

## Executive Summary of Review Process

During the months of April, May, June, July, and August, a review team met to conduct a self-study using the TRIO and Other Educational Opportunity Programs *Self-Assessment* developed by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) organization. The CAS self-assessment guide was used as a tool to assess the Educational Opportunity Center (EOC) department within Student Affairs at the Community College of Denver. The self-assessment guides consists of standards and guidelines used to evaluate the strengths, deficiencies, and to plan for improvement opportunities within the department.

Khara O'Connell, EOC Director, and Laura Escarcega, EOC Program Specialist, collected data with the help of an evaluation committee that was pulled together from staff members from several functional areas around the college – Shannon Webber, Assistant Director of Financial Aid Customer Service from the office of Financial Aid; Katherine Ridings, Career Services Manager from the Workforce Initiate Now Program, and Delmar Hamilton, Educational Access Specialist for the Educational Opportunity Center. Laura Escarcega, EOC Program Specialist, led the committee biweekly meetings, wrote the review reports, and created action plans for the completion of the first EOC CAS Self-Assessment.

The CAS Standards and Guidelines used for the review the Educational Opportunity Center Department at the Community College of Denver are as follows:

- Part 1: Mission
- Part 2: Program
- Part 3: Organization and Leadership
- Part 4: Human Resources
- Part 5: Ethics
- Part 6: Law, Policy and Governance
- Part 7: Diversity, Equity, and Access
- Part 8: Institutional and External Relations
- Part 9: Financial Resources
- Part 10: Technology
- Part 11: Facilities and Equipment
- Part 12: Assessment and Evaluation

The review team that conducted the evaluation of the Educational Opportunity Center department at the Community College of Denver were recommended by Khara O'Connell, EOC Director, because of their knowledge and involvement with the program and approved by Dr. Ryan Ross, Dean of Student Development and Retention. To conclude the assessment, all team members were given training for the CAS review and then supplied with individual notebooks containing the CAS self-assessment guides for TRIO and other Educational Opportunity Programs, information about the ratings to be used, appropriate CAS work forms for self-assessment guides, evidence to support ratings, and narrative information when evidence could not be provided because of the nature of the work.

A secure folder with access given only to members of the EOC CAS committee was created. Inside this secure folder, twelve subfolders were created to represent the twelve CAS self-assessment guides for TRIO and other Educational Opportunity Programs to be rated. Inside each one of this subfolders, evidence materials as well as a narrative document were saved to provide the committee with information and guidance about the EOC, its practices, and services.

The following rating scale was used during the assessment.

### **CAS Raters Definitions**

- ND - Does not apply
- 0 – Insufficient Evidence/Unable to rate
- 1 – Does not meet
- 2 - Partially Met
- 3 - Meets
- 4 - Exceeds
- 5 - Exemplary

To conclude the self-evaluation, the TRIO EOC CAS Committee met twice a month, every other Thursday, starting on April 23, 2015. First, individual members rated each one of the criteria on the CAS self-assessment guides work forms using the evidence and the narrative information provided for each one of the sections. Second, during the committees' meetings, every other Thursday, ratings were discussed and changed as each individual member felt the need. There were instances where the committee felt that a criteria did or did not fit within the scope of the EOC's work. During this time, notes were taken to ensure this information was captured and reflected on the findings. Also, for many criteria, the committee had to make a determination of what the criterion meant and how it applied to the EOC's scope of work since they were open to interpretation.

### **Summary of Initial Findings**

- Because of the EOC's unique situation in the institution, the EOC is seen as a powerful access program that supports higher education. It helps adults reach their potential by making a full assessment of where the individual is at the moment and where he/she wants to go. Starting from GED preparation, career assessment, financial literacy, admission, and enrollment.
- A common theme throughout the assessment was the lack of historical information/documentation kept and provided by the EOC. It was said that the EOC had provided several of the criteria, but historical data was not provided to show the improvements or changes done. For example, the EOC reviews its mission and vision on a yearly basis but not historical data about all the changes kept; therefore, the EOC was not able to provide evidence of yearly improvement to its mission and vision.
- Due to the lack of a baseline for some practices at the EOC and CCD, ratings were given to meet the expectation because there is no point of comparison to say that the EOC department was 4. Exceeding or 5. Exemplary on its practices.
- There was some ambiguity in some criteria where the committee and the committee chair had to make a determination in how the criteria met/did not meet the scope of the EOC for the committee to be able to provide a rating. For these instances, notes were taken as documentation.

