STRATEGIC LONG RANGE PLAN
2017-2021

Fall 2018 Update
Board Approved, November 15, 2018

College of DuPage
STRATEGIC LONG RANGE PLAN
2017-2021

Fall 2018 Update
Board Approved, November 15, 2018

Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

College of DuPage
425 Fawell Blvd.
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

The mission of College of DuPage is to be a center for excellence in teaching, learning, and cultural experiences by providing accessible, affordable and comprehensive education.
LEADERSHIP

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Deanne Mazzochi, Chairman  Charles Bernstein
Frank Napolitano, Vice Chairman  Daniel Markwell
Christine M. Fenne, Secretary  Joseph C. Wozniak
Alan L. Bennett  Sonia Paul, Student Trustee

CABINET

Dr. Ann Rondeau, President

James Benté, Vice President, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness  John Kness, General Counsel
Dr. Brian Caputo, Vice President Administrative Affairs and Treasurer (CFO)  Mary Ann Millush, Director, Legislative Relations and Special Assistant to the President
Dr. Mark Curtis-Chavez, Provost  Wendy E. Parks, Senior Director Public Relations, Communications and Marketing
Earl Dowling, Vice President, Student Affairs and Institutional Advancement  Linda Sands-Vankerkerk, Vice President, Human Resources Project Hire-Ed
Mia Igyarto, Interim Vice President, Human Resources
### STRATEGIC LONG RANGE PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

#### 2016-2017 Strategic Long Range Plan Advisory Committee
- Jim Benté, (Administration) – Chairman
- Dianne McGuire, (Trustee)
- Tom Carter, (Faculty)
- Ami Chambers, (Managerial)
- Judith Coates, (Managerial)
- Brett Coup, (Administration)
- Michael Dusik, (Adjunct Faculty)
- Jarret Dyer, (Managerial)
- Dennis Emano, (Faculty)
- Lisa Higgins, (Faculty)
- Joanne Ivory, (Administration)
- Saraliz Jimenez, (Managerial)
- Jamie Johnson, (Classified)
- Clarise Kavooras, (Classified)
- Christine Kickels, (Faculty)
- Kathryn Kotowski, (Adjunct Faculty)
- Karen Kuhn, (Administration)
- Deanne Mazzochi, (Trustee)
- Kirk Overstreet, (Administration)
- Mark Pearson, (Faculty)
- Gloria Roark, (Student Trustee)
- Joe Stahl, (Student, SLC)
- Patricia Sowatzke, (Classified)
- Katherine Thompson, (Managerial)
- David Virgilio, (Managerial)
- Andreas Vrettos, (Faculty)
- Eugene Ye, (Administration)

#### 2017-2018 Strategic Long Range Plan Advisory Committee
- Jim Benté (Administration) – Chairman
- Anna Campbell (Faculty)
- Brian Caputo (Administrator)
- Joe DalSanto (Faculty)
- Jarret Dyer (Managerial)
- Theresa Gant-Misher, (Adjunct Faculty)
- Debbie Hasse (Managerial)
- Bob Hayley (Managerial/Ex Officio)
- Chris Johnson (Faculty)
- Safia Khan (SLC President)
- Christine Kickels (Faculty)
- Sue Kerby (Classified)
- Jim Kostecki (Administrator/Ex Officio)
- Kirk Overstreet (Administrator)
- Mark Rudisill (Faculty)
- Antoinette (Toni) Stella (Classified)
- Anthony Walker (Student Trustee)
INTRODUCTION

College of DuPage engages in planning to assure that it is future-oriented in serving our students, community, and other stakeholders. College of DuPage’s strategic long-range planning is a continuous process that guides the future direction of the institution. Specifically, the Strategic Long Range Plan defines the College’s institutional philosophy, mission, vision, core values, long-term goals, and associated strategic objectives.

At College of DuPage, the Strategic Long Range Plan is based on the concept of planning “from the outside-in.” Therefore, the Strategic Long Range Plan is a map for the development and delivery of programs and services that address community challenges and needs.

With approval of the Board of Trustees, the Strategic Long Range Plan sets the College’s strategic direction over a five-year period. Therefore, the purpose of this document is to communicate to College of DuPage employees, students, community, and other stakeholders a reference point for comprehensive long range planning.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Overall stewardship of the strategic planning process is the responsibility of the Vice President for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, who coordinates the timeline and leads the Strategic Long Range Plan Advisory Committee (SLRPAC).

SLRPAC membership includes at least five full-time faculty, one adjunct faculty, two administrators, two classified staff, the Student Trustee, and a member of the Student Leadership Council. In addition, the Budget Manager and Director of Research and Analytics serve as ex officio members.

On an annual basis, the SLRPAC:
- Conducts or revises a comprehensive Environment Scan (E-scan).
- Reviews relevant surveys and other institutional data sets, which summarize the internal and external environment.
- Updates the SWOT analysis, which identifies strategic challenges and advantages.
- Recommends Strategic Long Range Plan modifications to the President, Cabinet and Board of Trustees for review and approval.

On an annual basis, the Vice President for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, in collaboration with all Cabinet Officers, develops the College’s Annual Action Plan, which drives the College’s Annual Action Plan.

To ensure that the College’s actions are consistent with the SLRP, the Vice President for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness coordinates a formal Quarterly Action Plan review by Cabinet. Based on the review, the Cabinet is accountable for taking the appropriate actions to ensure that the desired outcomes are achieved.

At the end of each fiscal year, the Vice President for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness develops and publishes an Institutional Outcomes Report that details the accomplishments of the College.
ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN TRENDS

HIGHEST IMPACT ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN TRENDS
Seventy-four total trends were identified in eight taxonomies (Competition, Demographic, Economic, Education, Labor Force, Politics, Social Values/Lifestyle and Technology). The following 17 were identified as having the highest impact on the communities served by College of DuPage.

COMPETITION

Partnerships with Feeder Schools
As higher education institutions recognize the significant role they play in the quality of our nation’s middle and secondary schools, efforts are increasing to build sustaining and mutually reinforcing partnerships with feeder schools.

DEMOGRAPHIC

Poverty Level in DuPage County
Between 2005 and 2011, the percentage of DuPage County residents living under the federal poverty level increased steadily. Then, between 2001 and 2013, the poverty level declined slightly. However, in 2014, the poverty level saw another spike.

Ethnic diversity in the Population of DuPage County
Underrepresented populations in DuPage County steadily increased since 1990 and are projected to continue increasing through 2020 and beyond.

EDUCATION

Underprepared Students Despite Implementation of Common Core
As the number of underprepared students continues to increase, community colleges will continue to play a significant role in serving this population.

Underprepared Students Increasingly Attend Community Colleges
As the number of underprepared students continues to increase, community colleges will continue to play a significant role in serving this population.

LABOR FORCE

Demand for Healthcare Workers
As the population ages, the demand for healthcare workers will continue through 2024.

Shortage of Middle-skill Workers
Between 2010 and 2020, 48 percent of jobs will require Middle-skills. Jobs that require Middle-skills require more than a high school credential, but less than a bachelor’s degree. Examples, include electricians, dental hygienists, and paralegals. In Illinois, the Bureau of Labor Statistics is showing a shortage of Middle-skill workers.

POLITICS

Accountability in Higher Education
Increasing state and federal attention continues to focus on accountability in postsecondary education.

Affordability in Higher Education
Tuition costs are out-pacing government funding for postsecondary student aid, with the greatest impact on low-income students who may be unable to afford college.

Higher Education Funding in Illinois
The state’s failure to properly manage funds continues to have a negative impact on Higher Education. This failure will ultimately change institutional operating procedures.
SOCIAL VALUES/LIFESTYLE
Digital Technologies Affect Learning and Careers
The use of existing digital technology for engagement and enhancement of learning will continue to expand as well as impact future careers.

Longer Life Expectancy
People in the United States are living longer, retiring later, and pursuing multiple careers. Therefore, additional education or training will be required.

TECHNOLOGY
Increased Demand for Technology Skills and Training
Given the rate of sustained rapid technological advancement, there is an ongoing need for increased base-level technology skills, continued technology training, and professional development.

Increased use of Mobile Devices Leads to New Education Opportunities and Strategies.
The transformative potential of mobile devices and applications will fuel change in the way college course are created and delivered.
**STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, OPPORTUNITIES, AND THREATS (SWOT)**

**MOST SIGNIFICANT SWOT ANALYSIS FACTORS**

SWOT analysis is a strategic planning method that is used to evaluate the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats facing the College. The aim of the analysis is to identify the most significant internal and external factors that are important to developing, implementing and achieving College of DuPage’s strategic goals and strategic objectives.

- Strengths are **internal** characteristics that give the College a competitive advantage.
- Weakness are **internal** characteristics that may place the College at a competitive disadvantage.
- Opportunities are **external** factors that the College can leverage to create value for our students and community or give the College a better competitive advantage.
- Threats are factors in the **external** environment that could cause trouble for the College or hinder us in advancing our mission and achieving our vision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>CHALLENGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRENGTHS</strong></td>
<td><strong>W</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Accessibility</td>
<td>1. Systematic Use of Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Comprehensive Academics, Programs and Services</td>
<td>3. Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) Ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Affordability and Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Academic Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPPORTUNITIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>T</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Cost Effective Transfer Preparation, Certificates, and Degrees</td>
<td>1. Public Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alternative Learning Options</td>
<td>2. Underprepared Incoming Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Changing District Profile</td>
<td>3. Illinois Pension Liability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Skills Gap in the Workplace</td>
<td>5. Student Mental Health Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Competition from out-of-state institutions of higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Decreasing in-district high school graduates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CORE STATEMENTS

INSTITUTIONAL PHILOSOPHY
College of DuPage believes in the power of teaching and learning. We endorse the right of each person to accessible and affordable opportunities to learn and affirm the innate value of the pursuit of knowledge and its application to life. Our primary commitment is to facilitate and support student success in learning.

College of DuPage is committed to excellence. We seek quality in all that we do. To ensure quality, we are committed to continual assessment and self-evaluation.

College of DuPage values diversity. We seek to reflect and meet the education needs of the residents of our large, multicultural district. To this end, we recognize the need for freedom of expression and that facts, arguments, and judgments should be presented, tested, debated, challenged, deliberated, and probed for their objective truth in the marketplace of ideas. Every College individual owes a duty to exercise his or her own individual judgment; and to permit others to exercise that same freedom of conscience.

We recognize the importance of embracing individual differences and cultures and value the contributions made to the College by people of all ethnic and cultural backgrounds. We affirm our role as a catalyst for promoting dialogue and tolerance on issues supporting the common good.

College of DuPage promotes participation in planning and decision making. We support participatory governance and the involvement of the College community in the development of a shared vision. We believe that all students, employees and residents can make meaningful contributions within a respectful environment that encourages meaningful discourse. We strive to build an organizational climate in which freedom of expression is defended and civility is affirmed. College of DuPage is a benefit to students and our community. The needs of our students and community are central to all we do.

VISION
College of DuPage will be the primary college district residents choose for high quality education.

MISSION
The mission of College of DuPage is to be a center for excellence in teaching, learning, and cultural experience by providing accessible, affordable, and comprehensive education.

VALUES:

INTEGRITY
We expect the highest standard of moral character and ethical behavior.

HONESTY
We expect truthfulness and trustworthiness.

RESPECT
We expect courtesy and dignity in all interpersonal interactions.

RESPONSIBILITY
We expect fulfillment of obligations and accountability.
GOALS AND STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

Goal 1: Accountability
   College of DuPage is committed to being transparent, answerable, and responsible to all stakeholders. To accomplish this we will:

Strategic Objectives
1.1 Exceed the accreditation requirements of the Higher Learning Commission and the other program specific accreditations and certifications (e.g., Accreditation Commission for Education in Nursing).
1.2 Develop, analyze and use meaningful metrics to demonstrate how well College of DuPage is educating students, including transfer and employment placement rates.
1.3 Ensure accuracy, integrity and reliability of data and of the data management system.
1.4 Integrate institutional data sources in order to track daily operations and overall organizational performance, including progress on achieving strategic objectives and annual targets.
1.5 Improve internal controls that create an auditable trail of evidence in order to promote efficiency and effectiveness of operations, ensure the safeguarding of assets, and to enhance fraud prevention and detection.
1.6 Ensure compliant and transparent processes that will promote stakeholder confidence and trust.
1.7 Create a fear-free culture where employees and other stakeholders feel compelled to speak up when they witness potential acts of wrongdoing or unethical conduct.

Goal 2: Value Added Education
   College of DuPage is committed to ensuring the courses and programs we provide deliver facts, experience, skills, and intellectual growth to students and the community. College of DuPage is committed to going beyond standard expectations and providing something more to the students and communities we serve. To accomplish this we will:

Strategic Objectives
2.1 Empower students to design/customize their education to meet their specific educational goals and needs.
2.2 Ensure that educational descriptions are clear (including required prerequisites), accurate, and that transferability is clearly stated.
2.3 Review, revise and develop curricular offerings to assure high quality education and alignment with the current and emerging employee skill needs of local businesses and employers.
2.4 Add additional and strengthen current academic transfer partnerships agreements (e.g., 3+1, 2+2) and create greater opportunities for students to earn college credit while still in high school (e.g. Early College initiative, dual credit).
2.5 Support student success by addressing student identified (e.g. Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory survey) issues with academic advising, with a focus on the academic advisor’s knowledge about programs at College of DuPage and transfer requirements at other institutions.
2.6 Support student completion within 150 percent of normal time (e.g., three years for an associate degree) by implementing a guided pathways approach to programs and degrees.

2.7 Expand efforts to attract and provide resources to assist nontraditional students to enroll in credit courses, especially those in the 55-plus age group.

2.8 Continue to improve Adult Basic Education (ABE)/High School Equivalency (SHE)/English Language Acquisition (ELA), etc., with a focus on transitioning students from non-credit to success in college degree and certificate programs of study.

2.9 Grow credit enrollment by enhancing and being known for providing exceptional educational and cultural experience to students (e.g., study abroad programs, learning technologies, co-curricular activities).

Goal 3: Student Centeredness
College of DuPage is committed to methods of teaching that shift the focus of instruction from the teacher to the student. To accomplish this we will:

Strategic Objectives:

3.1 Enhance and expand opportunities to support student learning needs, including helping students identify a course of study, recognize their specific goals, and assist them to overcome their weaknesses.

3.2 Create awareness among employees concerning student mental health and disability issues and adopt College policies and procedures to ensure they meet the needs of this population.

3.3 Develop innovative ways to gather quantitative and qualitative data from students about their needs and act upon that input.

3.4 Develop ways to better share data concerning student needs and success methods across all areas of the College.

3.5 Create effective communication pathways from the student, to the faculty, to the rest of the College.

3.6 Ensure that current College policies and procedures lead to improved student outcomes.

3.7 Foster a culture of intellectual expectations, achievement, and engagement for students.

3.8 Leverage faculty expertise to develop and implement original content/learning modules that can be scaled to meet current and emerging student educational goals and local employer needs.

Goal 4: Equality and Inclusiveness
College of DuPage is committed to ensuring that all stakeholders are involved in setting institutional direction; that their perspectives are heard and valued and their needs are understood and addressed. To accomplish this we will:

Strategic Objectives:

4.1 Implement methods (e.g., Personal Assessment of the College Environment survey) to assess the institutional culture and climate and develop specific actions related to identified opportunities for improvement.

4.2 Incentivize employees to utilize College of DuPage resources (facilities, services, and offerings).

4.3 Expand the availability and use of professional development funds for all employees.
4.4 Support cross-departmental knowledge exchange for all constituencies (starting with on-boarding and continuing throughout the employee’s career).

4.5 Expand the Shared Governance Council to drive the culture so that it is inclusive of people, processes, inputs, ideas, thoughts, beliefs, and perspectives.

4.6 Continue to foster a culture of inclusiveness for students, employees, and the community through programs, activities, policies, and procedures.

4.7 Develop and implement programs and services to enhance institutional diversity and global engagement, including recruitment and support for international students.

Goal 5: Relationships
College of DuPage is committed to cooperating and collaborating with all stakeholders in order to advance mutual interests. To accomplish this we will:

Strategic Objectives

5.1 Increase College of DuPage’s exposure and partnerships in District 502 by utilizing existing facilities in cities, towns, and village (e.g., municipal centers, libraries).

5.2 Develop a Learning Network by leveraging the off-campus centers and other community locations for the delivery of College programs and services.

5.3 Identify and implement optimal methods of communicating with and engaging all College stakeholders (e.g., alumni business leaders, elected officials).

5.4 Utilize internal resources to develop a new College of DuPage brand and implement a communications plan that considers the preferences and needs of students and other internal and external stakeholders.

5.5 Modernize College of DuPage’s website and other interfaces to improve functionality, information accessibility, and user friendliness.

5.6 Identify, assess, and enhance College of DuPage’s community outreach activities, with a focus on the visual and performing arts.

5.7 Support collaboration, creation, and learning by promoting and providing College of DuPage resources to all District 502 residents in DuPage, Will and Cook Counties (e.g., Center for Entrepreneurship).

5.8 Rebuild public confidence in college of DuPage’s institutional integrity through increased engagements by College staff, faculty, and Board members with community organizations (e.g., Rotary, Chambers, Libraries) with a focus on assessing and meeting community needs through the College’s programs and services.

5.9 Continue to “spotlight” and promote faculty through social media, live events, etc., in order to give students and other stakeholders insight into the quality of instruction and programs provided by College faculty.

Goal 6: Innovativeness
College of DuPage is committed to making meaningful change that enhances organization effectiveness and adds new value for stakeholders. To accomplish this we will:

Strategic Objectives

6.1 Foster an innovative culture and climate by encouraging (risk-free) experimentation and sharing of best practices by all employees.
6.2 Develop a process to systematically seek student perspectives and ideas in order to enhance the student experience.

6.3 Leverage College technology in innovative ways for the benefit of students and the community at large.

6.4 Provide professional development opportunities to promote innovative ideas and solutions College-wide.

6.5 Support cross-departmental knowledge exchange for all constituencies (starting with on-boarding and continuing throughout the employee’s career).

Goal 7: Financial Stewardship
College of DuPage is committed to the careful and responsible management of the resources entrusted to its care. To accomplish this we will:

Strategic Objectives

7.1 Keep tuition and property taxes as affordable as possible without impairing the quality or integrity of College programs and services.

7.2 Develop a financial model that identifies new revenue sources while eliminating the reliance on State of Illinois apportionment funds.

7.3 Educate stakeholders on the role, benefits, and value of community colleges, with a focus on College of DuPage’s value and stewardship of taxpayer dollars.

7.4 Increase philanthropic giving in order to increase access to education and to enhance cultural opportunities for the community.

7.5 Investigate and act upon opportunities to partner with co-branded programs and services with other Illinois community colleges.

7.6 Increase the active involvement of alumni in giving of their time and resources to support the College of DuPage Foundation mission.

7.7 Explore and, if feasible, incentivize students (e.g., reduced tuition) for taking courses during non-peak times.

Goal 8: Infrastructure
College of DuPage is committed to maintaining, improving, and developing structures, systems, and facilities necessary for the delivery of high quality education and meaningful cultural events. To accomplish this we will:

Strategic Objectives:

8.1 Use faculty and other stakeholder input and appropriate institutional and benchmark data to analyze and understand current space capacity and utilization, and further develop and implement a detailed Facility Master Plan with a focus on future academic and student support needs.

8.2 Unify the west and east sides of the Glen Ellyn campus, creating a pedestrian friendly crossing and a “one campus” feel.

8.3 Investigate the need for additional Centers with focus on how they would impact student preferences, accessibility, and needs and enhance a Learning Network that advances student success.

8.4 Revise, integrate and implement the Information Technology Strategic Plan in order to enhance student success, maximize institutional effectiveness, and ensure hardware and software are reliable, secure (from data breaches) and are user friendly to students, employees, and other stakeholders.
APPENDIX A
Key Strategic Initiatives
KEY STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

Strategic planning at College of DuPage (COD) is a continuous process that guides the direction of the institution and provides quantitative evidence of progress made towards advancing our mission and achieving our vision. The Annual (Action) Plan is the tactical component of the strategic planning process. The Annual (Action) Plan defines the strategies and actions under each Cabinet Officer that must be accomplished within a fiscal year. The Fiscal Year 2019 Annual (Action) Plan can be found at https://cod.edu/about/office_of_the_president/planning_and_reporting_documents/pdf/planning/annual-plan.pdf.

Within the Strategic Long Range Plan and Annual (Action) Plan, there are several high-impact initiatives involving numerous areas of the College. Please see below several of those initiatives.

Guided Pathways

Although a debated metric, in recent years graduation rates and student success overall has come under significant scrutiny by the federal Department of Education and regional accreditors. For example, in 2016, the Council of Regional Accreditation Commissions (C-RAC) undertook a study looking at graduation rates at four-and two-year institutions. A report summarizing the study was issued in February 2018. Among other things, the report noted: “while many high-and low-graduation rate institutions are introducing far-reaching changes to improve student outcomes, there is more work to be done that will require a concerted effort throughout the higher education community.”

