to let them know the Department Review is in progress and will be completed shortly.
- IT

6. Reminder: Susan will be out of the office from October 23, 2019 through December 3, 2019.

7. Adjourn 11:43 am

Next meeting: October 16, 2019

| Core Theme B: Transforming Lives – Education | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|-----------------|-------|
| Scale | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | |
| Objective | Measure | Surpasses Mission Expectation | | Meets Mission Expectation | | Below Mission Expectation | 2018-19 Results | Score |
| Objective B1: Applying processes that lead to student retention | B1.1 Student retention over 3 consecutive terms | 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 | 55% | 3 |
| | B1.2 Percent retention fall term to fall term | 50% or more retention of credit students fall term to fall term | | 40-45% retention of credit students fall term to fall term | | 35% or fewer retention of credit students fall term to fall term | 37.1% | 2 |
| Objective B2: Applying processes that lead to student progress, certificate/degree completion, and/or employment | B2.1 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 | 33.6% | 5 |
| | B2.2 Student completion – GEDs awarded compared to annual GED enrollment | 30% or more GEDs awarded compared to annual enrollment of GED seekers | | 18-22% GEDs awarded compared to annual enrollment of GED seekers ¹ | | 12% or fewer GEDs awarded compared to annual enrollment of GED seekers | | |
| | B2.3 Student completion – GED sections passed compared to GED sections attempted | 91% or more GED sections passed compared to GED sections attempted | | 80-85% GED sections passed compared to sections attempted | | 69% or fewer GED sections passed compared to sections attempted | | |
| | B2.4 Student completion- Enrolled in Dev. Ed. Writing who complete | 95% or more of students enrolled in Dev. Ed. Writing complete with a “C” or better | | 75% - 84% of students enrolled in Dev. Ed. Writing complete with a “C” or better | | 64% or less of students enrolled in Dev. Ed. Writing complete with a “C” or better | | |
| | B2.5 Student completion- Enrolled in Dev. Ed. Math who complete | 98% or more of students enrolled in Dev. Ed. Math complete with a “C” or better | | 78 – 87% of students enrolled in Dev. Ed. Math complete with a “C” or better | | 67% or less of students enrolled in Dev. Ed. Math complete with a “C” or better | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|-------|---|
| | B2.6 Students who transfer to Oregon University System. | 12% or more of students transfer to Oregon University System | | 10% of students transfer to Oregon University System | | 8% or less of students transfer to Oregon University System | 15.8% | 5 |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|-------|---|

¹ 5-year (2021-22) aspirational goal for Meets Mission Expectation at 30-40% GEDs awarded.

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|-------|---|
| | B2.7 GPA of transfer students in first year at university | 3.5 or higher Average OUS GPA for transfer students across all disciplines | | 3.0 – 3.25 Average OUS GPA for transfer students across all disciplines | | 2.75 or lower Average OUS GPA for transfer students across all disciplines | N/A | |
| | B2.8 CTE employment placements | 100 or more CTE employment placements | | 50-79 CTE employment placements | | 30 or fewer CTE employment placements | 49 | 2 |
| Objective B3: Ensuring student proficiency in course, program and institutional student learning outcomes | B3.1 Achievement of student learning outcomes at the course level | 95% or more students meeting course outcomes | | 80% - 89% students meeting course outcomes | | 69% or fewer students meeting course outcomes | 87.8% | 3 |
| | B3.2 Achievement of student learning outcomes at the degree/certificate/program level | 95% or more students meeting degree/certificate/program outcomes | | 80% - 89% students meeting degree/certificate/program outcomes | | 69% or fewer students meeting degree/certificate/program outcomes | 88.2% | 3 |
| | B3.3 Achievement of student learning outcome at the institutional level (Core Learning Outcomes) | 95% or more students meeting institutional Core Learning Outcomes | | 80% - 89% students meeting institutional Core Learning Outcomes | | 69% or fewer students meeting institutional Core Learning Outcomes | 63.74 | 1 |

1. Measurements which have milestone goals for targets will have the aspirational goal to which they are heading identified in the endnotes of this document. Provide a schedule for reaching the aspirational goal.

Core Theme B Work Group for 2017-18

Student Services - Mike Taphouse

Academic Assessment – Kristen Kane

Instruction - Mary Martin

CT Narrative Analysis for Core Theme B

Reporting of Core Theme Analysis and Actions for Improvement

Provide a narrative response to the following areas for each of the Core Theme Measurements (bullets in column titled "What to Measure"):

- **Description of results** (For example, if the results list that 4 committees were formed, the description would name those committees and give any other information determined to be needed in their description. If the results are self explanatory, the description is not needed.)
- **Analysis of results** (Interpret the results. What does it mean if the targets were met, not met, or surpassed? What actions/activities/realities are thought to have led to these results?)
- **Actions for Improvement** (What are the recommended next steps? Do the results and analysis point toward continuing on the same path or implementing some form of change? If change is recommended, what would that change be? Recommendations should be formed with the input of individuals directly involved in or impacted by the improvement action recommended.)
- **Effectiveness of Assessment**
 - **Tools & methodology** (Is the assessment tool or measurement still meaningful or has it been found to not accurately or meaningfully assess the objective? If not, what changes are recommended?)
 - **Future targets** (After reviewing results, do you find that the future targets/benchmarks were reasonable and represent the best intentions of the college? If not, explain. Do the targets need to be updated for the next year? What should the new target be?)