## Component Aras Overview

### **Part 1: Mission**

The overall average rating of **Part 1. Mission** of the self-assessment was 3.04, indicating that the EOC Mission meets the criteria.

Currently, the EOC's Mission is in alignment with the mission of the funding agency (US Department of Education) – according to criterion measure 1.4, which received an average rating of 3.33. However, the EOC CAS committee concluded that the EOC mission should be better aligned and more consistent with the mission of the host institution (Community College of Denver) – reference to criterion 1.3.1, which received an average rating of 2.66. The committee felt it was essential for the EOC's mission to reflect the importance of higher education as much as it reflects the importance of access to higher education.

There was discussion about the impact of the EOC in the community that it serves, how this is reflected on its mission, and how participants can identify with the EOC mission. It was pointed out that more people in the community should know about the EOC and the services it provides. Distributing more marketing materials, news presence, ads (newsletters, TV, radio, etc.), etc. would be a way to create awareness of the value provided by the EOC to the community (in reference to criterion 1.2.1, which received an average rating of 2.66).

Under the Leadership of the current EOC Director, Khara O'Connell, the EOC Mission has undergone revision on a yearly basis for three years. A historical record of the EOC Mission is not currently in place which imposed a challenge to the EOC CAS committee to provide a better rating on criterion 1.2.2, receiving an average score rating of 2.

### **Part 2: Program**

The overall average rating of **Part 2. Program** of the self-assessment was 3.43, indicating that the EOC Program meets the criteria.

The Educational Opportunity Center (EOC) is designed to enrich the social, civic, intellectual, and economic fabric of the community. All these by providing access and opportunity for nontraditional students to learn how to reach their potential and live more productive lives with knowledge and education. It was determined that this area of the EOC, based on the CAS self-assessment guide criterion 2.1.2 (average rating of 3.66) and 2.4.5 (average rating of 3.66), was a strength of the EOC. EOC staff members are constantly interacting with participants and giving them purposeful advised and assistance, depending on their individual needs, to help better their lives.

The EOC is able to reach the population it is funded to serve by creating strong partnerships and collaborations with different colleges and department across the institution and community organizations that support higher education, learning, and development. The EOC's partnerships and collaborations showed to be the biggest strength of the EOC in this section by receiving an average rating of 4.33 in CAS self-assessment guide criterion 2.2. It was recognized by the committee that the EOC has created strong connection with key colleges in student serving departments in the college such as Financial Aid, Admission, Accessibility, Advising, Student Development and Retention, COSO, CSP, etc. and also in the community by creating partnerships with other colleges, community organizations, and workforce centers.

The other two CAS self-assessment guide ratings that received high scores by the EOC CAS committee were criteria 2.4.2 and 2.4.3, receiving an average score rating of 4 each. This is because the EOC is guided by strong theories and knowledge of learning and development. This is reflected in the fact that all EOC staff members are knowledgeable about advising participants. Advising them in many areas of access to higher education and meeting them where they are in terms of knowledge, location, needs, and context. Talk to them in terms that are understandable and not intimidating. In terms of the CAS self-assessment criterion 2.4.3, according to the analysis of the committee, the EOC is seen as another department of CCD. This is by having a presence and a willingness to help the institution. Several EOC staff members are part of committees including the CCD strategic planning committee and HLC. The EOC is constantly supporting the Financial Aid office at CCD by having an Educational Access Specialist on site to help CCD students and prospective students understand the financial aid process and all the steps to follow.

For section 2. Program, the CAS self-assessment criterion that received the lowest average score was 2.3.3. This is because the EOC directly and indirectly articulates contributions to support participants in domains that are not tracked or documented by the Educational Opportunity Center. The committee's interpretation for this criterion was that the EOC has a much bigger impact on the community than just the ones assessed to reach the objectives. The EOC also articulates contributions with departments and individuals to help participants/students navigate the college environment. For instance, reaching out to people that might not otherwise have heard or thought about higher education. Also, when a participant has issues with its admissions application or financial aid, the EOC Specialists often times contact somebody in the admission office and/or financial aid office to help the participant understand what is happening and create that connection between offices for participants to feel comfortable.

### **Part 3: Organization and Leadership:**

The overall average rating of **Part 3. Organization and Leadership** of the self-assessment was 3.55, indicating that the EOC Program meets the criteria.

