

ROGUE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

2007 INTERIM ASSESSMENT REPORT

ASSESSMENT OF 2006 INSTITUTIONAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

ASSESSMENT TEAM

Larry Mullaly, Director, Operations and Special Programs, Riverside Campus
Curtis Sommerfeld, Associate Dean, College Services, IPEC Chair
John Lopez, Associate Dean, Redwood Campus, IPEC
Chelsea Kelsey-Hamilton, Advanced Secretary, Classified, Riverside
Bryan Herve, Institutional Researcher, Classified, College Services
Denise Swafford, Administrative Coordinator, Management, IPEC
Mark Bony, Full-time Faculty, Redwood, IPEC
Galyn Carlile, Executive Dean, Riverside Campus, IPEC
Nancy Maxwell, Executive Dean, Redwood Campus, IPEC
Mary O’Kief, Strategic Planning/Grants Development, President’s Office, IPEC
Marie Mueller, Faculty Emerita, Redwood, IPEC

Contact Person: Curtis Sommerfeld, IPEC Chair
curt@rogucecc.edu; 541-956-7238

**Assessment Sponsored by the
INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND EFFECTIVENESS COUNCIL**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

General Introduction: Process and Scope	3
<i>2006-08 Keys and Key Objectives</i>	5
Scoring, Values, and Procedures	6
Summary of 2007 Scores	6
Comparative Scores 2004, 2005, 2006	7
Key 1	8
Key Objective 1.1	9
Key Objective 1.2	12
Key Objective 1.3	13
Key Objective 1.4	14
Key Objective 1.5	15
Key Objective 1.6	15
Key 2	16
Key Objective 2.1	16
Key Objective 2.2	16
Key Objective 2.3	16
Key 3	18
Key Objective 3.1	18
Key Objective 3.2	19
Key Objective 3.3	20
Key 4	22
Key Objective 4.1	22
Key Objective 4.2	23
Key Objective 4.3	23
Recommended Procedural Changes	24
Data Sources	25

Process and Scope

Through its ongoing self-evaluation, Rogue Community College “asks questions, better understands itself, and sets new directions. In its *Annual Institutional Goals Assessment Report*, the College reviews how well it meets its planned goals and objectives, an important part of the evaluation and improvement process” (*RCC Institutional Assessment Plan*, p. 1). The *Assessment Report* is also an important tool when addressing Standard I: Institutional Mission and Goals, Planning and Effectiveness, of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities’ accreditation requirements.

The basis for the work in 2007 is this 2006 recommendation from the Commission on Colleges:

“It is recommended that Rogue Community College engage in ongoing planning to achieve its mission and goals. It must evaluate how well, and in what ways, it is accomplishing its mission and goals and using the results for broad-based, continuous planning and evaluation. Through its planning process, the institution must ask questions, seek answers, analyze itself, and revise its goals, policies, procedures, and resource allocation (Standard 1.B)”

The assessment, sponsored by RCC’s Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Council (IPEC), takes place each July or August and is conducted by an assessment team of faculty, staff and managers (the team). In 2006, the institution changed to a biennial cycle of goal assessment. In 2007, departments were responsible for updating their goals (adding, deleting, and revising as needed), but were not required to evaluate their success. In 2008 as the two-year cycle concludes, all reporting units will be asked to provide detailed information on accomplishments as these relate to RCC keys and key objectives.

In odd-numbered years, the assessment is data/statistics-driven; in even-numbered years, both data/statistics and anecdotal data and records from various college components are included. This 2007 interim assessment examines selected critical measures to gauge the pulse and heart rate of the institution.

The results of the annual report are publicized by IPEC to the institution and to the community and are used as a basis for institutional planning in the following year. The report of this team will be presented to the Rogue Community College Board of Education in November 2007.

While the RCC Mission remains unchanged at the present time (August 2007) from previous years, during 2007-08 a sub-committee of accreditation will be reviewing the mission, vision, operating environment, and similar documents. The College as a whole will be examining priorities, needs, and problems and will establish or adjust *2004-08 Keys and Key Objectives* to better focus college response to change. Proposed changes will be evaluated by the Strategic Planning Steering Committee and its four college-wide teams, which will recommend changes/revisions as needed. Once adopted, new goals and

objectives will be prominently displayed in the Board rooms on all campuses and with the college *Mission Statement* in the 2008-09 *RCC Catalog*.

Special Considerations for 2007

In this first year of strictly data-based interim assessment, the team was breaking new ground, so the resulting report differs from previous years' documents. The Team assessed how the data worked and made recommendations for future teams.

Given that this is a new approach to assessment, the data used are not longitudinal. The Assessment Team deliberately compared 2006-07 data only to 2005-06 data. Future assessments can use this benchmark as a point of beginning.

Since the RCC Four Keys and Key Objectives do not include a numerical goal (e.g., XYZ will grow by 8% during Year ABC), the team arbitrarily selected 5% as a reasonable target for growth and applied that figure to the judgments drawn.

