Core Themes Data & Analysis

2013 – 2014

Core Theme A

2013 – 2014

Core Theme A: Building Dreams – Opportunities								
Scale		5	4	3	2	1		
Objective	**Measure**	**Surpasses Mission Expectation**		**Meets Mission Expectation**		**Below Mission Expectation**	**2013-14 Results**	**Score**
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	**at least 5% more** FTE enrolled in programs compared to statewide average		**plus or minus 2%** FTE enrolled in programs compared to statewide average		**at least 5% less** FTE enrolled in programs compared to statewide average	Dev Ed= 11.9% CTE= 24.98% ACE=10.9% Non-Reimb=.33% LDC=51.50%	**3.8**
Objective A2: Offering diverse course delivery modes and service opportunities	A2.1 Course delivery methods	**35% or more** students taking distance learning courses at postsecondary level		**20-25%** students taking distance learning courses at postsecondary level		**10% or fewer** students taking distance learning courses at postsecondary level	59.80% of students took at least on online or hybrid course	**5.0**
	A2.2 course scheduling	**30% or more** course offerings which were online/hybrid		**20-25%** course offerings which were online/hybrid		**15% or fewer** course offerings which were online/hybrid	178/673 Distance/hybrid courses=26.45	**4.0**
	A2.3 Service delivery methods	**90% or more** services for students also available online		**70-80%** services for students also available online		**60% or fewer** services for students also available online	60%	**1**
Objective A3: Serving the diversity of the service area	A3.1 Demographics (students, staff, faculty)	a. **5% or less** difference from regional demographics for students		a. **10-15%** difference from regional demographics for students		a. **20% or more** difference from regional demographics for students	Service District= 21.7% CGCC=20.2% Difference=6.91	**4**
		b. **5% or less** variance from regional demographics for staff		b. **10-15%** variance from regional demographics for staff		b. **20% or more** variance from regional demographics for staff	W-5%=5 B-.7%= 5 AI-1.6%=5 AS- 3.4%= 5 H- 8.2%=4 2M-2.8%=5 NHPI-.4=5	**4.8**
		c. **5% or less** variance from regional demographics for full-time faculty		c. **10-15%** variance from regional demographics for full-time faculty		c. **20% or more** 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 2M-2.8%=5 NHPI-.4=5	**4.1**

Objective	Measure	Standard		Standard	Standard	Data	Score
		d. **5% or less** variance from regional demographics for part-time faculty		d. **10-15%** variance from regional demographics for part-time faculty	d. **20% or more** variance from regional demographics for part-time faculty	W-9%=4 B-.4%= 5 AI-1.8%=5 AS- .8%= 5 H-18%=2 2M-2.8%=5 NHPI-.4=5	**4.4**
Objective A4: Applying consistent hiring practices	**A4.1** Standardize notification, application, and selection processes	**100%** compliance across all hire and selection processes		**90-95%** compliance across all hire and selection processes	**80% or fewer** compliance across all hire and selection processes	100%	**5**
Objective A5: Applying processes that lead to retention (of faculty, staff and students) and high satisfaction	**A5.1** Percent retention (students, staff, faculty)	a. **50% or more** retention of credit students fall term to fall term		a. **40-45%** retention of credit students fall term to fall term	a. **35% or fewer** retention of credit students fall term to fall term	41%	**3**
		c. **10% or fewer** annual turnover for staff		b. **13-14%** annual turnover for staff	b. **15% or more** annual turnover for staff	10.5%	**4**
		c. **5% or fewer** annual turnover for faculty		c. **6-9%** annual turnover for faculty	c. **10% or more** annual turnover for faculty	10.5%	**1**
	A5.2 level of morale (students, staff, faculty)	a. **90% or more** students who would recommend CGCC to friend or family		a. **80-85%** students who would recommend CGCC to friend or family	a. **70% or fewer** students who would recommend CGCC to friend or family	96.2%	**5**
		b. **90% or more** staff who rate their overall satisfaction working at CGCC as 4 or 5		b. **70-80%** staff who rate their overall satisfaction working at CGCC as 4 or 5	b. **60% or fewer** staff who rate their overall satisfaction working at CGCC as 4 or 5	72%	**3**
		c. **90% or more** full-time faculty who rate their overall satisfaction working at CGCC as 4 or 5		c. **70-80%** full-time faculty who rate their overall satisfaction working at CGCC as 4 or 5	c. **60% or fewer** full-time faculty who rate their overall satisfaction working at CGCC as 4 or 5	73%	**3**
		d. **90% or more** part-time faculty who rate their overall satisfaction working at CGCC as 4 or 5		d. **70-80%** part-time faculty who rate their overall satisfaction working at CGCC as 4 or 5	d. **60% or fewer** part-time faculty who rate their overall satisfaction working at CGCC as 4 or 5	67%	**2**

Core Theme A Analysis 2013 – 14

Overview:

As the college completes the second year of core theme analysis, it has become clear to members of Core Theme A and B committees that there is some room for refinement of the objectives and measures within each core theme. There are areas of duplication as well use of inconsistent data sets related to the same measurement. For example, both Core Theme A and B have a measure related to retention, however the groups use different parameters to define the cohort group and the period of time they measure. One measures year-to-year, another measures three consecutive terms to determine retention rates.

In Fall 2014, all three Core Theme Committees met to discuss the developmental progression of core themes and the need to reassess our objectives and measures to better reflect the indicators of mission fulfillment. It was agreed to make recommended changes for the 2014-15 assessment cycle that would minimize duplication and eliminate measures that indicate the departmental "work" of the college and should be assessed as a departmental function rather than a measurement of mission fulfillment. Our desire is to create objectives and measures that align with our mission wording and are more consistent with other related activities measuring access and attainment such as the Student Success Plan and Achievement Compacts. We recommend that core themes be defined as:

- Core Theme A—Building Dreams (Access)
- Core Theme B—Transforming Lives (Quality, Progression and Completion)
- Core Theme C—Making a Difference in the Communities We Serve (Community Outreach)

The recommendations below will follow the above definition for Core Theme A.

A1.1 - FTE enrollment in programs compared to statewide average

The target comes from CGCC's strategic planning materials <http://cgcc.us/strategic-planning>, indicating a goal of 3% growth annually. 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.

The common indicators used by the state are:

LDC	Lower Division Collegiate	(49.6% statewide average, 48.4 CGCC)
ACE	Adult Continuing Education	(2.6% statewide average, 0.9% CGCC)
Dev. Ed	Developmental 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.

As the committee analyzed this measure, we were concerned that using this tool to measure mission fulfillment has inherent problems and raises questions as to its validity. One question that has consistently arisen is related to what this data really tells us…the "so what" factor. It might be interesting, but is it important? The committee agrees that perhaps this is not important. When we think about opportunities, measures related to access may be more indicative of CGCC meeting its mission. The second question is related to the timeliness of the data. With the state undergoing such drastic reinvention, it is questionable whether the data will be consistently available in a timely way. Currently the most recent report continues to be the 2010-11 data.

Recommendation: Eliminate this objective and measures.

A2.1 - Course delivery methods - % of students taking distance learning courses at postsecondary level
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>.

A2.2 - Course Scheduling – course offerings which were online/hybrid
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. Due to inconsistent staffing of an IR person, this is the most recent data available at this time.