The Educational Opportunity Center at the Community College of Denver is fortunate to have leaders that understand, are knowledgeable, and support TRIO programs. The main areas of strength showed in this section only shows the passion that the EOC leaders have in helping underrepresented populations and how strategic planning and program development revolves around reaching out to individuals and ensuring their success. This was reflected in criterion 3.2.2 from the CAS self-assessment guide by receiving an average rating of 4 showing that the EOC leaders exceed in setting goals and objectives based on the needs of the population. Reaching out to a population where getting the message about higher education is difficult to deliver, the EOC leaders exceed (receiving a rating of 4) in their jobs by creating short and long term goals that the EOC staff can achieve (relevant to criterion 3.2.1 of the CAS self-assessment guide); short term goals in the form of yearly mandated objectives and long term goals in the form of five year grant cycles and prior experience preference point. Having clear and reachable goals helps the EOC leadership become knowledgeable about new trends, theories, research, and methodologies related to student learning and retention showing another area where the EOC's leaders were recognized to exceed – criterion 3.7 of the CAS self-assessment guide, receiving an average rating of 4.

The EOC's structure in the college was also recognized by the EOC CAS committee as exceeding on the CAS self-assessment guides, by receiving an average rating of 4 (in reference to criterion measure 3.4). The committee felt that the EOC placement in the institutions organizational structure

ensures visibility, promotes interaction, and enlists support from senior administrators at a level that exceeds the expectations. The EOC is placed at the same level as the majority of student support services but with the added bonus of having the unique ability to create strong ties with other departments and community organizations that also have student involvement at their core. This in reference to criterion 3.5.4 of the CAS self-assessment guide where the EOC received an average score of 4. The committee determined that the EOC's leaders help with the advancement of the EOC program by initiating/keeping internal as well as external stakeholders informed about what is happening at the EOC and by being involved in committees around campus, professional associations, resource fairs, by sending monthly reports to different site locations, and the annual performance report signed by several institutional constituencies and presented to relevant stakeholders.

In the advancement of the program, the EOC's leaders promote staff involvement in order to reach its short and long term goals. The committee felt the EOC's leadership exceeded in their leadership by empowering professional and student staff to take on new opportunities personally and professionally and become involved in areas of their interest. This in reference to criteria 3.3.3 and 3.3.5 of the CAS self-assessment guides, which received an average score rating of 4 (each).

Even though, there were not any areas in this CAS self-assessment guidelines Part 3. Organization and leadership where the committee considered that the EOC - 2. Partially met or 1. Did not meet - there were some items that required follow up. The average ratings for criterion 3.3.1 show that the EOC is in compliance with the CCD's Human Resource Department, by receiving a 3.33 average rating; however, it is known that the EOC has involved its support networks in the process of recruiting staff members where there is a vacancy, but this process has not been formalized.

While the EOC received an average score of 3.66 in criterion 3.1.2 showing that the EOC as a department of CCD has policies and procedures to help guide staff members; in some instances, system policies have not been updated/revised in some time imposing a challenge on the EOC. Since the EOC still has to follow them, the EOC has to make sure that policies and procedures still hold value to the EOC and are applicable even with the changes happening in the community.

As mentioned before, the EOC leaders are involved in the community and know that change could be inevitable. As much as the EOC leaders can provide guidance, sometimes the opportunity calls for a situation where a policy might help. At the EOC there is not, however, a procedure or a process advising EOC staff how to manage change when it is foreseen to happen.

Additionally, another area where the committee felt the EOC needed additional clarification was in the description of professional development and what it meant to comply or become exemplary at providing professional development opportunities for staff members. This in reference to criterion 3.3.5 of the CAS self-assessment guide where the EOC received a 4. Exceeds average rating. It was discussed that that CCD's policy, in general, is about professional development and becoming the best professional you can be. There are areas where the EOC leaders get to provide more support for improvement and professional development, than other CCD department would or can. There is however, a need to create a baseline to know where the EOC and other departments within CCD fall in terms of providing professional development opportunities. It was also discussed the fact that the EOC has very knowledgeable staff members that could possibly contribute to the college and the community by sharing their knowledge in a more scholarly manner.

#### **Part 4: Organization and Leadership:**

The overall average rating of **Part 4. Human Resources** of the self-assessment was 3.36, indicating that the EOC Program meets the criteria.