Structure of the Report

Each Key or Key Objective is stated in its entirety. Following the statement is the scoring pattern—Met, Partially Met, Not Met—along with a 1-10 score, with 10 highest. The 2007-08 assessment is based on data collected and presented by the RCC Institutional Researcher, although Assessment Team members have added comments and interpretations. When data were needed for clarification, these were accessed on-site by Curtis Sommerfeld. These are followed by recommendations from the Assessment Team.

Dedicated to and with special thanks to

Lawrence “Larry” Mullaly, Assessment Chair

For his long-term commitment to excellence in education

Ensuring Each Learner's Success:

Rogue Community College Keys for 2006-2008

As Rogue Community College fulfills its mission to “nurture hope, fill educational gaps, and empower people to change their lives,” it focuses on four keys for success. Through their implementation, RCC will remain a powerful force for the quality of life in Southern Oregon.

First Key: Build FTE

Growth of student enrollment is a measure of service by the College to citizens and a basis for state financial support. To implement this key, RCC will:

- 1.1 Expand the scope, quality, and availability of programs and services.
- 1.2 Improve services to the diverse local communities, including active retirees
- 1.3 Increase the student base by fostering a supportive learning environment.
- 1.4 Strengthen recruitment efforts, above all to high school and Hispanic students.
- 1.5 Improve student retention rates.
- 1.6 Expand training opportunities with business and industry.

Second Key: Build the Foundation

The RCC Foundation is a community-based initiative committed to the needs of learners. Recognizing the Foundation's value to the College and region, RCC will:

- 2.1 Work with the Foundation to increase its endowment.
- 2.2 Build partnerships in local communities.
- 2.3 Improve awareness of the Foundation's role.

Third Key: Build Revenue

In order to provide excellent, low-cost, efficiently managed education to the community, RCC seeks an income base using a variety of funding sources. To achieve this key, RCC will:

- 3.1 Pursue alternative funding sources.
- 3.2 Strengthen partnerships with agencies and institutions.
- 3.3 Improve student access to funding resources.

Fourth Key: Manage Resources and Expenses

Rogue Community College is a trust held by its Board and employees on behalf of the people of Southern Oregon. To assure that these assets will be passed on to future generations, RCC will:

- 4.1 Align priorities and expenditures to ensure quality programs and services.
- 4.2 Pursue a stable funding base.
- 4.3 Nurture the college's human and material resources.

Each of these keys to success represents a benchmark of institutional performance. The keys are also references points for both campus and departmental objectives. Progress toward accomplishing these keys will be regularly reported to the campus and community.

Scoring, Values, Procedures, and Summary of Results

The Team first evaluated the objective, its meaning, and its intent. Supporting assessments (data/charts/tables) were listed under the Key Objectives on a handout (attached at the end of this report). After reaching a consensus, the Team decided upon an honest evaluation of the objective, not shying away from negative factors. Significant data were evaluated and summarized, and then a score was given.

Using data and discussion in reports received from RCC departments and campuses, institutional objectives were scored as follows:

- 10 = Fully accomplished
- 5 = Partly accomplished on the basis of ongoing work.
- 0 = Status Quo—maintenance; no new implementation efforts recorded. A “0” score may also mean that the evaluation was negative—with reversals rather than progress toward a goal.

After all the Key Objectives were individually assessed on a numeric scale of 1 to 10, each overarching Key was assessed as being Met, Partially Met, or Not Met.

INSTITUTIONAL KEYS AND KEY OBJECTIVES ASSESSMENT 2007	
Section	Topic and Score
Key 1	Build FTE: Partially Met: 3
Key 1.1	Expand Programs and Services: Partially Met—3
Key 1.2	Services to Diverse Communities, – Partially Met—4
Key 1.3	Increase Student Base— Not Met—0 Fostering Supportive Learning Environments: Partially Met—4
Key 1.4	Strengthen Recruitment— Mostly Met—9
Key 1.5	Improve Retention— Partially Met—4
Key 1.6	Expand Business & Industry Training Opportunities— Partially Met—7
Key 2	Build the Foundation: Not Scored
Key 2.1	Increase Endowment
Key 2.2	Build Local Partnerships
Key 2.3	Improve Awareness of the Foundation
Key 3	Build Revenue: Partially Met—5
Key 3.1	Alternative Funding Resources: Partially Met—4
Key 3.2	Strengthen Partnerships with Agencies/Institution: Partially Met—8
Key 3.3	Student Access to Funding Resources: Partially Met—5
Key 4	Manage Resources and Expenses: Not Scored
Key 4.1	Ensure Quality Programs and Services by Aligning Priorities and Expenditures
Key 4.2	Pursue Stable Funding Base
Key 4.3	Nurture Human and Material Resource