A2.3 - Service delivery methods - % of services also available online
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 16 Oregon community colleges, they had FTEs closest to ours.
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
Clatsop	y	n	y	y	n	y	y	y	n	n
Klamath	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n
CGCC	y	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	n

Recommendations: The committee has questions regarding the relevance of this objective in relation to the core theme of "opportunities". In terms of mission fulfillment, the committee feels that "opportunities" equates to access. Currently, the measures in this objective relate solely to delivery methods and scheduling. At this time, CGCC does not have target goals for enrollment in distance education, so to measure this function based on what other like colleges are providing does not make sense to the committee. There are many variables that would influence this number, not the least of which is enrollment. The college may offer a number of courses and services in a distance modality; however the course might not be enrolled at a fill rate that would indicate it is providing an opportunity for students. It is the recommendation of the committee that this objective be removed and that Core Theme A focus on enrollment measures which better indicate access as opposed to the numbers of classes delivered or the delivery method.

A3 .1 - Demographics (Variance from regional demographics for:
A3.1a (Students)
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.

The measurement is from demographics reported in the annual Student Profile 2012-13. This is the most recent report posted. <http://cgcc.us/institutional-assessment/reports>.

A3.1b, A3.1c, A3.1d (Staff and faculty)
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.

Recommendations: The committee feels that although diversity of faculty and staff are indeed indicators of a healthy college, these indicators are not necessarily relevant to Core Theme A. It is recommended that these measures be considered as an addition to Core Theme C and that Core Theme A develop measures that focus on enrollment of diverse populations by aligning measures with strategic enrollment goals.

A4 - Standardize notification, application, and selection processes - % compliance across all hire and selection processes
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

Recommendation: Remove this objective. This is related to the work we do and should be evaluated as a departmental function and goal. It does not necessarily indicate mission fulfillment.

A5.1 - Percentage retention:
A5.1a (Students)
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.

Recommendation: Remove this measure and move to Core Theme B—Transforming Lives. The rationale is that retention and persistence are indicators of success to degree and certificate completion, relevant to mission fulfillment within Core Theme B.

A5.1b, A5.1c (Staff and full-time faculty)
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.

Recommendation: Remove this measure since it does not relate to access.

A5.2 - Level of morale
A5.2a (Students)
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.

Recommendation: We like this measure and feel it is useful to the measure of access within this core theme. The committee would like to see a survey created to be administered every year that evaluates student satisfaction with activities related to access (such as admissions, advising, financial aid, registration etc.).

A5.2b, A5.2c, A5.2d (Staff and faculty)
The target is based on historical averages of results from the last 6 years of the CGCC Faculty and Staff surveys.

The data from this year were collected through a faculty/staff survey administered by an independent contractor. The survey was administered at the request of The Board of Education, to address the concern that the survey CGCC was administering in house was not indicative of the true satisfaction of the faculty and staff. Results indicate that the data is consistent and the actual numbers are included in this report.

Recommendation: Again, the committee feels this is work that is not necessarily indicative of access. We recommend that these measures be removed from Core Theme A.

Core Theme B

2013 – 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr><th colspan="8">Core Theme B: Transforming Lives – Education</th></tr>
<tr><th>Scale</th><th></th><th>5</th><th>4</th><th>3</th><th>2</th><th>1</th><th></th><th></th></tr>
<tr><th>Objective</th><th>Measure</th><th>Surpasses Mission Expectation</th><th></th><th>Meets Mission Expectation</th><th></th><th>Below Mission Expectation</th><th>2013-14 Results</th><th>Score</th></tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td rowspan="3">Objective B1: Ensuring alignment of programs with careers, industry standards and educational transfer requirements</td>
<td>B1.1 Adherence to program review process and schedule</td>
<td>95% or more programs reviewed using review process and schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td>76% - 85% programs reviewed using review process and schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td>66% or fewer programs reviewed using review process and schedule</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1.2 Implementation of program review recommendations</td>
<td>37% or more program review recommendations that were implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td>21% - 28% program review recommendations that were implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td>12% or fewer program review recommendations that were implemented</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1.3 Analysis of implemented program review recommendations</td>
<td>95% or more implemented program review recommendations analyzed for effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>76% - 85% implemented program review recommendations analyzed for effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>66% or fewer implemented program review recommendations analyzed for effectiveness</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td rowspan="4">Objective B2: Ensuring alignment of classes and services to meet student goals and needs</td>
<td>B2.1 Student graduation</td>
<td>18 % or more 2-year degree or 1-year certificate seeking students graduating within 150% of time</td>
<td></td>
<td>14% 2-year degree or 1-year certificate seeking students graduating within 150% of time</td>
<td></td>
<td>10% or fewer 2-year degree or 1-year certificate seeking students graduating within 150% of time</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2.2 Student drops and withdrawals</td>
<td>0 number of top five reasons for student drops or withdrawals attributed to CGCC</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 number of top five reasons for student drops or withdrawals attributed to CGCC</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 number of top five reasons for student drops or withdrawals attributed to CGCC</td>
<td>Drops :0 Withdrawals: 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2.3 Student satisfaction with CGCC experience</td>
<td>95% or more students reporting that they are satisfied with their CGCC experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>76% - 85% students reporting that they are satisfied with their CGCC experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>66% or fewer students reporting that they are satisfied with their CGCC experience</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2.4 Student retention</td>
<td>66% or more 1-year certificate & 2-year degree-seeking students attending for 3 consecutive terms</td>
<td></td>
<td>46 - 55% 1-year certificate & 2-year degree-seeking students attending for 3 consecutive terms</td>
<td></td>
<td>35% or fewer 1-year certificate & 2-year degree-seeking students attending for 3 consecutive terms</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core Theme B: Transforming Lives – Education								
Scale		5	4	3	2	1		
Objective	**Measure**	**Surpasses Mission Expectation**		**Meets Mission Expectation**		**Below Mission Expectation**	**2013-14 Results**	**Score**
Objective B3: Assessing attainment of course, program and degree outcomes on an annual basis.	**B3.1** Implementation of course evaluations	**95% or more** instructors completing the course assessment cycle per the annual course assessment schedule		**76% - 85%** instructors completing the course assessment cycle per the annual course assessment schedule		**66% or fewer** instructors completing the course assessment cycle per the annual course assessment schedule	82.6%	**3**
	B3.2 Achievement of student learning outcomes at the course level.	**95% or more** students meeting course outcomes		**76% - 85%** students meeting course outcomes		**66% or fewer** students meeting course outcomes	90.7%	**4**
	B3.3 Achievement of student learning outcomes at the degree/ certificate/program level	**95% or more** students meeting degree/ certificate/program outcomes		**76% - 85%** students meeting degree/ certificate/program outcomes		**66% or fewer** students meeting degree/ certificate/program outcomes	81.1%	**3**
Objective B4: Encouraging the acquisition and use of high quality teaching and support practices.	**B4.1** Professional development for faculty	**80% or more** faculty attending In-service		**60% - 69%** faculty attending In-service		**50% or fewer** faculty attending In-service	74.1%	**4**
		80% or more faculty participation in other professional development activities		**60% - 69%** faculty participation in other professional development activities		**50% or fewer** faculty participation in other professional development activities	44.1%	**1**
	B4.2 Student engagement with faculty	**95% or more** students reporting feeling engaged with faculty		**76% - 85%** students reporting feeling engaged with faculty		**66% or fewer** students reporting feeling engaged with faculty	77.1%	**3**
	B4.3 Faculty satisfaction with their jobs	**95% or more** faculty indicating satisfaction with their jobs		76% - 85% faculty indicating satisfaction with their jobs		**66% or fewer** faculty indicating satisfaction with their jobs	73% (full time) 67% (pt. time)	**2**
	B4.4 Faculty integration of instructional best-practices	**95% or more** faculty demonstrating best instructional practices		**76% - 85%** faculty demonstrating best instructional practices		**66% or fewer** faculty demonstrating best instructional practices	n/a	