The EOC as any other department at CCD receives support from the Human Resource Department. This according to the committee helps the EOC stay in compliance and meet the majority of the criteria established by CAS self-assessment guidelines. Nonetheless, there are areas where the EOC exceeds in providing access and support for the advancement of education and appropriate professional development opportunities to improve the leadership ability, competence, and skills of all employees (in reference to CAS self-assessment guide criterion 4.2.4, where the EOC received a 4 – Exceeds). For instance, through the EOC, one Jr. Educational Access Specialist applied and obtained a full time position as an EOC Educational Access Specialist (Mayra Guzman), a workstudy was trained to become a EOC Jr Educational Access Specialist (Jessica Albanez), several staff members have or are currently serving in executive level position with TRIO Support Organizations (Mike Nowicki, past ASPIRE Treasurer; Laura Escarcega, current ASPIRE Support staff; and Khara O’Connell, Current ASPIRE President Elect), two Educational Access Specialist became CDF certified through an intense program paid with grant funds (Mona Carey and Lisa Doroff), and two Educational Access Specialist are currently working on their Master’s degree (Mona Carey and Mike Nowicki). This type of support in conjunction with personal and professional background experiences prepare EOC professional to work with individual who are traditionally under-represented in postsecondary education which was also noted by the committee in criteria 4.9 of the CAS self-assessment guide where the EOC received an average score of 4.

In section Part 4. Human Resources, there were two sections where the committee felt like the EOC needed to improve on its practices. Regarding criterion 4.3.1 the committee felt that even though the EOC relies on HR for guidance and compliance in several aspects, the EOC is its own professional department at CCD and it should have copies of all position descriptions, giving this criterion measure a 2.66 average score. This was determined due to the fact that the EOC kept several copies of position descriptions but not all of them. Furthermore, for section 4.3.3 it was determined that no supporting documentation was provided to say that the EOC develops promotion practices that are fair, inclusive, proactive, and non-discriminatory. The discussion was based around the fact that the EOC, in a professional environment, meets this criteria with professionalism, especially by being part of a state agency with the understanding that legal concerns can develop if fair practices are not used but without written guidance concerning these matters.

Two items in this section required some follow up, criteria 4.7 and 4.8.4 of the CAS self-assessment guide. For item in section 4.7. The committee recognized that the fact that the EOC engages in the Work-Study program at CCD speaks greatly about the EOC commitment on student development. Training and supervising work-study employees takes time and energy; moreover, giving them opportunities to learn to become professionals is another part where the EOC is supporting higher education.

#### **Part 5: Ethics:**

The overall average rating of **Part 5. Ethics** of the self-assessment was 3.04, indicating that the EOC Program meets the criteria.

For section Part 5: Ethics, the committee agreed that the EOC complied with CCD's HR Code of Ethics. This meant that almost each one of the criteria on this section received a rating on 3. Meeting the standard. There is one criteria of the CAS self-assessment guideline that received a higher rating, criteria 5.5.1 receiving an average rating of 3.66. The reason why this criteria got a higher rating is because the committee reflected on the EOC's idea of having an I certify form for participants to sign and recognize their obligation when providing information to the federal government. Additionally, it is known that EOC Educational Access Specialist advises students in these areas where they are made responsible for providing accurate and verifiable information.

### **Part 6: Law, Policy, and Governance:**

The overall average rating of **Part 6. Law, Policy, and Governance** of the self-assessment was 3.31, indicating that the EOC Program meets the criteria.

For the most part in this section the EOC received ratings averaging on 3. Meet or higher up to an average rating score of 3.66. The only criteria that received a higher rating was 6.4 of the CAS self-assessment guideline. Initially, it was determined that since the EOC is not financially sponsored by any community organization, that this point did not apply to the EOC. Nonetheless, after some review and discussion, it was determined that even though the EOC is not sponsored by community organizations in the form of fiscal resources, the EOC is sponsored by community organizations in the form of space, use of resources such as computers, copy machines, paper, etc. and the committee gave this criterion a rating of 4 – Exceeds because each EOC Educational Access Specialist adheres to the standards of the community organization where she/he is serving.

In Part 6. Law, Policy and Governance, there were not any items that received an average rating score of 1. Does not meet or 2. Partially meets. There were however, some items that require follow up. Criteria 6.1.4 received an average score rating of 3.33 and the conversation was about the EOC creating its own emergency preparedness plan and creating scenarios to keep its staff members safe when a situation arrives. The weakness in the same criteria was that The EOC has many policies in place and available for staff members to know what to do in several situations. There is not, however, a history of policy revisions that would show that the EOC is constantly changing and updating policies and procedures to prove that they are reviewed on a regular basis.

### **Part 7: Diversity, Equity, and Access:**

The overall average rating of **Part 7. Diversity, Equity, and Access** of the self-assessment was 3.75, indicating that the EOC Program meets the criteria.