INSTITUTIONAL KEYS AND KEY OBJECTIVES
--

COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT 2004/05 - 2006/07				
Section	Key and/or Key Objective	04	05	06
Key 1	Build FTE:	NM*	2	3
Key 1.1	Expand Programs and Services:	4	1	3
Key 1.2	Services to Diverse Communities, including active retirees: New 2006-07	7	2	4
Key 1.3	Supporting Learning Environment:	3	2	0**
Key 1.4	Strengthen Recruitment Efforts -- New 2006-07	Na*	Na	9
Key 1.5	Improve Student Retention -- New 2006-07	Na	Na	4
Key 1.6	Expand Training Opportunities for Business and Industry— New 2006-07	Na	Na	7
Key 2	Build the Foundation	PM*	0	Na
Key 2.1	Increase Endowment:	1	0	Na
Key 2.2	Build Local Partnerships:	7	5	Na
Key 2.3	Improve Awareness of the Foundation:	1	0	Na
Key 3	Build Revenue:	PM	7	5
Key 3.1	Alternative Funding Resources:	8	8	4
Key 3.2	Strengthen Partnerships with Agencies/Institutions:	6	9	8
Key 3.3	Student Access to Funding Resources:	6	4	5
Key 4	Manage Resources and Expenses:	PM	4	Na
Key 4.1	Ensure Quality Programs and Services by Aligning Priorities and Expenditures:	4	3	Na
Key 4.2	Stable Funding Base:	8	5	Na
Key 4.3	Nurture Human and Material Resources:	5	2	Na

*NM = Not Met; PM = Partially met; Na = Not applicable or Not assessed.

**In the August 2007 Assessment, Key 1.3 was divided: Increase Student Base was labeled NOT Met: 0; however, Fostering Supportive Learning Environments was considered Partially Met: 4

As Rogue Community College fulfills its mission to “nurture hope, fill educational gaps, and empower people to change their lives,” it focuses on Four Keys for success. Through their implementation, RCC will remain a powerful force for the quality of life in southern Oregon. Each of these Keys to success represents a benchmark of institutional performance. The Keys are also reference points for both campus and departmental objectives. Progress toward accomplishing these Keys is regularly reported to the campus and the community. The report that follows is part of the annual cycle of information for interested institutional and community members.

Key 1: Build FTE¹

Growth of student enrollment is a measure of service by the College to citizens and is a basis for state financial support. To implement this Key, the College has designed three objectives, as noted and scored below:

Key 1 Score: 3

Partially Met

FTE is up 47, an increase of 1.18%

2005-06: 4,114.68 Total FTE	4,005.15 Total Reimbursable FTE
2006-07: 4,419.34 Total FTE	4,052.78 Total Reimbursable FTE

Special Note: When 300 +/- FTE were included from the learning centers due to a flaw in processing, a “bubble” was formed three years ago by an artificially high FTE number. This has affected all FTE assessments since that date.

A second major factor in the “partially met” score is the presence of 2 + 2 enrollment. This forms a positive—a strong positive—for the year and represents considerable work by many staff; however, 292 of the 554 recorded 2 + 2 FTE is non-reimbursable. In addition, the level of reimbursement will change in the next year.

¹ FTE = Full-time Equivalent. This is the combination of full- and part-time student enrollments that equate to that of a student enrolled full-time for a minimum of 12 credits per term.

Key Objective 1.1: Expand the scope, quality, and availability of programs and services

Key Objective Score: 3 (Partially Met)

2005-06 FTE	2006-07 FTE	Numerical Change	Percent
1997	1965	<-32>	<-1.6%>

These figures represent instructional² FTE sections with enrollment numbers, but they exclude the following:

- 2 + 2
- Distance Learning (extra-large course enrollments)
- Section 50—independent study (extra-small enrollments)
- Human Development classes (very small enrollments)

Several steps were taken to reduce instructional costs:

- Summer 2006 classes took a 15% “hit,” with a strong cut also occurring during Fall 2006.
- At the same time, carefully planned and managed additions to “entry-point” courses in writing and biology, for example, occurred. These were strategic increases in classes to best serve beginning students’ needs. A goal of these decreases and increases was to increase class sizes; unfortunately, class sizes did not react as anticipated and actually declined during some terms. To allow students to complete their program, most required courses were maintained, even if they had low enrollment.
- One program was added: Dental Assisting
- One program returned: Truck Driving
- Three programs were retired: The associate of science degrees articulated with the University of Phoenix (UP) were retired when the UP re-evaluated its articulation with RCC and discovered the specific bachelor’s degree programs did not exist. The retired baccalaureate programs were:
 - Computer Support/Help Desk
 - Digital Graphics Design
 - Networking
- The College deliberately cut 120 sections as a budget reduction measure., targeting primarily Humanities, Business Technology, and Social Science programs, traditionally major generators of FTE.
 - Humanities averaged a two-section increase, producing .36% FTE increase.
 - Social Science dropped five sections, decreasing .78% FTE.
 - Business Technology dropped 25 sections. See discussion, next page.

² “Instructional” FTE at RCC generally refers to lower division college transfer classes, professional-technical classes, and the like; these are credit-bearing classes.