Core Theme B: Transforming Lives – Education								
Scale		5	4	3	2	1		
Objective	**Measure**	**Surpasses Mission Expectation**		**Meets Mission Expectation**		**Below Mission Expectation**	**2013-14 Results**	**Score**
	B4.5 Faculty orientation and mentoring	**95% or more** new faculty receiving an orientation and/or mentoring		**76% - 85%** new faculty receiving an orientation and/or mentoring		**66% or fewer** new faculty receiving an orientation and/or mentoring	n/a	

Overview: As the college completes the second year of core theme analysis, it has become clear to members of Core Theme A and B committees that there is some room for refinement of the objectives and measures within each core theme. There are areas of duplication as well use of inconsistent data sets related to the same measurement. For example, both Core Theme A and B have a measure related to retention, however the groups use different parameters to define the cohort group and the period of time they measure. One measures year-to-year, another measures three consecutive terms to determine retention rates.

In fall 2014, all three Core Theme committees met to discuss the developmental progression of core themes and the need to reassess our objectives and measures to better reflect the indicators of mission fulfillment. It was agreed to make recommended changes for the 2014-15 assessment cycle that would minimize duplication and eliminate measures that indicate the departmental "work" of the college and should be assessed as a departmental function rather than a measurement of mission fulfillment. Our desire is to create objectives and measures that align with our mission wording and are more consistent with other related activities measuring access and attainment such as the Student Success Plan and Achievement Compacts. We recommend that core themes be defined as:

- Core Theme A—Building Dreams (Access)
- Core Theme B—Transforming Lives (Student Learning, Progression and Completion)
- Core Theme C—Making a Difference in the Communities We Serve (Community Outreach)

The recommendations below will follow the above definition for Core Theme B.

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 2013-14 and both were completed on time.

  Analysis: Program reviews are scheduled and systems are in place to facilitate timely completion and report out of findings for those programs reviewed. The assignment of an assessment coordinator and provision of administrative support has been instrumental in developing a system that can be supported long-term.

  Recommendation: The committee recommends that this objective be deleted. It is the opinion of the committee that the objective and measures do not indicate mission fulfillment, but are the work of the instructional department. Program reviews are essential to the provision of a quality program and should be implemented and assessed within the department.

- **B1.2**: Percentage of program review recommendations that were implemented.
  Description of Results: 50% of program review recommendations were implemented in 2013-14. Of the two programs assessed, one program implemented recommendations. The other program undertook its first program review. Although improvements have been made, there were no formal recommendations to implement in response to a previous assessment.

  Analysis: Systems are not in place for collecting this data. As the Assessment Coordinator continues to develop our assessment program, a system for tracking this data will occur.

  Recommendation: The committee recommends that this objective be deleted. It is the opinion of the committee that the objective and measures do not indicate mission fulfillment, but are the work of the instructional department. Program reviews are essential to the provision of a quality program and should be implemented and assessed within the department.

- **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 2013-14.

  Analysis: Systems are not in place for collecting this data. As the Assessment Coordinator continues to develop our assessment program, a system for tracking this data will occur.

  Recommendation: The committee recommends that this objective be deleted. It is the opinion of the committee that the objective and measures do not indicate mission fulfillment, but are the work of the instructional department. Program reviews are essential to the provision of a quality program and should be implemented and assessed within the department.

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: This data was not readily available in time for this report.

  Analysis: Instability in staffing an Institutional Researcher has made it extremely difficult to get the data in a timely manner. This measure is rather specific and is in opposition to the same measure related to retention in Core Theme A. The intent of the measure is to ensure students are completing in a timely manner which would indicate that the college is providing an alignment of classes and services to meet student

needs/goals. This information is typically obtained from national reporting and looks at a very specific cohort of students (first-time/full-time), which does not address all students as was perhaps intended by this measure.

Recommendation: Eliminate this measure. Replace with measures to address progression and completion for all students.

- **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).

  Recommendations: 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. It is recommended that this measure be eliminated as there are many variables that influence a student when deciding to withdraw or drop that do not necessarily indicate mission fulfillment.

- **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.

  Recommendation: It is recommended that this measure be eliminated. The committee suggests that Core Theme B focus on student learning outcomes, progression and completion measures which seem to the Committee to be more indicative of mission fulfillment. Satisfaction is measured in Core Theme A.

- **B2.4** Student retention
  Description of Results: N/A

Analysis: This measure is seeking to identify students who have attended for 3 consecutive terms as an indicator of retention. The challenge here is identifying a cohort of students in order to determine persistence. In order to truly reflect the retention of all students, a new cohort would need to be identified each term with new students and track their enrollment status throughout their enrollment period. Currently, there is no tracking mechanism available to do this type of work. Further, it would seem more appropriate to address this objective by measuring retention (term-to-term and year-to year) and completions as an indicator of meeting student goals and needs.

Recommendation: Eliminate this measure, identify measures that can be easily tracked and consistent with reporting requirements already in place.

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

- **B3.1** Course Assessment
  Description of Results: 82.6% implementation

  Analysis: Implementation of course evaluations achieves a high overall score (82.6%), due to a well-organized scheduling (of courses to be evaluated) through Instructional office staff (currently Jensi Smith). In order to sustain this progress, systems should be developed to track and monitor non-compliance. The addition of an Assessment Coordinator in Fall 2014 will be helpful in the development of processes that monitor non-compliance and hold accountable those not performing course assessment as assigned.

  Recommendation: Develop non-compliance accountability processes.

- **B3.2** Course Outcomes Achievement
  Description of Results: 90.72% based on student self-reported data from course evaluations.

  Analysis: 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. There are some issues still to be worked out. First, the yearly evaluation seems to be placing an undue burden on faculty members who teach multiple different classes within a year. The Assessment Coordinator has developed a longer rotation schedule which will eliminate this issue. We believe this will also impact the number of non-compliance issues as well.

Recommendation: 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. It is recommended an accountability measure be incorporated in order to ensure compliance in assessing courses.

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

  Description of Results: 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.

  BA Accounting: 76.54%
  BA Acct. Clerk: 68.69%
  BA Management: 91.27%
  BA Marketing: 97.41%
  BA Retail: 77.79%
  AAOT: 81.80%
  AGS: 74.87%
  AS: 81.37%
  ASOT-Bus: 80.01%
  Average: 81.09%

  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 might 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. This assessment is premised on the idea that aggregated course grades are an accurate reflection of program-level outcomes attainment. There is still question as to whether using grades as an indicator of student achievement of learning outcomes is valid. Confidence in the validity of this premise would increase if outcomes-based grading was widely understood and practiced.