Dr. Gellman-Danley, President of the Higher Learning Commission and current C-RAC Chairman stated: “Our nation must do a better job at ensuring more of our students not only enroll, but also complete their college education. As regional accreditors, we fully understand our important role in helping institutions improve, monitoring progress, and holding institutions accountable.”

The Higher Learning Commission’s recently adopted strategic plan also reflects an increased focus on student success and increased transparency so that students and those closest to them will know better the value of regional accreditation, whether their aims and purposes for higher learning are rooted in liberal education, career training or a combination of these.

Based on research by the Community College Research Center, students are more likely to graduate on time if they have structured pathways to guide them. Having an academic plan, a clear idea of which program and courses to choose, and timely support such as advising can help them stay on track. Over the past several years, the concept of guided pathways has spread rapidly through community colleges and four-year institutions in many states and districts. The guided pathways model is based on coherent and easy-to-follow college-level programs of study that are aligned with requirements for success in employment and at the next stage of education.

Therefore, College of DuPage is redesigning and re-aligning programs, support services, and instructional approaches to help students to clarify their goals, choose and enter pathways that will achieve those goals, stay on those pathways, and master knowledge and skills that will enable them to advance in the labor market and successfully pursue further education.

Project Hire-Ed

A recent CNBC survey of company presidents and CFOs revealed that 46 percent believe the workforce is not developing the proper skills businesses require. Additionally, the National Federation of Independent Business found that as of first-quarter 2017, 45 percent of small businesses were unable to
find qualified applicants to fill job openings.

Furthermore, in a 2015 JPMorgan Chase Report, Growing Skills for a Growing Chicago, which focused on Cook, DuPage, Kane, Kendall, Lake, McHenry, and Will Counties, the following observations were made:

- The Chicago metropolitan region’s economy is gaining momentum and is soon projected to recover all the jobs lost over the previous decade. The region’s diverse array of high-demand industries and large share of middle-skill jobs are expected to fuel the growth.
- Forty-four percent of jobs in the Chicago region are in middle-skill occupations – jobs that require more than a high school credential but less than a Bachelor’s degree.
- Of those middle-skill jobs, half are what this report refers to as “target middle-skill jobs” – high-demand occupations that also pay a living wage.
- Some employers in the Chicago metropolitan region are having difficulty filling certain middle-skill positions.
- World Business Chicago has identified the shortage of middle-skill workers as a major regional hurdle.
- Approximately 60% of job openings require middle-skill credentials, but only 54% of the region’s workforce have the necessary education levels – reflecting the mismatch between the education and skills that workers currently have and the skills required by the region’s emerging industries.

The skills gap is hurting national and local competitiveness and impeding economic growth. College of DuPage wants to work with business leaders to develop strategies to close the gap in both white collar and industrial or technical areas, and ensure our local workforce is prepared to perform. COD has a long history of partnering with employers to develop educational programs to meet changing workforce needs.

Therefore, Project Hire-Ed is focused on working with employers to determine what jobs they are having difficulty filling and where their talent pipelines need help. Once the gaps are identified, the College will work with respective employers to build a bridge between hiring and education.

**Innovation DuPage**

Our economy needs more entrepreneurs who can be agile, flexible, creative, and keep pace with an increasingly complex world where technology is a growing part of every business, where industries are merging, and where yesterday’s approaches will not work.

College of DuPage has 50 years of successful support of economic and workforce development. For example, in FY15 and FY16, COD’s Center for Entrepreneurship helped small and medium-sized businesses close $192 million in contracts, $4.7 million in exports and $9.5 million in capital loans. Since 1994, the Center has supported over $1.2 billion in economic development.

Building on a history of results, Innovation DuPage is a cooperative venture promoting business growth and job creation. It involves partners from higher education and the public and private sectors working together to guide entrepreneurs, small businesses and new companies on the path to success.

Modeled after other effective innovation centers like Chicago’s 1871 and Washington State’s Business Accelerator at Everett Community College, Innovation DuPage serves as both a business incubator and accelerator, connecting small businesses with the necessary resources to thrive and stimulate job growth.

Innovation DuPage provides a variety of opportunities for participants who utilize the center, from idea sharing and mentoring to workshops and workspace access. Innovation DuPage will harness the strengths
of all its partners to nurture and guide the next generation of entrepreneurs.

Innovation DuPage mirrors the diversity of regional industry clusters and the College’s breadth of programming to focus significant resources and expertise from across dozens of partner institutions on the small companies that drive our economy, grow jobs and create tomorrow’s business solutions. The Board of Trustees at College of DuPage, Choose DuPage, Glenn Ellyn and DuPage County have all aligned in support of this economic development initiative.

Facilities Master Plan
Every five years, each Illinois community college district is required to submit an application for recognition in accordance with the provisions of Section 2-15 of the Community College Act. As a part of that submission, a current (within five years) Facilities Master Plan (FMP) is required. The FMP will be used as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illinois Community College Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RECOGNITION STANDARDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 - 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>AUTHORITY</th>
<th>INDICATORS OF COMPLIANCE/QUALITY</th>
<th>ITEMS TO BE EVALUATED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FINANCE/FACILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Financial Planning: Financial planning for current and future operations shall provide for both a sound educational program and the prudent use of public funds. | ICCB Rule 1501.502 (Financial Planning) Sections 3-33.5, 33.6 of the Act (Working Cash) | **Indicators of Compliance:**  
  - Existence of long-range plans and contingency plans for reduced state or local tax revenues  
  - Monies in the working cash fund principal have not been used as current revenue.  
  - Interest transferred from working cash fund to education or operations and maintenance funds authorized through separate board resolution.  
  - **Indicators of Quality:**  
    - Trends in past and current operating balances  
    - Magnitudes and trends in indebtedness  
    - Review and integration of long-range financial plans into overall college mission  
    - **Review integration of facilities master plan into overall college mission and strategic planning process.**  
    - All college departments are included in the financial planning and accountability process.  
    - Board received report on financial conditions of the institution no less than once every three months. | **• Annual Budgets**  
  - **External Audits**  
  - **Uniform Financial Statements**  
  - **Board Minutes**  
  - **Strategic Planning documents**  
  - **District Financial Records**  
  - **Facilities Master Plan**  
  - **Long-range Financial Planning Model** |
| 4. Facilities a. Approval of Construction Projects: The expenditure of funds for the purchase, construction, remodeling, or rehabilitation of physical facilities...shall have prior ICCB approval. Changes in budget/scope to approved construction projects shall be submitted for approval.... When completed, each project shall be certified.... | 110 ILCS-805/2-12c ICCB Rule 1501.602 ICCB Rule 1501.605 ICCB Rule 1501.609 | **Indicators of Compliance:**  
  - College projects, including locally funded; protection, health, and safety; and state-funded projects have received local board and/or ICCB approval prior to construction, as required.  
  - **Existence of a current facilities master plan to support requested projects** | **• ICCB Capital Projects Records**  
  - **District Construction Projects Files**  
  - **Board Minutes**  
  - **District Financial Records**  
  - **Campus Facilities**  
  - **Facilities Master Plan** |
As part of the Guided Pathways initiative, the College will hire a number of Student Services Specialists who will be responsible for a caseload of assigned degree or certificate seeking students. Student Services Specialists will monitor students' progress through various College software and provide on-going support including the referral of students to College resources as needed. The FMP will address additional physical space needs for the Student Services Specialists and other staff related to the Guided pathways initiative.

**Technology Enhancements**

Gretchen Schmidt, executive director of the Pathways Project at the American Association of Community Colleges, recently gave an interview to Ellucian. One of the topics she addressed was the role of the Student Information System in Guided Pathways. In the interview, Dr. Schmidt noted the “this (Guided Pathways) is about students being on academic plans, and advisors and students being able to access the academic plan to see the student’s progress toward their academic goals, what they have left to take, and when it is being offered. Students and advisors also need to know that when students make decisions that take them off-plan, there’s a trigger and intervention.

Therefore, an RFP was developed and a team is assessing various technological solutions that will assist in keeping students of their academic plans.

**Higher Learning Commission**

The Higher Learning Commission Board of Trustees removed COD’s sanction of probation at their Nov. 2-3, 2017 meeting. As a condition of the sanction of probation being removed, the HLC Board of Trustees required COD to submit an Interim Report by no later than May 15, 2018. The report was to focus on:

- A description of a clear policy for awarding credit that addresses all delivery formats employed by the College, including an explanation of how credit hours are calculated for distance learning formats.
- A description of consistent processes and practices that demonstrate adherence to the course outcomes as listed in the Active Course File by full-time and part-time faculty, regardless of course delivery format.

The HLC reviewer noted, “The College of DuPage (COD) interim report is clearly written, organized effectively, and thorough in its presentation. In support of the report’s narrative, the institution has developed extensive appendices that contain a range of materials including, among other items, pertinent Board of Trustee documents, a series of public communications, and the institution’s HLC Response Planning Committee agenda and minutes.” The HLC further acknowledged the efforts of the College and will not require additional reporting on these matters.

In addition to the Interim Report, the HLC is requiring the College to host a focused visit, with accompanying report no later than September 2019. The report and focus visit will address:

**Core Component 2.A and 5.B**

- Documented evidence of the application of new and revised Board of Trustee policies and procedures. (Accountability: M. Millush, J. Benté)
- Documented evidence of compliance with open meeting laws per Illinois statute. (Accountability: J. Kness, J. Benté)
- Documented evidence of continued training for board members on matters of ethics, open meetings laws, and fiduciary responsibilities. (Accountability: M. Millush, J. Benté)
- Documented evidence of continued professional relationships within the board members and college employees. (Accountability: Dr. Rondeau, J. Benté)
• Documented evidence that the College is using results from an anonymous climate survey of College employees to improve the campus climate and reduce perceptions of fear and mistrust. (Accountability: Dr. Rondeau, J. Benté)

Core Component 4.B
• Documented evidence that all career and technical programs have developed assessment plans, and are assessing program learning outcomes, and are using the assessment data to inform decisions. (Accountability: Dr. Curtis-Chavez)
• Documented evidence that student-learning outcomes are communicated and are available to all constituents. (Accountability: Dr. Curtis-Chavez)
• Documented evidence that aggregated results of the assessment of general education informs curricular change. (Accountability: Dr. Curtis-Chavez)
• Documented evidence of progress and assessment that demonstrates how co-curricular activities support and enhance the educational objectives of the College. (Accountability: Dr. Curtis-Chavez)

Core Component 4.C and 5.D
• Documented evidence of how data and metrics inform decisions and initiatives adopted by the College. (Accountability: Dr. Curtis-Chavez, Dr. Caputo, J. Benté)
• Documented evidence that the College is setting internal targets of performance for operational areas of the College and is using data to measure success in those areas, especially regarding program targets for persistence and completion. (Accountability: Dr. Curtis-Chavez, Dr. Caputo, J. Benté)
• Documented evidence of infrastructure to support data collection and usage for accreditation purposes. (Accountability: J. Benté)

Public Service Institute at College of DuPage
The goal of the Public Service Institute (PSI) is to provide professional development and comprehensive training for the ongoing success of local government agencies, including local towns, cities, villages, and DuPage Country, along with their employees. Created together with the DuPage Mayors and Managers, this program delivers best practices in civil service management while connecting employees from across the region to share, learn and promote improved operations.

Leadership Excellence and Development
PSI has developed programming focused on key topics and best practices in public service leadership. Each term, one or more of the following series is offered:
• Engaging Employees I and II
• Leading Teams I and II
• Leadership Excellence I and II

Elected Officials Training at PSI
In response to an identified need, PSI is developing training specific to the jobs of elected officials. In order to be responsive to specific needs, elected officials are encouraged to complete an on-line survey on the College’s web site under Public Service Institute.

Academic and Student Affairs Alignment
With the introduction of a Provost, Academic and Student Affairs have been aligned under the under single leadership. Specifically, the Provost will direct the work of the Academic and Student Affairs leadership team, promoting an effective interrelationship in blending both Academic and Student Affairs
in support of implementing a Guided pathways Model.

The Provost Office consist of:

- The Provost
- An Assistant Provost of Student Affairs
- An Assistant Provost of Instruction
- Two Associate Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, and
- Support staff

The newly developed Assistant Provost roles will assist in the alignment of the Academic and Student Affairs organizations under the Provost. The intent is to create a cross-functional and collaborative organization aimed at student success and operational efficiency.

Other changes will occur in phases as follows:

- Phase I – effective immediately
  - Biological Sciences, Electro Mechanical and Electronic Technology (including Faculty and Lab Support) become part of the new STEM Division Dean
  - Cosmetology and Real Estate (including Faculty and Staff) become part of the new CE & Public Services Division
- Phase II – effective January 18, 2019
  - Fire Science and EMT-B/ Paramedic (including Faculty and Program Manager) become part of the new CE & Public Services Division
  - Support Staff (including Program Specialists and Administrative Staff) realigned based on division/department needs
- Phase III – date to be determined
  - CIT/CIS (including Faculty and Staff) become part of the STEM Division

**HR Reorganization**

In order to better support the College, the Human Resources Department has reorganized under a Human Resources Partner Model.
APPENDIX B
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STRENGTHS

Strength 1: Accessibility
Overview:
In order to create easy access to educational offerings and services, in addition to the main (Glen Ellyn) campus, COD operates four strategically placed centers in Addison, Carol Stream, Naperville and Westmont.

Specific (select) evidence:
In a 2018 community survey (error margin ± five percent), “location and accessibility” was rated as the College’s second highest strength.

Strength 2: Financial Position
Overview:
The College has been conservatively managed throughout its history and this philosophy continues today. COD’s financial position is sound and steps are taken to ensure continued financial stability.

Specific (select) evidence:
The College has a fund balance of greater than 100 percent.

Among community colleges in Illinois, District 502 has one of the highest equalized assessed valuations per community college student (although the tax cap imposes limits on the amount of tax revenue the College can collect).

In March 2017:

- Moody’s Investors Service affirmed the Colleges Aa1 rating and shifted its outlook from stable to positive. In its rationale, Moody’s, like S&P, cited the College’s strong financial operations and leadership. Moody’s wrote, “The positive outlook reflects the removal of the district’s accreditation from probation as officials have made progress towards improved governance. Additionally considered is the district’s strong financial performance during the state’s budget impasse.”

- Standard & Poor’s has revised the College of DuPage bond rating from “AA” to “AA+” and affirmed its rating outlook of “stable” on the College’s outstanding general obligation bonds. In their rating S&P noted: “The raised rating reflects the College’s continued positive financial operations and its successful implementation of a new governing structure.” S&P further cited the College’s:
  - Participation in the Chicago metropolitan statistical area’s (MSA) deep
and diverse economy, with sizable supporting tax base
  o Very strong incomes and extremely strong market value per capita
  o Very strong financial position with very little reliance on the state of Illinois
  o Low to moderate debt burden

**Strength 3: Comprehensive Academics, Programs, and Services**

**Overview:**
Annually College of DuPage offers a broad scope of educational and cultural programming to approximately 60,000 credit and non-credit students of all ages, as well as to 100,000 patrons of the visual and performing arts.

**Specific (select) evidence:**
As a comprehensive community college, COD meets five key community educational needs through a wide range of programs, degrees, certificates, and services:

- Transfer Education that prepares students for transfer to a four-year institution to pursue a bachelor’s degree.
- Career and Technical Education that prepares students who will graduate with an Associate in Applied Science degree or certificate to directly enter the workforce.
- Developmental Education that provides remedial education for students who are not academically ready to enroll in college-level courses.
- Continuing Education that provides non-credit courses to the community for personal development and enrichment.
- Business Training that provides specialized or customized training and education to local companies for their employees.

COD grants nine degrees: the Associate in Arts, Associate in Science, Associate in Engineering Science, Associate in Applied Science, Associate in General Studies, Associate in Fine Arts in Art, Associate in Fine Arts in Music, Associate in Arts in Teaching Secondary Mathematics, and the Associate in Arts in Teaching Early Childhood Education. In addition to associate degrees, COD offers over 170 certificates in 52 areas of study.

COD provides many services to assist students in making appropriate academic and career plans, addressing other issues and enriching their college experience through co-curricular activities. Key services include:

- Student Counseling and Advising Services
- Center for Access and Accommodations
- Veteran and Military Personnel Student Services
- International Student Services
- The Career Services Center
- Math Assistance Area
- Tutoring Services
• Writing, Reading, and Speech Assistance
• Library/Research Services
• Tuition and Financial Aid Assistance
• Placement Testing
• Honors Program

The McAninch Arts Center (MAC) is a conveniently accessible cultural arts and gathering place in DuPage County. Each season includes more than 200 performances of plays, concerts and lectures offered in the MAC’s theatres and stages, as well as numerous art exhibits in both the Cleve Carney Art Gallery and MAC lobby area. To date the MAC has welcomed more than 1.5 million audience members.

COD is one of the founding members of the Illinois Consortium of International Studies and Programs, which seeks to build and expand international opportunities for community college students. This long-standing membership has resulted in strong relationships with partner institutions around the world, enabling COD to offer a diverse array of programs. Because of its success, COD’s Field and Experiential Learning/Study Abroad/Global Education program is so successful in creating new opportunities for students, the Institute of International Education recently ranked it second among community colleges nationwide for international study opportunities.

COD is a lead partner in Innovation DuPage, an initiative that will significantly impact regional economic development by leveraging public and private partners in support of startup and early-stage business enterprises by connecting them to the knowledge, expert mentors, and resources necessary to succeed.

**Strength 4: Modern Facilities**
**Overview:**
COD provides students and community members with up-to-date, well-maintained facilities.

**Specific (select) evidence:**
Facilities improvement has been an integral part of the College’s strategic planning cycle. COD has received substantial financial support from the community and will have built new facilities or renovated all current facilities within a five-year period. This large-scale facility project was integrated closely with the annual planning cycle and was done to directly support COD educational programs and services. Today, no building on the main Glen Ellyn campus is older than 2008.

**Strength 5: Affordability and Value**
**Overview:**
COD is one of the most affordable colleges in the Midwest.
Specific (select) evidence:
At $4,080 per year for tuition and fees, COD tuition is significantly less than regional competitors such as Northern Illinois University at $12,262, Benedictine at $34,290, North Central College at $38,149, and DePaul University at $38,410.

With the 3+1 degree program, students can earn a Bachelor’s degree from six different partner universities for around $35,000, without ever leaving the COD Glen Ellyn Campus.

From fall 2014 to fall 2018, COD reduced tuition and fees by $9, from $144 to $135 per credit hour. In AY 2019, at $136 per credit hour for tuition and fees, COD will remain below the average cost (approximately $140 per credit hour) for community colleges in Illinois.

In a 2018 community survey (error margin ± five percent) 67 percent of the respondents strongly agreed that COD’s tuition is a good value, and only one percent of the respondents strongly disagreed.

**Strength 6: Academic Partnerships**

Overview:
There is an increasing nationwide focus on developing partnerships between community colleges, high schools, universities, and business and industry entities.

Specific (select) evidence:
Dual credit is defined as a college course taken by a high school student for which the student is granted both college and high school credit. Recognizing the importance of dual credit courses to district high school students, COD has consistently worked with district high schools so that they have the opportunity to offer more dual credit courses. For example, in spring 2018, 14,865 credits were offered in district high schools through dual credit.

COD has 2+2 and enhanced 2+2 partnerships with 20 four-year colleges and universities. These agreements allow COD students to complete two years at COD and another two years at a college/university to complete a bachelor’s degree. An enhanced 2+2, allows a COD student to complete up to 90 semester credits of coursework, mostly general education courses, and then transfer to complete the remaining credits toward a bachelor’s degree at a four-year college/university.

COD has 3+1 partnerships with six universities. These partnerships allow a COD student to take three years of classes at COD, at COD tuition rates, with the fourth year taught by the partner universities on COD’s campus. In addition, the upper-level classes are offered at a significantly reduced tuition rate by partner institutions.
WEAKNESSES

Weakness 1: Systematic Acquisition and Use of Data
Overview:
The College does not systematically collect and use data to identify root causes, prioritize issues, allocate resources, identify targets for improvement and assess the effectiveness of processes and programs.

Specific (select) evidence:
Feedback from the April 2017 Higher Learning Commission site visit noted that while there is a great deal of activity related to collection of data, it is not always apparent how the data informs decisions on the campus or how an understanding of the data drives improvement.

Weakness 2: Systematic Evaluation of Effectiveness for Student Learning
Overview:
The College does not systematically use student outcome data when modifying or improving educational programs and support services.

Specific (select) evidence:
Feedback from the April 2017 Higher Learning Commission site visit noted that on site, and in a review of the college’s documents and records, the HLC site visit team found evidence to confirm that the College has developed a commitment to the assessment of student learning and the monitoring of student achievement to promote continuous improvement. It was further noted that the College has an established program review cycle and annual assessment of student course learning outcomes.