➤ Enrollment Trends: Business Technology Dept.

Quarter	Number of Business Technology Sections *	Enrollment in all Business Technology Sections **	2+2 Enrollment in Business Technology courses	Number of Distributed Delivery Sections	Enrollment in Distributed Delivery Sections	Percent of Distributed Delivery Sections	Percent of Students enrolled in Distributed Delivery Sections
2005-06	164	3007	374	64	1610	39%	54%
2006-07	139	2787	3656	61	1461	44%	52%

• Excludes CWE sections

** Excludes 2+2 enrollment

The figures from the table come directly from section reports generated in the Admin View program. They may vary somewhat from institutional numbers because of such factors as certain classes (MO100, WR227, and CS125ww) being counted in other departments (Workforce Training, Humanities, and Computer Science respectively) from time to time because of the “non-business” prefix. CWE sections were excluded because there are typically 12 sections per county listed each quarter for BA280, while the department treats CWE as one section in Jackson County and one section in Josephine County.

Overall enrollment for 2006-07 within the Business Technology department was down by 7.3% compared to the previous year. Two factors significantly contributed to that decline: (1) a continued reduction in the number of full-time faculty, and (2) a 15% reduction in the number of sections mandated by the College because of part-time budget overages. Given those factors, our department has actually fared quite well in maintaining student numbers. Assuming the department is now “right-sized” based on the number of sections offered in 2006-07, that year should now be considered the baseline for determining all future enrollment trends.

The department continues to provide access by adding distributed delivery courses every year. More than 90% of the AAS degree in Business Technology can be taken through distance learning. This has not only freed up physical classroom space, but has also met needs of working students. It is important to point out that overall attrition rate for traditional versus distributed delivery classes does not differ significantly. We feel confident that students taking distributed delivery classes are just as competent as those taking the same classes in a classroom setting. Evidence shows that students will take a class that fits their schedule, and we have many students who alternate between telecourses, on-line classes, and in-class courses with no detrimental impact. Students are able to complete sequential classes regardless of the delivery method.

Finally, 2+2 enrollment figures have been excluded from regular Business Technology enrollment figures. This allows the department to better track enrollment patterns of those students attending classes at RCC. It also avoids making decisions

based on anomalies such as the mass registration of previously “parked” 2+2 courses in the system resulting in the appearance of a 10-fold increase in high school credit from 05-06 (374 students enrolled) to 06-07 (3656 students enrolled).

Recommendations

Continue to work toward increases in FTE, focusing especially on Academic and Professional/Technical programs where FTE dropped.

Design a measure for “Expand the scope, quality, and availability of . . .**services**” to be included in the areas assessed in 2008. The Team recognized that the 2007 SBDC Technology Initiative was an increase in services to students, but had no data by which to assess its impact, nor did the team have data on other increases in services from other areas.

Key Objective 1.2 Improve services to the diverse local communities, including active retirees.

Key Objective Score: 4 (Partially Met)

Retirees were defined by the Team as those 60+ years old. The Team declined to define “active” or to use the term in its assessment. The “less than 19-20” category includes the 2 + 2 bubble; “up to 29” will include the Power Up cohort.

The Team noted that there was a major disconnect between goals and budget during this reorganization year. For example, the College purposefully took effort and funding out of Community Education and channeled it toward Workforce Development, thus disconnecting a major tie to the retired community. There was a corresponding effort to move toward only Community Education offerings which were reimbursable and to shed those which were non-reimbursable. This impacted the types of courses offered. Positions were created to address the disconnect, but their work will begin during 2007-08: TRiO, Latino outreach, high school outreach (presently unfilled and unbudgeted position) and the Adult Learner recruiter position.

Reimbursable Enrollment Data for Community Education			
Year	FTE	# Sections	# Enrolled
2005-06	54.3	281	2685
2006-07	60.06	265	2791

This table reflects only reimbursable numbers. The FTE values for non-reimbursable Community Education FTE were 60.22 and 36.98 for 2005-06 and 2006-07, respectively.

Signature Events

- In 2006-07, music courses (band, chorus, jazz and orchestra) were added as credit, auditable classes, which resulted in 12.33 new FTE and were included in the 2006-07 FTE above. Previously these were non-FTE bearing non-credit courses.
- Community Ed’s partnership with our local senior computer club (RASCALS) generated 7.3 and 6.07 FTE in 2005-06 and 2006-07, respectively.
- Course enrollments by Hispanic students (primarily at Riverside Campus) increased .24%. The unduplicated Hispanic headcount served increased 8%.
- Other ethnicities (of which southern Oregon has few representatives) decreased slightly: Black <-3.19%>; Asian <-6.3%>; Native American <-5.9%>; Foreign Students <-38%>.
- Those 19-20 and under increased 40.8%; headcount was up 703. Note that this includes the large bubble of 2 + 2 students.
- Retiree (60+) enrollment decreased 28, for a drop of 2%.
- Two events aimed at the senior market were held at RWC. The May Adult Health Care Fair drew 159 participants, many of them seniors. The Master Gardeners, a primarily senior group, participated in workshops that attracted 195 participants in Spring 2007.