  Recommendation: Attainment of student learning outcomes is essential to mission fulfillment. Considering the developmental progression of assessment strategies, it is recommended that continued professional development opportunities be presented to expand faculty understanding of outcomes and outcomes-based grading. Further analysis

of the data as well as a discussion of benchmarking to determine what would be an acceptable percentage to indicate outcomes attainment might be valuable.

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, 74.1% of the current faculty attended the mandatory in-service.   In addition, 44% of faculty participated in a college sponsored/funded professional development activity.

  Analysis: Participation in faculty in-service exceeded participation in 2012-13. This could be due to multiple factors including accountability measures. Participation in other professional development activities was measured differently than in 2012-13. In 2012-13 a survey was presented at in-service surveying faculty as to their participation in other types of professional development, ranging from reading a journal to conference attendance. That garnered greater participation results (84%) than in 2013-14. During this measurement cycle, other professional development was measured using numbers of faculty participating in a professional development activity that was paid for by the college against the total number of faculty. The results were 44.08% as opposed to 84% last year.

  Recommendation: It is recommended that this measure be eliminated as it does not necessarily gauge mission fulfillment. Not to be misinterpreted, professional development is important and vital to provision of a quality teaching environment. However, it is the opinion of the committee that this is a departmental function and not relevant here.

- **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.

Recommendation: 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. It is recommended that perhaps some research into other way to collect this data might be useful to making sustainable changes. Since the CCSSE is only administered every 3 years, a more frequent data collection tool could prove helpful.

- **B4.3:** Faculty Job Satisfaction
  Description of Results: Under the request of the Board of Education, CGCC outsourced the annual employee survey in 2013-14. The results were similar to those in previous years. On average 70% of faculty were satisfied with their jobs. The two predominant areas where faculty were less satisfied continue to be in increased salaries/ bigger increases/ improved benefits as well as in improved communication / listening from management.

  Analysis: Although the percentage of satisfied faculty was higher than the average of the previous five years (73%) there continues to be discontent with pay and benefits as well as with communication with management.

  Recommendation: Eliminate this measure. It is being tracked and analyzed in Human Resources and is not a direct indicator of mission fulfillment.

- **B4.4:** Best Instructional Practices
  Description of Results: N/A

  Analysis: In the previous year, a survey was provided to faculty to determine their use of best-practice in the classroom. In 2013-14, a survey was not distributed.

  Recommendation: Eliminate this measure from core theme. Measure within the Instructional Department review.

- **B4.5:** Faculty Orientation and Mentoring
  Description of Results: N/A

Analysis: In the previous year, a survey was provided to faculty to determine their use of best-practice in the classroom. In 2013-14, a survey was not distributed.

Recommendation: Faculty onboarding is not directly related to mission fulfillment, however very relevant to the success of the Instructional Services department. It is recommended it be removed as a measure in core themes, but included as an assessment measure in Instructional Services.

Core Theme C

2013 – 2014

Core Theme C: Strengthening Our Community - Partnerships								
Scale		5	4	3	2	1		
Objective	**Measure**	**Surpasses Mission Expectation**		**Meets Mission Expectation**		**Below Mission Expectation**	**2013-14 Results**	**Score**
Objective C1: Cultivating productive business and industry relationships	**C1.1** Effectiveness of grants, funding and in-kind donations	**85% or more** grants receiving a 4-5 rating on rubric upon award completion.		**60-74%** grants receiving a 4-5 rating on rubric upon award completion.		**50% or fewer** grants receiving a 4-5 rating on rubric upon award completion.	**NA**	
	C1.2 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.		**200-299** businesses demonstrating increased private investment as a result of, or are otherwise counseled or trained by, SBDC/CCP.		**150 or fewer** businesses demonstrating increased private investment as a result of, or are otherwise counseled or trained by, SBDC/CCP.	**372** businesses	**4**
	C1.3 Effectiveness of processes to assess business and industry needs	**100%** Mid-Columbia employment sectors assessed for emerging skill sets through site visits, surveys or CGCC advisory committee participation.		**60-89%** Mid-Columbia employment sectors assessed for emerging skill sets through site visits, surveys or CGCC advisory committee participation.		**40% or fewer** Mid-Columbia employment sectors assessed for emerging skill sets through site visits, surveys or CGCC advisory committee participation.	**72%** of sectors	**3**
	C1.4 Number and effectiveness of workforce training activities	a. **10 or more** employers using customized trainings serving **90 or more** employees		a. **5-8** employers using customized trainings serving **75-84** employees		a. **2 or fewer** employers using customized trainings serving **60 or fewer** employees	8 employers used customized trainings serving 66 employees	**3**
		b. **100 or more** CTE employment placements		b. **50-79** CTE employment placements		b. **30 or fewer** CTE employment placements	**43** CTE employment placements	**2**
Objective C2: Creating, Maintaining, and growing academic partnerships	**C2.1** Number, type and results of activities supporting high school relationships	b. **5% growth or more** enrollment in dual credit programs as compared to historic average		b. **1 to 3% growth** enrollment in dual credit programs as compared to historic average		b. **Decline** enrollment in dual credit programs as compared to historic average	**18%** growth (415 students participated)	**5**
	C2.2 Number, type and results of activities supporting community college, university and career tech relationships	a. **8 or more** articulation agreements		a. **4-6** articulation agreements		a. **3 or fewer** articulation agreements	2 articulation agreements	**1**
		b. **8 or more** degree partnerships		b. **4-6** degree partnerships		b. **3 or fewer** degree partnerships	7 degree partnerships	**4**
		c. **10 or more** dual enrolled students		c. **6-8** dual enrolled students		c. **4 or fewer** dual enrolled students	**NA**	

Objective C3: Cultivating relationships with governmental entities to promote economic growth and community development	**C3.1** Effectiveness of grants, funding and in-kind donations	**85% or more** grants receiving a 4-5 rating on rubric upon award completion.	**60-74%** grants receiving a 4-5 rating on rubric upon award completion.		**50% or fewer** grants receiving a 4-5 rating on rubric upon award completion.	**NA**	
	C3.2 Number of CGCC advocacy and collaborative efforts	**10 or more** Partnerships, including business recruitment, public agency collaboration and joint grant proposals.	**4-8** Partnerships, including business recruitment, public agency collaboration and joint grant proposals		**1 or none** Partnerships, including business recruitment, public agency collaboration and joint grant proposals	**11** partnerships	**5**
Objective C4: Creating, maintaining, and growing community relationships	**C4.1** Direct and indirect investments in the community	a. **35 or more** community events sponsored by CGCC, or in which CGCC participated	a. **25 - 30** community events sponsored by CGCC, or in which CGCC participated		a. **20 or fewer** community events sponsored by CGCC, or in which CGCC participated	**32** community events	**4**
		b. **100%** space requests accommodated	b. **80 – 90%** space requests accommodated		b. **70% or fewer** space requests accommodated	**93%** of requests accommodated	**4**
		c. **70 or more** faculty/staff representing the college on **120 or more** off-campus committees	c. **45 - 55** faculty/staff representing the college on **95-105** off-campus committees		c. **35 or fewer** faculty/staff representing the college on **80 or fewer** off-campus committees	**50** faculty/staff represented college on **69** off-campus committees	**2**
		d. **14 or more** college-wide service activities and faculty-led service learning projects	d. **10 – 12** college-wide service activities and faculty-led service learning projects		d. **7 or fewer** college-wide service activities and faculty-led service learning projects	**7** service activities	**1**
	C4.2 Engagement of the broader community in the exploration of art, science, culture, and the humanities	a. **60 or more** co-curricular educational events/programs offered by CGCC	a. **40 – 50** co-curricular educational events/programs offered by CGCC		a. **30 or fewer** co-curricular educational events/programs offered by CGCC	**17** co-curricular events	**1**
		b. **190 or more** community education courses offered with an **16% or lower** cancel rate and **900 or more** enrolled	b. **160 – 175** community education courses offered with an **19 – 21%** cancel rate and **750 – 850** enrolled		b. **145 or fewer** community education courses offered with an **24% or higher** cancel rate and **700 or fewer** enrolled	**204** community education courses offered with an **28%** cancel rate and **1092** enrolled	**5**
	C4.3 Community awareness of CGCC	a. **25 or more** news and press releases annually	a. **15-20** news and press releases annually		a. **10 or fewer** news and press releases annually	**24** news & press releases	**4**
		b. **500 or more** Increase in annual	b. **400 - 450** Increase in annual		b. **300 or fewer** Increase in annual	**293** Additional Facebook	**1**