Objective B1: Applying processes that lead to student retention

B1.1 Student retention over 3 consecutive terms

Data for student retention over 3 consecutive terms for 2018-19 academic year is listed in the table below. This includes all students who enrolled in fall 2017 as a degree-seeking college student and took credit courses in each term.

| 1 st Term | Enrolled Headcount | 2 nd Term | Enrolled Headcount | 3 rd Term | Enrolled Headcount | Fall-to-Spring Retention |
|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Fall 2018 | 803 | Winter 2019 | 558 69.5% | Spring 2019 | 442 79.2% | 55.0% |

Description of results: Current data indicates a 55% rate of retention from fall 2018 to spring 2019. This number demonstrates that CGCC is meeting mission expectations with a score of 3. The data includes all degree seeking students who were enrolled in Fall, 2018.

Analysis of results Retention averages of three consecutive terms indicates a 55% rate of retention fall term to spring term. These numbers indicate that CGCC is meeting mission expectations, with a score of 3. These retention rates indicate a slight drop from last years findings of 56.1%. Though it is not a significant drop, it is worth noting in this report. The greatest drop in students continues to occur between fall and winter terms, losing 245 students (30.5% of students were not retained), compared with winter to spring with a loss of 116 students (20.8%).

Actions for Improvement: CGCC continues to focus a significant amount of time and energy toward promotion of student success and retention efforts. It is recognized as an institutional priority and efforts have been made to promote a global perspective toward student success. An example can be seen in the creation of a Faculty/Student Mentor Program (FSMP). This program encourages students to make connections with faculty outside the classroom as the student begins their transition to a transfer institution or career field.

Effectiveness of Assessment The assessment methods seem to be accurate indicators of retention over 3 consecutive terms. The data includes all degree seeking students and is an accurate indicator of our student enrollment patterns.

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

B1.2 Percent retention fall term to fall term

Data for student retention from Fall 2018-Fall 2019. This includes all students who enrolled in fall 2018 as a degree-seeking college student and took credit courses in each term.

| 1 st Term | Enrolled Headcount | 4th Term | Enrolled Headcount | Fall-to-Fall Retention |
|----------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------------|------------------------|
|----------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------------|------------------------|

| | | | | |
|------------------|------------|------------------|------------|--------------|
| Fall 2018 | 803 | Fall 2019 | 298 | 37.1% |
|------------------|------------|------------------|------------|--------------|

Description of results: Current data indicates a 37.0%% rate of retention from fall 2018 to fall 2019. This number demonstrates that CGCC is not meeting mission expectations, with a score of 2. This data includes all degree seeking students who were enrolled in Fall, 2018.

Analysis of results: The current fall-to-fall retention rate of 37.1% is a slight increase over last years finding of 36.7%. However, the findings indicate that we are still not meeting our mission expectation. What the findings don't reveal is why a majority of CGCC students are not returning for a second year. Are they completing their certificates and transitioning into the workforce; have they received the education/training they need for their current work requirements; or have they completed the transferable credits that they were seeking in order to transfer-on to another institution? In addition, it would be important to know how this retention number compares to other similar sized institutions.

Actions for Improvement: Maintain current efforts to increase retention rates for all students. Two examples include required OnTrack 1 and 2 advising appointments and implementation of the Faculty/Student Mentor Program (FSMP). The group recommends that future research efforts should include where we are losing the students who are not retained from fall-tofall, and how do these findings compare to other like-sized institutions? Once these comparison numbers are found the institution should consider adjusting their mission expectation if deemed appropriate. The institution should also continue to review best practices for future retention efforts.

Effectiveness of Assessment: As stated above, the assessment methods seem to be accurate indicators of retention over 4 consecutive terms. The data includes all degree seeking students and is an accurate indicator of our student enrollment patterns. However, additional research options are listed below as a way to gather more specific data points for future retention results..

- **Tools & methodology** Data provided by contracted resource associated with Linn Benton Community College.
- **Future targets:** The group recommends that future research efforts should include where we are losing the students who are not retained from fall-tofall, and how do these findings compare to other like-sized institutions? Once these comparison numbers are found the institution should consider adjusting their mission expectation if deemed appropriate.

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

B2.1 Student graduation

Description of Results: Within 894 degree-seeking students who enrolled full-time or part-time in CGCC in Fall 2015, 300 (33.6%) students have been awarded with at least one 2-year degree (AAOT, AAS, AGS, AS, ASOT, 2-year Certificate) or 1-year certificate.

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

Actions for Improvement: It is recommended to view the current data as a baseline for future research. Further research should include comparisons with similar FTE institutions.

Effectiveness of Assessment: The method of assessment is an accurate indicator of degree and certificate seeking student graduation/completion rates.

- **Tools & methodology** Data provided by contracted resource associated with Linn Benton Community College
- **Future target** Current results, coupled with last year's results, indicate that we have been exceeding our mission expectation in this area by a significant amount for the last two years. As such, this group recommends that we raise our mission expectation to an amount that reflects a more meaningful measure of student graduation/completion rates.

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

- **Description of results:**
- **Analysis of results:**
- **Actions for Improvement:**
- **Effectiveness of Assessment:**
 - **Tools & methodology**
 - **Future targets -**

- **Description of results -**
- **Analysis of results -**
- **Actions for Improvement -**
- **Effectiveness of Assessment -**
 - **Tools & methodology -**
 - **Future targets -**

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

- **Description of results -**
- **Analysis of results -**
- **Actions for Improvement -**
- **Effectiveness of Assessment -**
 - **Tools & methodology -**
 - **Future targets -**

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

- **Description of results -**
- **Analysis of results -**
- **Actions for Improvement -**
- **Effectiveness of Assessment -**
 - **Tools & methodology -**
 - **Future targets -**

B2.6 Students who transfer to Oregon University System.