The EOC operates in a culture of access; therefore, the committee rated this Part 7. Diversity, Equity, and Access the highest with an overall average rating of 3.75. The committee agreed that the EOC creates and maintains a work environment that is inviting for people regardless of ability; age; cultural identity; ethnicity; family educational history; gender identity and expression; nationality; political affiliation; race; religious affiliation; sex; sexual orientation; economic, marital, social, or veteran status; or any other basis included in institutional policies and codes and laws. This has been embedded in the culture of the EOC by merely having a diverse staff operating the office. The one criteria of the EOC CAS self-assessment guide received the highest commutative rating score of 4.33 was criteria 7.3.1. The committee agreed that is important to have a sense of what is fair and support participants, students, and staff in their beliefs. The EOC office, in the front desk manual, used for training of work-study participants, has EOC Guidelines for ethical practices including

service, social justice, dignity and worth of a person, importance of human relations, integrity, and cultural competency. This section was found by the committee to have a tremendous impact in how the EOC saw diversity and how it was applied to access and responding to the needs of its participants and staff members.

In Part 7. Diversity, Equity, and Access; section 7.3.10 was initially considered by the EOC Director and the EOC Program Specialist as not applicable to the scope of service of the EOC. Nonetheless, the committee decided that the EOC does serve distant learners. Distant learners defined as someone who want to study in a school of higher education that is in a different geographic area or someone who seeks services in one of the site locations provided by the EOC because of its ease to get there and not to the main office. Regardless of the geographic area where the participant want to attend higher education, the EOC specialist will have the essential tools to guide him/her in the journey of higher education. The EOC main office is located downtown but for some people who might be new to the state or who cannot get to the main office and is studying in a college where there are site locations, services are provided to this participants who might have not otherwise had access to the services provided by the EOC. On the bases of this description, there where discrepancies in how the EOC serves this population, if they are receiving full services or basic information, and if it was going above and beyond in recognizing, addressing, and meeting their needs.

Another area where the committee felt that the EOC needed to improve in the way they are implementing initiatives to foster a friendly environment is by having documentation of what the EOC is doing. For instance, The EOC holds annual retreats to talk about it mission, vision, and strategic plan for the year. Great things come out of the retreats and employees feel empowered to take action from the information gathered. To make these kinds of retreats stronger, minutes or notes could be provided as documentation for future reference (this in reference to criteria 7.3.3 which received an average rating of 4 – Exceeds)

## **Part 8: Institutional and External Relations**

The overall average rating of **Part 8. Institutional and External Relations** of the self-assessment was 3.66, indicating that the EOC Program meets the criteria.

The EOC at its core is a community based program. It has to maintain relationships with a diverse pull of organizations, institutions, and government agencies not only to reach out to the population it is funded to serve but to provide participants with a rich educational experience. This in reference to criteria 8.1.4 and 8.1.5 that received an average rating of 4.3 (each). The committee agreed that the EOC has developed relationships with places where participants can be referred when the EOC does not provide the types of services the participant needs. For example, the EOC creates opportunities for participants to engage with community organization and institution when it organizes its biyearly event “Pathways for Educational Opportunities.” This event usually has a resource fair component where participants can learn about different program in the community and institutions.

For Part 8. Institutional and External Relations there was one criterion that according to the committee required follow up. Criterion 8.1.3 received an average score rating of 3.66. The discussion around this criterion was based on the idea that the EOC used to have different methods for disseminating information about the program and the services it provides. Historically, the EOC used to have fliers in grocery stores, banks, and other places where the community can refer to them



and call the office to schedule an appointment. Additionally, the EOC used to have news articles and Public Service Announcements in radio and television. This help reach out more to the community and advocate for higher education.

### **Part 9: Financial Resources:**

The overall average rating of **Part 9. Financial Resources** of the self-assessment was 3.34, indicating that the EOC Program meets the criteria.

The majority of the funding for the EOC comes from the federal government. Provided this information it's understandable that the EOC has to go through approval process based on spending regulations. Regulations imposed by the federal government of the EOC grant and by CCD as the host institution.

To show the management and monitoring of funds, the EOC Program Specialist prepares monthly expenditure reports that are given to the EOC Director to establish priorities and budget expenditures. By doing this the committee determined that the EOC exceeds (4 average score rating) in demonstrating efficient and effective use of fiscal resources consistent not only with institutional protocols but also regulations mandated by the federal government.