		Facebook users		Facebook users		Facebook users	users	
		c. **50,000 or more** unique website visits/month		c. **35,000 - 40,000** unique website visits/month		c. **30,000 or fewer** unique website visits/month	21,372 unique website visits per month	**1**
	C4.4 Community perception of CGCC	**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	**83%**	**4**

Core Theme C Narrative

C1   Cultivating productive business and industry relations
C1.1 – Effectiveness of grants, funding and in-kind donations.

Description of Results

There was relatively little new grant funding obtained during 2013-14 compared with previous years. Instead, activity focused on management of on-going major grants obtained in 2012-13 or earlier, especially the Title III "Strengthening Institutions" grant. Considerable effort went into three unsuccessful proposals, TAACCCT IV, OEIB RAC and HEP. Grant review rubric was not used.

1. Sherman County contribution of $100,000 for welding lab equipment

2. Sherman County contribution to CGCC Foundation for student scholarships

3. Caithness Energy Partners contribution of $25,000 for the RET program (2nd of 10 annual donations to total $250,000)

4. Wrap-up and institutionalization of US Department of Education Title III grant

5. Unsuccessful US Department of Labor TAACCCT IV application (statewide)

6. Unsuccessful High School Equivalency (HEP) application (partnership with Oregon Human Development Corporation)

7. Oregon Education Investment Board Regional Achievement Collaborative (OEIB-RAC)

8. Continuation at reduced level of The Dalles Enterprise Zone funding

9. John & Betty Gray Foundation early childhood education (continuation of two-year grant)

10. CGCC Foundation endowment campaign on track

11. CGCC Foundation 2014 golf tournament exceeded 2013 net proceeds on reduced gross revenue. All proceeds dedicated toward endowment campaign.

Analysis of Results

Score = 1 – Below Mission Expectation

Scoring criteria are based upon rubric review. In theory, this should be a useful tool. In practice, it has been very difficult to apply over the past year. The TAAACCT IV grant was a joint commitment of all 17 Oregon community college presidents; there was no

opportunity for rubric review prior to that commitment being made. The HEP application should have gone through the rubric process, but there was insufficient time for this to occur because of a looming grant deadline. The OEIB-RAC Request for Proposals and submission deadline occurred during a two-week window over the Christmas break, again effectively precluding opportunity for rubric review.

A separate, continuing concern is the need to identify broad, long-range strategic goals for Columbia Gorge Community College. This would help inform selection of grant opportunities and focus limited staff time on those grants which align most closely with institutional strategies.

Actions for Improvement

- Redouble efforts to use the rubric for grant review. This would be a useful tool if we are able to use it consistently, and if we have opportunity to do so.

- Establish strategic goals and a critical direction for the institution that will help inform grant applications and grant database searches.

Effectiveness of Assessment

The rubric scoring mechanism will be an effective assessment mechanism if used consistently.

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

Description of Results

1. Child Care Partners: 133 businesses were provided with support, technical assistance, and training.

2. Small Business Development Center: 231

3. Customized training: 8 employers (also captured under C1.4)

Analysis of Results

Score = 4 – Above Mission Expectation

Child Care Partners served a slightly larger number of clients in 2013-14 than in the previous academic year. This was driven in part by the state's new Quality Ratings Improvement Standards (QRIS) which require child care providers to meet more rigorous training standards; Child Care Partners is a training provider. It also reflects Child Care Partners' continuing outreach into the five-county service delivery area, and partnerships

established through Columbia Gorge Community College's leadership in creating the Four Rivers Early Learning Hub. The Child Care Partners director represents a state-mandated sector (early education) on the early learning hub's governance board.

Small Business Development Center met or exceeded its metrics as reported to the US Small Business Administration and Oregon Business Development Department. Equally important to conducting this work was the need to accurately track data in CenterIC, the statewide reporting system. Some areas, such as business starts, had been under-reported previously.

Given limited resources in these departments, a situation which is not likely to change in the near future, the target goal for "exceeds expectation" is unlikely to be realized.

Actions for Improvement

- Expand program capacity in order to serve more employers.

- A critical process under way at the state level involves the formal recognition of early learning hubs. The Four Rivers Hub is effectively in a probationary status, pending changes to its governance structure to more accurately reflect state mandates. The state has assigned resources (both financial and personnel) to this process. If the resulting governance structure is not acceptable, the hub may be dissolved and its member counties divided among adjoining hubs (in Portland, Bend and Pendleton), which would adversely affect the efficient delivery of services by Child Care Partners. Conversely, successful restructuring will increase the efficiency of Child Care Partners' service delivery. The ultimate goal of all this work is increased kindergarten readiness through early childhood education and nutrition.

Effectiveness of Assessment

Metrics used by Child Care Partners and Small Business Development Center comply fully with state and federal requirements; data have been gathered through these systems for many years and provide an accurate record of achievement if used consistently.

We should consider consolidating customized workforce trainings data captured under C1.4, since this includes data relevant to C1.2.

C.1.3 – Effectiveness of processes to assess business and industry needs

Description of Results

1. Survey of industry sectors indicated broad, unmet need for skilled workforce across various disciplines. Survey was conducted in August 2014. Survey results are being used to guide university partnership discussions through Regional Center of Innovation and

"makerspace" concept being developed with Gorge Technology Alliance and Clark College.

2. Industry advisory groups (healthcare, renewable energy, business, early education) met regularly throughout the year and provided additional guidance.

Analysis of Results

Score = 3 – Meets Mission Expectation

Combination of survey and advisory groups provides representation from these Mid-Columbia major industry sectors: Construction, Education, Agriculture, Financial Services, Healthcare, Manufacturing, Natural Resources, Information Services, Office and Administrative Support, Production, Trade and Sales, Utilities. Sectors not represented: Government, Installation, Professional, Leisure and Hospitality, Transportation. (See attached). The industry sector survey occurred on a very short time-frame, driven by a CGCC initiative involving Oregon State University. The results were helpful but not comprehensive, since questions were formulated around a particular project focus rather than the broader goal of informing multi-disciplinary instructional programming.