- **Description of results** Within 894 degree-seeking students who enrolled in CGCC in Fall 2015, 141 (15.8%) students had at least one transfer record to a 4-year Oregon university on or before 12/31/2018.
- **Analysis of results** Current findings (15.8%) indicate that CGCC has surpassed mission expectations. Though currently this percentage appears high, it is recommended that CGCC re-evaluate whether this percentage is an acceptable target or if the ranges should be adjusted to reflect a more ambitious objective.
- **Actions for Improvement** With more than 15% of students transferring to a 4-year Oregon university CGCC is surpassing expectations for B2.6. As stated above, it is recommended that CGCC re-evaluate whether this percentage is an acceptable target or if the ranges should be adjusted to reflect a more ambitious objective.
- **Effectiveness of Assessment** The method of assessment is an accurate indicator of the percentage of CGCC degree seeking students who transferred on to a 4-year Oregon university.
 - **Tools & methodology** Data provided by contracted resource associated with Linn Benton Community College.
 - **Future target** Current results, coupled with last year's results, indicate that we have been exceeding our mission expectation in this area by a significant amount

for the last two years. As such, this group recommends that we raise our mission expectation to an amount that reflects a more meaningful measure of student transfer rate to an Oregon 4-year university. In addition, as a large percentage of CGCC students reside in Washington, it is recommended that we include transfer rates to schools outside of the OUS system since we can now retrieve that data from the clearinghouse.

B2.7 GPA of transfer students in first year at university

- **Description of results** According to CGCC’s Institutional Researcher (IR), the GPA of transfer students in first year at university is currently not being collected or tracked by HECC due to insufficient staffing. While the Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development (CCWD) used to provide a report that showed something similar to this data requested, the IR indicates that this report has been “dead for 5 years”.
- **Analysis of results N/A** - there is no data to analyze
- **Actions for Improvement N/A** - without this data, it’s difficult to determine where improvements need to be made.
- **Effectiveness of Assessment** Since so many factors may cause changes in GPA when a student transfers from our small college/community to a larger school, the committee for B2.7 questions whether GPA of transfer students in a first year university is the most accurate way to determine how CGCC students are doing.

Tools & methodology N/A

Future targets It is difficult to determine whether targets are realistic or whether future targets need to be reconsidered since data for GPA of transfer students in first year university cannot be obtained. One suggestion is to consider using retention rates instead of GPA, since this information may be more readily available and could be useful in determining if students are successful after they transfer from CGCC to 4 year institutions.

B2.8 CTE employment placements

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

The numbers below come from the Health Occupations department chair, the lead instructor for the Medical Assisting program and the CTE dean and faculty, however all state that numbers are incomplete and only anecdotal.

2017-18 numbers are used to measure CTE employment rates, giving students a year after graduation to take licensing exams and find employment.

| Program | Number of 2017-18 Graduates | Number Reported Passing Licensing Exams | Number Reported Employed | Percentage of Graduates Employed |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Nursing | 23 (AAS) | 23 | 23 | 100% |
| Medical Assisting | 15 | 9 (AAMA) 1 (NCMA) | 7 | 47% |
| Electro-Mechanical Technology | 19 | N/A | 19 | 100% |
| Total | 57 | 33/38 | 49 | 86% |

- **Analysis of results** 49 CTE graduates reported employment, placing CGCC below mission. 50 employment placements are considered meeting mission expectation, meaning that CGCC is close to meeting its mission for B2.8.

It's difficult to provide an analysis of what this number means because the numbers are incomplete and anecdotal. Also, using a number to determine whether we are meeting mission expectation seems random. It might be better to use a percentage, as this puts that number in context with the number of graduates. Stating that 86% of our graduates found employment seems to carry more significance than stating that 49 graduates found employment.

- **Actions for Improvement** Without some kind of alumni tracking system, we will not be able to obtain CTE employment placements.

- **Effectiveness of Assessment** While it's obvious that CGCC does not currently have a method of tracking CTE student employment, a few questions continue to arise. It's unclear whether CGCC would like to track student employment in general or employment in a career connected to a student's degree/certificate. If a student finds employment, even if they are considered

underemployed, would this be considered moving towards meeting mission expectations? One of the difficulties with these criteria is that student employment may be impacted by so many factors such as lack of employment in this region in higher end careers.

Tools & methodology Health Occupations and CTE department reported numbers, which are anecdotal and incomplete.

Future targets It is difficult to determine whether targets are realistic or whether future targets need to be reconsidered since data for CTE student employment placements is anecdotal, incomplete or questionable. At the very least, it is recommended that CGCC consider a percentage of employed graduates as a measure of whether we are meeting our mission of applying the processes that lead to student success and employment, as employment numbers when not compared to number of graduates do not provide context.

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

B3.1 Achievement of student learning outcomes at the course level (based on students' self-perception)

- **Description of results** Results from course level outcomes assessment indicate that 87.8% of CGCC students are achieving some level of mastery of their student learning outcomes. A total of 81 assessments of course outcomes were completed with 1229 students (may be duplicated) assessed over the academic year (3 outcomes per course). The results from course outcomes assessment indicate that CGCC is meeting its mission.

- **Analysis of results** All instructors are required to complete a course outcomes assessment each year. With an 84% completion rate of course outcomes assessment by instructors in 2018-19, these numbers provide a broad range of student achievement of course level SLOs, as these results incorporate all departments. With the majority of instructors indicating that they are using direct measures to determine whether students are achieving course level outcomes, an average of 87.8% of students achieving course learning outcomes indicates that CGCC is meeting its mission for B3.1. Data indicates that there was a slight decrease in student achievement of course outcomes from 88.1% in 2017-18, however when compared over four years, data shows that student achievement of course outcomes remains relatively high, within the 87% to 89% range.