The only comment made by the committee in this section is that the EOC does not have a policy or procedure in place to help with the continuity of responsible stewardship of resources.

### **Part 10: Technology**

The overall average rating of **Part 10. Technology** of the self-assessment was 3.33 indicating that the EOC Program meets the criteria.

For Part 10. Technology the committee agreed that the EOC has what it needs to accomplish its mission. As any other department at CCD, the EOC receives help and support from the CCD IT department and complies with its policies and procedures, in addition to having its own internal policies and procedures (referring to criterion 10.6.1 with an average score rating of 4-Exceeds). There were a couple more areas where the committee felt the EOC exceeded and gave it an average rating score of 4-Exceeds. 10.1 was a criterion of the CAS self-assessment guide that received a 4-Exceeds. This because the EOC meets the needs of its specialist and participants by providing each one of its Educational Access Specialist with an iPad, on top of having a laptop, access to a printer, projectors, fax, etc., to help them stay on top of participants needs and access data when they are at a site location (not in the main office). Having technology available, helps the program accomplish its mission and goals but also helps participants of the program receive more services and information. When Educational Access Specialists have access to technology, they can help participants fill out online forms, refer them to places where they can receive different services, explore career opportunities, school interests, etc. all by helping enrich the participant's experience when meeting with an Educational Access Specialist, which will refer to criterion 10.4 that received an 4-Exceeds average rating score.

There were a couple places where the committee felt the EOC can improve in its practices of technology usage, criteria 10.8.1 and 10.11. The EOC guides its practices off the Student Conduct Handbook where students rights and responsibilities are delineated; there is not, however, a clear policy/statement that addresses specifically the responsibilities of the EOC participants and the proper usage of the technology on the TRIO Lab. Additionally, on reference to 10.11, receiving an

average score rating of 3, the EOC does not currently have a procedure or a referral system available for students who experience negative or psychological consequences from the use of technology (ex. Cyberbullying, online discrimination and retaliation, etc.).

### **Part 11: Facilities and Equipment**

The overall average rating of **Part 11. Facilities and Equipment** of the self-assessment was 3.40 indicating that the EOC Program meets the criteria.

The EOC office is conveniently located on the intersection of Colfax and Speer where it can easily serve members of the community. This space is great for the EOC since the Auraria campus is big and people who are not familiar with it can easily get lost. The EOC location is accessible for people who use the public transportation and in compliance with ADA standards.

The Criterion that stood out in this section was 11.3.1., receiving an average score rating of 4. The committee concluded that EOC has well equipped workspaces where the participants' privacy can be protected. In the conversation in this criterion, the support of the leadership was highlighted since there was knowledge that in the original design of the space, cubicles were the preference over offices. It was recognized that the EOC leadership had to advocate to have offices and protect participants' confidentiality.

### **Part 12: Assessment and Evaluation**

The overall average rating of **Part 12. Assessment and Evaluation** of the self-assessment was 3.51 indicating that the EOC Program meets the criteria.

For Part 12. Assessment and Evaluation the committee agreed that the EOC, because of its mandated objectives, does a great job at creating a plan, keeping track of the progress, and showing results in achieving its short and long term plans. One criterion where the committee felt like the EOC exceeded was in the area of demonstrating accountability, criterion 12.1.2, receiving an average score rating of 4. The discussion was about the EOC having a presence in Denver for over 40 years which can only demonstrate accountability and effectiveness.

Additionally, as a department at CCD, the EOC is constantly evaluated and to make sure objectives are on track to be completed. This by submitting monthly reports to the office of Student Development and Retention.

Initially, it was determined that criterion 12.7.5 did not apply to the EOC's scope of work. After some discussion, however, the committee agreed that the EOC exceeds (receiving an average score rating of 4) on improving students' persistence and success by educating and assisting them in accessing and staying in higher education. Participants build a support network by being connected to the EOC and having someone guide them as they progress on their educational journey.