Recommendations

Enrollment in these diversity groups/ethnicity areas needs to be tracked to see if programs are successfully attracting a diverse component of the local students.

Determine if marketing is targeting non-Hispanic ethnicities effectively or at all. Only Hispanics and seniors are presently targeted, while ethnicity and diversity is a far broader concept. The College should broaden its approach to target ethnicity percentages more closely to southern Oregon demographic ethnicities.

Concern was expressed at the large number of students not reporting ethnicity. Explanations include the likelihood of undocumented aliens and the high probability that few, if any, 2 + 2 students reported in this category.

Key Objective 1.3 Increase the student base by fostering a supportive learning environment.

Key Objective Score: (see below)

1. Increase the student base: **0 (Not Met)**
 - a. No increase in the student base
 - b. Lack of supportive data
2. Supportive Learning Environment: **4 (Partially Met)**
 - a. Retention did improve in the snapshot view.

The challenge to the Team was to determine what measures “Supportive Learning Environment”; it was decided that student retention over time was a suitable measure.

In a “snapshot view,” there were improvements.

- Unduplicated Headcount was up 110 students, or 2.4% from Fall to Winter 2006-07 over 2005-06.
- Retention was up 144 students or 4.43% from Fall to Winter 2006-07 over 2005-06.
- Save Our Students. This retention effort targeted only a very small number of students, so it is statistically insignificant. Among those students contacted and reported, however, re-enrollment increased 3.13% from 61 students (45.19%) in 2005-06 to 72 students (48.32%) in 2006-07.

On a yearly basis, averages decreased.

Category: Unduplicated Headcount	2005-06	2006-07	Change
Credit	6, 659	6, 534	<-125>
Non-Credit	12,896	12,051	<-815>

Retention	2005-06	2006-07	Change
Fall-Winter	77%	80%	+3%
Winter-Spring	82%	82%	-0-

Recommendations

Other measures of a supportive learning environment could be the following: use of tutoring services, use of laboratories, enrollment in discussion sessions, appointment during office hours, use of counseling services. No data were available to the team, but this information could strengthen the assessment in future years.

Key Objective 1.4 Strengthen recruitment efforts, above all to high school and Hispanic students.

Key Objective Score: 9 (Mostly Met)

Signature Events

Placement Testing is up 5.88%, an increase of 205:

2005-06	3,277
2006-07	3,482

New recruitment positions have been identified:

- TRiO program renewal
- Latino outreach position
- High school outreach (presently unfilled/unbudgeted position)
- Adult Learner recruiter position
- Course enrollments by Hispanic students (primarily at Riverside Campus) increased .24%. The unduplicated Hispanic headcount served increased 8%.

Recommendations

Develop ways to track participation in Compass Days, El Mundo, and high school partnerships as represented at Table Rock Campus

Key Objective 1.5 Improve student retention rates.

Key Objective Score: 4 (Partially Met)

Signature Events

Retention was up 144 students or 4.43% from Fall to Winter 2006-07 over 2005-06.

Retention	2005-06	2006-07	Change
Fall-Winter	77%	80%	+3%
Winter-Spring	82%	82%	-0-

Recommendations: Continue the good work.

Key Objective 1.6 Expand training opportunities with business and industry (now within Rogue Extended Learning or REL).

Key Objective Score: 7 (Partially Met)

While readers might anticipate that this category would include professional/technical classes, the category is restricted to consideration of Business and Industry as in Workforce Development, Apprenticeship, and the like. The table below states the Business and Industry portion of REL's enrollment numbers.

Signature Events

Business and Industry increased sections by 62 over 2005-06, an increase of 10.6% in the sections available to students and thereby served 7.3% more students.

Enrollment Data for Rogue Extended Learning (Business and Industry only)			
Year	FTE	# Sections	#Enrolled
2005-06	288.63	584	6,195
2006-07	287.04	646	6,647

Key 2: Build the Foundation

The RCC Foundation is a community-based initiative committed to the needs of learners. Recognizing the Foundation's value to the College and region, RCC has designed three objectives (see below) to support this effort.

Key Score:

Key Objective 2.1 Work with the Foundation to increase its endowment.

Key Objective 2.2 Build partnerships in local communities.

Key Objective 2.3 Improve awareness of the Foundation's role.

Team Assessment:

Given challenges in collecting information to effectively assess this topic, the Team decided to not evaluate Foundation connections in 2007. The problem is not a lack of data; rather, it is a lack of evidence that college personnel are actively involved with and have internalized the needs and opportunities of the RCC Foundation. Work with the RCC Foundation is primarily accomplished by the RCC President and the Grants Development Officer, but not by departmental staff of any area.