Actions for Improvement

- Industry sector survey needs to be expanded to include all major sectors, especially Government, which is one of the region's largest employers, and Leisure & Hospitality, another large and growing sector (albeit one characterized by relatively low wage scales). The non-classifiable sector, which is defined by the State of Oregon to include home care workers and non-covered agricultural workers, should also be surveyed; these are also significant sources of employment in the Mid-Columbia region.

- The survey needs to take place on a systematic basis, with questions formulated to guide instructional programming across the institution.

- Additional advisory groups should be considered, to represent Government, Leisure & Hospitality, and Transportation/Utilities.

Effectiveness of Assessment

Given limited resources, the combination of an annual, comprehensive industry sector survey and multiple advisory groups provides appropriate guidance for strategic planning.

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	Programmable Logic Controllers	1
Insitu – engineering staff	2	Kepner-Tragoe project management/problem solving	40
Insitu – engineering staff	1	Programmable Logic Controllers	2
Turtle Island Foods	1	Programmable Logic Controllers	2
Coburn Electric	1	Programmable Logic Controllers	1
Cardinal Glass	1	Programmable Logic Controllers	2
Oregon Cherry Growers	1	Programmable Logic Controllers	3
Full Sail Brewing Company	1	Programmable Logic Controllers	2
The Dalles Public Works	1	Flagger certification	13
TOTAL	10		66

Analysis of results

Score – 3 Meets Mission Expectations

Target achievement for this measure was achieved. As a result the college reported that it provided ten trainings to eight organizations and scored 3 for the first component of the measure. In the second component, number of employees trained, the college came close to the target of 75.

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.

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 43 CTE employment placements: 11 Nursing, 12 Medical Assisting, 20 Renewable Energy Technology. In addition, one Nursing graduate and two Medical Assisting graduates reported that they were continuing their education and seeking advanced degrees.

Analysis of Results

Score – 2 Does Not Meet Mission Expectations

While not "below mission expectations," CTE employment placements cannot be reported as attaining the level of 50 placements 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 three areas (Nursing, MA, and RET), whereas the target is based on 6 areas (Nursing, MA, RET, Computer Applications, Early Education and Family Studies, and Business Administration). If data were available for the additional three areas, expectations are that the college would be able to show that it is meeting mission expectations and possibly exceeding.

Actions for Improvement

Action recommendations cannot be developed until complete data are available.

Effectiveness of Assessment

Nursing gathers data through employer and graduate satisfaction surveys. Medical Assisting and RET employment placement data is anecdotal. Currently, CGCC has no system in place to track students' employment placement for Early Education and Family Studies, Computer Applications, or Business Administration degree and certificate completers. A new state data system (D4A) is being developed and is advertised to support the gathering of these data. We anticipate this new system to be operational next year. In addition, a method needs to be developed for reconciling graduates who go on to seek advanced degrees rather than enter the workforce immediately.

C2   Creating, Maintaining, and growing academic partnerships

C2.1 – Number, type and results of activities supporting high school relationships

Description of Results

The number of high school students attending Columbia Gorge Community College continues to increase. In 2013-14 we saw 415 students enroll at the College compared to a total of 351 in 2012-13. This is an 18% increase in one year. Below is a breakdown of the programs where students are participating to earn college credit.

Program	Students
College Now	266
Early College	35
Expanded Options	65
Running Start	49
Total	**415**

Analysis of Results

Score – 5 Surpasses Mission Expectations

The significant increase in high school students enrolling at CGCC can be strongly attributed to the increased time advisers are spending in the high schools. This practice not only provides a live person for high school students to connect to and build a relationship with, it also provides time for advisers to do one-on-one recruitment.

Of course, the state Achievement Compacts with the impending requirement that students earn a minimum of 9 college credits while they are in high school also has had an impact on this increase in student participation. However, due to this impending requirement, it will be important for CGCC to remain competitive in terms of cost and offerings as college credit opportunities increase across the state.

Actions for Improvement

Referencing the statement above, college credit opportunities for high school students have the potential to become competitive, which means students can pick and choose what institutions are most cost-effective and/or offer the most options. While "buying local" is preferred, students will not be required to stay local. CGCC may want to consider dedicated staff to coordinate and manage college credit opportunities for high school students. This position would not only serve as a direct contact for potential students and parents, but could monitor statewide programs and help CGCC remain competitive in its offerings.

Effectiveness of Assessment

These data provide an effectiveness analysis of high school student enrollment at CGCC.

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); OIT – Articulation Agreement for select EET/RET courses to transfer to Bachelor of Science in Electronics Engineering Technology; OIT – Articulation Agreement for Associate of Science Oregon Transfer: Business to transfer from CGCC in full.

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

No data are available for dual-enrolled students.

Analysis of Results

Score – 2.5 Does Not Meet Mission Expectations

CGCC's results reflect a strong interest in establishing and maintaining degree partnerships with four-year institutions in the state. However, there is no evidence that students are encouraged to dual enroll with the four-year institutions while they attend CGCC and/or that there is any benefit to the student to do so. In addition, CGCC does not currently track students who may be dual enrolled with a four-year institution.

Conversations are continuing with both OIT and OHSU to form new and/or renew existing articulation agreements with CGCC. Discussions are also ongoing with Oregon State University (Open Campus), Portland State University and Washington State University with a goal of creating or expanding existing degree partnerships. All of these are in an effort to address industry interest in growing four-year opportunities in the Columbia River Gorge.

Actions for Improvement

Achievement Compacts are now asking for the number of students dual enrolled in OUS, as well as how many students transfer to OUS institutions. CGCC will want to establish a tracking mechanism for these data.

Effectiveness of Assessment

Currently available data provide a good first step, but CGCC will want to continue to look at new ways to collect valuable data that will tell a bigger story about our students who are continuing their education at four-year institutions. For example, is there benefit to the students to be dual enrolled during their time at CGCC? And, how successful are CGCC students when they transfer compared to those who start at four-year institutions?

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

This section differs from C1.1 only in its focus on governmental entities rather than business and industry relationships. In practice, grant opportunities typically require concomitant participation by both sectors, so it is difficult to separate the two areas for analysis. Findings below are thus identical to those stated under C1.1 above.

1. Sherman County contribution of $100,000 for welding lab equipment

2. Sherman County contribution to CGCC Foundation for student scholarships

3. Caithness Energy Partners contribution of $25,000 for the RET program (2nd of 10 annual donations to total $250,000)

4. Wrap-up and institutionalization of US Department of Education Title III grant

5. Unsuccessful US Department of Labor TAACCCT IV application (statewide)

6. Unsuccessful High School Equivalency (HEP) application (partnership with Oregon Human Development Corporation)

7. Oregon Education Investment Board Regional Achievement Collaborative (OEIB-RAC)

8. Continuation at reduced level of The Dalles Enterprise Zone funding

9. John & Betty Gray Foundation early childhood education (continuation of two-year grant)

10. CGCC Foundation endowment campaign on track

11. CGCC Foundation 2014 golf tournament exceeded 2013 net proceeds on reduced gross revenue. All proceeds dedicated toward endowment campaign.