However, the site visit team found that the assessment of student program learning outcomes is limited in career and technical programs and program outcomes are not readily available to students. They also found that assessment of general education outcomes is occurring, but how it is informing decisions for improvement is not clear. The team also noted that the College has a robust set of data to utilize for decision-making, however, utilization of the data for decision-making by individual programs should be enhanced.

Weakness 3: Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) Ratings
Overview:
The College has administered the Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory five times since 2004. With few exceptions, COD ratings have consistently been below the nation mean at a statistically significant level of 0.001.
Specific (select) evidence:
The Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) is a nationally normed tool of Ruffalo Noel Levitz, LLC., that measures student satisfaction and priorities in community colleges. The SSI is well tested with exceptionally high internal reliability as demonstrated by a Cronbach’s coefficient alpha of 0.98 for the satisfaction scores.

The SSI utilizes 70 standardized questions, 6 questions concerning diverse populations, 10 College specific questions and 3 summary questions. Using a seven point Likert scale, students taking the SSI rate each question with respect to importance and satisfaction. The questions are grouped into 12 “Scales.”

The College has administered the Noel Levitz survey five times (approximately every three years) since 2004. The following tables shows the mean difference from the national average for each Scale over the five survey years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>-0.48***</td>
<td>-0.58***</td>
<td>-0.38***</td>
<td>-0.40***</td>
<td>-0.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Services</td>
<td>-0.18***</td>
<td>-0.17***</td>
<td>-0.11***</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions &amp; Financial Aid</td>
<td>-0.43***</td>
<td>-0.49***</td>
<td>-0.40***</td>
<td>-0.35***</td>
<td>-0.35***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Climate</td>
<td>-0.35***</td>
<td>-0.36***</td>
<td>-0.31***</td>
<td>-0.27***</td>
<td>-0.16***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Support Services</td>
<td>-0.34***</td>
<td>-0.34***</td>
<td>-0.20***</td>
<td>-0.19***</td>
<td>-0.15***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for the Individual</td>
<td>-0.40***</td>
<td>-0.44***</td>
<td>-0.33***</td>
<td>-0.30***</td>
<td>-0.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Effectiveness</td>
<td>-0.34***</td>
<td>-0.31***</td>
<td>-0.24***</td>
<td>-0.22***</td>
<td>-0.09***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Effectiveness</td>
<td>-0.29***</td>
<td>-0.31***</td>
<td>-0.27***</td>
<td>-0.17***</td>
<td>-0.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness to Diverse Populations</td>
<td>-0.16***</td>
<td>-0.19***</td>
<td>-0.21***</td>
<td>-0.15***</td>
<td>-0.15***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>-0.46***</td>
<td>-0.48***</td>
<td>-0.15***</td>
<td>-0.07*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Excellence</td>
<td>-0.33***</td>
<td>-0.37***</td>
<td>-0.25***</td>
<td>-0.21***</td>
<td>-0.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Centeredness</td>
<td>-0.34***</td>
<td>-0.38***</td>
<td>-0.39***</td>
<td>-0.35***</td>
<td>-0.22***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Difference statistically significant at the 0.05  
**Difference statistically significant at the 0.01 level  
***Difference statistically significant at the 0.001 level

The College also participates in the National Community College Benchmarking Project (NCCBP). Since 2004, over 400 two-year institutions have participated in the NCCBP data-collection and reporting process. NCCBP is the largest community college comparative database in the nation. Among numerous other metrics, many community colleges also report their Noel Levitz SSI scores. In 2017, approximately 100 community colleges reported their Noel Levitz SSI scores to NCCBP.

NCCBP analysis includes each institution’s “percentile ranking” in comparison to the entire reporting database, higher percentiles are better. As noted in the following table, when comparing Noel Levitz scores of all community colleges in the NCCBP database, not only are COD’s scores significantly lower, but most Scales, with the exception of Responsiveness to Diverse Populations (21st percentile) and Academic Services (10th percentile) are below the 5th percentile.
Weakness 4: Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) Student Ratings
Overview:
The College has administered the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) six times since 2003. With few exceptions, COD ratings have consistently been below the nationally standardized mean score of 50.

Specific (select) evidence:
The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) is a product and service of the Center for Community College Student Engagement at the University of Texas at Austin College of Education. CCSSE is a well-established tool that helps institutions focus on good educational practice and identify areas in which they can improve their programs and services for students. Administered during the spring to mostly returning students, CCSSE asks about institutional practices and student behaviors that are highly correlated with student learning and retention. The College has administered the CCSSE survey six times (approximately every three years) since 2003.

CCSSE questions are grouped into five “Benchmarks” (Active and Collaborative Learning, Student Effort, Academic Challenge, Student-Faculty Interaction, and Support for Learners). Benchmark scores are standardized to have a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 25 across all respondents.

As can be seen in the following table, with the exception of Student-Faculty Interaction, most of COD’s Benchmark scores over the six surveys are below the national cohort mean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>COD 2017 Percentile Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>&lt;1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Services</td>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions &amp; Financial Aid</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Climate</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Support Services</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for the Individual</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Effectiveness</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Effectiveness</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness to Diverse Populations</td>
<td>21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Excellence</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Centeredness</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active and Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Effort</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Challenge</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Learners</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPPORTUNITIES

**Opportunity 1: Cost Effective Transfer Preparation, Certificates, and Degrees**

**Overview:**
Area baccalaureate-granting institutions have higher tuition rates than COD. There is a financial benefit for students to complete their general education requirements at COD. There also is an opportunity for the College to develop and expand its 3+1 and 2+2 partnerships with area universities.

**Specific (select) evidence:**
Increased annual costs of tuition at many institutions of higher education (e.g., Northern Illinois University at $12,262, Benedictine at $34,290, North Central College at $38,149, and DePaul University at $38,410) provide an opportunity for the College to attract students who planned to start at a four-year school. They can complete their general education courses at COD and save money in doing so.

**Opportunity 2: Alternative Learner Options**

**Overview:**
COD will attract learners from a larger geographical area as well as those who do not or cannot attend classes on campus by increasing the College’s online learning program. Increasingly, learners seek to complete degrees and certificates at a distance.

**Specific (select) evidence:**
Statewide, enrollment in online courses has grown rapidly and steadily for the past eight years. Between 2016 and 2017, fall on-line headcount at COD has increased by 3.8 percent (from 5,632 to 5,848). In the 2017 Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory, 78 percent of COD students indicated they were employed (18 percent full-time and 60 percent part-time). Therefore, providing classes at various times is important.
Opportunity 3: Changing District Profile

Overview:
District 502 has seen and expects to see a continued increase in ethnic and cultural diversity. In addition, the age of district residents is increasing. Low income and poverty affects a significant portion of DuPage County. The College has an opportunity to serve growing populations of non-English speakers, older learners and low-income students.

Specific (select) evidence:
Between 2015 and 2020 those 65 years of age and older in DuPage County are predicted to increase from 14 percent of the County’s population to approximately 16 percent.

While at the same time the 0 to 19 age group is projected to drop from 27 percent to 25 percent, and the 20 to 64 age group is projected to drop from 60 percent to 59 percent of the County’s population. For the past two decades, DuPage County has been experiencing significant and ongoing demographic changes, marked by substantial increases in the number of residents with incomes that place them at or below the federal poverty level. Although significantly lower than the state (IL) or national poverty levels, the 10-year (2005-2015) rate of increase in poverty in DuPage County (2.9 percent) is greater than the rate of increase for either the state (2.3 percent) or country (2.2 percent) for the same period. Between 1990 and 2014, the *underrepresented population of DuPage County increased by over 165 percent (from 11.6 to 31 percent). The largest increase was seen in the Hispanic population (from 4.5 to 14.4 percent), while the white population decreased by almost 20 percent.

* Underrepresented refers to racial and ethnic populations that are historically disproportionately represented in the population. Historically means that there is a ten-year or longer trend in a given population.

In DuPage County, census supported research identifies historically underrepresented groups as:

- **American Indian/Alaska Native**: 3,720 persons or 0.4 percent of the population
- **Asian**: 112,545 persons or 12.1 percent of the population
- **Black or African American**: 48,366 persons or 5.2 percent of the population
- **Hispanic or Latino**: 133,954 persons or 14.4 percent of the population
- **Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander**: 930 persons or 0.1 percent of the population
- **Two or more races**: 18,602 persons or two percent of the student population

Therefore, in DuPage County underrepresented groups make up approximately 34 percent of the total population.
Opportunity 4: Rising cost of Education (external to COD)
Overview:
The price of college tuition has increased at a pace much faster than that of inflation in recent years. Through the 3+1 COD partnership, students can obtain a bachelor’s degree from one of six partner universities at a cost of about $35,000.

Specific (select) evidence:
According to the U.S Department of Education for the 2014-15 academic year, annual current dollar prices for undergraduate tuition, room, and board were estimated to be $16,188 at public institutions, $37,424 at private nonprofit and for-profit institutions. Between 2004-05 and 2014-15, prices for undergraduate tuition, room, and board at public institutions rose 33 percent, and prices at private nonprofit and for-profit institutions rose 18 percent, after adjustment for inflation.

Based on the College Board Annual Survey of Colleges, over a seven-year period (2011 to 2018), the average annual cost of tuition and fees at Illinois four-year institutions increased by over $2,600 or over 20 percent, whereas, COD’s tuition over the same period increased by $210, or about five percent. On average, between 2011 and 2018, the annual tuition and fees at all Illinois community colleges increased by over $1,000 or 26 percent.

Opportunity 5: Skills Gap in the Workplace
Overview:
The demand for skilled workers will exceed the development of skilled workers resulting in a skilled worker shortage.

Specific (select) evidence:
Three million Illinois adults have only a high school degree or less, but 67 percent of jobs in Illinois will require some type of post-secondary training by 2020. The 2015 Talent Shortage survey indicated that 32 percent of US employers indicate difficulty filling jobs. Lack of applicants, technical competencies, and industry-specific qualifications are the top three reasons employers are having difficulty filling jobs.

COD offers a plethora of Career and Technical Education (from accounting to welding) that prepares students who will graduate with an Associate in Applied Sciences degree that prepares them with the skills necessary to directly enter the workforce. In addition to the AAS degree, COD offers over 170 certificates in 52 areas of study, again preparing students with the skills needed in today’s job market. Business Solutions is available to partner with area businesses to provide non-credit focused, customized training and professional development for their workforce.

In a 2015 JPMorgan Chase Report, Growing Skills for a Growing Chicago, which focused on Cook, DuPage, Kane, Kendall, Lake, McHenry, and Will Counties, the following observations were made:
• The Chicago metropolitan region’s economy is gaining momentum and is soon projected to recover all the jobs lost over the previous decade. The region’s diverse array of high-demand industries and large share of middle-skill jobs are expected to fuel the growth.
• Forty-four percent of jobs in the Chicago region are in middle-skill occupations – jobs that require more than a high school credential, but less than a Bachelor’s degree.
• Of those middle-skill jobs, half are what this report refers to as “target middle-skill jobs” – high-demand occupations that also pay a living wage.
• Some employers in the Chicago metropolitan region are having difficulty filling certain middle-skill positions.
• World Business Chicago has identified the shortage of middle-skill workers as a major regional hurdle.
• Approximately 60% of job openings require middle-skill credentials, but only 54% of the region’s workforce have the necessary education levels – reflecting the mismatch between the education and skills that workers currently have and the skills required by the regions’ emerging industries.

Opportunity 6: Public Awareness and Promotion of COD
Overview:
Although COD plays a significant role in the education, culture and economics of District 502, many residents are unaware of the programs and services the Colleges offers.

Specific (select) evidence:
In a 2018 community survey when asked to identify the most significant strength or weakness of the College, a significant number of respondents (58.5 percent) indicated that they did not know or were unaware of any weaknesses. This was in contrast to 26.5 percent who responded in the same way for the 2016 Pulse survey. In addition, the community college “stigma” was ranked as the number three weakness, with name recognition/marketing noted as the number five weaknesses of the College.

THREATS

Threat 1: Public Funding Overview:
Given the present state of Illinois finances, state funding is likely to decrease for the foreseeable future.

Specific (select) evidence:
In a 2017 report from The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities noted that a decade since the Great Recession hit, state spending on public colleges and universities remains well below historic levels, despite recent increases.
Overall state funding for public two- and four-year colleges in the 2017 school year (that is, the school year ending in 2017) was nearly $9 billion below its 2008 level, after adjusting for inflation. The funding decline has contributed to higher tuition and reduced quality on campuses as colleges have had to balance budgets by reducing faculty, limiting course offerings, and in some cases closing campuses.

Statistics for Illinois included:
- Illinois spent less per student in the 2017 school year than in 2008.
- Per-student funding in Illinois fell by 36.9 percent from 2008 to 2017.

A 2017 CNN Money report based on Illinois Board of Higher Education information noted that:
- Funding for state colleges in Illinois fell 61% for the 2015-2016 school year.
- Funding for state colleges in Illinois fell 61% for the 2015-2016 school year.

Schools received slightly more money for the most recent school year, but it still was about half of what was received before the cuts -- and was mostly spent on unpaid bills from the previous year.

After passage of the state budget in July 2017, Inside Higher Ed noted that the state's spending plan is a mixed bag for the higher education sector. It cuts state support for universities and community colleges by 10 percent below 2015 levels.

**Threat 2: Underprepared Incoming Students**

**Overview:**
A large number of students entering COD are not prepared to enter college-level coursework.

**Specific (select) evidence:**
The following data is based on the Illinois State Board of Education 2016-2017 Illinois Report Card. The ACT is no longer a component of the state assessment. College and career readiness will be redefined next year due to ESSA. As a result, the college and career readiness measure for the 2016-17 Report Card has not been changed for consistency. Beginning with the 2016-17 school year, grade 11 students take the SAT as the high school accountability assessment. However, the College Course Work Readiness data point on the Illinois Report Card reports on the graduating class of the reporting year. The data represents the most recent ACT score earned by a 2017 graduate.
Public High School Districts in Community College District 502

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Percent Ready for College Work*</th>
<th>Met ACT Benchmarks on all 4 subjects**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hinsdale Township High School District 86</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenbard High School District 87</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuPage High School District 88</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community High School District 94</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community High School District 99</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community High School District 100</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community High School District 108</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Unit School District 200</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Unit School District 201</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Unit School District 202</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Unit School District 203</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Unit School District 204</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons Township High School District 204</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmhurst School District 205</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemont Township School District 210</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Graduating seniors who achieved a combined score of at least 21 on any ACT assessment taken prior to graduating, and therefore are classified as being Ready for College Coursework. State average 51 percent.

**Math, English, Reading and Science. State Average 28.2 percent.

The average percent of students ready for college work across all high schools in District 502 is 63.5 percent, and the average percent of students who met all four ACT Benchmarks was 39.7 percent. Although higher than the state average on both measures, it still shows that a considerable number of District 502 graduating seniors are not prepared for college work.

In fall 2017, 15,855 credits, or over seven percent of the total credits generated at COD were in developmental education.

**Threat 3: Illinois Pension Liability**

Overview:
The news continues to worsen for America’s public pensions and for the people who depend on them. The median funding ratio—the percentage of assets states have available for future payments to retirees—declined to 71.1 percent in 2016, from 74.5 percent in 2015 and 75.6 percent in 2014.

Specific (select) evidence:
New Jersey, Kentucky and Illinois continue to lose ground and now have only about one third of the money they need to pay retirement benefits. As a result, Bloomberg ranked Illinois third worst in the nation after New Jersey and Kentucky based on the size of their funding gap.
In May 2017, credit ratings service Moody’s estimated that the Illinois pension funds have $251 billion in unfunded liabilities.

In June 2017, S&P Global Ratings dropped Illinois’ credit rating to BBB-minus (lowest investment grade rating), and warned the state could sink into junk unless it passes a budget that addresses a gaping structural deficit. In October 2017, prior to a bond sale, S&P maintained the BBB-minus rating and stable outlook. While the credit rating agency affirmed the lowest investment grade rating, it cautioned that the nation’s fifth-largest state still faces fiscal challenges that could push the rating into junk.

**Threat 4: Data Security**

**Overview:**
Higher education institutions with their rapid turnover of students’ devices each year present particular problems when it comes to protecting data.

**Specific (select) evidence:**
In an infographic from enterprise security and backup specialist, SysCloud looks at the risks higher education bodies face and how they can improve their levels of protection. Amongst the findings:

There have been over 500 security breaches at more than 320 higher education institutions since 2005, or about one security breach a week.

- Thirty-five percent of all breaches take place in higher education. The most common cause is hacking or malware at 36 percent, followed by unintended disclosure at 30 percent. Portable devices are more likely to be the source of a breach than fixed workstations.
- The Center for Digital Education recently surveyed higher education leaders about data security:
  - Seventy-two percent think data breaches are one of their greatest concerns.
  - Seventy-three percent say cybersecurity is a high or very high priority among their other technology priorities.
  - Seventy percent expect spam and phishing to be a major threat in the next 12 months.

Phishing is the fraudulent practice of sending email purporting to be from reputable companies in order to induce individuals to reveal personal information, such as passwords and credit card numbers.

COD’s Information Technology Security Team tests College staff by sending “phishing” emails and noting the response rate. In January 2018, 4,471 test emails were sent by IT Security, with 185 staff (4.2 percent) opening and clicking in the emails.
Threat 5: Student Mental Health Issues

Overview:
Mental health issues at community colleges are as significant as or worse than those at 4-year institutions.

Specific (select) evidence:
A March 2016 study conducted at 10 community colleges across the nation by the Wisconsin HOPE Lab at University of Wisconsin-Madison reveals that:

- Half of the more than 4,000 community college students surveyed are experiencing a current or recent mental health condition.
- Less than half of these students are receiving any mental health services.
- Students age 25 and younger are especially likely to have an untreated mental health condition.
- Nearly half (49%) of the community college students surveyed report at least one mental health condition, with depression (36%) and anxiety (29%) the most common issues. These rates are high when compared with incidence among four-year students, and the disparity persists within age groups.
- Within community college populations, mental health conditions appear more prevalent among students age 25 and younger when compared to older students (56% vs. 42%). There are no evident gender differences except when it comes to eating disorders (6% of males and 13% of females report this condition).
- This high prevalence of mental health conditions was not driven by a small subset of community colleges in the sample; on the contrary, eight of the ten colleges exhibit rates of 48% or higher (the remaining two colleges have rates of 35% and 40% respectively).
- The use of services among community college students (irrespective of mental health condition) is considerably lower (30%) than the prevalence of mental health conditions (49%). Usage patterns among community college students appear similar to those of four-year students, but community college students are considerably less likely to have visited a health provider including for reasons unrelated to mental health (83% of four-year students did this compared to 70% of community college students).
- Community college students are also much less likely to report receiving informal (non-clinical) counseling or support for mental health, as compared to four-year students (46% versus 70%).
- While students over age 25 are less likely than younger students to report a mental health condition, they are more likely to have received support (33% vs. 26%). Service usage rates are slightly higher for females than males (30% versus 28%).
- The majority (60%) of community college students with a mental health condition receive some form of non-clinical counseling or support, but this rate is significantly lower than it is for four-year students (79%).
The data in the Hope report highlight the vast number of community college students who are experiencing significant challenges related to their mental and emotional health. Most of these students are not accessing mental health services. These challenges are even greater than those that have been well documented at four-year institutions.

**Threat 6: The Community College “Stigma”**

Overview: Some consider community colleges less favorable than four-year colleges and universities. Unfortunately, there is a certain stigma surrounding community college. Some believe it is not a real college; it is easier than university, etc.

Specific (select) evidence:
In Mar. 2018, Community College Review published the article, *Overcoming the Stigma of Community College: Spring 2017 Trending Topics*. In that article, it stated:

Many students choose to attend community college because it is a more affordable option than most traditional four-year colleges and universities. It is also common for students to complete their general education requirements at community college before transferring to a more specialized school to finish their degree. Though there are many benefits associated with community college, there are also a number of myths and misconceptions that perpetuate the idea that community college somehow isn’t “real” college. Here are some of the most common myths and misconceptions about community college:

- Myth #1: Students Rejected from Four Year Colleges
- Myth #2: All Community College Students are Older
- Myth #3: Community College Professors are Second Rate
- Myth #4: Community Colleges Don’t Offer Many Majors

**Threat 7: Competition from out-of-state institutions of higher education**

Overview: Over the past several years, institutions of higher education from neighboring states have become more aggressive in their recruitment of Illinois high school graduates. In addition, some of these institutions have started to collaborate with Illinois high schools, providing college dual credit opportunities for Illinois high school students.