**Judgment of Performance**

IDENTIFY AREAS OF STRENGTH (4-Exceeds – 5-Exemplary)

Part 1: Mission	Part 2: Program	Part 3: Organization and Leadership	Part 4: Human Resources	Part 5: Ethics	Part 6: Law, Policy and Governance	Part 7: Diversity, Equity and Access	Part 8: Institutional and External	Part 9: Financial Resources	Part 10: Technology	Part 11: Facilities and Equipment	Part 12: Assessment and Evaluation
1.3.3	2.2 2.4.2 2.4.3	3.2.1 2.2.2 3.3.3 3.5.4 3.7	4.9		6.4	7.1 7.3.1 7.3.3 7.3.4 7.3.7 7.3.8 7.3.10	8.1.1 8.1.4 8.1.5 8.2	9.4	10.1 10.4 10.6.1	11.3.1	12.1.2 12.7.5

AREAS OF MEETS STANDARDS (3-Meets – 3.99-Meets)

Part 1: Mission	Part 2: Program	Part 3: Organization and Leadership	Part 4: Human Resources	Part 5: Ethics	Part 6: Law, Policy and Governance	Part 7: Diversity, Equity and Access	Part 8: Institutional and External	Part 9: Financial Resources	Part 10: Technology	Part 11: Facilities and Equipment	Part 12: Assessment and Evaluation
1.1	2.1.1	3.1.1	4.1	5.1	6.1.1	7.1.2	8.1.2	9.1	10.2	11.1.1	12.1.1
1.3.2	2.1.2	3.1.2	4.2.1	5.2	6.1.2	7.1.3	8.1.3	9.2.1	10.3	11.1.2	12.1.3
1.3.4	2.1.3	3.1.3	4.2.2	5.3	6.1.3	7.2	8.3.1	9.2.2	10.5	11.2.1	12.1.4
1.4	2.3.1	3.1.4	4.2.3	5.4.1	6.1.4	7.3.2	8.3.2	9.3	10.6.2	11.2.2	12.2.1
	2.3.2	3.2.3	4.3.2	5.4.2	6.1.5	7.3.5	8.3.3		10.6.3	11.3.2	12.2.2
	2.3.4	3.2.4	4.3.4	5.4.3	6.1.6	7.3.6	8.3.4		10.7	11.3.3	12.2.3
	2.3.5	3.2.5	4.3.5	5.4.4	6.1.7	7.3.9			10.8.1	11.4	12.2.4
	2.4.1	3.2.6	4.4.1	5.4.5	6.1.8	7.4			10.8.2	11.5	12.3.1
	2.4.4	3.3.1	4.4.2	5.4.7	6.1.9				10.8.3	11.6	12.3.2
	2.4.5	3.3.2	4.5.1	5.4.8	6.2.1				10.8.4		12.3.3
	2.4.6	3.3.4	4.5.2	5.5.1	6.2.2				10.9		12.4
	2.6	3.4.1	4.6	5.5.2	6.2.3				10.10		12.5
	2.7	3.4.2	4.7.1	5.5.3	6.2.4				10.11		12.6
		3.4.3	4.7.2	5.6	6.3						12.7.1
		3.4.4	4.7.3	5.7							12.7.2
		3.4.5	4.8.1								12.7.3
		3.4.6	4.8.2								12.7.4
		3.4.7	4.8.3								12.8
		3.5.1	4.8.4								
		3.5.2									

		3.5.3 3.5.5 3.5.6 3.6.1 3.6.2 3.6.3 3.8								
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

IDENTIFY AREAS OF WEAKNESS NEED IMPROVEMENT

Part 12: Assessment and Evaluation	
Part 11: Facilities and Equipment	
Part 10: Technology	
Part 9: Financial Resources	
Part 8: Institutional and External	
Part 7: Diversity, Equity and Access	
Part 6: Law, Policy and Governance	
Part 5: Ethics	
Part 4: Human Resources	4.3.1 4.3.3
Part 3: Organization and Leadership	
Part 2: Program	2.3.3
Part 1: Mission	1.2.1 1.2.2 1.3.1

FILL IN NUMBER CORRELATING TO JUDGEMENT AND FILL IN RATING (STRENGTH, MEETS, ETC).

CAS Component Area

CAS Component Area	Judgment	Rating (average)
Part 1: Mission	Meets	3.04
Part 2: Program	Meets	3.43
Part 3: Organization and Leadership	Meets	3.55
Part 4: Human Resources	Meets	3.36
Part 5: Ethics	Meets	3.04
Part 6: Law, Policy and Governance	Meets	3.31
Part 7: Diversity, Equity and Access	Meets	3.75
Part 8: Institutional and External Relations	Meets	3.66
Part 9: Financial Resources	Meets	3.34
Part 10: Technology	Meets	3.33
Part 11: Facilities and Equipment	Meets	3.40
Part 12: Assessment and Evaluation	Meets	3.51

Prioritized Action Plan

1. FIRST ACTION ITEM-DESCRIBE ACTION PLAN, BULLET MAIN POINTS, WHO WILL COMPLETE, AND DEADLINE/DATE.

Mission:

1. 1.1. and 1.3.1. The EOC’s mission will be reviewed on the EOC’s annual retreat. This to have the EOC’s mission to reflect the services provided (including completion) and be better aligned with CCD’s mission.
  - EOC Annual retreats for this year will be in October – To be completed by the EOC Director
2. 1.2.2. An EOC mission folder will be created where a historical record of the EOC mission will be saved.
  - EOC Annual mission revision will be completed during the annual EOC retreat in October – To be completed by the EOC Director

### Program:

3. 2.2. Create an information campaign to inform CCD about the services provided by the EOC. This to focus more on the academic/teaching side.
  - An informational campaign that will start with the beginning of each semester - To be completed by EOC Educational Access Specialist, the EOC Director, EOC Program Specialist, and the EOC Program Assistant.
4. 2.4.6. As more technology becomes available and participants become more knowledgeable about the use of technology, the EOC will develop an online form to help expedite the intake process.
  - An online form will be available by the Spring semester - To be completed by Educational Access Specialist
5. 2.3.3. and 2.3.4. Seek out GED community partnerships to support student learning, development, persistence, success, and create a sense of community for participants.
  - This will be a process that will be ongoing for the EOC - To be completed by the EOC Educational Access Specialists and the EOC Director

### Organization and leadership:

6. 3.3.5. Provide more professional development/scholarly contributions from the EOC professional to the institution/community
  - To be implemented year round - To be completed by all EOC's full time staff members
7. 3.3.1. Implement an internal EOC procedure to manage the recruitment and hiring processes to include TRIO networks.
  - A new procedure will be in place by the end of the calendar year - To be completed by the EOC Program Specialist
8. 3.2.1. Include a brief overview of how Prior Experience points work and how they are part of the EOC five year plan (long term goal) in the EOC annual retreat.
  - EOC Annual retreats for this year will be in October – To be completed by the EOC Director
9. 3.4.1. Implement a departmental procedure in how to proceed when conditions arise that inhibit EOC's mission. A procedure that will guide EOC's full time staff in case the EOC Director is not available to help.
  - This will be completed by the end of the calendar year - To be completed by the EOC Program Specialist and the EOC Director

### Human Resources

10. 4.3.1. Ensure that all personnel folders have copies of all important documents including position descriptions
  - This will be completed by the end of the grant year - To be completed by the EOC Director

### Ethics

11. 5. Will develop a code of ethical standards that will help the EOC get a culture more fitting and fair
- This will be completed by the end of the grant year - To be completed by the EOC Director

### Law, Policy, and Governance:

12. 6.1.4. Create a policy and procedure reviewing process to make sure all policies/procedures are up-to-date and create a historical account of the changes made by creating new versions and keeping past ones for reference.
- This will be completed by the end of the grant year - To be completed by the EOC Program Specialist
13. 6.2.2 and 6.3. Make insurance and legal advice information available to all full time staff members because this information is not readily available
- This will be completed by the end of the grant year - To be completed by the EOC Director and the EOC Program Specialist

### Diversity, Equity, and Access

14. 7.1.1 and 7.2. Add a non-discriminatory statement on the EOC Access Specialist manual to comply with law codes and standards
- This will be completed by the end of the grant year - To be completed by the EOC Director
15. 7.3.3, 7.3.4, and 7.3.6. Create a documentation trail with minutes taken on all office minutes and retreat where ideas and information could be traced back and shared as needed.
- This will be an ongoing processed monitored by the EOC Director

### Institutional and External Relations

16. 8.1.5. Create an information campaign to inform the community about the services provided by the EOC to have a stronger participant/referral system.

### Financial Resources

17. 9.2 develop a written procedure about the process for establishing funding priorities and making changes to help with the continuity of responsible stewardship of resources.
- This will be completed by the end of the calendar year - To be completed by the EOC Program Specialist

### Technology

18. 10.8.1. Implement a statement in the lab sign in sheet to inform participants and users of the Laboratory's technology of their responsibilities.
- This will be completed by the end of the calendar year - To be completed by the EOC Program Specialist

19. 10.11. Develop a referral system for participants who experience negative emotional or psychological consequences from the use of technology.
- This will be completed by the end of the grant year - To be completed by the EOC Program Specialist

Evaluation and Assessment

20. 12.5 and 12.8. the EOC will create a promotional campaign to let stakeholders know about yearly results from the EOC's APR
- This will be completed by the end of the grant year - To be completed by the EOC Director