Analysis of Results

Score = 1 – Below Mission Expectations

Scoring criteria are based upon rubric review. In theory, this should be a useful tool. In practice, it has been very difficult to apply this tool over the past year. The TAAACCT IV grant was a joint commitment of all 17 Oregon community college presidents; there was no opportunity for rubric review prior to that commitment being made. The HEP application could have gone through the rubric process, but there was insufficient time for this to occur because of a looming grant deadline. The OEIB-RAC Request for Proposals and submission deadline occurred during a two-week window over the Christmas break, effectively precluding the opportunity for rubric review.

A separate, continuing concern is the need to identify broad, long-range strategic goals for Columbia Gorge Community College. This would help inform selection of grant opportunities and focus limited staff time on those grants which align most closely with institutional strategies.

Actions for Improvement

- Establish strategic goals and a critical direction for the institution that will help inform grant applications and grant database searches.

Effectiveness of Assessment

- Redouble efforts to use the rubric for grant review. This would be a useful tool if we are able to use it consistently, and if we have opportunity to do so.

- Combine C1.1 and C3.1 objectives and measures, or revisit the measures applied to Objective C3.1 to differentiate these from C1.1 measures.

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 2013-14 academic year, the college partnered **11 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. The Dalles Community Outreach Team trips to Washington, D.C. to advocate for community projects and policy issues affecting our local region – September 2013 and March 2014

2. Memorandum of Understanding with the Department of Veterans Affairs to allow electronic transfer of enrollment information by CGCC to the VA –September 5, 2013

3. Intergovernmental Agreement with the State of Oregon (on behalf of the Oregon Education Investment Board) for the Regional Center of Innovation to serve as a Regional Achievement Collaborative – October 30, 2013

4. Development Agreement with the Oregon Military Department in regard to the use of the Fort Dalles Readiness/CGCC Workforce Center – December 19, 2013

5. Memorandum of Understanding with Mid-Columbia Housing Authority to provide business and technical assistance through the Small Business Development Center – February 19, 2014

6. Memorandum of Understanding with Mid-Columbia Community Action Council for CGCC to serve as an alternate food distribution site during a disaster – February 26, 2014

7. Oregon Solutions Declaration of Cooperation (Signatory) – Bridges to Health in the Columbia Gorge, connecting and coordinating existing community health workers – May 28, 2014

8. Intergovernmental Agreement with the Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development to assist in CCWD's goal of promoting education, training and employability for Community Health Workers – May 29, 2014

9. Land Use Agreement with Cycle Oregon and North Wasco County Parks and Recreation District to use our land for the Cycle Oregon Event in September 2014 – June 3, 2014

10. Letter of Support for City of The Dalles in support of seeking a Transportation and Growth Management grant for a new transportation system plan – June 4, 2014

11. Letter of Support for City of The Dalles/Wasco County, Enterprise Zone to be designated for electronic commerce in order to attract new businesses and expand existing businesses – June 5, 2014

Analysis of Results

Score = 5 – Surpasses Mission Expectation

Even though the college exceeded expectations for this target, the target is thought to be appropriate. Collaboration and advocacy for and by the college occurred at many different levels and on different topics benefitting the college's stakeholders. The college's advocacy and collaborative efforts during 2013-14 were diverse and focused on promoting economic growth and community development, as was the recommendation in the 2012-13 core theme report.

Actions for Improvement

The college is doing well in this area and 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.

C4 Creating, maintaining, and growing community relationships

C4.1 Direct and indirect investment in the community

C4.1a – Community events in which CCGC participated or sponsored

Description of Results

The college sponsored and participated in 32 community events: RET Career Fair, Oregon Transfer Days, Bi-State Education & Industry Summit, Legislative Summit, Four Rivers Early Learning Hub Organization, Leadercast, White Salmon Spring Festival, Cross Channel Swim, Reconnect to the River Festival, Cherry Festival Parade, Festival of Trees, etc.

Analysis of Results

Score = 4 – Above Mission Expectation

The sponsored events reflected a varied group of activities that were relevant to the communities CGCC serves.

Actions for Improvement

None at this time.

Effectiveness of Assessment

There is no systemized gathering of this data. It requires contacting individuals thought to have knowledge regarding CGCC participation in and sponsorship of community events. As a result, it is very likely that not all events are recorded.

C4.1b – Accommodation of space request

Description of Results

The college provided space to a variety of organizations (The Dalles and Hood River Chambers of Commerce, Strongwomen, Amateur Radio Association, Indian Creek Stewards,

Yakima Valley Farm Workers, Gorge Health Connect, Gorge Grown Food Network, HRVHS Job Club, Toastmasters, The Dalles Theater Company, Robotics Club, etc.) during the year. Seventy-nine (79) organizations were identified as having held events/activities at The Dalles campus and thirty-four (34) at the Hood River campus with only 8 of the space requests made by the community not being accommodated. 93% accommodation rate.

Analysis of Results

Score = 4 – Above Mission Expectation

Actions for Improvement

None at this time.

Effectiveness of Assessment

Effective and easily done.

C.4.1c – Faculty/staff representation on off-campus committees

Description of Results

According to the results of a July 2014 survey to staff and faculty, 50 staff and faculty responded, indicating service on 69 unique, non-CGCC community organizations and groups, with only one of those organizations having more than one CGCC employee associated with it.

Analysis of Results

Score = 2 – Does not meet mission expectation

Something new about this year's survey was that respondents were asked to estimate the number of volunteer hours spent working with the organization over the year. Of the 50 respondents, 27 of them had participated in an off-campus committee, volunteering approximately 1,647 hours over the course of the year. Another 12 respondents indicated volunteering with 12 groups for a total of 318 hours in positions not directly related to their employment at CGCC.

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 representatives 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 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.

Effectiveness of Assessment

Due to the timing of the survey and the poor response rate, the assessment is not considered to be a true representation of faculty and staff representation on off-campus committees.

C4.1d − College-wide service activities and faculty-led service learning projects

Description of Results

CGCC students participate in a variety of community service activities with organizations such as: Spring Creek Fish Hatchery, Columbia Riverkeepers, Hood River Parks and Recreation, Mid-Columbia Medical Center, and the Red Cross. Activities included: processing hatchery salmon, journaling salmon activity, water quality assessment and data entry, lamprey studies, blood drive, and health check-ups.

Analysis of Results

Score − 2 Does not meet mission expectation

Results may be under-reported, and CGCC may well be meeting mission expectations currently.

Actions for Improvement

Effectiveness of Assessment

Because of the difficulty in obtaining complete records of these activities, particularly faculty-led service learning projects, it is thought that this measure is under-reported. It is recommended that faculty should be asked how best to report out the good work they are doing in this area with their students.

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

C4.2a – Co-curricular educational events/programs

Description of Results

The college hosted 17 co-curricular events including:

- 8 student art shows
- Employee art show
- Cuéntame Coyote – bilingual play
- Milagro Theatre workshop
- Tommy Gaffney (author reading)
- 2 Shared Voices book readings/signings
- Girl Rising (movie screening and discussion)
- Wind Challenge (science/engineering event)

Analysis of Results

Score – 2 Does not meet mission expectation

The number of co-curricular events dropped this year with the cancellation of two significant event areas: after 10 years, the Humanities Series (total of 8 events) was not continued based on expense and lowered participation; theatre performances (potentially 14 events) were not pursued in 2013-14 following the death of CGCC's theatre arts instructor. In place of the Humanities Series, it was planned to offer smaller, individual events/presentations (author readings, lectures). Two such events were offered - Cuéntame Coyote and the Milagro Theatre workshop. The goal would be to increase this number. The future of theatre performances at CGCC is uncertain. It is possible that the new adjunct theatre arts instructor will be able to bring productions back to the college; however, budget concerns may hamper this. As mentioned in last year's report, four to five individuals have been responsible for making these events happen, each working on his or her own. The college lost one of these individuals and so lost a significant number of offerings. 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.