Specific (select) evidence:
According to the Illinois Board of Higher Education in fall 2016:

- The pool of 18-year-olds in the Midwest has been shrinking in recent years, so competition for high school graduates has intensified.
- Illinois had a net loss of 19,275 students to out-of-state institutions.
- Nationally, Illinois’ net loss of college bound students was only second to New Jersey and up 2,652 from a net loss of 16,623 in fall 2014.
• A total of 35,445 students enrolled in colleges and universities in other states, compared with 78,265 who chose Illinois schools, a recent low.
• Among recent Illinois public high school graduates attending four-year institutions, 46 percent enrolled in out-of-state schools in 2016, compared to 29 percent in 2002. When private high schools are included, the percentage is even higher - 48 percent, according to the IBHE.
• The top destinations for Illinois freshmen were Iowa (4,801), Indiana (4,470) and Wisconsin (4,089). The top four schools came from three of those states: the University of Iowa, Iowa State University, Indiana University and the University of Missouri. In past years, Purdue and Marquette universities were among the top four.
• All but two state institutions — the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and the UI Chicago — saw enrollment declines.
• Institutions in bordering states have been aggressive about offering scholarships to Illinois students that bring their costs down to in-state tuition levels. For example, at the University of Missouri, first time, out-of-state students once admitted are automatically considered for a scholarship – no application is required.

Neighboring states have become aggressive in partnering with Illinois high schools in order to offered dual credit opportunities to Illinois high school students.

For example, the following information is from Indiana University’s web-site:
Advance College Project (ACP) is a dual-enrollment partnership between Indiana University and select high schools throughout Indiana and surrounding states. IU courses taught through the ACP program provide both high school and college credits (known as concurrent or dual enrollment) and allow students to fulfill high school graduation requirements as well as start building their college career. IU Courses are
taught during the regular school day by certified high school teachers who hold adjunct lecturer status through IU.

This partnership is being taken advantage of by District 502 high school. For example, York Community High School (District 205) has the following information on their web site:

*Dual credit courses provide high school students in grades 9 through 12 with the opportunity to enroll in selected courses for which they will receive both college and high school credit.*

Classes are taught at the high school during the regular school day by high school teachers who are also approved as adjunct faculty at College of DuPage or Indiana University. Students pursuing dual credit should remember that these courses become part of your permanent collegiate level academic record. The grade earned for a dual credit class will appear on the college transcript.

**Threat 8: Decreasing in-district high school graduates**

**Overview:**

Projections released in April 2018 from the federal government’s National Center for Education Statistics show that between 2014 and 2026, enrollment nationwide is expected to go up about 3 percent in public grade schools and high schools. However, the Northeast and Midwest are expected to see a decline in students, while the South and West regions would expect increases.

Overall, 19 states are expected to see a drop in enrollment by 2026, with Illinois being one of the top 10 states.

**Specific (select) evidence:**

- According to Illinois State Board of Education figures, between 2012 and 2016 the number of seniors enrolled in District 502 public high schools dropped by 815, or by 5.5 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School District</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hinsdale</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenbard</td>
<td>-300</td>
<td>-12.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addison Trail/Willowbrook</td>
<td>-57</td>
<td>-5.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Chicago</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downers Grove</td>
<td>-126</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenton</td>
<td>-70</td>
<td>-19.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Park</td>
<td>-63</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheaton</td>
<td>-57</td>
<td>-5.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School District</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westmont</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-25.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisle</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>-25.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naperville</td>
<td>-95</td>
<td>-6.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Prairie</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemont</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>-815</td>
<td>-5.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bolded high school districts are highest feeders to COD.
• Based on current freshmen enrollment in District 502 high schools, in three years the senior population is expected to decline by 266 students, or by another two percent.
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HIGHEST IMPACT ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN TRENDS
Seventy-four total trends were identified in eight taxonomies (Competition, Demographics, Economic, Education, Labor Force, Politics, Social Values/Lifestyle and Technology). The following 17 were identified during the Implications Workshop as having the highest impact on the communities served by College of DuPage.

COMPETITION
Partnerships with Feeder Schools
As higher education institutions recognize the significant role they play in the quality of our nation’s middle and secondary schools, efforts are increasing to build sustaining and mutually reinforcing partnerships with feeder schools.

Student Satisfaction
Factors which contribute to the satisfaction of those with a college degree include the quality of the experience in relationships and access to faculty, internships and other experiential learning, as well as the overall student experience, including extracurricular activities. Those with less debt and good jobs are most satisfied, and also able to participate sooner in things such as continuing their education or buying a home. This appears to be the case regardless of race, ethnicity, or generation.

DEMOGRAPHIC
Poverty Level in DuPage County
Between 2005 and 2011 the percent of DuPage County residents living under the federal poverty level increased steadily. Then, between 2011 and 2013, the poverty level declined slightly. However, in 2014 it again saw another spike.

Ethnic Diversity in the Population of DuPage County
Underrepresented populations in DuPage County have steadily increased since 1990, and are projected to continue increasing through 2020 and beyond.

ECONOMIC
Illinois Budget Deficit
There is a high probability state and local funding of education will decrease in the near future.

Skills Gap
The demand for skilled workers will exceed the development of skilled workers resulting in a skilled worker shortage.

EDUCATION
Underprepared Students Despite Implementation of Common Core
As the number of underprepared students continues to increase, community colleges will continue to play a significant role in serving this population.

Underprepared Students Increasingly Attend Community Colleges
As the number of underprepared students continues to increase, community colleges will continue to play a significant role in serving this population.

LABOR FORCE
Demand for Healthcare Workers
As the population ages, the demand for healthcare workers will continue through 2024.

Shortage of Middle-Skill Workers
Between 2010-2020, 48 percent of jobs will require Middle-Skill. Jobs that require Middle-Skills need more than a high school credential but less than a bachelor’s degree. Examples include electricians, dental hygienists, and paralegals. In Illinois, the Bureau of Labor Statistics is showing a shortage of Middle-Skill workers.

POLITICS
Accountability in Higher Education
Increasing state and federal attention is being focused on accountability in postsecondary education.
Affordability in Higher Education
Tuition costs are out-pacing government funding for postsecondary student aid with the greatest impact on low-income students who may be unable to afford college.

Higher Education Funding in Illinois
The state’s failure to properly manage funds continues to have a negative impact on Higher Education. This failure will ultimately change institutional operating procedures.

SOCIAL VALUES/LIFESTYLE
Digital Technologies Affect Learning and Careers
The use of existing digital technology for engagement and enhancement of learning will continue to expand as well as impact future careers.

Longer Life Expectancy
People in the United States are living longer, retiring later and pursuing multiple careers. Therefore, additional education or training will be required.

TECHNOLOGY
Increased Demand for Technology Skills/Training
Given the rate of sustained rapid technological advancement, there is an ongoing need for increased base-level technology skills, as well as for continued technology training and professional development.

Increased Use of Mobile Devices Leads to New Educational Opportunities and Strategies
The transformative potential of mobile devices and applications will fuel change in the way college courses are created and delivered.
ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN

JANUARY 2016
by Strategic Long Range Plan Advisory Committee and Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

ENVIRONMENTAL SCANNING
Brown and Weiner (1985) define environmental scanning as “a kind of radar to scan the world systematically and signal the new, the unexpected, the major and the minor.” Therefore, the Environmental Scan (E-Scan) is intended to identify current and emerging external trends that impact our community, students and other stakeholders of the College.

By identifying and understanding external trends, the College can develop plans to proactively meet and address changing needs of our community, students, and other stakeholders. To be as comprehensive as possible, the College scans eight areas or taxonomies which include:

• Competition
• Demographic
• Economic
• Education
• Labor Force
• Politics
• Social Values/Life Style
• Technology

Prior to conducting the E-Scan, members of the Strategic Long Range Plan Advisory Committee (SLRPAC) participated in a half-day training session.

Following the training session, SLRPAC members were divided into taxonomy teams and spent two months doing evidence-based research, conducting interviews of subject matter experts and compiling seventy-four trend statements that were presented to community leaders during the Community Implications Workshop. Each trend statement identifies the probability of change over the next three to five years, as well as the rationale and source of the evidence that supports the trend.

COMPETITION
Trend #1: For-Profit Enrollment
Trend statement:
After years of fast paced growth, for-profit institutions of higher education are seeing a significant slowing or decline in enrollment.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Supporting rationale:
Enrollment at for-profit colleges has fallen by 26 percent since the high point, a far greater decrease than the nine percent decline in overall post-secondary enrollment. Corinthian Colleges have gone bankrupt and Education Management Corps public trading shares are worth pennies. Throughout the literature it is clear that many of the for-profit institutions are struggling to stay afloat. Private institutions such as Loyal University and similar for-profit colleges and universities are looking for alternative ways to grow enrollment, including adding Associate Degree and Certificate programs to their offerings. These may represent some areas of concern and further research for community colleges.

Sources:

Trend #2: Investment in Online Education

Trend statement:
The higher education sector will continue to invest in online education. While the trend seems to be at a plateau it continues to be a viable delivery of instruction to the Higher Education industry overall.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
Online offerings continue to allow institutions of Higher Education to grow enrollment and tuition revenue. According to the Online Learning Consortium and the 2014 Survey of Online Learning, conducted by the Babson Survey Research Group, the number of higher education courses delivered online has increased by 3.7% over the previous year. However, this is the lowest increase seen since the OLC began collecting enrollment data 13 years ago. Academic leaders continue to see learning outcomes as the same or superior to face to face courses, while faculty are still skeptical (379 Babson Survey Research Group 2016).

Sources:

Trend #3: Online Competitive Advantages

Trend statement:
To be competitive in the online delivery market, colleges must invest in the technology, tools and processes that support such delivery, i.e., innovative LMS products and services, new programs of study, and solid pedagogical professional development for instructors.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
Institutions that continue to support and develop such programs can successfully differentiate themselves from other schools and from for-profit institutions and other non-academic options. These institutions should continue to have strong enrollment and good retention and completion rates for students in online courses.

Sources:

Trend #4: Workforce Partnerships

Trend statement:
Business and education realize by collaborating they are increasing the potential for a skilled and thriving workforce.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
This continues to be an important trend. According to the sources discovered, collaboration with workforce partners will continue to be of utmost importance in the Career and Technical Education/Continuing Education programs. Higher Education needs to be more aware that industry trends and needs will continue to grow and that instruction and learning outcomes need to grow as well.
Trend #5: Partnerships with Feeder Schools

Trend statement:
As higher education institutions recognize the significant role they play in the quality of our nation’s middle and secondary schools, efforts are increasing to build sustaining and mutually reinforcing partnerships with feeder schools.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
The blame game continues to run throughout the educational system and beyond. Employers blame colleges and universities for inadequately preparing students for the workforce; post-secondary schools blame secondary schools for inadequate college prep; secondary schools blame middle and elementary schools for advancing under-prepared students; and elementary schools blame parents for not providing students with fundamental needs, basic learning skills and self-discipline. Federal and state administrators have attempted to address this issue with programs such as Every Student Succeeds Act, Common Core, PARCC test, P-16 legislation and assessment/accountability requirements for schools. Educators at every level are subject to increasing accountability for student achievement and graduation rates and schools will begin to address the need for better communication and collaboration across educational levels.

Sources:

Trend #6: Student Satisfaction

Trend statement:
Factors which contribute to the satisfaction of those with a college degree include the quality of the experience in relationships and access to faculty, internships, and other experiential learning, as well as the overall student experience, including extracurricular activities. Those with less debt and good jobs are most satisfied, and also able to participate sooner in things such as continuing their education or buying a home. This appears to be the case regardless of race, ethnicity, or generation.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
When it comes to market value, the trend is even more consistent and downward. With the exception of Grand Canyon, many of the companies have seen their value drop, often drastically, as enrollments have fallen and scrutiny has increased.

The new “gainful-employment” rule, which could eliminate federal student aid for degree programs that leave students with too much debt relative to the incomes they can earn with those degrees, is also having a major effect on the sector. Several colleges have recently cited the regulation as a reason for closing and many others are eliminating or altering their pricier programs to comply with it.

Sources:


Trend #7: Federal Regulations and reduced Federal and State funding

Trend statement:
A change in government regulation and federal and state funding has made an impact on higher education.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High
Support rationale:
Many for-profit colleges have been affected by increased regulations, especially around federal tuition. For-profit institutions are facing scrutiny by multiple government regulators regarding “deceptive and predatory tactics to enroll as many students as possible without regard to their potential for success or ability to afford tuition.” Records show that Apollo Education Group (parent company to University of Phoenix), DeVry University, and Corinthian College to be some of the for-profit colleges/universities affected. In some cases, the institution has closed, leaving students without the ability to complete degrees.

Community colleges continue to have issues receiving budgeted state funding and have been forced to decrease programs or reduce the workforce of the college.

Sources:

Trend #8: Alternative Scheduling
Trend statement:
While community colleges have been providing the bridge to a BA or BS degree with 3+1 or 2+2 partnerships, for-profit colleges and universities are starting to provide transfer degrees and alternative scheduling as well.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
For-profit schools have recognized the “need to increase access to, and completion rates of, post-secondary education degrees for students.” To do this they are providing education and degrees with more consideration to flexible scheduling, alternative delivery methods, and reduced payment options.

Currently many community colleges offer a partnership with a four-year college. A student is able to attend the community college, but complete with a degree from the four-year college. This greatly reduces the tuition cost to the student who graduates with a BA or a BS.

Focusing on students who cannot may not be able to afford college, Loyola University’s Arrupe College’s has started offering a two-year associate’s degree program. Sources site that Pennsylvania State University awarded 1,958 associate degrees in the 2012-13 academic year. In addition, many colleges have focused on providing more hybrid or online education and degrees in order to accommodate student’s schedules and tuition constraints.

Sources:
DEMOGRAPHIC

Trend #1: Population Growth in DuPage County
Trend statement:
Population growth in DuPage County is projected to increase at an average annual rate of one percent or less over the next five years.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
From 2010 to 2014 the population change in the five Chicago collar counties (DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, and Will) has been between -0.5 percent for McHenry to 2.3 percent for Kane. During that time frame, DuPage’s population change was 1.7 percent and the state’s population change was 0.4 percent.

From 2015 to 2020, DuPage County’s population is projected grow by approximately 44,000, from 948,165 to 992,383. (Chart 1, below)

Sources:

Trend #2: Aging Population in DuPage County
Trend statement:
From 2015 to 2020, it is projected that DuPage County residents 65 years of age and older will grow at a significantly faster rate than any other age group.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
Between 2015 and 2020 those 65 years of age and older in DuPage County are predicted to increase from 14 percent of the County’s population to approximately 16 percent. While at the same time the 0 to 19 age group is projected to drop from 27 percent to 25 percent, and the 20 to 64 age group is projected to drop from 60 percent to 59 percent of the County’s population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 19</td>
<td>243,200</td>
<td>243,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 64</td>
<td>572,922</td>
<td>587,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>132,043</td>
<td>161,462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:
Woods & Poole Economics, Inc. 2015. 2015 County Data Pamphlet for DuPage County, IL.

Trend #3: Household Income in DuPage County
Trend statement:
Between 2010 and 2015 the mean household income in DuPage County increased at a rate of 3.9 percent, however, between 2015 and 2020 it is expected to increase close to seven percent.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: Moderate

Support rationale:
Prediction for DuPage County household income remains strong, with those households having a mean income of less than $75,000 declining slightly (three percent), while those in the upper wage brackets (greater than $120,000) increase slightly (two percent).

Based on 2009 dollars, between 2010 and 2015 the mean household income in DuPage County increased by 3.9 percent (from $138,287 to $143,680). Mean household income is projected to increase 7.1 percent from 2015 ($143,680) to 2020 ($153,921).
### Trend #4: Poverty Level in DuPage County

**Trend statement:**
Between 2005 and 2011 the percent of DuPage County resident living under the federal poverty level increased steadily. Then between 2011 and 2013 the poverty level declined slightly. However, in 2014 it again saw another spike.

**Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:** High

**Support rationale:**
For the past two decades, DuPage County has been experiencing significant and ongoing demographic changes, marked by substantial increases in the number of residents with incomes that place them at or below the federal poverty level. Although significantly lower than the state (IL) or national poverty levels, the 10 year (2005-2015) rate of increase in poverty in DuPage County (2.9 percent) is greater than the rate of increase for either the state (2.3 percent) or country (2.2 percent) for the same period. (Chart 2, below.)

### Sources:
Woods & Poole Economics, Inc., 2015. 2015 County Data Pamphlet for DuPage County, IL.

---

### Chart 2: All Ages in Poverty

#### Table: Household Income in 2009 Dollars vs. Percent of Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income in 2009 Dollars</th>
<th>Percent of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $45,000</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000 - $75,000</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $125,000</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,000 - $200,000</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$200,000</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trend #5: Child Poverty Rate in DuPage County

**Trend statement:**
From 1999 to 2012 the number of DuPage County children living in poverty increased significantly.

**Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:** High

**Support rationale:**
From 1999 to 2012 all five Chicago collar counties (DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, and Will) have seen a significant increase in child poverty, while Chicago (city) saw a slight decrease. During this same period, the number of DuPage County children living in poverty increased from 9,818 to 23,279, for an increase of 137.1 percent. Likewise, the DuPage County child poverty rate went from four percent in 1999 to 10.5 percent in 2012.

### Table: Child Poverty Rate in DuPage County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th># of Children in Poverty</th>
<th>15 Year % Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>211,780</td>
<td>206,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuPage Co.</td>
<td>9,818</td>
<td>13,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane Co.</td>
<td>10,912</td>
<td>17,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Co.</td>
<td>13,484</td>
<td>15,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHenry Co.</td>
<td>3,239</td>
<td>5,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Co.</td>
<td>8,770</td>
<td>12,606</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sources:

### Trend #6: Ethnic Diversity in the Population of DuPage County

**Trend statement:**
Underrepresented populations in DuPage County have steadily increased since 1990 and are projected to continue increasing through 2020 and beyond.
Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
Between 1990 and 2014, the underrepresented population of DuPage County increased by over 165 percent (from p 11.6 to 31 percent). The largest increase was seen in the Hispanic population (from 4.5 to 14.2 percent), while the white population decreased by almost 20 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American or Black</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:
Woods & Poole Economics, Inc., 2015. 2015 County Data Pamphlet for DuPage County, IL.

Trend #7: Ethnic Diversity of Public High Schools in Community College District 502
Trend statement:
Over the past ten years the number of underrepresented students in public high schools located in Community College District 502 has increased steadily, with the Hispanic/Latino population showing the largest increase.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High
Support rationale:
Public high schools in Community College District 502 includes 15 districts (HSD 86; HSD 87; HSD 88; HSD 94; HSD 99; HSD 100; HSD 108; CUSD 200; CUSD 201; CUSD 202; CUSD 203; CUSD 204; HSD 204; SD 205; and SD 210) with 25 individual high schools (Hinsdale Central and South; Glenbard East, North, South and West; Addison Trail and Willowbrook; West Chicago; Downers Grove North and South; Fenton; Lake Park; Wheaton North and Warrenville; Westmont; Lisle; Naperville Central and North; Metea, Neuqua Valley and Waubonsie; Lyons Township; York; and Lemont).

With respect to public high schools in Community College District 502, over the past ten years the Hispanic/Latino population increase from 9.3 percent to 17.3 percent, while the white student population decreased from 76.8 percent to 62.1 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American or Black</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More/Other</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Low-income students are from families receiving public aid, living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, being supported in foster homes with public funds, or eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches.

Sources:

Trend #8: Education Level in DuPage County
Trend statement:
Between 2005 and 2014 the percent of DuPage County residents 25 years and older without a high school diploma (or equivalency) decreased slightly, while the percent of individuals with a college degree increased moderately.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: Moderate
Support rationale:
Over the past 10 years the percentage of DuPage County residents (25 years and older) with a college degree increased by from 49.8 percent to 55.4 percent, a change of 5.6 percent. Those possessing a graduate or professional degree increased from 15.9 percent to 19.4 percent, out-pacing the rate of change for those possessing either an associate’s or bachelor’s degree.
### Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school diploma</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or equivalent</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s degree</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or Professional degree</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sources:

### ECONOMIC

**Trend #1: DuPage Economy**

**Trend statement:**
The DuPage County economy, mirroring the national economy, is characterized overall by weak economic indicators. However, recent changes indicate the local economy is trending upward.

**Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:** High

**Support rationale:**
The DuPage County economic recession has mirrored the national recession. While economic indicators have been considered weak, recent changes indicate an upward trend is emerging. The annual average unemployment rate in DuPage County for 2014 fell to 5.6 percent, lowest of the Collar Counties and below the National and State average rates of 6.2% and 7.1%, respectively. (Charts 3 and 4, below.)

Sales tax receipts in DuPage County increased approximately $20 million from $344 million in 2013 to $364 million in 2014, a 5.8% increase. The office vacancy rate fell to 16.8 percent in March 2015, from 17 percent in March 2014; it is higher than Cook (12.8 percent), but lower than McHenry (20.2 percent), and roughly the same as Kane (16.7 percent) and Lake (16.5 percent).

The Midwest Economy Index (MEI) is a monthly index designed to measure growth in non-farm business activity in the Seventh Federal Reserve District. It serves as a regional counterpart to the Chicago Fed National Activity Index. The index is constructed to have an average value of zero and a standard deviation of one. Since Midwest economic activity tends toward trend growth rate over time, a positive index reading corresponds to growth in Midwest economic activity above trend, while a negative reading corresponds to growth below trend. The Midwest Economy Index (MEI) was -0.15 in September, 2015. This is down from +0.15 in September, 2014.