- **Actions for Improvement** Instructor results using direct measures to assess student achievement of course level outcomes is considered a more accurate indicator than B3.1's measure of students' self-perception of course outcomes achievement as reported in Student Course Evaluations (SCEs). Concern over student understanding of the purpose of SLOs and their connection to student proficiency in a course has made this indirect measure a questionable method of determining student achievement of SLOs in the past. Data gathered in 2018-19, however, indicates that the majority of instructors (91%) are explaining the purpose and value of course outcomes to their students with some level of intentionality and connecting course outcomes to student activities and assessments. Consequently, results from SCEs may still have value as an indirect measure, providing instructors, and CGCC, with an opportunity to compare instructor-generated results against students' perception of whether they think they have made an improvement towards the achievement of SLOs.

One of the difficulties that confronts CGCC in using SCEs as a measure of student success, however, is the long-standing struggle with low student response rates, with many instructors receiving very few if any student responses. A focused effort to increase the student response rates to the SCEs is recommended.

- **Effectiveness of Assessment** Results from course outcomes assessment provide an accurate measure of student achievement of SLO at the course level.

Tools & methodology Student self-perception of achievement of SLOs are gathered from Student Course Evaluations (SCE). Courses that are up for course outcomes assessment are provided with SCE, which are then distributed electronically by the instructor to students during the final week of the term. Course outcomes assessment is a more accurate measure of student achievement of SLO, as the results come from instructor data that focuses primarily on direct measures of assessment.

Future targets The targets are realistic and it is recommended that they stay the same. It may be unrealistic to expect larger numbers of students to achieve SLO without questioning the inflation of grading.

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

● **Description of results** Assessment of student achievement of outcomes were completed separately for each degree, certificate and program, then combined to reach the one number of 88.2% for all degrees, certificates and programs, surpassing mission expectations. This percentage reflects a total of 39,109 student assessments at the degree, certificate and program level, with a total of 34,494 successfully achieving those outcomes. Three different assessment models were used to determine whether students achieved degree, certificate or program outcomes: 1) end of term grades for courses that have been mapped to specific degree and certificate outcomes and are aggregated and measured against set targets; 2) specific course assignments that were mapped to given degree/certificate outcomes, with targets set for grade achievement and 3) external evaluators assessed student performance using a rubric that aligns with outcomes, then compared to set targets. Of the 106 degree, certificate, program outcomes assessed*, 103 or 97% of those had a student achievement rate 80% or higher for the outcome (meeting or exceeding mission expectations). Results for each degree, certificate and program can be found on the [Completed Degree, Certificate and Program Outcomes Assessments](#) webpage.

*CGCC has a total of 119 degree/certificate/program outcomes. 6 degree outcomes were not assessed as a result of changes to program faculty prior to the collection of data. 7 degree/certificate outcomes could not be assessed due to the cancellation of courses used to measure student achievement of those outcomes.

- **Analysis of results** While this one number of 88.2% indicates that CGCC meets mission expectations for B3.2, caution should be used in reading too much into these results. These results are taken from a total of 19 degrees, certificates and programs with varying numbers of outcomes, students and methods of assessments (see Appendix). Degrees, certificates or programs that may be struggling could easily get lost in this one number. For example, of the 39,109 students assessed, 35,767 are from the AAOT, AS, ASOT-BUS and AGS outcomes assessment, meaning that over 91% of the results come from 4 degrees, with 15 degrees, certificates and programs making up the remaining 9%. The vice president of instruction, deans and department chairs should look at individual results for degrees, certificates and programs when determining actions for improvement and where budget is needed. For example, some degrees, certificates and programs struggled with achieving their targets for student achievement of outcomes. Others found that when one course was canceled many corresponding degree/certificate outcomes could not then be assessed.

- **Actions for Improvement** Since CGCC is meeting mission expectations for degree, certificate and program outcomes, no actions for improvement are suggested from this broad analysis of all degrees, certificates and programs. As stated under Future Targets, 88.2% is a reasonable result and higher results might be questionable with regards to grading inflation. Instead, the vice president of instruction, deans and department chairs should look to the results of the individual degree, certificate and program outcomes assessment to gain a clearer perspective of where resources are needed to bolster student achievement of outcomes.

- **Effectiveness of Assessment** Admittedly, this is not the best assessment strategy because while it gives us a broad idea of how our students are doing, some programs carry far more weight in the 88.2% than other programs. For example, the AAOT weighs heavily into this number with 21 outcomes and its 11,996 students assessed when compared to smaller CTE programs that have 4 or 5 outcomes and 13 or 44 students assessed. The achievement of outcomes for these smaller degrees, certificates and programs get lost when compared to the Transfer and General Studies degrees. When consulting with the Institutional Researcher, however, it was determined that this was the best means of getting one number from 119 degree, certificate and program outcomes.

Tools & methodology

Results of student achievement of outcomes compared to total number of students assessed were gathered from individual degree, certificate and program outcomes assessment. Number of successful student achievement of outcomes for all degree, certificate and program outcomes assessment were then added and divided by the total number of students who had been assessed for all degree, certificate and programs.

Future targets

It is recommended that targets remain the same. 80% to 89% seems realistic for meeting mission expectations. While some degrees and certificates are surpassing mission expectations, these are generally smaller programs. It seems that if 95% (the target for exceeding mission expectations) or more students were achieving degree, certificate and program outcomes, grade inflation might be suspected.

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

- **Description of results** A total of 365 students were enrolled in the 22 200-level courses from 12 disciplines that participated in the assessment of CLO#5 Recognize the consequences of human activity upon our social and natural world (*Community and Environmental Responsibility*). Of those students, 333 completed the assignments and were scored using the [Community and Environmental Responsibility rubric](#). A total of 63.74% of those students scored into the levels of 3 and 4 (accomplished or better). 24.17% of students scored into the category of 2 (developing) and 7.38% of students scored into the category of 1 (beginning). 4.71% scored into “not demonstrated” and 7.25% were scored into the “not applicable” category.