The original intent behind Key 2 was to have college personnel assist the RCC Foundation to broaden its participation in the College from the outstanding scholarship fund to collecting for and donating to other college needs, such as dedicated "faculty chairs"; equipment purchases; etc. This does not seem to be evident.

Certainly the RCC Foundation has wide support from RCC personnel, from the Board of Education, to management, to faculty, to classified—and to students and alumni. All categories of RCC personnel have contributed to the Foundation and many have received benefits from the Foundation. The number of staff contributing to the Foundation through "We Care" increased in 2006. Board of Education members conducted meetings with Foundation staff. More local attorneys are aware of the RCC Foundation and are able to recommend it to interested clients.

Impressive work has been done by the RCC Foundation, which is healthy and strong. See below:

Signature Events

- Scholarships
 - 2006: \$410,000
 - 2007: \$530,000—An increase of \$120,000 for students.
- Grants—See also Objective 3.1, p. 16
 - 2006: \$70,000
 - 2007: \$48,000—See next bullet also.
 - (Final figure for 2007: \$62,000-- RCC Foundation project grants, including an additional \$14,000 that was added after the previous report.)

Causes of the decline

- RCC lacked compelling grant applications, so full amounts were not awarded.
- Small grants were applied for.
- Fewer staff were willing to develop major grant applications
- Endowments/Assets
 - 2005
 - Foundation Total New Assets: \$6,123,344
 - Value of Endowment Assets: \$4,294,309
 - 2006
 - Foundation Total New Assets: \$6,405,872
 - Value of Endowment Assets: \$4,494,653

Key 3: Build Revenue

In order to provide excellent, low-cost, efficiently managed education to the community, RCC seeks an income base using a variety of funding resources. To achieve this Key, the College designed the following three objectives:

Key 3 Score: 5 (Partially Met)

While Assessment Team members could easily access the RCC Budget documents, the Team felt uncomfortable attempting to process and accurately interpret the figures. The General Fund account is up \$500,000 each of the last three years, but that includes both Operating Revenues and Non-Operating Revenues—and the latter incorporates the bond levy for infrastructure improvements in Jackson County. Given the rise in utility costs, PERS and retirement costs, transportation, etc., the “increase” seems moot.

Key Objective 3.1 Pursue alternative funding resources.

Key Objective Score: 4 (Partially Met)

- Grants

What’s most illuminating is the average award per grant over the last 5 years. From the Grant Matrix (available on request from Mary O’Kief), the difference is very apparent.

- 2006: Number of grants awarded: 29; average award per grant: \$101,073
- 2007: Number of grants awarded: 23; average award per grant: \$19,454

Foundation Project Grants

- 2006: \$70,000-- RCC Foundation project grants.
- 2007: \$62,000-- RCC Foundation project grants, including an additional \$14,000 that was added after an earlier report.

Causes of the decline

- Related to increase in distance learning, construction, TRiO and Title III grant activity over previous years—RCC didn’t pursue those funding sources in 2006-2007.
- RCC lacked compelling grant applications, so full amounts were not awarded.
- Small grants were applied for.
- Fewer staff were willing to develop major grant applications.
- The Title III grant (2005) raised grants sharply for that year.
- No TRiO grant was received in 2006-07, decreasing grants for that year.

Signature Events

New Grants by Year	Am't Request	Am't of Award	% Requests Awarded	Change in \$\$\$	% of Change	# Req.	# Award	% Award
2006-2007*	\$2,546,393	\$447,445	17.57	(\$2,483,661)	-84.73	44	23	52.27
2005-2006	\$3,846,597	\$2,931,106	76.20	(\$862,532)	-22.74	43	29	67.44

*Results for seven grants are still unknown as of August 29, 2007.

Key Objective 3.2 Strengthen partnerships with agencies and institutions.

Key Objective Score: 8 (Mostly Met)

Key 3.2 is highly qualitative in nature and is best assessed when departmental information and anecdotal evidence can also be employed in the assessment process. These are not available in the database, so cannot be included for the 2007 assessment.

Signature Event

Partnership in the RCC/SOU Building in downtown Medford.

The RCC/SOU Building partnership has jointly raised \$22.2 million for construction of this state-of-the-art shared building, located beside the RCC Riverside Campus. Offering offices, laboratories, classrooms, and meeting areas, the building is a gem—and is being used as a prime example of community college/university cooperation in a time of fiscal shortages.