Note: The previous version of this scan included the Chicago Fed Midwest Manufacturing Index (CFMMI). Monthly release of this index was suspended in December 2013, and is undergoing a process of data and methodology revision. (Chart 5, following page.)

**Sources:**
Trend #2: Personal Wealth
Trend statement:
The recession reduced the personal wealth of many Americans, but several indicators of wealth (housing value, investments, etc.) have begun to rise in recent years.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
Between 2010−13, median net worth fell 2 percent and the mean increased slightly for most groups. However, in 2015, the value of investments, particularly in the stock market, was trending upwards. In 2015, U.S. Treasury yield were beginning to trend slightly up. (Chart 6, below right.)

Growth in consumer spending increased in 2014. In 2015, the average price of a home in the Chicago metropolitan area increased by 1.86 percent; this is compared to 5.09 percent nationally. (Charts 7, below right, Charts 8 and 9, opposite page.)

The consumer price index fell .04 percent for Chicago regional, compared with being essentially unchanged nationally over the previous year.

Sources:

Trend #3: Illinois Budget Deficit
Trend statement:
There is a high probability state and local funding of education will decrease in the near future.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
The State of Illinois continues to experience a record budget deficit which will require either large reductions in state spending or large increases in taxes or both to close a more than $100 billion pension gap. Illinois had just 39.3
percent of assets needed to meet promises to retirees in 2014, the worst ratio among states, according to Bloomberg.

Governor Bruce Rauner remains locked in a budget “fight” with State democrats. The State has been operating without a complete budget since July 1, 2015. In October 2015 an announcement was made by the Comptroller’s office that the state’s monthly pension payment would be pushed back due to a cash flow problem.

Shortly after that announcement Fitch Ratings lowered Illinois’ bond rating from A- to BBB+, citing the “continued deterioration of the state’s financial flexibility.” This downgrade impacts the state’s general obligation bonds. Later in October 2015 Moody’s Investors Services downgraded the state’s bond rating from A3 to Baa1. Illinois is the worst-rated state with a Moody’s ranking three steps above junk, and an A-, one level higher, from Standard & Poor’s.

Meanwhile, in September 2015, the Comptroller’s office announced that the state’s backlog of unpaid bills could hit $8.5 billion in December – not counting an additional $4 billion in spending for state universities, lottery winners, and other purposes being indefinitely deferred. This would be up from $3.96 billion in July 2015.

Sources:


Trend #4: Performance Based Funding
Trend statement:
Performance based funding systems have been implemented in Illinois higher education, however, the impact in total funding to community colleges is low.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
A Performance Funding Steering Committee was established by the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) to assist with linking the goals of the Illinois Public Agenda for College and Career Success to the state’s higher education budgeting process. Performance funding is an important component of the state’s plan to meet the Complete College America (CCA) goal that by 2025, 60 percent of Illinois adults will have a college degree or credential. To that end, the Committee is to assist the IBHE in devising a system for allocating state resources to public institutions of higher education based upon performance in achieving state goals related to student success and certification and degree completion.
Historically, many colleges have received state funding based on how many full-time equivalent students are enrolled at the beginning of the semester. This model provides incentives for colleges to enroll students and thus provide access to postsecondary education, but this model does not necessarily provide incentives for institutions to help students successfully complete degree programs. Many states are reconsidering the enrollment-based funding model and instead are aligning funding models with state goals and priorities.

Thirty-two states—Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Mexico, New York, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming—have a funding formula or policy in place to allocate a portion of funding based on performance indicators such as course completion, time to degree, transfer rates, the number of degrees awarded, or the number of low-income and minority graduates.

Currently, in Illinois, less than one percent of base funding to 2-year institutions is determined based on performance based measures ($360,000 in total for fiscal year 2015) (Chart 10, below).

Sources:

Trend #5: Competition from the Global Economy
Trend statement:
The global economy is growing more integrated, with the fastest growing economies in China, India and former Soviet Union states.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
The United States goes up in the rankings for a second year in a row and regains the 3rd position on the back of improvements in a number of areas, including some aspects of the institutional framework (up from 35th to 30th), and more positive perceptions regarding business sophistication (from 6th to 4th) and innovation (from 7th to 5th). U.S. companies are highly sophisticated and innovative, and they are supported by an excellent university system that collaborates admirably with the business sector in R&D. On the other hand, some weaknesses in particular areas remain to be addressed. The business community continues to be rather critical, with trust in politicians still somewhat weak (48th), concerns about favoritism of government officials (47th), and a general perception that the government spends its resources relatively wastefully (73rd). The macroeconomic environment remains the country’s greatest area of weakness (113th), although the fiscal deficit continues to narrow and public debt is slightly lower for the first time since the crisis.

Sources:
Trend #6: Healthcare Insurance

Trend statement:
After several years of a relatively stable uninsured rate between 2008 and 2013, as measured by the American Community Survey (ACS), the percentage of the population who were uninsured dropped between 2013 and 2014.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
In 2014 the percentage of people without health insurance decreased to 11.7% from 14.5% in 2013. The number of uninsured people decreased to 36.7 million, down from 45.2 million in 2013. 2014 was the first year that people began enrolling in health coverage on the Affordable Care Act’s (ACA) newly created marketplaces.

The percentage and number of people with health insurance increased in 2014, to 89.6% and 283.2 million, up from 86.7% and 271.6 million in 2013.

In 2015, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) estimate 36 million non-elderly people will be uninsured—about 19 million fewer than would have been uninsured in the absence of the ACA. From 2016 through 2025, the annual number of uninsured is expected to decrease to between 29 million and 31 million—that is, between 24 million and 27 million fewer than would have been uninsured in the law’s absence. The 31 million people projected to be uninsured in 2025 represent roughly one out of every nine residents under age 65.

Sources:

Trend #7: Widening Income Gap

Trend statement:
The income gap in the United States is continuing to widen.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
The years from the end of World War II into the 1970s were ones of substantial economic growth and broadly shared prosperity. The income gap between those high up the income ladder and those on the middle and lower rungs — while substantial — did not change much during this period. Then, beginning in the 1970s, income disparities began to widen, with income growing much faster at the top of the ladder than in the middle or bottom (Chart 11, below).

A family’s income is the flow of money coming in over the course of a year. Its wealth (sometimes referred to as “net worth”) is the total stock of assets it has as a result of inheritance and saving, less any liabilities. The Federal Reserve’s Survey of Consumer Finances (SCF) data show that

![Chart 11: Income Gains Widely Shared in Early Postwar Decades — But Not Since Then](chart11.png)
the top three percent of the income distribution received roughly a third of all income in 2013, while the top three percent of the wealth distribution held 54 percent of all wealth.

While the SCF is invaluable, it has its limitations, especially for detecting trends in wealth concentration at the very top. Recently, Emmanuel Saez and Gabriel Zucman have used tax-return information on income derived from wealth to infer the underlying distribution of wealth over time. As with income, these data show a long historical decline in the concentration of wealth from the late 1920s into the late 1970s. Concentration at the top has increased markedly since then, driven by a rising share of wealth at the very top. (Chart 12 below.)

Sources:

Trend #8: Loss of Manufacturing Jobs
Trend statement:
Manufacturing output is indicating above-average growth in both Illinois and the Midwest region.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
The Chicago Fed Midwest Economy Index is a weighted average of 129 state and regional indicators encompassing the entirety of the five states in the Seventh Federal Reserve District (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, and Wisconsin). The index measures growth in non-farm business activity based on indicators of four broad sectors of the Midwest economy: 1) manufacturing, 2) construction and mining, 3) services, and 4) consumer spending. From January 2012 through September 2015, the index fluctuated from .52 to -.06 with 85% positive reports indicating above-average growth for the region. However, in Illinois, the index fluctuated only from .13 to -.05 with 60% positive reports indication above-average growth. However, although manufacturing is trending upward, the number of employees in manufacturing is trending downward.

Note: A zero value for the MEI indicates that the Midwest economy is expanding at its historical trend rate of growth; positive values indicate above-average growth; and negative values indicate below-average growth. (Charts 13, below; 14 and 15, following page.)

Note: The previous version of this scan included the Chicago Fed Midwest Manufacturing Index

Chart 12

Chart 13 Midwest Economy Index - Manufacturing
(CFMMI). Monthly release of this index was suspended in December 2013, and is undergoing a process of data and methodology revision.

**Sources:**

**Trend #9: Skills Gap**
The demand for skilled workers will exceed the development of skilled workers resulting in a skilled worker shortage.

**Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: Low**

**Support rationale:**
Three million Illinois adults have only a high school degree or less, but 67% of jobs in Illinois will require some type of post-secondary training by 2020. The 2015 Talent Shortage survey indicated that 32% of US employers indicate difficulty filling jobs. Lack of applicants, technical competencies, and industry-specific qualifications are the top three reasons employers are having difficulty filling jobs. (Charts 16 and 17, below.)

**Sources:**

---

**Chart 14** Illinois Manufacturing Output (In Billions)

**Chart 15** Illinois Manufacturing Employees (In Thousands)

**Chart 16** Percentage of U.S. and Global employers having difficulty filling jobs

**Chart 17** Reasons U.S. employers are having difficulty filling jobs
EDUCATION

Trend #1: National Spotlight on Community Colleges

Trend statement:
There is a new national spotlight on community colleges, including the creation of the Aspen Prize to recognize excellence.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: Unknown

Support rationale:
In 2010, President Obama announced the Aspen Prize for Community College Excellence. According to the Institute’s website, this biannual $1 million prize “is the nation’s signature recognition of high achievement and performance among America’s community colleges and recognizes institutions for exceptional student outcomes in four areas: student learning, certificate and degree completion, employment and earnings, and high levels of access and success for minority and low-income students” (The Aspen Institute, 2016). This is a prize worth striving for. In 2015, Kennedy-King, City Colleges of Chicago, was a “Rising Star” finalist.

Sources:

Trend #2: Underprepared Students Despite Implementation of Common Core Standards

Trend statement:
As the number of underprepared students increase, community colleges will continue to play a significant role in serving this population.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: Unknown

Support rationale:
Recent test scores and investigative reports indicate that an increasing number of high school graduates are not ready for college. Community colleges are on the front lines when it comes to helping students develop the skills and knowledge necessary to succeed in college, and must provide remedial/developmental programs, tutoring and other support services. The Illinois State Board of Education indicates that “48.7 percent of graduates who enrolled in the community college system needed remedial instruction to prepare them for entry-level college coursework,” “with about 41 percent needing additional preparation in [math]” (Associated Press, 2015). State-wide data from the fall 2015 Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) exams, which test areas based on Common Core standards, indicate that among high school students in Illinois, only 17% “met” or “exceeded expectations” in math, while only 31% did so in English (Rado, 2015). Although students in specific DuPage County schools scored better, COD must embrace its role as a leader in developmental programs and college-preparation. There is a continued need for innovative, affordable and supportive programs for underprepared students.

Sources:

Trend #3: The Most Common Community College Major is the Liberal Arts

Trend statement:
Nationally, community college students most commonly major in Liberal Arts with the intention to transfer.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: Unknown
Support rationale:
Given the rising costs of college tuition, many Liberal Arts students are saving money by completing required courses at a community college before transferring to a four-year college. According to Professor Peter Cappelli, director of The Wharton School's Center for Human Resources, the most common major for community college students is Liberal Arts. He attributes this to a desire on the student's part to save money while taking foundational courses that will transfer. Therefore, transfer and articulation agreements continue to be important for students. At COD, the majority of our graduates in 2015 earned a liberal arts degree. We had 1,953 liberal arts graduates out of 2,892 degree completers (i.e. A.A., A.S., A.G.S., and A.F.A.) (Thompson 2016).

Sources:

Trend #4: President Obama’s Proposal for Free Tuition at Community Colleges
Trend statement:
President Obama proposed making two years of community college free.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: Unknown

Support rationale:
In January 2015, President Obama announced the America’s College Promise proposal, which would “make two years of community college free for responsible students, letting students earn the first half of a bachelor’s degree and earn skills needed in the workforce for no cost (The White House, 2015). According to the proposal, community college could be “as free and universal as high school.” Although the details may change, the proposal calls for students maintain a 2.5 GPA and attend at least half time. Colleges need to have academic programs that are fully transferable and vocational programs for careers that are in demand. States would pay 1/4 of the cost, with federal funding covering the rest. It’s unclear how this would be implemented, and there have been calls for more public debate (Wyner & Stimpfel, 2015).

Sources:

Trend #5: Diversion of Funding from Instruction to Administrative Salaries
Trend statement:
Increases in administrative positions and salaries have diverted state and local funding from instructional costs, such as faculty.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: Unknown

Support rationale:
Colleges have been increasing the number of administrators and their salaries at a rate that far out-paces that of full-time faculty. This is an inefficient use of funds that increasingly raises the ire of the public. According to a report published by the Goldwater Institute, “Between 1993 and 2007, the number of full-time administrators per 100 students at America’s leading universities grew by 39 percent, while the number of employees engaged in teaching, research or service only grew by 18 percent. Inflation-adjusted spending on administration per student increased by 61 percent during the same period, while instructional spending per student rose 39 percent” (Greene, 2017- E-SCAN
Kisida, & Mills, 2010). The Association for American University Professors responded, “If we hope to successfully engage, educate, and graduate a larger number of students, it is time to reverse the decades-long trend and systematically reinvest in academic positions, particularly full-time, tenure-track positions. This includes the conversion of faculty and positions that are contingent to tenure-track lines” (Bunsis and Witt, 2010).

Sources:

Trend #6: Too Much Technology in K-12 May Lead to Worse Test Scores

Trend statement:
Technology is often touted as a panacea for learning shortfalls, but some new studies indicate that too much technology in K-12 can lead to worse test scores and poor performance in writing and math.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: Unknown

Support rationale:
Two new studies raise concerns that too much technology may actually cause student learning to lag behind students in traditional learning environments. The National Study of Online Charter Schools found that “[s]tudents in the nation’s virtual K-12 charter schools—who take all of their classes via computer from home—learn significantly less on average than students at traditional public schools. The online charter students lost an average of about 72 days of learning in reading and 180 days of learning in math during the course of a 180-day school year. In other words, when it comes to math, it’s as if the students did not attend school at all” (Layton, 2015). An international study of test results conducted by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development has found that countries that have invested heavily in making technology very accessible in the classroom “have seen ‘no noticeable improvement’ in Pisa test results for reading mathematics and science” (Coughlin, 2015). On the other hand, countries and cities “with the lowest use of the internet in school–South Korea, Shanghai, Hong Kong and Japan–are among the top performers in international tests” (Coughlin, 2015). The OECD’s education director Andreas Schleicher points out that East Asian educational systems use technology in the classroom moderately. He suggests that “classroom technology can be a distraction and result in pupils cutting and pasting prefabricated homework answers from the internet” (Coughlin, 2015). In addition, a recent study comparing the quality of the note-taking of college students who used a laptop versus those that wrote notes by hand has indicated that typing notes can lead to a mindless verbatim transcription and shallow understanding of the material. Whereas, students who wrote their notes tended to paraphrase information in their own words and show a deeper understanding of material (Mueller & Oppenheimer 2014). Recent neurological studies are raising concerns regarding the negative effects of teaching keyboarding instead of hand writing on the developing minds of preschool and primary school students (Klemm, 2014).

Sources:
Layton, Lyndsey. (2015, October 27). Stanford study shows that online charter school students


Trend #7: MOOCs
Trend statement:
So far, Massive Online Open Courses (MOOCs) have not succeeded in significantly changing the landscape of higher education. On the other hand, they have no disappeared and continue to be come of highly quality.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: Medium

Support rationale:
Massive open online courses (MOOCs) are a recent addition to the range of online learning options and their effects appear to be contradictory. On one hand, MOOCs have been run by a variety of public and elite universities in increasing number and quality. On the other hand, although they were initially introduced with great fanfare (Waldrop 2013), they have yet to have a significant effect on higher education and no organization has created a profit model for them. MOOCs should be monitored closely, because it is possible that one of the first institutions affected by them will be community college, specifically their career and continuing education arms. “(0)ne can hypothesize that MOOCs will become polarized into two main groups: MOOCs whose certificates-or, better still, degrees-are given value in the jobs market; and others which contribute to the personal betterment of the ‘student’ or which serve as refresher courses without an immediate simple objective” (Pomerol, 2015).

Sources:
Dennis, Marguerite. (2012, Fall) The Impact of MOOCs on Higher Education. College and University 88.2.

Trend #8: Students Attending Multiple Colleges
Trend statement:
The number of students attending more than one college at a time is on the rise.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
“Swirling students appear to be following unpredictable enrollment patterns. These students may be at a greater risk for not completing a degree, but they don’t have to be” (AACRAO, 2013).

“Among students who enrolled in postsecondary education for the first time in 1995-96, 40 percent had attended more than one institution, while among 2001 college graduates, nearly 60 percent had done so” (Peter, & Cataldi, 2005).

“Students’ transfer patterns reflect the important role of community colleges. Among students who transfer from four-year public institutions, more than half (51.9 percent) transfer “in reverse,” to two-year public institutions. And among students who transfer from two-year public colleges, more than a third (37.6 percent) move laterally, to other two-year public colleges. That is nearly as many as transfer from two-year to four-year public institutions; 41.2 percent” (Gonzalez, 2012).

Sources:
American Association of College Records and Admission Officers. (2013). The ‘swirling’ transfer student: How to work with the unpredictable. AACRAO online.


**Trend #9: Underprepared Students**

**Trend statement:**
As the number of underprepared students continues to increase, community colleges will continue to play a significant role in serving this population.

**Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:** High

**Support rationale:**
Enrollment patterns at area community colleges support this trend—including COD. The enrollment in developmental courses is far and away the largest enrollment segment at the College of DuPage (College of DuPage, 2010).

Nationally this trend is also observed—and is a topic of considerable concern for global positioning (Collins, 2006).

As specific additional examples, from (American College Testing, 2004). “Our nation is in a college-readiness crisis. Too few of our students are prepared to enter the workforce or post-secondary education without additional training or remediation when they graduate from high school. And far too many have to take remedial courses as part of their post-secondary education.”

“For example one study, sponsored by the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB), at the College of DuPage (COD) in Glen Ellyn, Illinois—a middle-class suburb of Chicago, reported that 50 percent of the students new to the College in fall 2005 placed into developmental courses and, moreover, that this developmental education population has grown steadily over time” (Illinois Community College Board, 2006).

Other community colleges and four year schools throughout the country report similar, if not more dramatic results (Krone, 2006).

Moreover, the four year public institutions are not embracing this population (Duranczyk and Higbee, 2006, p.1) and the community colleges may not be resourced for the job according to several sources (Schuetz, and Barr, 2008). Unfortunately for the students, this is a significant barrier to student success. Students are likely to drop out if they fail developmental courses and the failure rates are far too high (Lipka, 2010).

At the state level there will be changes in standards at the high school level of education. Community colleges will serve those students and so will proprietary institutions. Therefore, there will be a need to balance the equity considerations of community colleges with the completion agenda and developmental education needs to be paired with General Education.

**Sources:**


**Trend #10: Increase in Number of Nontraditional Aged Students**

**Trend statement:**
National research suggests enrollments of people 25 years and older in higher education will increase through 2017.

**Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:** High

**Support rationale:**
“The history of adult learning in the United States is nearly as old as the nation itself, yet the adult learner only recently has moved to the forefront of research agendas in higher education. As scholars and policymakers seek to make sense of changing demographics, emerging labor force demands and shifting patterns of educational attainment, research on adult learners will become increasingly vital.” (The Lumina Foundation, 2009).

“With the number of high-school-aged Americans beginning to ebb, President Obama’s goal of dramatically increasing the number of U.S. citizens with postsecondary credentials is going to be impossible to achieve without significantly more adults returning to and graduating from college” (Lederman, D. 2010).

Community colleges will push for more adult students in order to meet completion goals; however, in order to do so, community colleges will need to rethink policies and procedures which currently have a negative direct or indirect impact on adult students.

**Sources:**
Ulmer, M. 2008. *Academic Perspectives: Economics, Cost and Flexibility Rank Among Top Considerations for Adult Learners*. Hoboken, NJ. EducationDynamics, LLC.

**Trend #11: Accountability**

**Trend statement:**
There continues to be an increased focus placed on accountability for community colleges and higher education in general.

**Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:** High

**Support rationale:**
There continues to be an increased call for accountability community colleges and higher education in general (Cowan, 2015) although it is not clear the form this accountability will take (Ebersole, 2015). As institutions funded by public funds, both local and state, successful outcomes for students attending community colleges may be defined by legislators and regulating bodies viewing statistics such as retention, graduation, and transfer rates. Colleges will need to accurately monitor these quantities.

Similarly, as accountability to government and private funding bodies increases, colleges will also need to continue to implement program review and program evaluation plans in order to successfully document student outcomes that go beyond examining retention, graduation and transfer rates.
to include other important outcomes of a college education (Moltz, 2009).