- **Analysis of results** With an expectation for mission accomplishment at 80%, 63.74% of students achieving accomplished or better in the area of Community and Environmental Responsibility is below mission expectations. It’s important to note that this overall percentage derived from the total number of students who scored into “Accomplished” or better on five different criteria from the [Community and Environmental Responsibility rubric](#), while providing a percentage for fulfillment of Core Themes, is not used to inform faculty where or if improvements to instruction need to be made. Instead, faculty use the rubric and student scores to better understand where to focus intentional instruction as a means to move students closer to accomplished or mastery in the categories where scores indicate their skills and knowledge are lacking. Results indicate that students scored lowest in the areas of “Understanding Global Systems” and “Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Global Contexts”. Of interest is that students scored lowest in the categories that addressed community and environmental responsibility on a global level, while percentages of students scored into accomplished or better in the categories that addressed community and environmental responsibility on a more personal level were much higher.

- **Actions for Improvement** Faculty will increase instruction and assessment in the two areas of “Understanding Global Systems” and “Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Global Contexts” in an effort to move more students from beginning/developing levels to the level of accomplished. During 2019 fall in-service, faculty collaborated to create a list of instructional resources and ideas to support these efforts. The academic assessment coordinator will track strategies faculty implement to support student achievement. This CLO will be assessed again in 2023-24, and faculty efforts towards increasing student achievement of this CLO will be analyzed.

Continuing to educate instructors and students about the purpose and importance of CLOs is also recommended. Course Content and Outcomes Guides were updated in 2018-19 to better align with which CLOs are addressed as majors and minors. Plans are moving forward in 2019-20 to help instructors design assignments that can be assessed using the rubrics for CLO assessment. These efforts should help strengthen the process of CLO assessment, as well as involve more instructors, thus helping to familiarize instructors with CLOs. In an effort to address the recommendation from last year that students begin to be educated about CLOs and skills that they should expect to be able to demonstrate upon graduation from CGCC, listing CLOs in course syllabi was required starting the spring of 2018-19 as well.

As recommended by the CLO Assessment Committee, the college may also want to consider adopting a 6th CLO, splitting CLO#5 into two separate Core Learning Outcomes: Community Responsibility and Environmental Responsibility. The committee noted that the inclusion of environmental responsibility in the college's Core Learning Outcomes represents a value that is somewhat unique among colleges. As such, it would express a strong commitment to this value if it was in a separate Core Learning Outcome, better supporting CGCC's identity as a green institution. Focusing on environmental responsibility as a 6th Core Learning Outcome will also allow the college to focus more instruction on this CLO, thus having a greater impact on students.

- **Effectiveness of Assessment** Student artifacts from 200-level courses are used in the assessment of student achievement of the CLO, with the assumption that students could potentially be taking these courses towards the end of their degree, and therefore could have received sufficient instruction in the skills and knowledge required for assessment of the institutional core learning outcomes. In reality, however, the college does not have a way to identify which students are close to graduation in the 200-level General Education courses used for CLO assessment. As such, there is no means to ensure that the assessment is taking place during a student's final term. The adapted LEAP rubrics used for scoring student artifacts are accurate indicators of student achievement. The rubrics, developed by the AACU, have been tested and widely adopted by post-secondary institutions across the US. While instructors scoring their own student artifacts may be somewhat subjective and inflate scores, it is recommended that CGCC continue with this method until a baseline is gathered for each Core Learning Outcome. The rubrics are also effective indicators of where faculty can collaborate and focus increased instruction in an effort to help more students achieve specific criteria of community and environmental responsibility.

What may be more difficult to determine, however, is the impact of instructor intervention due to the fact that different CLOs are assessed each year and it is most likely that different students are being assessed pre and post-intensified instruction.

Tools & methodology: Student artifacts were scored by instructors using a [rubric adapted](#) from [AACU's LEAP Value Rubrics: Global Learning](#). Results were gathered by the Academic Assessment Coordinator and analyzed by the CLO Assessment Committee.

Future targets It should be recognized that student achievement at the community college level will differ for each Core Learning Outcome, as each requires different levels of skills that are dependent on time, education and practice in order to mature beyond the level of “developing” to the level of “accomplishment. It is recommended that appropriate targets for each CLO be developed by the CLO Committee and used to guide the targets for student achievement for Core Theme B3.2

