



April 15, 2013

TO: Joint Committee on Ways and Means Sub Committee on Education
Honorable Representative Betty Komp Co-Chair
Honorable Senator Rod Monroe Co-Chair
Member Representative Lew Frederick
Member Representative Sherrie Sprenger
Member Senator Chris Edwards
Member Senator Fred Girod

Dear Co-chairs and members of the Committee;

I appreciate the opportunity to report to you on Clackamas Community College's Achievement Compacts process, and I can of course answer any follow up questions you might have.

Briefly describe the process in your school district (or other entity) in developing your district's compact and setting the goal (e.g. who is responsible, who participates, and who makes final proposal/decision).

Process: CCC reviews and sets targets using our well established culture and network of collaboration and shared governance. Our Dean of Curriculum, Planning, and Research coordinates the process of getting input from a range of representation including deans, department chairs, and other strategic faculty and staff. Standing councils – with each Oregon Education Association affiliated group-- are represented and have an opportunity to review and provide input into target setting. Groups such as our College Council, Presidents' Council (comprised of student and union leadership), and the broadly representative constituency of our Vice President's Meeting all participate. By design, each of these groups has active responsibility for providing input and facilitating communications back in their respective areas. This process is strongly supported by our Office of Institutional Research and a unique group known as the Knowledge Network – a group of service, data systems specialists, and faculty department chairs integrated throughout the campus.

Once preliminary numbers have been established, external groups – chambers of commerce, district superintendents and our local workforce boards have an opportunity to discuss and review to ensure our numbers are realistic. During our budget process, the Budget Committee reviews the achievement compact in the context of our budget, planning, and assessing process. It then is brought back to Presidents' Council for action as a final recommendation to our Board of Education. The president submits the proposal to the Board for adoption. At times, input from external stakeholders is sought – such as feedback from area superintendents. This input is collated and presented to the president's staff and then the Board for final approval.

Describe the content/numbers of your compact and discuss which figures are the greatest challenges to reach.

Our Numbers: Whenever possible, our targets reflect consideration of five years of data trend. This upward, downward or steady trend of the data informs our initial target setting. We then consider the internal and external factors that may cause increase, decrease, or growth restriction of the target and adjust accordingly. We also have integrated the achievement compact indicators with our accreditation mission indicators, our department planning process, and our new three-year strategic plan. We have actively aligned them with our planning, assessment and communications processes.

An example of the latter: Advanced College Credit. We decided to drop our numbers slightly for 12-13. From here, we decided to increase for 13-14 to bring us back to the actual 11-12 level. A significant internal factor explaining the slight drop is the fact our current Educational Partnership position has been unfilled for a fair amount of time due to lack of qualified applicants. So, there is no additional staffing available to commit effort to strategic growth at this time.

Greatest Challenges: GED data are the most challenging to reach, as the current testing system is changing and making it difficult to obtain current data on testers/completers. As we understand it, this testing is also moving online, and it is unclear whether or not or with what consistency we will have access to the data. Another challenging aspect of this particular indicator is the fact it does not directly reflect the extent or impact of our college's work with this population. Completion is reported by the testing center, but this data point does not fully account for the efforts of our staff to help students achieve the GED. Furthermore, people testing here may or may not have had anything to do with CCC. However, with 40-40-20, we do appreciate the state's interest in actively embracing an indicator related to this population. It is meaningful to an extent, just not directly influenced by our college.

How do you plan to use the compact in your district including budgeting, professional development, curriculum development, and other areas?

Review and Implementation: Ownership of and review of these indicators and our progress toward targets are integrated with our annual planning cycle at the student service and instructional department level, as well as institutional level. Periodic updates on these indicators will be given to division leadership by strategic staff. Similar to other college indicators and our continuous improvement cycle, division leadership will keep these updates present in their working meetings throughout the year, particularly the implementation status of our key strategies for assuring meeting or exceeded targets.