While many state systems include persistence (retention), graduation and transfer to a four-year college as indicators of student success, these measures alone are not sufficient in assessing community college performance as they serve students who have many different academic intentions beyond graduation or transfer (Institute for Higher Education Policy, 2006).

Rightly or wrongly, colleges that can demonstrate accountability through adequate retention, graduation and transfer rates as well as on other important student outcomes may have a competitive advantage over those who cannot.

Sources:

Trend #12: Gap Between High School Curriculum and College Expectations
Trend statement:
Evidence as to how prepared high school students are for college is mixed. Two trends are evident in this area: 1) There is evidence of an increasing gap between high school and college expectations for learning and curriculum. 2) Many students defined as under-prepared have attended community colleges and there is no evidence to suggest this will not continue.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
Between 2000 and 2003, high school graduation rates in Illinois increased, but in recent years a decline has been seen. There is also evidence of different curricular expectations and assessment of learning in high school and colleges:
• Research shows little to no agreement or consensus between high schools and colleges in terms of what it means to be prepared for college, topics that should be covered and what students should learn.
• Research shows that the highest predictors of success in community college (as measured by transfer or attainment of an occupational degree) is the attainment of college-level math credit, avoidance of no-penalty withdrawals and continuous enrollment. Only 11 percent of community college students completed a math course beyond Algebra II in high school, compared to 44 percent of students who enroll in four-year colleges and universities. In Illinois, as in many states, there is no requirement for enrollment past Algebra II in high school, meaning that many students who lack preparation in math will probably continue enrollment in community colleges.
• Increasingly high grades resulting from grade inflation are sending students and parents the false impression that high grades are sufficient in preparing them for college.

According to ACT, only 25 percent of the 2012 high school graduates met all college readiness benchmarks.

Sources:


**Trend #13: Initiative Fatigue**

**Trend statement:**
The amount of time, energy, resources, and personnel has remained relatively fixed but institutions of higher education have been called upon to do more, leading to a decline in organizational effectiveness.

**Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:** High

**Support rationale:**
Expectations for students and school systems continue to rise while many states face the toughest financial challenges of recent history. These dual realities mean that policy makers and practitioners must do more with the resources they have during these difficult budget times.

The Lumina Foundation for Education, one of the best-known higher-education philanthropies in the country, spends nearly $50-million annually on projects to improve college completion. In 2010, the Foundation announced that it is worried about “initiative fatigue,” and is shifting its focus away from giving money to new projects to develop policy ideas to enacting changes needed to improve college graduation rates.

**Sources:**
Brian Durham, ICCB Senior Director for Academic Affairs and Career and Technical Education.
U.S. Department of Education.
*The Chronicle of Higher Education.*

**LABOR FORCE**

**Trend #1: Job Gain in DuPage County**

**Trend statement:**
Since 2012, DuPage County gained 36,000 jobs. Job growth is expected to continue to increase at the rate of 13,000 jobs per year through 2018. DuPage County has the lowest countywide unemployment rate in Northeastern Illinois. Unemployment peaked at 8.9% in 2010 and trended downward to 5.6% in 2014.

**Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:** High

**Support rationale:**
Woods & Poole uses well-designed models for estimates and projections.

**Sources:**

**Trend #2: Fastest Growing Industries in DuPage County**

**Trend statement:**
The industries with the most growth in employment as compared to 2011 employment are Offices of Physical, Occupational and Speech Therapists, and Audiologists; Other Services related to Advertising; Other Grocery and Related Products Merchant Wholesalers; and Services for the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities.

**Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:** High

**Support rationale:**
According to EMSI reports, some of the fastest growing occupations by percentage to 2011 employment include Offices of Physical, Occupational and Speech Therapists and Audiologists; Other Services related to Advertising; Other Grocery and Related Products Merchant Wholesalers; and Services for the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities. Recent reports from the Bureau of Labor Statistics also confirm that occupations with the most job growth will be health related and/or related to the...
care of the elderly and persons with disabilities. Nationwide, occupations such as personal care aides, registered nurses and nursing assistants are projected to be among some of the fastest growing occupations through 2024. The largest industries in DuPage County are Elementary/Secondary Schools; Corporate, Subsidiary, and Regional Managing Offices; Full Service Restaurants; Temporary Help Services; and Local Government Excluding Education and Hospitals as recorded by 2011 total employment. (Chart 18, below.)

Sources:

Trend #3: Demand for healthcare workers
Trend statement:
Demand for healthcare workers through 2024 will continue as the population ages.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: Low
Support rationale:
Overall employment is projected to increase by 6.5% from 2014-2024 adding about 9.8 million jobs with the fastest growth expected in occupations related to healthcare support occupations and healthcare practitioners. Nearly one in four new jobs will be in these two occupational areas. Changes in demographics as the population ages will drive demand for healthcare practitioners and technical occupations and healthcare support operations. (Chart 19, below.)

Sources:

Trend #4: Projected growth for transportation, warehousing and construction jobs but not manufacturing
Trend statement:
Employment in manufacturing is projected to continue to fall as it has for the last 10 years nationwide according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The construction industry is projected to show an increase in employment nationwide but is not expected to reach prerecession levels by 2024. Both transportation and warehousing positions are projected to show demand locally in DuPage County.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: Moderate
Support rationale:
Employment in construction should continue to rise, but will be challenged by the lack of demand for new housing as residents leave the State.

---

Table 3. Employment and wages of occupations with the most projected job growth, 2014-2024 (numbers in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>2011 Jobs</th>
<th>2020 Jobs</th>
<th>Change to 2020</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>2016 Earnings Per Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Public Utilities</td>
<td>15,772</td>
<td>20,030</td>
<td>4,258</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Systems Design Services</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Processing, and Related Occupations</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade, and Related Occupations</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services, Including Religious Organizations</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 18: Fastest Growing Industries in DuPage County
Chart 19: Employment and wages of occupations with the most projected job growth, 2014-2024 (numbers in thousands)
Since 2010, employment in transportation and warehousing jobs has increased by eight percent in DuPage County. By 2025, Choose DuPage is projecting employment to be 34,546 in these fields due to our location and proximity to a multimodal transportation network. Manufacturing jobs are expected to decline nationwide, but DuPage County may not be as affected as shown by the increase in warehousing and transportation positions.

**Sources:**


**Trend #5 Growth in the state’s energy efficiency industry**

**Trend statement:**
Demand for employment in Architecture, Engineering, Farming, Construction, Production and Transportation could increase in the State of Illinois due to growth in the state’s energy efficiency industry.

**Probability of change for the next 3 to 5 years:** High

**Support rationale:**
If demand for alternative energy continues (wind, solar, geothermal, and biofuels), the jobs needed would be in the professional services sector and related occupations. Positions in the following occupational categories of Architecture, Engineering, Farming, Construction, Production and Transportation would likely be affected. However, the price of oil will greatly affect the expansion of these areas and subsequent employment in the alternative energies.

**Sources:**


**Trend #6: Shortage of Middle-Skill Workers**

**Trend statement:**
Between 2010-2020, 48 percent of jobs will require Middle-Skills. Jobs that require Middle-Skills need more than a high school credential but less than a bachelor’s degree. Examples include electricians, dental hygienists, and paralegals. In Illinois, the Bureau of Labor Statistics is showing a shortage of Middle-Skill workers.

**Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:** High

**Support rationale:**
Several well-respected data collection sources agree with this projection.

**Sources:**


**Trend #7: Postsecondary Degree Impact on Hiring and Wages**

**Trend statement:**
Research is continuing to show that postsecondary education has a positive effect on lifetime earnings. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, occupations that usually require some
postsecondary education for entry are projected to grow the fastest during the decade 2014-2024. Research is projecting that wind turbine service technicians, occupational therapy assistants, and physical therapy assistants to be among some of the fastest. None of these positions require a bachelor’s degree.

**Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:** High

**Support rationale:**
Several well-respected data collection sources agree with this projection. (Chart 20, below.)

**Sources:**

**Chart 20**

Trend #8 Labor Force Continues to Age

**Trend statement:**
The median age is projected to be 42.4 in 2024. This is up from 41.9 in 2014. At the same time, the labor force participation rate is expected to decrease from 62.9 percent in 2014 to 60.9 percent by 2024. In DuPage County, workers 55 years and older are the second largest group of employees as of 2013. The largest group is 30-54 years of age.

**Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:** High

**Support rationale:**
Projections based upon solid census data.

**Sources:**

**POLITICS**

**Trend #1: Public Pensions Systems in Crisis**

**Trend statement:**
Increasing pressure to pay for required public pension systems has contributed toward the financial crisis in Illinois.

**Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:** High

**Support rationale:**
According to the Center for Tax and Budget Accountability, “the state’s failure to make its required employer contributions to the five pension systems can be traced to one simple cause:” a state fiscal system “that is so poorly designed it, for decades, failed to generate enough revenue
growth to both maintain service levels from one year to the next, and cover the state’s actuarially required employer contribution to its five pension systems” (Wheeler, 2010). Analysts project the state retirement systems will need $131 billion to cover benefits, the other $85 billion represents the unfunded liability, an obligation that the State must meet, but for which no funding source exists because there is only $46 billion in the bank.

The Illinois Supreme Court rejected the state’s solution for its worst-in-the-U.S. $111 billion pension shortfall, handing organized labor a victory while deepening a crisis with national implications. In addition to the $111 billion in unfunded pension liabilities, it is also $56 billion in debt for health benefits for the retired. It already devotes one in four of its tax dollars to pension according to the Civic federation, a budget watchdog group (Harris & Campbell, 2015; The bottomless pit, 2015).

Almost 80 percent of the workers covered by the state plans are not eligible for Social Security, so the state does not pay a federal tax on their salaries. “The state’s pension plans must be reformed and made less costly.” In the alternative, the business community is pushing for setting up a second tier of pension benefits for new employees that would reduce future pension costs to the state and track more closely private sector cutbacks on employee benefits (Illinois Pension System, 2014). Unless there is a pension reform system implemented, the pension shortfall burden will continually increase.

The stakes for teachers unions are high, as a 2011 Wisconsin law illustrates. Wisconsin Act 10, known as the Wisconsin Budget Repair Bill, eliminated agency fees there and reshaped the collective bargaining process. Since the law’s passage, membership in the Wisconsin Education Association Council and the American Federation of Teachers-Wisconsin has fallen by more than 50 percent, according to a 2015 report from the National Education Association (NEA). In 2014, NEA membership in agency fee states grew by 5,300. In states without agency fees, it fell by more than 47,000 (Antonucci, 2016).

Gov. Rauner is now working with John Cullerton, the Democratic Senate President, to prepare a new version the Illinois Pension Reform Bill that was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court last year (Ahern, 2016). The new proposal would allow public workers a choice of reduced benefits, giving them the option of keeping their pension benefits without a guarantee of certain health care or keeping their health care benefits with a lower retirement plan. (Charts 21, below and 22 to 26, following page.)

Sources:

![Chart 21 (Growth of Illinois' unfunded pension liability, 2010)](chart21)
Trend #2: Accountability in Higher Education

Trend statement:
Increasing state and federal attention is being focused on accountability in postsecondary education.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
As one of the Department of Education initiatives, they have developed a Postsecondary Institutional Ratings System (PIRS). This system is designed to provide information about performances of various institutions based on specific metrics. This information will be incorporated into the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, and the President will propose allocating financial aid based on the college ratings by 2018 (Harmon & Cielinski, 2014; Leveille, 2006; Ebersole, 2015; Stratford, 2014). If approved, not only this act will greatly impact funding distribution for colleges throughout the United States, it will further provide a direct correlation to student enrollment, retention and completion.

Sources:

Chart 22 (Growth of Illinois' unfunded pension liability, 2010)
Illinois Issues, February 2010

Chart 23 (Kloster & Griffith, 2015)
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Trend #3: Affordability in Higher Education

Trend statement:
Tuition costs are out-pacing government funding for postsecondary student aid with the greatest impact on low-income students who may be unable to afford college.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
According to Arthur Haupman, State funding remains one of the largest sources of revenues in American Higher education (Heller, 2001). The challenge in some states (particularly in Illinois) is that fiscal mismanagement has practically destroyed the funding structure and the state is now struggling to pay its share.

In light of the fact that (on average) the graduation rate at four-year institutions is approximately 60%, some states are considering the option of implementing performance benchmarks as a means of providing funding to higher education institutions. As student success rates improve, so would state funding (Conner & Rabovsky, 2011). This option would allow for the potential for institutions to be more equally funded.

During the periods of 2007 through 2013, there has been very significant (negative) changes in the Illinois spending indicators in higher education. These continued changes will have long-term and far reaching implications on the educational systems in Illinois and beyond.

In 2011, City Colleges of Chicago began an ambitious plan of reforming their District. This plan focused on increased student funding via scholarships, grants and industry partnerships, and developing sector based instructional education (Star Program, 2015). Once implemented, it leveled the “playing field” for all CCC students, regardless of location and/or socio-economic background.

As part of its report on Higher Education in 2006, the Spellings Commission wrote: American higher education has become what, in the business world, would be called a mature enterprise: increasingly risk averse, at times self-satisfied, and unduly expensive. It is an enterprise that has yet to address the fundamental issues of how academic programs and institutions must be transformed to serve the changing educational needs of a knowledge economy (McPherson & Schapiro, 2007). Increasingly the government is looking to implement measures of assessment that can be directly tied to funding. Higher Education must embrace metrics that validate their success and support their continued existence.

Sources:
Trend #4: Higher Education Funding

Trend statement:
State funding for colleges and universities are continually declining.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:
High

Support rationale:
In 2012, the National Income and Product Accounts conducted a survey of state funding and determined that in 2011, funding was down by 40.2% compared with fiscal 1980. Extrapolating that trend, the national average state investment in higher education will reach zero in fiscal 2059. In other words, states are already 40 percent of the way to zero. At this rate of decline, it will take another 48 years to finish off the remaining state support for higher education (Mortenson, 2012). This downward spiral is occurring in almost every state within the United States.

A recession beginning in 2008 dramatically reduced state revenue and ended the growth in state and local support achieved between 2004 and 2008. In 2014, for the second straight year, overall state and local funding for higher education increased, reaching $86.3 billion, up 5.7 percent from 2013, but still below 2008-2011 levels. Initial estimates from the Grapevine survey of FY 2015 appropriations for higher education show continued growth overall of 5.2 percent in nominal terms. These data all point to continuing economic recovery and restoration of state funding for higher education on average nationally. In addition to state and local revenues, public institutions collected net tuition revenue of $64.3 billion in 2014, for a total of about $150.7 billion available to support higher education. For the first time since the recession, the share of overall funding for public and private higher education from tuition decreased slightly to 42.7 percent. Net tuition revenue as a share of public higher education revenue was 47.1 percent (Pernsteiner & King, 2014). Interestingly, even though states continue to struggle with educational funding, higher education is the third largest category in State budgets. June, 2015, Pew published a detailed report that outlined federal and state funding and spending for Higher Education.

Sources:

Trend #5: Higher Education Funding in Illinois

Trend statement:
The state’s failure to properly manage funds has resulted in a negative impact on Higher Education and will ultimately change institutional operating procedures.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
The State of Illinois has no operating budget for FY ’16 and as a direct result, numerous colleges and universities throughout the state are experiencing financial hardships.

State colleges and universities in Illinois have thus far seen 1,000 fewer students return for the second semester due to the budget impasse’s impact on the (MAP) Monetary Award Program. Higher education appropriations have also been frozen during the budget standoff and as a result, at least one local university (Chicago State) could soon go broke. Thirty percent of their (Chicago State) operating budget comes from the state, if funding is not
received, then by March they will be unable to pay their $5 million payroll (Journal, 2016). Less MAP funding translates into fewer students’ enrollment.

In addition to Chicago State, Eastern Illinois University, Western Illinois, and Northern Illinois University are facing challenges. Last year S&P lowered EIU, WIU and Chicago’s Northeastern Illinois University ratings to A-minus, with a negative outlook (Strahler, 2015). Community colleges are not immune to the pressures of the non-existent state budget. Heartland, Rock Valley, Blackhawk, Richland, Logan, John Wood, Kaskaskia and Sandburg are just some of the two-year colleges that are currently experiencing financial hardships due to the lack of state funding. (Chart 27, below.)

Sources:
education-enrollment.


Trend #6: Funding Sources in Higher Education
Trend statement:
Higher Education must identify alternative funding opportunities to support institutional sustainability.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High
Support rationale:
Continual budget cuts will negatively impact operating budgets and reserve funds of colleges and universities. As a means of minimizing this reduction in funding, institutions should develop stronger relationships with corporate America who, in turn, can provide financial support not only to programs that support their specific needs but also to the institution at large (Maise, 2012). (Chart 28, below left, and Chart 29 below.)

Financial pressures have also resulted in institutions looking to offer corporate sponsorship, as an example, in 2010, UCLA embarked on a program to sell campus-wide sponsorships in multiple areas, such as the school of arts museum,
professional schools, student activities, festivals and other events and programs. Sponsorships of this type have the potential to provide institutions with multi-million dollars of annual revenue (UCLA Breaks New Ground In Higher Education Sponsorship, 2010). (Chart 30, below.)

Sources:

Trend #7: Leadership and Management in Higher Education
Trend statement:
The path to presidency typically begins in the classroom as a tenured professor.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: Medium

Support rationale:
Colleges and universities have hundreds and even thousands of employees; operating budgets range from millions to billions of dollars annually. Yet, within higher education, rarely are potential presidents required to complete any type of leadership training prior to assuming their role. Additionally, succession planning (in higher education) is practically non-existent. Institutional presidents are often chosen based on their academic experience and less attention is focused on their business acumen.

In light of current budget crisis in states throughout the United States, it is incumbent upon institutions to select candidates that have excellent academic credentials as well as exceptional fiduciary knowledge and skills.

The most common career path to the presidency has remained unchanged since 1986. The Chief Academic Officer continues to be the most frequently cited immediate prior position for college presidents in 2011; more than one in three current presidents were CAOs prior to their current positions. Another constant is that most presidents have spent their entire careers in higher education. Interestingly, however, while more than half of college presidents have never worked outside higher education, the share of presidents whose immediate prior position was outside higher education has increased since 2006, from 13 percent to 20 percent. Much of this growth occurred in the private sector, both nonprofit and for-profit. Not only have the majority of college presidents spent their professional lives in higher education, an overwhelming majority have served as full-time faculty members at some point in their career. Despite the changing nature of the path to the presidency, the share of presidents who have been full-time faculty members remained virtually unchanged between 2011 (70 percent) and 1986 (75 percent) (Cook, 2012).

Sources:
Trend #8: Student Activism in Higher Education

Trend Statement:
Student activism is a catalyst for change.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:
Moderate

Support rational:
Colleges and universities are listening and responding to the needs of students. The advancement of modes of communication (social media and the internet) has provided them with a platform to instantly engage with colleges and universities throughout the United States-and beyond, as they seek to voice their concerns about academic, political and matters of social justice (Dalton, 2015).

Student activism in today’s society includes a much broader range of causes, which includes, international solidarity, human rights, affirmative action, gender equality, diversity in higher education, programs of study and environmental concerns (Alvarado, 1999); (Arthur, 2011).

As a true measure of student activism, one needs to look no farther than the “Black Lives Matter” and the “Path to Citizenship” movements across the United States. Previously, such movements were led and organized by community activists that provide a platform for community causes, however, the face of the movement has now changed. While well-established organizers are still present, college and university students are now leading these efforts. Further, student activism has expanded to include middle and high school students.

Sources:


Trend #9: Sustainability Measures and Implementation

Trend Statement:
Community colleges must become actively engaged in identifying and implementing measures that will support their efforts of academic relevance and sustainability.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:
High

Support rational:
Community colleges can use the option of offering baccalaureate degrees to support sustainability in the areas of student enrollment, retention, and completion. This measure would also assist in financial solvency.

According to the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), the nation’s 1,132 community colleges enroll nearly half of all undergraduates in the U.S.— more than 13 million students. These community colleges graduate up to 25% of all first-time, full-time students, compared with 59% at four-year institutions, according to the National Center for Education Statistics (DiSalvio, 2015). While this option is not ideally suited for all community colleges, there are some community colleges that are in a very good position to provide students with coursework necessary to obtain a four-year degree. This is not a new or uncommon phenomenon. In the state of California alone, there are fifteen community colleges that
offer bachelor’s degrees. The Community College Baccalaureate Association (CCBA) provides data, articles, and updates on legislation that are specific to this area.

Source:

Community College Baccalaureate Association website: http://www.accbd.org/.

Trend #10: Illinois Workforce and Economic Concerns in Higher Education
Trend Statement:
Community colleges must actively engage in programs that meet the needs of current and future workforce.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
A primary concern in industry is the inability to identify qualified applicants; they lack academic, technical, and critical thinking skills. Community colleges can help to bridge these particular gaps by providing short-term certificates, associate and bachelor’s degrees in high-target areas. These areas include: information technology; business; health care; manufacturing; transportation, distribution and logistics.