Other partnerships include:

- Asante—Nursing Program strengthened: through direct financial support for Nursing faculty, RCC has been able to increase the number in each class from 24 to 36.
- Early Childhood Education Center: Opened early 2007. Strengthened the Education Department. Constructed and designed through agreements among Rogue Community College, City of Grants Pass, Southern Oregon Head Start, and Early Intervention.
- Providence (through 2006-07)—Nursing Program strengthened.
- Rogue Valley Alliance for Healthcare Education—This grant-writing consortium of staff from Asante, Providence, Rogue Valley Manor, Oregon Health Sciences University and RCC has obtained grant- and in-kind funding for the development of several High Fidelity Simulation laboratories. Incorporating these labs into RCC's nursing curriculum has supported an increase in the size of the nursing (ADN) program, as well as adding depth to the students' learning experience.
- Agency partners that vouchered staff or clients to RCC for training included:

- Department of Veterans Affairs \$166,630
 - The Job Council \$ 98,797
 - Employment Department \$ 52,708
 - Vocational Rehabilitation \$ 65,601
 - Oregon Military Department \$ 32,528
 - Southern Oregon Head Start \$ 28,895
 - SAIF Corporation \$ 21,879
 - Liberty Northwest \$ 16,655
 - Americorps \$ 13,223
- Robert Wood Johnson Foundation—for development of a One-Year Certificate in Health Care Informatics and an A.A.S. in Health Care Informatics with work based learning as the primary learning/teaching mode
 - Grants Pass/Josephine County Chamber of Commerce/SORED I grant—workforce development
 - Grants Pass High School—culinary arts, welding, automotive programs
 - Art Works and Oregon Art Commission—The RCC Art Department and RCC Galleries are assisted by development of partnerships and cooperative projects through Art Works which create more arts-related opportunities and activities throughout the district. The OAC Arts Build Communities grant was used for strategic planning with the community and businesses, including two Artrepreneurship conferences for artists themselves. The OAC Art Service grant (2007) will help fund Art Works projects.
 - Moving On/Bright Futures/Discovery Programs—assistance to students from non-college family backgrounds

Key Objective 3.3 Improve student access to funding

Key Objective Score: 5 (Partially Met)

Several issues have affected this objective since it was first designed:

- Federal funding for Developmental Education was heavily impacted when some developmental education courses were determined to be not eligible for federal financial aid in 2006-07. To best meet federal guidelines, students must not exceed a 45 credit maximum in Developmental Education credits for a two-year degree program.
- Applications for funding were down.
- Awards were down correspondingly.
- FTE was down, resulting in fewer applications.
- State categories for student aid changed and were further limited, resulting in fewer successful applications.

On the positive side,

- The State Opportunity Grant fund increased in 2006-07 with further increases expected for 2007-08. Applications and disbursement procedures are complicated, but the money is available.

- The RCC Foundation disbursed \$120,000 more in scholarship funding than in 2006.
- Helped by counseling and advising, the number of student loans is down. This is considered a positive due to effects of a debt burden on recent graduates and the problems with repayment.

Student Financial Aid*	2005-06	2006-07
Total Net Awards	\$12,021,730	\$11,252,857
*Excludes Veterans' Administration funding and Learn and Earn funding		

Key 4: Manage Resources and Expenses

Rogue Community College is a trust held by its Board and employees on behalf of the people of southern Oregon. To assure that these assets will be passed on to future generations, the following three objectives were put into place:

Key Objective 4.1 Align priorities and expenditures to ensure quality programs and services.

Key Objective 4.2 Provide a stable funding base.

Key Objective 4.3 Nurture the college's human and material resources.

Key 4 Score: Not Scored

Team Assessment:

It is not appropriate to evaluate Key 4 during a year

- When state support declined
- When resources were inadequate to allow college components to effectively complete their goals
- When reduction-in-force so severely affected morale across the college

Were the team to complete an assessment, results would be skewed by yearly events, even though the whole process was an effort to complete Objective 4.1: "Align priorities and expenditures" with Objective 4.2: "Provide a stable funding base." The process is viewed to not have accomplished Objective 4.3: "Nurture the college's human . . . resources." That being said, much was still accomplished.

Signature Events

Key Objective 4.1 Align priorities and expenditures to ensure quality programs and services.

Considerable work went into the alignment process, at great personal and mental cost to those involved, whether management, faculty, or classified. Efforts included:

- Right-sizing work
- Reorganization work
- Priorities were established in drastic and painful ways, but assessment will occur in 2008 as impacts are reported by departmental evaluations. The alignment only took place as of July 1, 2007, so effects cannot be assessed until a year's work shows strengths and weaknesses of the process and results.
- Program Reviews of Academic and Professional/Technical programs were conducted. These identify markets for programs and thereby direct funding requests and distribution.

- Strategic Planning is in progress as of July 2007. Plans for 2008-2012 will be developed in the coming year. Assessment will begin in 2008-09.

Key Objective 4.2 Provide a stable funding base.

- The RCC President, members of the RCC Board of Education, RCC Education Association, and Oregon School Employees Association, and Associated Students of RCC all worked with the legislature as a whole and with local state legislators to achieve an increase to \$500 million in funding; however, no state-based stable funding base was achieved.
- This is well known, but there is no data with which to assess these efforts.

Key Objective 4.3 Nurture the college's human and material resources.

- *RCC/RCCEA Collective Bargaining Agreement* (faculty contract) is complete, signed, and in place.
- *RCC/OSEA Collective Bargaining Agreement* (classified contract) is complete, signed, and in place
- Both agreements were supported by their respective association memberships.
- A 2% COLA has been established for supplies, with unused funding not being subtracted from coming years' funding requests.