| Core Theme C: Strengthening Our Community - Partnerships | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|-----------------|-------|
| Scale | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | |
| Objective | Measure | Surpasses Mission Expectation | | Meets Mission Expectation | | Below Mission Expectation | 2018-19 Results | Score |
| Objective C1: Cultivating productive business and industry relationships | C1.1 Number of businesses and industries assisted by CGCC | 400 or more Businesses demonstrating increased private investment as a result of, or are otherwise counseled or trained by, SBDC/CCP/Customized Training. | | 200-299 Businesses demonstrating increased private investment as a result of, or are otherwise counseled or trained by, SBDC/CCP/Customized Training. | | 150 or fewer Businesses demonstrating increased private investment as a result of, or are otherwise counseled or trained by, SBDC/CCP/Customized Training. | 384 | |
| | C1.2 Responsiveness to business and industry | 85% or more Percentage of surveyed rating CGCC as having excellent or above average responsiveness to business and industry recommendations (Business and Industry Survey Q5) | | 65 – 75% Percentage of surveyed rating CGCC as having excellent or above average responsiveness to business and industry recommendations (Business and Industry Survey Q5) | | 55% or fewer Percentage of surveyed rating CGCC as having excellent or above average responsiveness to business and industry recommendations (Business and Industry Survey Q5) | 55% | |
| | C1.3 Regional industry satisfaction with CGCC | 85% or more Percentage of surveyed rating CGCC excellent or above average as a community partner to business and industry (Business and Industry Survey Q3) | | 65 – 75% Percentage of surveyed rating CGCC excellent or above average as a community partner to business and industry (Business and Industry Survey Q3) | | 55% or fewer Percentage of surveyed rating CGCC excellent or above average as a community partner to business and industry (Business and Industry Survey Q3) | 50% | |
| | C1.4 Employability and preparedness of CGCC graduates | a. 85% or more Percentage of surveyed rating the analytical skills training of CGCC graduates as excellent or above average (Business and Industry Survey Q9) | | a. 65 – 75% Percentage of surveyed rating the analytical skills training of CGCC graduates as excellent or above average (Business and Industry Survey Q9) | | a. 55% or fewer Percentage of surveyed rating the analytical skills training of CGCC graduates as excellent or above average (Business and Industry Survey Q9) | 27% | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|------|--|
| | | b. 85% or more Percentage of surveyed rating the job specific skills training of CGCC graduates as excellent or above average (Business and Industry Survey Q10) | | b. 65 – 75% Percentage of surveyed rating the job specific skills training of CGCC graduates as excellent or above average (Business and Industry Survey Q10) | | b. 55% or fewer Percentage of surveyed rating the job specific skills training of CGCC graduates as excellent or above average (Business and Industry Survey Q10) | 25% | |
| | | c. 85% or more Percentage of surveyed rating the interpersonal skills training of CGCC graduates as excellent or above average (Business and Industry Survey Q11) | | c. 65 – 75% Percentage of surveyed rating the interpersonal skills training of CGCC graduates as excellent or above average (Business and Industry Survey Q11) | | c. 55% or fewer Percentage of surveyed rating the interpersonal skills training of CGCC graduates as excellent or above average (Business and Industry Survey Q11) | 33% | |
| Objective C2: Creating, maintaining, and growing community relationships | C2.1 Community awareness of CGCC (community survey) | 85% or more Percentage of surveyed identifying themselves as very or somewhat aware of education and services offered by CGCC | | 65 – 75% Percentage of surveyed identifying themselves as very or somewhat aware of education and services offered by CGCC | | 55% or fewer Percentage of surveyed identifying themselves as very or somewhat aware of education and services offered by CGCC | 100% | |
| | C2.2 Community perception of CGCC (community survey) | 85% or more Percentage of surveyed identifying themselves as very or somewhat satisfied with the quality of education and services offered by CGCC | | 65 – 75% Percentage of surveyed identifying themselves as very or somewhat satisfied with the quality of education and services offered by CGCC | | 55% or fewer Percentage of surveyed identifying themselves as very or somewhat satisfied with the quality of education and services offered by CGCC | 36% | |

Core Theme C Narrative Analysis

Objective C1: Cultivating productive business and industry relationships

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

Description of results

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

| | | |
|---|-----|-------|
| Small Business Development Center | 268 | (284) |
| Child Care Partners Resource & Referral | 105 | (104) |
| Customized Training | 11 | (4) |
| Total | 384 | (392) |

Analysis of results

Two of the measures increased over the previous year, in Child Care Partners and, in particular, Customized Training. While this may reflect greater awareness of Customized Training in the regional business community, another possibility is simply that the number reported in the previous year did not accurately reflect the total number of Customized Training contracts. Changes in process and improved record-keeping instituted this past year may validate this assumption. It will be important to review this metric in the 2019-20 cycle. It is also important to note that Customized Training has an inverse relationship with the economy. When the economy is robust it is difficult for business owners to find the time to send employees for training. The regional economy has been very robust since recovery from the 2008 Great Recession. Child Care Partners also showed a slight increase over the previous year, which reflects favorably upon the continued outreach and hard work of a dedicated department staff. There is a chronic shortage of child care in the region; as a training provider, an important component of Child Care Partner's mission is to foster an overall increase in this number. That's constrained by the low salaries typically associated with this industry, and the workload placed upon providers, many of whom are small business owners with very few (or no) staff. Motivation is another challenge. As noted by Nancey Patten, director of Child Care Partners: *"The challenges that we have been facing in working with programs is the struggle to get businesses motivated to attend trainings and work on continuous quality improvement. We have a very active group of Spanish speaking [clients] that are working on Spark and a Star Rating, but have only a small number of active English speakers who are actively engaged in Spark."* Patten is referring to a child care quality rating system instituted at the state level; as more clients become acquainted with this system (and the negative ramifications of not achieving an acceptable quality rating) program participation is expected to increase.

The decline in the number of businesses served by SBDC indicates, to some extent, the continued robust regional economy; many businesses are simply too busy to avail themselves of SBDC. As is the case with Customized Training, an economic downturn may have a direct impact on annual metrics.

Actions for Improvement:

The college's adoption in Summer 2019 of "Ed2Go," an on-line training resource, is expected to have a significant increase in the number of businesses served through Customized Training. For instance, the business and industry survey conducted from June through August 2019 indicated a strong interest in Excel training, but it's been difficult to schedule Excel classes around business owners' schedules; on many occasions, not enough students sign up to justify a class. Ed2Go is a national service, allowing sufficient economy of scale to provide classes such as Excel consistently. One-day seminars, reasonably priced, will be another strategy offered through Customized Training and Community Education. It is also anticipated that expanded marketing, and regional awareness of the college as it launches major new construction projects in 2020, will have a positive impact on this metric. Results of the 2019 business survey also identified numerous new areas of study, which will inform institutional planning and, in the process, identify additional Customized Training classes to provide either through locally contracted vendors or Ed2Go. Development of the college's workforce skills center starting in 2019 will call additional regional attention to the institution's many services, SBDC among them; for instance, the college is now working closely with Gorge Technology Alliance to develop strategic partnerships in the aerospace sector; given the many smaller businesses (as well as large employers) engaged in this sector, there should be new opportunities to connect these businesses with the services offered by SBDC. Likewise, the anticipated new Construction Trades program should also provide opportunity for growth in the number of businesses served by SBDC. Specific SBDC strategies moving forward will be to continue recruiting for the Small Business Management program and run more "Advanced Business Training" modules. This will help address a core challenge confronting SBDC clients in general, regarding a significant lack of proper bookkeeping skills, understanding of finance, and awareness of the principles of human resource management. In terms of Child Care Partners, as is the case with Customized Training and SBDC, it is incumbent upon the institution as a whole to assist in marketing these services to raise awareness in the business community of the trainings offered by all three programs. A more targeted delivery of the college's annual business and industry survey will be another way to raise awareness, and should be incorporated in marketing strategy. As is the case with Customized Training, Child Care Partners is also expanding the use of on-line classes; the department will also be starting a "Focused Child Care Network" to call attention to new programs. Finally, close coordination between Community Education and Customized Training, with staff now solely assigned to focus on these two programs, should result in expanded participation in both programs. Certain offerings are a "cross-over" between the two, such as a Leadership Series offered in 2019 by Dana Meyers. This attracted participation by the City of The Dalles, suggesting an area of enrollment growth (local government) which has rarely been tapped in the past.