Actions for Improvement

Bring together for an annual meeting those individuals interested in producing and promoting these types of activities. At a minimum, the group could build a rough calendar of the potential events for the year. They could also provide some support to each other in the working out of logistic, budgetary, and publicity issues. Finally, some interactive collaboration may lead to greater inspiration for determining offerings.

Effectiveness of Assessment

This measure is difficult to track without a central calendar. Even the creation of an advance/tentative calendar would be helpful in ensuring a complete report. While recognized to be difficult to determine, a metric for attendance may be a valuable measurement to consider.

C4.2b – Community Education courses

Description of results

The number of community education classes offered exceeded the previous year's total, increasing from 183 to 204, an 11% increase. Cancellation rates (28%) were up 2% from the 2012-13 rate. Total enrollment increased from 655 in 2012-13 to 1092 in 2013-14, a 67% increase.

Analysis of results

Score – 5 Surpasses Mission Expectation

Enrollment and cancellation rates are affected when new classes are offered each term. The high cancellation rate may be attributed to the department's goal to achieve ideal programming percentages: 50% repeat classes; 30% seasonal classes; and 20% new classes. New classes need time to grow - in some cases one academic year or more.

Actions for improvement

Continue to target ideal programming percentages.

Effectiveness of assessment

Given the limited staffing of the community education department, no changes recommended.

C.4.3 – Community Awareness of CGCC

Description of Results

During 2013-14, the college hired a consultant who produced 24 press releases which were posted on the college's website and distributed to local media. Not all of the press releases were reproduced; however, 76 articles about CGCC were published in either The Dalles Chronicle or Hood River News during the academic year, including those reproduced from our consultant's work.

Also during the same time, the college's Facebook "likes" increased by 293 (up to 1,347 from 1,054) and our website received an average of 21,372 unique visits per month.

Analysis of Results

Score = 2.33 – Does not meet mission expectation

With regard to news and press releases produced, the college has maintained good relationships with the press and continues to receive sufficient, positive news coverage.

The increase in Facebook "likes" of 293 may indicate that the college's social media audience is being saturated.

The average of 21,372 unique website visits per month was far below the expected outcome for this measure but an increase from last year's average of 18,595. This figures includes both the old web domain and the new Drupal site. Starting in 2015 there will be only one source for the data as the old site will be completely shut down.

Actions for Improvement

It is recommended that the Marketing Coordinator explore a better way of capturing community awareness through Facebook than by measuring an increase in "likes" because it appears that our market may be saturated and we won't be growing our "likes" as much.

It is recommended that the target for number of unique website visits per month be revised downward. The online services specialist suggests a target of 20,000 unique visits per month.

Effectiveness of Assessment

Because two of the targets were well below mission expectation, the respective targets (Facebook likes and unique website visits) should be analyzed and revised to accurately reflect the intent of the measure if necessary.

C4.4 – Community perception of CGCC

Description of Results

A professional survey of community perceptions in Hood River and Wasco counties occurred near the start of the data year (Anzalone-Liszt-Grove, August 2013), providing good baseline data for future comparisons. On-going college programs and marketing occurred throughout the data collection period.

1. Survey findings: Very favorable opinion of the college, 58 percent; somewhat favorable, 32 percent; total favorable, 83 percent. Somewhat unfavorable, 3 percent; very unfavorable, 1 percent; total unfavorable, 4 percent. (Unrated balance, 13 percent.)

2. Marketing via website, Campus View, press releases and other avenues

o Press releases:	37	
o Increase in annual Facebook users:	293*	
o Unique website visits/month:	21,372 **	

3. College annual report
4. Small Business Development Center and Child Care Partners public visibility
5. Four Rivers Early Learning Hub preparation
6. Oregon Solutions "Bridges to Health" community partnership
7. Faculty vote of no confidence
8. College budgetary challenges
9. Community Outreach Team
10. Foundation board outreach and foundation activities
11. Hood River Economic Development Working Group
12. Regional Center of Innovation
13. Columbia Gorge Education Summit
14. Columbia Gorge Legislative Summit
15. Fort Dalles Readiness Center ribbon-cutting

Increase from July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014
***12-month average from 256,469 cumulative*

Analysis of Results

Score = 2 – Meets mission expectations / Below mission expectation

A public opinion survey took place August 21-27, 2013, and gathered information on community perceptions of the institution. The survey was prompted by a potential bond measure, and several questions focused on this topic rather than delving more deeply into general public awareness. For instance, the survey did not attempt to determine how people obtained local news, or whether they visited the college website. Nevertheless, the survey did provide useful baseline data for subsequent surveys.

Numerous activities contributed toward a positive perception, including the college's continuing leadership in regional initiatives, goodwill toward the college nursing and renewable energy programs, Foundation board activities, and a successful launch of the Fort Dalles Readiness Center, which now enjoys the support of neighbors who previously opposed this project.

While most activities and developments were positive, one significant event – a faculty vote of no confidence in the president – created significant public discussion that has not yet subsided. This vote and resulting publicity occurred approximately two months after the community survey; the vote may or may not affect public perception, but this has not yet been measured. College budgetary challenges began to be reported during this period, but likely did not affect public perception because news coverage during this period was relatively light.

Marketing metrics were mixed. The number of press releases (37) exceeded mission expectation, but the overall score in this area was reduced because increase in Facebook users and unique website visits were both below mission expectation (Facebook metric only barely missing mission expectation).

A constraining factor is the lack of regular media coverage of the college and other institutions in the community, which is precipitated by a continuing decline in the capacity of local media to report the news (example: seven full-time news staff at The Dalles Chronicle in 2005, compared to four or fewer in 2014). This means that in order to ensure public awareness, the college needs to look to internal rather than external communication resources.

Actions for Improvement

Expand the number of media releases generated each year in order to provide comprehensive awareness of outreach activities and regional initiatives. Conduct Facebook "Friend" sign-up campaigns. Make better use of the course catalog as an information and promotional vehicle, since it regularly reaches residents throughout the college service district. Expand radio and social media marketing efforts. Reach more of the Latino market through alternative strategies such as Radio Tierra, which has invited the college to assist in regular programming.

Effectiveness of Assessment

Conduct the community perception survey annually, and expand the scope so the survey is not driven by a single purpose (such as a bond measure) but rather explores a broader range of public perceptions. The survey should also provide data about how people obtain information about the college. Finally, the survey should be delivered through multiple channels, rather than relying upon telephone landlines and limited cell directories.

A properly structured, regular survey of community perception, adjusted for increasing reliance on cell phones and also delivered through multiple communication vehicles (Facebook, Twitter, college website) will provide relevant data when compared with the limited but still useful data set acquired during the August 2013 survey.