RECOMMENDED PROCEDURAL CHANGES

For future assessment teams

1. Clarify the differences among OCCURS and IPEDS data, how and what data is reported to each, what each excludes/includes, and to whom the data is reported. Indicate how the data is used by RCC and the recipients.
2. Measurable objectives would add validity to the assessment process.
3. Identify reasonable objectives in the current strategic planning process and make sure they are measurable, with identified benchmarks.
4. Data seem to be a good approach for an interim assessment report, but the data available need to be matured to provide more depth and a better variety of data types.
5. Add data such as used this year to the full assessment in 2008 to be used in addition to departmental input.
6. Adding a statement of intent or a definition to keys and key objectives would aid in clearer interpretation and evaluation. The Assessment Team anticipates that the 2007-08 Strategic Planning process will include some of the keys or the concepts within them in the 2008-2012 Strategic Plan.

DATA SOURCES

This list includes all the proposed data sources from IPEC members. **Items actually used during the assessment are in red.**

KEY I: BUILD FTE

Type of data for Key 1: FTE by area

Source: *IR/FTE Reports on AdminView and/or Custom IR reports for*

- FTE by Campus
- Academic programs
- Professional Technical programs
- Continuous Enrollment programs (includes Community Education, Personal Enrichment, etc.)

1.1 Expand the scope, quality, and availability of programs and services

1.1.1 Source: AdminView and IR

1.1.1 Number of sections offered by category—Custom report from I/R

1.1.1.1 Comparative data from selected years

1.1.1.1.1 Instructional

1.1.1.1.2 Business and Workforce

1.1.1.1.3 Community Education

1.1.1.1.4 Student Services

1.1.1.1.5 Preparatory Studies/Academic Skills studies

1.2 Improve services to the diverse local communities, including active retirees

1.2.1 Source: Custom report IR; RCC-At-A-Glance documents (2005-06 completed; 2006-07 preliminary version completed)

1.2.1.1 Age data to count senior citizens

1.2.1.2 Ethnicity comparisons

1.3 Increase the student base by fostering a supportive learning environment

1.3.1 Source: AdminView/Headcount/Headcount by credit load

1.3.2 Source: Student Services

1.3.2.1 Unduplicated Student Headcount data, Fall-to-Winter retention rates for credit students (excluding 2 + 2) included with this.

1.3.2.2 Referrals from Save Our Students retention database, met with Kori Bieber to see what was available.

1.4 Strengthen recruitment efforts, above all to high school and Hispanic students

1.4.1 Source: RogueNet Placement Test Reporting Module

1.4.2 Source: RCC At-a-Glance data

1.4.2.1 Placement test headcount data

1.4.2.2 Student headcount by age category—Custom report from I/R

1.4.2.3 Percentage by age statistics

1.4.2.4 Headcount from tours of various campuses (needs to be consistently collected, however, if it is to be used and of value)

1.5 Improve student retention rates

1.5.1 Source: AdminView/Report/Section Attrition

1.5.2 Source: Student Services

Success/failure of referrals from Save Our Students retention database

1.6 Expand training opportunities with business and industry.

1.6.1 Source: Spot FTE reports from AdminView

1.6.1.1 FTE counts for Business and Workforce Development

1.6.1.2 Success of follow-ups from tours

1.6.1.3 Headcounts

Key II: Build the Foundation

Source: Contact Jennifer Wheatley, Executive Director, RCC Foundation for statistical information

2.1 Work with the Foundation to increase its endowment

2.2 Build partnerships in local communities

2.3 Improve awareness of the Foundation's role

Key III: Build Revenue

Key 3 Source: RCC Website/Site Map/Annual Financial Report/Budget Documents

- Comparison of total revenue figure for selected years.
- Total revenue figure are available in December for the previous year.

3.1 Pursue alternative funding sources

3.1.1 Source: Mary O'Kief

3.1.1.1 Grant applications

3.1.1.2 Grant successes by dollar amount

3.1.1.3 Comparison of selected years

3.2 Strengthen partnerships with agencies and institutions

3.2.1 N/A to Interim Assessment. No measure.

- 3.3 Improve student access to funding resources.
 - 3.2.2 Source: Financial Aid, provided by Anna Manley
 - 3.2.3 Source: RCC Foundation
 - 3.2.3.1 Financial aid award data
 - 3.2.3.2 Scholarship award data
 - 3.2.3.3 Student loan award data

KEY iv: Manage Resources and Expenses

- 4.1 Align priorities and expenditures to ensure quality programs and services
- 4.2 Pursue a stable funding base
- 4.3 Nurture the College's human and material resources

N/A for Interim Assessment.

Not being measured this year due to sensitive nature of RIFs and their results on personnel and contracts.

At its annual retreat, the Assessment Team changed tactics slightly on this one and, while not scoring Key 4, did elect to list a number of positive efforts toward this goal. This was done anecdotally, using information from team members.