Effectiveness of Assessment:

No changes are recommended. With the exception of Customized Training, data from this measure are taken from annual reports prepared by the respective departments as mandatory reporting requirements to state and federal agencies. These data have been collected for many years, providing good baseline information. While Customized Training does not have a similar reporting requirement, changes to program administration occurred in 2019; it would be premature to change the reporting or assessment process at this time, in order to compare 2019-20 data with the current assessment cycle.

C1.2 Responsiveness to business and industry:

Description of results

The college conducted an on-line survey of businesses and industries, and also the community at large, from June through August 2019. This used the Qualtrics survey tool, which enabled respondents to identify themselves as business owners or managers; students or prospective students; parents of current or prospective students; or other members of the general public. Using the Qualtrics “skip-logic” survey structure, those who self-identified as business owners or managers (15 total) were directed to a survey specific to assessing measures C1.2, C1.3 and C1.4. Those who self-identified as belonging to any of the other categories (29 total) were directed to a separate survey with questions specific to the C2.1 measure (Community awareness and perception). The survey asked respondents to rate the institution on a Likert scale (Example: Excellent, above average, average, below average, poor); results shown below report cumulative sub-totals for each question. When no sub-total is provided it is because there were no responses for that rating. The survey instrument captured individual IP addresses of respondents; by this measure, a total of 111 people responded to the survey. Unfortunately, many respondents did not self-identify in any category, but nevertheless proceeded to take either the business or community perception survey. Those completing both surveys could also elect to take a third survey, which asked questions specific to the college’s upcoming student housing project. (Respondents first needed to complete either of the first two surveys before receiving the option to proceed to this third survey.) The overall survey was widely marketed through media stories, chamber websites and social media. The total number of respondents compares favorably to the last time the college conducted a business survey, in 2016-17, when only 36 people responded. (No survey took place in 2017-18.) However, relatively few of the survey respondents elected to answer all of the questions in the survey. Results are provided as percentages in the Core Theme C rubric; specific results are provided for each measure below. There were nine responses to C1.2 (institutional responsiveness); one rated this as excellent, four as above average, two as average and two as below average.

Analysis of results

While the number of survey responses represented improvement over the 2016-17 survey, it is nevertheless problematic to draw broad conclusions from the relatively small number of people responding to any one survey question. With some 80,000 people in the college’s potential service region, the total number of responses (111) and the subset responding to the business survey is not statistically valid. Greater value may be found in other survey questions that invited respondents to indicate ways of improving college services, in identifying new classes and skills the college should consider offering, and in questions that were designed to determine how best to reach potential respondents in future surveys. These responses are attached as Appendix A to this analysis. This analysis applies equally to Items C1.3 and C1.4

Actions for improvement

If this measure is to continue to rely upon a broad survey of responses, there needs to be even greater emphasis given to marketing the survey, including provision of incentives for respondents who complete the survey. The same challenges identified above by SBDC and Child Care Partners, of recruiting businesses to participate in available trainings, affects participation in the survey itself: Business owners and managers are busy, and simply do not have time to respond to surveys unless there is a very pressing need to do so. The institution should consider intentional outreach through focus groups, and by taking advantage of existing regional conferences and summits hosted by organizations in which CGCC is a member. These include chamber forums and, in particular, the annual Business and Industry Summit organized by Mid-Columbia Economic Development District. For instance, a printed survey could be provided to each summit participant with request that it be completed and turned in by the end of the day. (The next Summit will occur Nov. 1, 2019, and is co-hosted by CGCC. This would be an excellent opportunity to distribute a paper version of the 2019 Business and Industry survey.) Another avenue for

improved data gathering is the college's contractual relationship with East Cascades Workforce Investment Board (EC Works), as five-county provider for federal Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act funds allocated through EC Works. EC Works maintains an extensive network of business and industry contacts, and could be invited to help the college obtain feedback for future assessments. Finally, and of special importance: The college should make every effort to respond to the workforce training needs expressed by business partners, both through this survey and in other forums. For instance, the need for "soft skills" has been expressed for many years. The college's Pre-College Department offers relevant training in this regard; this needs to be marketed more effectively to build awareness, and obstacles to attendance (lack of time, lack of transportation, lack of child care among them) need to be resolved. Expanded distance education could be one effective strategy. This response applies equally to Items C1.3 and C1.4.

Effectiveness of assessment:

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

C1.3 Regional industry satisfaction with CGCC:

Description of results

There were ten responses to C1.3 (CGCC as a community partner): Five rated CGCC as above average, two as average and three as below average.

Analysis of results

See C1.2 above.

Actions for Improvement:

See C1.2 above.