What could change in the compact process to improve the use of them?

Three aspects of the process may be ready for improvement, based on our experience so far:

- 1) OCCWD has a tremendously lean research and reporting staff. Even without Achievement Compacts, their workload is already significant. Their time and expertise is critical to the integrity of this process and other important research and reporting functions at this level. Further, they have access to the very data system – a constantly improving system – that can give us collective understanding of student momentum and success. Building their capacity to better support *research* in addition to *reporting*

improves our continuous learning as a committed state. Supporting them in this capacity also better positions them to pro-actively work with the institutional research offices statewide to make ongoing improvements to data integrity, data processes, and insights.

- 2) At the very least, OCCWD and ODE should have greater financial support as they work together to generate reports back to the high schools on: (a) those high school seniors completing nine colleges credits – per K-12 achievement compact; and, (b) a reporting system that reports the core information about the participation, preparedness, and progress of those secondary students who go on to post-secondary. This knowledge exchange and collaborative consideration of these data are critical to the success of both the K-12 and the community college compacts.

- 3) The achievement compact focuses on education at the expense of workforce development. As an integral leader in workforce development, we are concerned that recognition is not included as part of the rhetoric being used to describe the compact or the outcomes sought. Of particular concern is the lack of a reporting category for adults who are re-learning or learning new skills to retain or seek economic opportunities. We cannot focus on children without focusing on parents.

Thank you for reviewing how Clackamas Community College supports the Achievement Compact, and our local communities.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joanne Truesdell". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "J" and "T".

Joanne Truesdell, President



ACHIEVEMENT COMPACTS 2012-13 Key Dates and Tracking

- ✓ April 11: Clackamas Community College Board receives information on Achievement Compacts
- ✓ April 12: The OEIB distributes compacts to all community colleges
- ✓ April 16: Executive Team reviews key dates and identifies framework of process for Expanded Presidents' Council
- ✓ April 17: Expanded Presidents' Council reviews draft process for compact data, college wide input and review for 2011-12 Projections and 2012-13 Targets
- ✓ April 18: District superintendents review compact 2010-11 Actuals and seek understanding of educational environments related to 2011-12 Projections and 2012-13 Targets related to dual enrollment of high school students
Brief North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce Board on Achievement Compacts information and processes
CCC department chair faculty reviews information and approach to target setting and assigns a subgroup to be part of the data group
- ✓ April 19: Workforce Investment Council of Clackamas County reviews compact information.
Department chair meeting to review compact and process to set 2011-12 Projections and 2012-13 Targets
- ✓ April 20: College Council reviews compact information and draft process for setting 2011-12 Projections and 2012-13 Targets
- ✓ April 23: OEIB and CCWD host Webcast – President, VPs Provost and CFO, Board Members, data group
- ✓ April 25: Budget Advisory Group reviews process to determine projections and targets and determine how to approach identifying key budget strategies addressing the outcomes
- ✓ May 2: Review with CCC Foundation Executive Board to determine possible connections to Foundation Campaign opportunities
- ✓ May 4: Administrative and Faculty - VP meeting review of 2011-12 Projections and 2012-13 Targets
- ✓ May 7: Deadline for colleges to request corrections to CCWD/OEIB
- ✓ May 8: Presidents' Council update on project's status
- ✓ May 15: Budget Advisory Group reviewed draft compact projections, process and rationale.
- ✓ May 17: Presented draft achievement compact to CCC Budget Committee and for public testimony
- ✓ May 24: Present CCC Achievement Compact to CCC Foundation Board
- ✓ May 25: Reviewed CCC Achievement Compact with Faculty department chairs
- ✓ May 29: Expanded Presidents' Council reviews final draft of compact materials
- ✓ May 31: Deadline for OEIB to complete corrections.
- ✓ June 1: Presented CCC Achievement Compact to College Council
- ✓ June 11: Received Draft NCHEMS data from presentation made at June 11, 2012 OEIB meeting.
To Be Determined: OEIB develop and provide guidance to districts on the progress needed statewide to achieve the "middle 40" of the state's 40/40/20 goal
- ✓ June 20: Final Communication and compact information to be adopted by Board of Education.
- ✓ June 30: Deadline for colleges to complete their compacts.
- ✓ July 5: Deadline for colleges to return completed compacts to the OEIB.
- ✓ TBD: Deadline for Chief Education Officer to accept achievement compacts and local priority measures.

Working Clackamas Community College Achievement Compact for 2013-2014

The following questions are used by key CCC stakeholders as we collaboratively go about setting new targets.

- What is the number and characteristics of the population under consideration?
- What is the 5+ year trend for variable under consideration – including the breakout of these trends by race, gender and Pell receipt?
- What about our current or planned practices in our instructional or service environment can impact momentum to target?
- What about our policies can help or get in the way?
- What about how we are currently resourcing these areas can help or hinder?
- What about our secondary or four-year partnerships can help or hinder?
- What is going on in the local, State and National community that can help or hinder? (e.g., economy, other initiatives, business/industry changes, etc.)
- What about Federal or State policy could impact target? (e.g. Pell)

Outcome Measures	2010-11 Actual		2011-12 Projected		2012-13 Target		2013-14 Target	
Are students completing their courses of study and earning certificates and degrees?								
<i>Number of students completing:</i>	All	Underrepresented	All Projected/Actual	Underrepresented Projected/Actual	All Original/New	Underrepresented Original/New	ALL	Underrepresented
Adult HS diplomas/GEDs	645	N/A	540/540	N/A	620/540	NA/	540(?)	N/A
Certificates/Oregon Transfer Modules	487 (558 actual)	126	580/514	185/157	750/625	230/	812	
Associate degrees	552 (615 actual)	206	650/712	240/256	700/877	260/	1,026 <i>is this our 'break 1000 associates year'?</i>	
Transfers to four-year institutions	2190	376	2180/2201	370/511	2200/2223	380/	2245	
Programs of study (under development)								
Are students making progress at the college?								
<i>Number (&/or % where indicated) of students:</i>	All	Underrepresented	All Projected/Actual	Underrepresented Projected/Actual	All	Underrepresented	ALL	Underrepresented

Enrolled Dev. Ed. Writing who complete (%)	72	74	68/69.44	65/67.85	68/	65/	70.00	
Enrolled in Dev. Ed. Math who complete (%)	69	68	66/65.95	64/63.94	66/66	64/	67.00	
Who earn 15 college credits in the year (#)	5283	2397	5530/5345	2570/2567	5790/	2760/	6,062	
Who earn 30 college credits in the year (#)	2353	1259	2240/2235	1210/1258	2130/	1160/	2130	
Who pass a national licensure exam (#/%)	136 (95%)	N/A	95%/94.62%	N/A	95%/95%	N/A/	95%	

Are students making connections to and from the college?

Number of students who:	All	Underrepresented	All Projected/Actual	Underrepresented Projected/Actual	All	Underrepresented	All	Underrepresented
Are dual enrolled in Oregon high schools	2418	280	3000/2803	330/462	3150/2850	340/	3000	
Are dual enrolled in OUS	349	113	330/347	110/121	350/300	110/	375	
Who transfer to OUS	1431	245	1830/1489	310/363	1850/1548	320/	1,609	
Employment (under development)								

Local Priorities (Optional for each district)

Number and/or percentage of students who:	All	Underrepresented	All	Underrepresented	All	Underrepresented	All	Underrepresented

What is the level of public investment in the district?

	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Projected	2012-13 Target	2013-14 Target
State funds	11,755,920	11,166,105	9,585,564	
Local Property tax revenue	14,373,186	14,554,825	14,738,759	
Total state and local operating funds	26,129,106	25,720,930	24,324,323	