Effectiveness of assessment:

See C1.2 above.

C1.4 Employability and preparedness of CGCC graduates:

Description of results

- There were 11 responses to C1.4 (analytical skills of CGCC graduates): Three rated graduates as above average; one as average; and seven had no experience with CGCC graduates.
- There were 11 responses to C1.4 (job-specific skills): One rating of above average, three as average; and seven indicating no experience with CGCC graduates.
- There were 10 responses to C1.4 (interpersonal skills): One rating of above average, two of average; and seven as having had no experience with CGCC graduates.

Analysis of results

See C1.2 above.

Actions for Improvement:

See C1.2 above.

Effectiveness of assessment:

See C1.2 above.

Objective C2: Creating, maintaining and growing community relationships**C2.1 Community awareness and perception of CGCC****Description of results**

Twenty of 29 respondents self-identifying as current or prospective students, parents of current or prospective students, or other college constituents, indicated a “very familiar” level of awareness of CGCC. Three more indicated “some familiarity” with the institution. No respondent indicated a complete lack of familiarity with CGCC. Twenty-two people responded to a question regarding the quality of education and services provided by the institution: Seven were satisfied, eight very satisfied, three dissatisfied, one very dissatisfied, and three neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Ten participants said they are considering taking classes at CGCC; eight said they are not at this time.

Analysis of results

As is the case with the number of people responding to the business and industry survey, it is problematic to draw broad conclusions based upon the relatively small sample size. The fact that none of the 111 respondents (again, as defined by individual IP addresses recorded through the on-line survey) indicated no awareness of CGCC is encouraging. However, it is not consistent with anecdotal evidence, when college staff encounter community members through informal conversation who are not aware of the institution. It is also important to note the demonstrable successes the college has had in terms of community perception which are not captured by the survey. For instance, over the past year, the college obtained fiscal support of the City of The Dalles, Wasco County, and Port of The Dalles in securing \$5 million in grant and loan commitments to construct a skills center and student housing. This, despite other pressing community needs for these funds. (In fact, the college obtained the support of two other local governments, North Wasco County School District and Mid-Columbia Fire & Rescue District, which would also benefit from a city and county funding allocation. These two local governments supported the college project, even knowing their own priorities would be deferred as a result.) The college is often approached with requests for allocation of meeting space, letters of support for grant proposals, and requests for new programs; none of these indications of community perception and awareness are captured in the survey.

Actions for Improvement:

A robust, well-funded marketing program with at least one full-time staff, and an annual budget sufficient to promote a consistent, long-term messaging program across multiple channels (social and traditional media, etc.) will be essential, especially at the college embarks upon two major construction programs (skills center and student housing). Appropriate marketing will be critical to the success of these initiatives, as well as current and anticipated new academic and career-tech programs. Additional methods of measuring community awareness and perception are needed beyond an annual survey. These could include feedback from community forums, focus groups, and community events. Selected tracking of requests for meeting space, grant partnerships, and social media followers would add relevant data.

Appendix A:

Following are respondents’ verbatim comments submitted through the business and community perception surveys from June through August 2019:

What can we do better?

- More CTE
- More tutors
- Shouldn’t have to sign into Moodle every time. Needs to be more convenient.
- Make sure that all courses are very solidly grounded in skills and competencies that will be most beneficial in the workplace. Don't create busywork for the sake of some trendy educational thing, but instead make sure the instructors know what they're talking about and have experience in their field. The workplace is competitive and money is tight. Make sure you give us the maximum benefit for our hard-earned money.
- Provide more communication to the student body.
- Would love to see more online classes available for Expanded Options students, similar to many of the bacc core classes they need for higher education.
- Offer Japanese language courses again! It is such an important piece of the Gorge's history and especially considering The Dalles and Hood River both have strong relationships with their Sister Cities in Japan.
- Give discount to veterans with a 50% or higher disability rating like you do with senior citizens
- You could offer more [career] choices not everyone is interested in Nursing or Wind Energy.
- more adult post graduate opportunities in literature and sciences. guest lectures and presentations... use of facilities to draw the community in
- More short-term credentials.
- It would be helpful to provide local employers with Spanish. Bend Community College did this for their construction industry and it was helpful and was mindful of the needs of the employers.
- Partner with employers to offer classes onsite during work hours.

What skills should we offer?

Accounting/bookkeeping, coding/programming, family budgeting, brewing/winemaking, teaching, agriculture, customer relations, construction trades, mechanics, basic computer applications, welding.

How do you learn about classes at CGCC?

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Telegram Messenger | 1 |
| Facebook | 6 |
| No social media or radio | 8 |
| All Classical FM | 1 |
| Radio Tierra | 3 |
| KODL | 3 |
| KIHR/KCGB/KACI/97.2FM | 7 |
| Not through radio | 8 |
| Newspaper articles | 3 |
| Course catalog | 6 |
| College schedule | 5 |

| | |
|-------------------------------|----|
| College website | 5 |
| Billboards | 2 |
| Movie theatre ads | 1 |
| High school instr./counselors | 1 |
| Job fairs | 1 |
| Friends/relatives | 22 |

What Community Education classes should we offer?

- Conversational Spanish, personal investing, regional history, paddle-boarding, cooking, ceramics, dance, geology, mountain biking, photography

Common reasons for not enrolling in Community Education, ESOL, GED:

- Lack of child care, lack of time, not aware of classes, lack of transportation, no need for classes.

Which workplace skills are most often unfilled?

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Construction trades | 3 |
| Mechanics | 1 |
| Accounting/bookkeeping | 2 |
| Soft skills | 3 |
| HVAC repair | 1 |
| Basic computer applications | 1 |
| Marketing | 2 |
| Web design/development | 1 |
| EMT/paramedic | 1 |
| Customer relations | 1 |