Workforce trends and international competition suggest that Illinois will need larger numbers of better-educated workers over the coming decades (Perna & Finney, 2011).

The economic importance of higher education will continue to grow. In a 2013 report, researchers from the Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce projected that by 2020, nearly two-thirds of all jobs will require at least some college education, up from 59 percent in 2007. The Georgetown Center further projects that, based on current trends, without significant new investment in capacity, the nation’s education system will not keep pace with the rising demand for educated workers. By 2020, the country’s system of higher education will produce five million fewer college graduates than the labor market will demand (Mitchell & Leachman, 2015).

Sources:

SOCIAL VALUES AND LIFESTYLES
Trend #1: People Without Health Insurance
Trend statement:
The number of people with health insurance in the United States and in DuPage County may increase due to healthcare reform as portions of the legislation are implemented.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
• Nationally, in 2008 about 50 million people were uninsured. This number decreased to 48.6 million uninsured in 2011.
• In 2013, the healthcare bill states there will be an increase in access to affordable care. Increasing Medicaid payments for primary care doctors and providing additional funding for the Children’s Health Insurance Program.
• In 2014, the healthcare bill states there will be an improvement in care quality and lowering costs with the establishment of the Health Insurance Marketplace—increasing access to Medicaid and promoting individual responsibility.
• In 2015, the healthcare bill states there will be an improvement in quality by lowering costs of care and paying physician based on value, not volume.
• Since the Affordable Care Act (ACA) became law, about 17.6 million uninsured people have gained coverage—the largest reduction in the uninsured in decades. This is a historic start, but there is more work to do.

Sources:

Trend #2: DuPage County Poverty Issues
Trend statement:
The number of people living below the poverty line in DuPage County is increasing.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
• The DuPage County poverty growth rate has increased by 63.3 percent between 1980 and 2006.
• Homelessness is an increasing reality for a significant number of residents in DuPage County. A one night homeless count of sheltered and unsheltered persons was conducted on January 28, 2015. The total number of sheltered homeless persons increased 2.7% from 625 to 642.
• In fiscal year 2014, 3215 persons in 1236 households received financial assistance for rent, security deposits, moving costs, or mortgage in order to prevent them becoming homeless.
• In fiscal year 2014, 1074 persons in 384 households received financial utility assistance in order to prevent them becoming homeless.
• In fiscal year 2014, 2656 persons in 1052 households received case management, legal services, and/or financial counseling to prevent them becoming homeless.
• In 2013, DuPage County had 64,737 people with incomes below the Federal Poverty Level.
• In 2013, the number of children in poverty is 9.8% of the population.

Sources:

Trend #3: Diversity and Religious Affiliation
Trend statement:
Affiliation with organized religions remains steady for older adults, but is decreasing within the millennial generation; these dynamics appear to be influenced by the increase of diversity in the County.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: Moderate

Support rationale:
• The Pew Research study shows an increasing number of individuals have shifted from identifying themselves as being associated with a religious organization; but not participating, to “no religious affiliation.” From 2007-2014 there was a 6.7% increase in religious unaffiliated in the U.S. population.
• Studies indicate that changing attitudes about lifestyles and sexual orientation are linked to the same generational forces helping to reshape religious identity and practices in the U.S. with Millennials expressing far more acceptance of these factors than older adults.
• Ethnic, religious, and sexual diversity of the student population, faculty, and staff is perceived to create a more welcoming, respectful, supportive, and successful environment on campus.

Sources:

Trend #4: Pollution in DuPage County
Trend statement:
DuPage County’s concerns with pollution may decrease as sustainability practices and green initiatives become more accepted.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:
Moderate

Support rationale:
• In 2014 DuPage County received the Governor’s Sustainability Award, for the second time, which recognizes public and private organizations for significant achievements in protecting the environment through sustainable practices.
• The County Health Rankings and Roadmaps; released in 2015 states that DuPage ranks 3rd out of 102 Illinois counties in physical environmental quality.
• DuPage County is an active participant in the Sierra Clubs “Cool Counties” program which focuses on decreasing air pollutants and greenhouse gases to promote better air quality. The goal is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the county by 10 percent in 2020 and 20 percent in 2030 by inviting businesses, environmental leaders and other community members to be a party of the effort which will be led by the Conservation Foundation.
• Illinois community colleges have been key in developing and maintaining resiliency in their communities by developing sustainable strategies, utilizing green products, creating green curricula, researching best practices, and incorporating sustainability principals into their educational priorities.

Sources:
“Certificates and Degrees, Green Careers”, Illinois Green Economy Network (IGEN), September 2015.
“DuPage County starts initiative to drop greenhouse gas emissions”, Hank Beckman, Naperville Sun, April 14, 2015.
“Celebrate Campus Sustainability Month”, Hilary Valentine, Parkland College News and Events, October 08, 2015.
Trend #5: Usage of Social Media

**Trend statement:**
Usage of social media platforms will continue to expand over the next 3-5 years.

**Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:** High

**Support rationale:**
- Traditional college-aged students continue to rely on Facebook as their main social media outlet, with YouTube, Snapchat, LinkedIn, and podcasts growing in popularity while Twitter decreases.
- Mobile technology continues to improve, including streamlined apps and greater data capacity, thus reinforcing this continued means of social interaction.
- More attention is being paid to improving the current popular social media platforms, rather than creating new ones.
- Videos and photos are regarded as the most popular uses of social media; Facebook and YouTube plan to introduce spherical video, also known as “360 video.”
- Social commerce, making purchases from a social media post, is gaining momentum.
- College of DuPage enrollment in online classes has remained steady, increasing slightly between Fall 2014 and 2015.

**Sources:**
College of DuPage, Tenth Day Semester Statistics, Spring 2014 through Fall 2015.
College of DuPage, Local Student Survey – 2015 to 2016 Fall/2015 to 2016 Spring.

Trend #6: Digital Technologies Affect Learning and Careers

**Trend statement:**
The use of existing digital technology for engagement and enhancement of learning will continue to expand as well as impact future careers.

**Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:** High

**Support rationale:**
- Improving student’s digital literacy through technology based curriculum will facilitate their ability to seek and find information in formal (classroom) and informal (employment or home) learning environments.
- Student’s educational needs should be met by the use of technology to reach diverse learners such as those living in rural areas, the disabled or impaired, homeless, migrant, or have language barriers.
- Students need to gain technological skills and critical thinking abilities in order to expand general employment opportunities.
- Students are increasingly tech-savvy and demand relevant and engaging modes of instructional delivery as well as access to up-to-date occupational equipment.

**Sources:**
“Coming to an office near you”, The Economist; Technology and Jobs, January 18th, 2014.

Trend #7: Work Patterns Are Changing
Trend statement:
Employees are requiring more flexibility with work schedules and locations (home, office, or offsite) to establish work-life balance.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
• The U.S. Department of Labor (Wage and Hour Division—WHD) announced a proposal rule that would require employers to pay overtime to employees earning as little as $23,660 per year, as many as five million people who are required to work more than 40 hours per week without additional compensation.
• There has been a rise in informal employment, undeclared and temporary work arrangements, as well as involuntary part-time work.
• Those who spend less than 20% of their time working remotely are the most engaged. These employees likely enjoy an ideal balance of both worlds—the opportunities for collaboration and camaraderie with coworkers at the office and a relative sense of freedom that comes from working remotely.
• Those who spend more than half of their time working remotely have similar engagement to employees who do not work remotely.
• Rapid changes in communication technologies and their increasing use in the workplace have modified employees’ accessibility and has led to greater permeability between the boundaries of work and non-work life.
• 70% of happy workers report having some workplace flexibility in the forms of scheduling (daily and break times) and working from home.

Sources:

Trend #8: Longer Life Expectancy
Trend statement:
People in the United States are living longer, retiring later and pursuing multiple careers. Therefore, additional education or training will be required.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: Moderate

Support rationale:
• When it comes to the hardest places to live in the United States, DuPage County residents struggle less with health and wealth than most, ranking 69 out of 3,135 total counties, according to the New York Times data map.
• 72% of individuals over the age of 50 say their ideal retirement will include working—often in new, more flexible and fulfilling ways.
• The average retirement age is around 63 years, but by 2050, the average retirement age is estimated at 67-68, due in part to increase longevity, an aging workforce and receding government benefits.
• In 2012, 62% of the 45-60 population experienced at least a 20% decline in the value of their financial assets, compared with only 41% in 2010. This occurred despite strong increases in stock prices between 2010 and 2012. Both in 2010 and 2012, households that experienced a major decline in their financial assets were much more likely to plan on delaying retirement.
• Present evidence suggests that people are not only living longer than they did previously, but with less disability and fewer functional limitations.

Sources:

Trend #9: Volunteerism
Trend statement:
Volunteerism is on the rise among the Millennial generation.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
• Most Millennials volunteer between 1 and 10 hours per year and are more likely to volunteer if they can leverage their skills or expertise. About 25 percent said they were able to use their skills to benefit the cause.
• Millennials are interested in and passionate about a cause, but tangible incentives like name recognition, prizes, and more time off, can encourage participation. Some 43 percent said they would be more likely to give if competition was involved.
• Today’s young Americans are more serious about giving back than their parents were. Those under age 30 now are more likely to say citizens have a “very important obligation” to volunteer, an Associated Press-GfK poll finds.
• Millennials are volunteering in record numbers. 63% of survey respondents volunteered for a nonprofit in 2011, and 90% expected to volunteer as much or more in 2012 than in 2011. An astonishing 75% gave a financial gift in 2011, and 71% had raised money on behalf of nonprofits.

Sources:

TECHNOLOGY
Trend #1: Redesigning Learning Spaces
Trend Statement:
As new technology-driven models for teaching and learning emerge, new types of physical spaces for teaching and learning will be required.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
Smart rooms, active learning classrooms, collaboration spaces, maker spaces and spaces that facilitate cross-disciplinary problem solving are emerging within higher education.

Educational institutions are encouraging and facilitating new forms of teaching and learning by rearranging and redesigning the physical spaces within which these activities occur. From simple reorganization of desk patterns to more advanced technology enhanced smart rooms, web based collaboration spaces, and maker spaces, emerging technologies are shifting the physical space requirements within higher education institutions.

As higher education continues to move away from traditional lecture based programming to more hands on scenarios, university classrooms must shift to accommodate project based and cross-disciplinary learning. This requires a
A rethinking of the design of educational spaces, from reconfiguring traditional classroom to more advanced new spaces to accommodate emerging technologies (Johnson, et al., 2015).

These trends are fueled by the emergence of the Internet of Things (IoT), bring your own device (BYOD), and cloud based technologies where everything and everyone are connected at all times. Spaces that facilitate and encourage connectivity and communication are being developed for educational purposes. This trend is also driven by a technology savvy, do it yourself (DIY) culture. The emergence of accessible, and relatively affordable 3D printing has spurred development of maker spaces, fab labs, and tinker spaces that encourage design thinking and project based learning.

The Maker movement has already led to the opening of workshops in libraries, community centers, and other public venues. As this trend moves into higher education, colleges are using these spaces to address a multidisciplinary approach to teaching and learning. Higher Education Institutions are linking design thinking, lean startup models, and entrepreneurship activities into maker spaces that allow students to test, prototype, and launch creative startups (Carlson, 2015).

Furthermore, the accessibility of rapid prototyping and 3D printing technologies is changing the way products are designed and manufactured. This is having a profound impact on project-based learning throughout many academic disciplines. Universities are creating spaces dedicated to nurture creativity and stimulate intellectual inquiry around these new and emerging pedagogies (Johnson, et al., 2014).

The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign just announced that it is constructing an entire building dedicated to these types of design thinking activities. A new design center will bring together students from different disciplines and allow them to collaborate, create, and prototype new ideas and inventions. The building will give students access to materials, mentors, courses, programs, workshops and other resources for testing ideas (Wurth, 2015).

Sources:
Wurth, Julie (2015) UI’s new Campus Design Center to provide ‘one-stop shop’ for students to create, The News-Gazette, Sunday, December 27, 2015.

Trend #2: Higher education IT moves toward the cloud
Trend Statement:
With the expansion of cloud-based technology, colleges and universities outsource IT infrastructure and services at an increasing rate. This change is driven by financial efficiency as well as a search for increased ease of use and flexibility for students and faculty.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High
Support Rationale:
Moving to the “cloud”—shorthand for utilizing off-site commercial server hosting facilities and services—can save institutions considerable amounts of money and provide a higher level of service and increased flexibility. In higher education, this change requires a cultural shift in how IT professionals see their positions in the institution, and focus on tasks that contribute more directly to the institutional mission (Bedrossian, et al., 2014).

Private sector companies use cloud services at a much higher rate than educational institutions,
with the decision to move infrastructure and services off-site driven by financial realities.

- Dow Jones & Company “stands to realize a $100 million dollar savings by converting 75% of on-premises infrastructure to the cloud over three years.” The company will consolidate 40 physical data centers into six, and move the rest of their data to Amazon Web Services (Bedrossian, et al., 2014).
- At Facebook, the Director of Infrastructure Strategy and Analytics has said that on-premises infrastructure is operationally viable “only when public cloud expenditures exceed $300,000 per month” (Bedrossian, et al., 2014).
- Lionsgate Vice President of IT reports that the company will save 50% of their infrastructure costs by using the public cloud rather than a traditional hosting facility (Bedrossian, et al., 2014).

In higher education, institutions are increasingly outsourcing the hosting of their learning management system. The 2014 Annual Report from the Instructional Technology Council confirms this trend. The survey found that in 2014, only 25% of respondents own and maintain their own servers. This is down from 30% in 2013 and down from 50% in 2008 (Mullins, 2014).

In fact, some LMS vendors require that institutions adopt their hosting solutions. Canvas, the popular LMS, is only offered through Amazon Web Services and is not available to be hosted locally (Instructure, 2016).

Student email is another function now most-often hosted outside the institution. Columbia University noted that 30% of their student email was being forwarded to outside vendors. They report adopting a strategy of “following their users” and migrated to a suite of email and online tools provided by Google (Bedrossian, et al., 2014).

Central Piedmont Community College in North Carolina also moved their student email to the cloud. Ken Engle, the Director of Web Development, reports:

“This project has been one of the most successful and popular efforts undertaken at the College. When the service went live, helpdesk support calls for email virtually disappeared. The student response to the project has been overwhelmingly positive and spawned requests for additional services and tools provided by Google” (Engle).

Kevin Roberts, the Chief Planning and Information Officer at Abilene Christian University, reports a $120,000 per year savings with their move from self-hosted email to Google. “People’s fears around moving email to the cloud are like the fears of old world sailors around traveling to the edge of the world” (Geer, 2011).

Sources:

Trend #3: Online Learning Drives Change Across the Institution
Trend Statement:
As online learning matures, early consumption-model courses are being replaced with a variety of new, innovative course formats. Blended classes, flipped classrooms and other new course configurations take advantage of the technology infrastructure available now to most institutions and are becoming drivers of academic and institutional change.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High
Support Rationale:
As of 2015, questions about the effectiveness of online and blended learning have largely been answered (Johnson, et al., 2015). The general acceptance of online learning has encouraged the smart use of technology to flow back to all course formats. New delivery methods and new course configurations are able to take advantage of modern pedagogical strategies and currently available technology infrastructure (Johnson, et al., 2014).

With brick and mortar now proven not to be a requirement, innovation in online learning is also calling into question our assumptions about traditional semester schedules, the efficacy of traditional course content and perhaps even the primacy of traditional colleges and universities compared to new, emerging options.

By 2014, 350 institutions were offering or experimenting with competency-based programs of study and prior-learning assessment, where student success and completion is measured by the knowledge and skills they can demonstrate, rather than relying on any set time period of study. The US Department of Education now grants federal financial aid eligibility to these programs (Fain, 2014).

Within individual courses, students are increasingly being required to create original content – video or audio recordings, websites, blogs, and similar projects. Courses in departments that traditionally would have no hands-on component are now incorporating this type of work as a significant part of the curriculum (Horizon, 2014). Many institutions have created “maker spaces” to provide campus locations for students to complete this kind of work (Johnson, et al., 2014).

“Teaching methods and models of delivery will certainly shift to fit our increasingly digital world. The “sage on the stage” at a university will no longer be a common mode of delivery. In the classroom—whether physical or virtual—we will see more attention given to group projects, conversations and applied learning, with lecture content going the way of textbooks as something experienced in preparing for class” (Koller, 2015).

High quality free or low-cost online learning opportunities are now available outside of traditional higher education institutions. Coursera, Udacity and Udemy all offer free or relatively inexpensive courses to anyone, anywhere in the world. Coursera courses are designed and delivered by faculty from some of the most prestigious universities in the world. Udacity offers “nanodegrees” in a few different Computer Science and technology fields, and as of 2016 guarantees a technology job for their students upon graduation, or it will refund half their tuition (Udacity, 2016).

These nanodegrees may be a harbinger of more career-focused online learning. Future students will increasingly be able to find out the level of math, science and other subjects they need for their chosen career and complete that work online (Gates, 2015).

Sources:
Trend #4: Increased Demand for Technology Skills/Training

Trend Statement:
Given the rate of sustained rapid technological advancement, there is an ongoing need for increased base-level technology skills, as well as for continued technology training and professional development.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
Instructors and students alike need to stay current with technology trends for future success. Households need a growing base level of technology access and support. Concerns continue to arise about the growth of knowledge obsolescence as technological change outpaces people’s ability to stay current with emerging technologies. With the proliferation of open educational resources, and increases in online, hybrid, and blended learning, faculty training, support, and engagement in new pedagogical methodologies are critical issues. While digital divide gaps have closed significantly over the past 15 years, gaps still remain in educational preparation and technology savvy amongst both faculty and students alike (SCUP, 2015).

Assisting faculty with successful integration of technology and optimizing the use of technology in teaching and learning are enduring themes in the top IT issues for higher education (Dahlstrom, 2015).

Recent horizon reports discuss the importance of creating a culture that embraces innovation. Faculty ‘buy-in’ to view new methodologies as viable alternatives to traditional face to face learning is critical. Institutions need to reward and value teaching, and to encourage faculty to develop and explore ways to integrate emerging technology into the curriculum. Faculty training often does not acknowledge the needs for increased digital fluency, and the lack of rewards for teaching (especially at research focused institutions) are seen as impeding the progress of innovation and implementation for new and effective digital pedagogies (Johnson, et al., 2014, 2015).

Ren Witaker discusses the need to find ways to ease the pedagogical transition for inexperienced, curious, or even reluctant faculty, as well as the need to give faculty better opportunities to understand, explore, experience and critique these new methodologies (Whitaker, 2015). Greer and Mott discuss the inevitability of growing knowledge obsolescence and an increasing demand for instructors and students alike to stay current with technology trends. Also explored is the growing technological competencies required for career success. Students will need to have expanded technology skills for success. Instructors and students will need continued training and re-training (Greer and Mott, 2010).

Sources:
Freich, Lisa. (January 29, 2013) Phone interview.
Halal, William E. (February 1, 2013) Phone interview.
**Trend #5: Learning Analytics and data-driven decision making**

**Trend Statement:**
As data related to teaching and learning becomes increasingly extensive and accessible, and as visualization and analytic methods for this data are invented, there is an increasing trend toward using this “Big Data” for evidence-based decision making in higher education.

**Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:** High

**Support Rationale:**
Learning Analytics, the use of data to answer questions about teaching and learning, continues to mature as an area of inquiry. As more and more institutions invest in and deploy data warehouses, and as the amount of actual coursework taking place through a learning management system continues to increase, the ability to connect student behavior to outcomes is greater than ever before (McKay, 2015a).

With increasing frequency, institutions are using this data to create a comprehensive picture of each student, and use that picture for various reasons—to build better course experiences, empower students to be active learners, address at-risk students, and assess factors affecting completion and student success. (Johnson, et. al., 2015, 2014) “It takes a lot of mystery out of why students succeed and why students fail. It gives you more information, and when you can put that information into the hands of faculty who are really concerned about students and completion rates and retention, the more you’re able to create better learning and teaching environments.”—Robert W. Wagner, executive vice provost and dean at Utah State (Young, 2016).

There is federal support for data initiatives that is not specific to higher education. In March 2012 the Obama administration launched the Big Data Research and Development Initiative with the aim of “improving the ability to extract knowledge and insights from large and complex collections of digital data” (Obama, 2012).

Along with this increased access to information come increased ethical and privacy concerns. (Johnson, et. al., 2015) Judgements of individuals might be colored by access to data about groups to which they belong, or data could be generated from a system with embedded errors or biases and provide and incorrect view of reality. Finally, the risk exists to expose unflattering information about an institution, department or individual (McKay, 2015b).

However, Tim McKay from the University of Michigan believes there is an “ethical imperative” to collect and analyze as much information as possible. “If there’s bad news about our performance lurking in our data, I think we’re obliged to find out and to respond” (McKay, 2015b).

**Sources**

**Trend #6: Increased use of Mobile Devices leads to new educational opportunities and strategies.**

**Trend Statement:**
The transformative potential of mobile devices and applications will fuel change in the way college courses are created and delivered.

**Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:** High
Support rationale:
A 2014 survey of four-year college students reports that 95% of students owned a smartphone, 57% owned a tablet and 29% owned an e-book reader. Institutions are responding to this level of usage by updating their IT infrastructure to accommodate BYOD policies (Johnson, et al., 2014). The Adobe report “The State of Mobile Benchmark” states that tablets drive an increasing percentage of web traffic, and according to EdTech magazine, a strong indicator that colleges should be preparing tablet-friendly experiences for their websites and course materials (Daly, 2013).

“BYOD is often less about the devices and more about the personalized content that users have loaded onto them. Devices are often already populated with productivity apps helping them to better organize their notes, syllabi and schedules. Students can use iPads during class to annotate instructor’s slides, record lectures, take notes, and create mind maps of complex topics. Higher education institutions are increasingly updating their IT infrastructures to accommodate BYOD policies (Johnson, et al., 2014).

The increasing ubiquity of mobile devices can drive new educational models. “On-demand videos in Adult Learning and educational games for K-12 are just two examples of new ways to educate…using the mobile platforms (Bali, 2013). “It’s likely that interest in MOOCs and other freely available educational opportunities has grown faster because of the saturation of mobile technology (Daly, 2013).

One area of slower-than-expected adoption is with e-textbooks. Questions about accessibility remain, with institutions considering whether requiring e-books means that they should also provide the device.

Sources:


Trend #7: The Internet of Things is growing.
Trend Statement:
Mobility and the Internet of Things (IoT) are intertwined and mutually reinforcing. As devices and sensors become cheaper and more ubiquitous, the amount of data generated from them will increase drastically. As long as an institution has the proper tools for analyzing this data, the IoT has the potential to reveal new, revolutionary pedagogical methods better suited for today’s students.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: Medium

Support rationale:
As people’s devices become more powerful, integrated with multiple sensors and the ability to connect to the internet, an increasing amount of data is created from this device-network interaction. This data is called The Internet of Things (IoT), and as the devices that create this data become more ubiquitous the rate at which it is created will increase drastically. Mike Abbiatti, executive director of the Western Cooperative for Educational Technologies, writes in an article that “The Internet of Things is NOT simply a story about connecting millions of devices to the global Internet. IoT is about what our states and institutions actually DO with Internet connectivity… What do we do when our students arrive on our campuses in Internet-enabled vehicles, wearing Internet-enabled clothing, carrying eight to ten Internet-enabled devices, and with clear expectations that our systems can support them?” (2015).

In an article written for Center for Digital Education, Travis Seekins (AVP of Student Technology at Hardin-Simmons University) wrote concerning the growing ubiquity of these devices.
“A typical five-year plan for infrastructure growth may only last three years. It is impossible to future-proof the network with a “wired-only” budget. Plan for expanded bandwidth and wireless access points by working collaboratively across the business, IT, housing and student services departments to meet student expectations, now and into the future” (Seekins, 2015).

In 2011, the amount of smartphone shipments outnumbered those of personal computers for the first time, and that trend has remained since (Canalys, 2012). Smartphones will become the “personal gateway to the IoT”, serving as a remote control or hub for the connected home, connected car, or the fitness devices people are increasingly starting to wear (Jankowski, et al., 2014). With increasing amounts of people using multiple devices, the shift toward a larger IoT is accelerated. Consumer expectations will be driven by this expanding market and the design structures that integrate IoT will become less a novelty and more a necessity.

For instruction, IoT in higher education empowers blended learning models that integrate personalized materials and assessment technologies that deliver instant feedback. In this landscape, students will have the ability to monitor their own environment and collect real-time data for further study (Cisco, 2013). In addition, the IoT could open up new ways to conduct research and learning. The IoT has the capacity to connect the entire campus infrastructure, from the largest building and all its classrooms to the smallest piece of laboratory equipment. With so many objects linked, the IoT could facilitate new pathways for research that explore the kinds of knowledge available when so many things are connected (Educause, 2014).

In short, the IoT has great potential. The increasingly connected network of devices and data streams could coordinate campus spaces, integrating information from sensors embedded in objects which could include everything from library books to robots. The components that collect and relay data are being used in makerspaces, laboratories, and projects undertaken by students and faculty (Educause, 2014). While few institutions have started utilizing the IoT, the possibilities are as boundless as the imaginations of the students themselves.

Sources:

Trend #8: Ubiquity of Social Media Usage
Trend Statement:
Social media is changing the way people interact, present ideas and information, and judge the quality of content and contributions of others.

Probability of change for the next 3-5 years: High

Support rationale:
Social media tools such as Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter and Skype have greater and greater impact on our lives as more and more of our daily interactions occur digitally and asynchronously. Among all American adults, social media has a 65% usage rate, and a 90% usage rate among Americans aged eighteen to twenty-nine (Perrin, et al., 2015).
This increasing ubiquity has changed the way people communicate, and promotes individuals from simply consumers of media to co-creators.

“Not to put too fine a point on it, but the moment we’re living through is the largest increase in expressive capability in human history…Media is less and less about crafting a single message to be consumed by individuals, but more and more often a way of creating an environment for convening and supporting groups” (Shirky, 2009).

Increasingly, students express an interest in using social media to communicate with their instructors and peers, and faculty are formally incorporating the use of social media into their courses (Coffin, 2013). Here at College of DuPage, students in Education and English courses, among others, collaborate online by creating Wikipedia articles (Henningsen, 2015) and share information with industry professionals and experts on Twitter (Zawlocki, 2015).

The increased activity and interaction keeps the new generation of college students engaged more than traditional lecture, and this is one aspect of the new role of faculty in higher education (Zawlocki, 2015).

**Sources:**


**Trend #9: Data Privacy Issues and Cyber Attacks will remain a prominent issue in higher education.**

**Trend Statement:**
The increased reliance on IT systems and networks will continue to make those same systems a desirable target for attack by hackers, cyber criminals and cyber terrorists. Higher education institutions need to plan for next-generation security technologies and policies to respond to evolving threats.

**Probability of change for the next 3-5 years:** High

**Support rationale:**
As work and life becomes increasingly digital, the opportunity for theft and fraud increases as well. More and more services are becoming cloud-based, and the industry is expected to grow by at least 18% next year (Handmer, 2016).

Security policies vary from company to company, and some may expose users to unintended risks (Handmer, 2016). Cloud based service providers may not meet the standards set by an institution’s IT department (Network World, 2016). The prevalence of ransomware attacks is increasing. These attacks leave data inaccessible until a ransom is paid (TrendMicro, 2015).

Over the next 12 months we can expect to see more of these attacks because the easiest way to get the data back to pay the ransom. “With a bit of forethought, better education and real-time security protection, not to mention a regular, robust back up routine, the threat of ransomware can be cut down to size (Network World, 2016).

Phishing attacks—tricking users into entering their credentials—are also increasing. “Phishing
attacks are growing more sophisticated all the time, as official-looking messages and websites, or communications that apparently come from trusted sources, are employed to gain access to your systems” (Network World, 2016).

In response to these threats, institutions will spend more on security technology and provide a higher level of training for employees. We can also expect to see security issues addressed in new legislation (Handmer, 2016).

The top three information security issues as reported by top-ranking IT professionals in higher education are:
1. Ensuring that members of the institutional community receive information security education and training;
2. Developing an effective information security strategy that responds to institutional organization and culture and that elevates information security concerns to institutional leadership;
3. Planning for and implementing next-generation security technologies to respond to evolving threats (Grama, 2016).

Sources:
APPENDIX D.
Community College Survey of Student Engagement
COLLEGE OF DuPAGE
2017
Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)

Overview
The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) was established in 2001 as a project of the Community College Leadership Program at The University of Texas at Austin. Today, CCSSE is a product and service of the Center for Community College Student Engagement, which is part of the Program for Higher Education Leadership in the Department of Educational Administration at The University of Texas at Austin.

CCSSE provides information on student engagement, a key indicator of learning and, therefore, of the quality of community colleges. The survey, administered to community college students, asks questions that assess institutional practices and student behaviors that are correlated highly with student learning and student retention.

College of DuPage administers the CCSSE survey approximately every three years. The first survey was administered in 2003, with subsequent surveys administered in 2006, 2009, 2012, 2014, and 2017. The 2017 survey was administered to 705 students at the classroom level. As a result, full-time students, who by definition are enrolled in more classes than part-time students, are more likely to be sampled. To adjust for this sampling bias, CCSSE uses a statistical weighting procedure which is uniquely calculated for each institution, and is based on the most recent publicly available IPEDS enrollment figures.

2017 marked the first administration of the Center's refreshed CCSSE survey instrument. As a result, CCSSE 2017 utilizes a single-year cohort (2017 CCSSE participant colleges only) in all of its data analyses, including the computation of benchmark scores.

The 2017 CCSSE Cohort includes 297 institutions from 40 states and one Canadian province. One hundred thirty-five are classified as small (<4,500), 74 as medium (4,500-7,999), 63 as large (8,000-14,999), and 25 as extra-large institutions (15,000+) credit students. A list of the 25 extra-large community college participants can be found at the end of this report.

CCSSE Benchmarks
CCSSE benchmarks are groups of conceptually related survey items that focus on institutional practices and student behaviors that promote student engagement—and that are positively related to student learning and persistence. The five CCSSE benchmarks are:

1. Active and Collaborative Learning
2. Student Effort
3. Academic Challenge
4. Student-Faculty Interaction, and
5. Support for Learners
Benchmark scores are standardized to have a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 25 across all respondents.

**COD Benchmark Scores Over Time**

**Active & Collaborative Learning**
Students learn more when they are actively involved in their education and have opportunities to think about and apply what they are learning in different settings. Through collaborating with others to solve problems or master challenging content, students develop valuable skills that prepare them to deal with the kinds of situations and problems they will encounter in the workplace, the community, and their personal lives.

**Questions related to Active and Collaborative Learning:**
- Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions.
- Made a class presentation.
- Worked with other students on projects during class.
- Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments.
- Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary).
- Participated in a community-based project (service learning activity) as a part of a regular course.
- Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.).

**Student Effort**
Students’ behaviors contribute significantly to their learning and the likelihood that they will attain their educational goals. “Time on task” is a key variable, and there are a variety of settings and means through which students may apply themselves to the learning process.

**Questions related to Student Effort:**
- Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in.
- Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources.
- Come to class without completing readings or assignments.
- Number of books read on your own (not assigned) for personal enjoyment or academic enrichment.
- Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, rehearsing, doing homework, or other activities related to your program).
- Frequency: Peer or other tutoring.
- Frequency: Skill labs (writing, math, etc.).
- Frequency: Computer lab.

### Student Effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Student Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Academic Challenge

Challenging intellectual and creative work is central to student learning and collegiate quality.

**Questions related to Academic Challenge:**

- Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations.
- Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory.
- Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information.
- Making judgments about the value or soundness of information, arguments, or methods.
- Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations.
- Using information you have read or heard to perform a new skill.
- Number of assigned textbooks, manuals, books, or book-length packs of course readings.
- Number of written papers or reports of any length.
- Extent to which your examinations during the current academic year have challenged you to do your best work at this college.
- Encouraging you to spend significant amounts of time studying.
Student-Faculty Interaction
In general, the more interaction students have with their teachers, the more likely they are to learn effectively and persist toward achievement of their educational goals. Personal interaction with faculty members strengthens students’ connections to the college and helps them focus on their academic progress. Working with an instructor on a project or serving with faculty members on a college committee lets students see first-hand how experts identify and solve practical problems. Through such interactions, faculty members become role models, mentors, and guides for continuous, lifelong learning.

Questions related to Student-Faculty Interaction:
- Used email to communicate with an instructor.
- Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor.
- Talked about career plans with an instructor or advisor.
- Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with instructors outside of class.
- Received prompt feedback (written or oral) from instructors on your performance.
- Worked with instructors on activities other than coursework.
Support for Learners
Students perform better and are more satisfied at colleges that are committed to their success and cultivate positive working and social relationships among different groups on campus. Community college students also benefit from services targeted to assist them with academic and career planning, academic skill development, and other areas that may affect learning and retention.

Questions related to Support for Learners:
- Providing the support you need to help you succeed at this college.
- Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds.
- Helping you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.).
- Providing the support you need to thrive socially.
- Providing the financial support you need to afford your education.
- Frequency: Academic advising/planning.
- Frequency: Career counseling.

[Graph showing Support for Learners over the years with data points for 2003, 2006, 2009, 2012, 2014, and 2017, with values 44.7, 45.8, 45.4, 45.6, 46.8, 45.2 respectively.]

Cohort Standardized Mean Score
COD Benchmarks Compared to Extra Large Colleges & Top Performers

Aspects of HIGHEST Student Engagement
The following items reflect the largest difference in mean score between COD and the 2017 Cohort.

Aspects of Lowest Student Engagement
The following items reflect those items on which COD performed the least favorably relative to the 2017 CCSSE Cohort.
COD Benchmarks by Full-Time and Part-Time Students

Active & Collaborative Learning
Students learn more when they are actively involved in their education and have opportunities to think about and apply what they are learning in different settings. Through collaborating with others to solve problems or master challenging content, students develop valuable skills that prepare them to deal with the kinds of situations and problems they will encounter in the workplace, the community, and their personal lives.

Student Effort
Students’ behaviors contribute significantly to their learning and the likelihood that they will attain their educational goals. “Time on task” is a key variable, and there are a variety of settings and means through which students may apply themselves to the learning process.
Academic Challenge
Challenging intellectual and creative work is central to student learning and collegiate quality.

Student-Faculty Interaction
In general, the more interaction students have with their teachers, the more likely they are to learn effectively and persist toward achievement of their educational goals. Personal interaction with faculty members strengthens students’ connections to the college and helps them focus on their academic progress. Working with an instructor on a project or serving with faculty members on a college committee lets students see first-hand how experts identify and solve practical problems. Through such interactions, faculty members become role models, mentors, and guides for continuous, lifelong learning.
Support for Learners
Students perform better and are more satisfied at colleges that are committed to their success and cultivate positive working and social relationships among different groups on campus. Community college students also benefit from services targeted to assist them with academic and career planning, academic skill development, and other areas that may affect learning and retention.

2017 Special Focused Items
The Center adds special-focused items to CCSSE each year to help participating colleges further explore fundamental areas of student engagement. The 2017 special-focus areas elicited new information about student’s experience associated with academic advising and planning such as whether students were required to meet with an advisor before registering for classes, how many times they met with an advisor over the course of an academic term, and whether they met with the same person each time.
The following five graphs show the Academic Advising and Planning special focused item responses for COD compared to the 2017 cohort.

**Since your first academic term at COD, have you met (in person or online) with an academic advisor before registering for classes each term?**

- COD (n=705)
- 2017 Cohort (n=167,302)

**Prior to registering for classes before this academic term at COD, were you required to meet (in person or online) with an academic advisor?**

- COD (n=672)
- 2017 Cohort (n=163,611)
During this academic term at COD, how many times have you met (in person or online) with an academic advisor?

- COD (n=702)
- 2017 Cohort (n=166,778)

During this academic term at COD, if you have met (in person or online) with an academic advisor more than once, did you meet with the same academic advisor each time?

- COD (n=705)
- 2017 Cohort (n=166,656)
During your most recent meeting (in person or online) with an academic advisor during this academic term at COD, he or she discussed when you next advising session should be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COD (n=691)</th>
<th>2017 Cohort (n=164,660)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have not met with an academic advisor during this term</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man/Male</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman/Female</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other &amp; Prefer Not To Respond</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race Ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity Unknown</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Student</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2017 CCSSE Cohort Extra-Large Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield College, CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward College, FL</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College of San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of DuPage, IL</td>
<td>IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Southern Nevada, NV</td>
<td>NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus State Community College, OH</td>
<td>OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso Community College, TX</td>
<td>TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida South Western State College, FL</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno City College, CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Community College, AZ</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston Community College, TX</td>
<td>TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River State College, FL</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa Community College, AZ</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Community College, MO</td>
<td>MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Area Technical College, WI</td>
<td>WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesto Junior College, CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraine Valley Community College, IL</td>
<td>IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Virginia Community College, VA</td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Vista College, TX</td>
<td>TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio College, TX</td>
<td>TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica College, CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole State College of Florida, FL</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg College, FL</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa Community College, OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia College, FL</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E.
Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory Survey
Background

In 1984, Dr. Lee Noel and Dr. Randi Levitz established the original Noel-Levitz Centers for Institutional Effectiveness in Iowa City, Iowa. Previously, Drs. Noel and Levitz served as recruitment and retention authorities with ACT’s National Center for the Advancement of Educational Practices.

In 2014, RuffaloCODY and Noel-Levitz joined to form today's Ruffalo Noel Levitz. Their vision: to lead the charge to excellence in enrollment and fundraising management, helping organizations meet their challenges and fulfill their missions.

Today’s Ruffalo Noel Levitz team operates from offices throughout the United States and abroad. The firm is owned by Summit Partners, Quad Partners, and its management team, and is directed by an eight-member Board of Directors.

The Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) is a tool to improve the quality of student life and learning. It measures student satisfaction and priorities, providing the institution with knowledge about how satisfied students are as well as what issues are important to them.

Survey Methodology

The survey was administered at the section level by student proctors working under to auspices of the Research and Analytic Department. Sections were randomly selected from all location and disciplines with the exception of English as a Second Language (ESL) and On-line students.

Once sections were identified, arrangements were made with the section’s faculty members to have the survey administered to his/her students. Once completed by his/her students, the surveys were sent to Noel-Levitz for aggregation and processing.

Noel-Levitz SSI “Scales”

For analysis and planning purposes, the Noel-Levitz SSI survey groups the questions into 12 “Scales” as follows:

- **Academic Advising/Counseling Effectiveness** assesses the academic advising program, evaluating advisors and counselors on their knowledge, competence, approachability, and personal concern for students.
- **Academic Services** assesses services that students utilize to achieve their academic goals, such as the library, computer labs, tutoring and study areas.
- **Campus Climate** assesses how the institution promotes a sense of campus pride and belonging.
- **Campus Support Services** assesses the quality of support programs and services.
- **Concern for the Individual** assesses your commitment to treating each student as an individual. This assessment includes groups who deal personally with students (e.g., faculty, advisors, counselors, and staff).
- **Instructional Effectiveness** assesses students' academic experiences, the curriculum, and the campus's commitment to academic excellence.
- **Admissions and Financial Aid Effectiveness** assesses the competence of admissions counselors, along with students' perceptions of the financial aid programs.
- **Registration Effectiveness** assesses registration and billing, including how smooth the registration process is.
- **Responsiveness to Diverse Populations** assesses the institution's commitment to specific groups of students enrolled at the institution (e.g., under-represented populations, students with disabilities, commuters, part-time students, evening students and adult learners).
- **Safety and Security** assesses the campus' responsiveness to students' personal safety and security as well as the adequacy of parking space on the campus.
- **Service Excellence** assesses quality of service and personal concern for students in various areas of campus.
- **Student Centeredness** assesses the institution's attitude toward students and the extent to which they feel welcome and valued.

### Factors in Enrollment Decision

In addition to assessing the student’s perception of the institution based on the 12 Scales, the Noel-Levitz instrument also addresses the factors that influence students to attend a particular community college. In this respect, the surveys asks students how cost, academic reputation, financial aid, geographic setting, campus appearance, personalized attention prior to enrollment, recommendations from family or friends, size of the institution, and the opportunity to play sports contributed to the student’s decision to attend a particular institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors in Decision to Enroll at COD</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Reputation</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Setting</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Appearance</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalized Attention Prior to Enrollment</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations from Family/Friends</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Institution</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to Play Sports</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart illustrates the percentage of students who considered each factor in their decision to enroll at COD.
Scale Importance and Satisfaction
The following chart shows the Scale importance rating for the 2017 survey compared to the 2014 survey. As can be seen, students rated each Scale higher in 2017 than 2014.

The following chart shows the 12 Scales as they were rated by students over the five survey years.
**Performance Gap, Strengths and Challenges**

Performance Gap is defined as the difference between the student’s importance rating and satisfaction rating. As can be seen in the following table, Safety & Security and Academic Advising and Counseling have the most significant Performance Gaps, with Campus Support Services and Academic Services having the smallest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Student Importance Rating</th>
<th>Student Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>COD Performance Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising/Counseling</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Services</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions &amp; Financial Aid</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Climate</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Support Services</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for the Individual</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Effectiveness</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Effectiveness</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness to Diverse Populations</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Excellence</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Centeredness</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Noel-Levitz instrument does not have students rate Responsiveness to Diverse Populations for importance.

Based on the students’ importance ratings and satisfaction scores, Noel-Levitz identifies Strengths and Challenges for each institution.

- Strengths - items of high importance to students and that have a low performance gap
- Challenges - items of high importance to students and that have a high performance gap

**COD Strengths** (in descending order of high to low significance)

Q8. Classes are scheduled at times that are convenient for me.
Q70. I am able to experience intellectual growth here.
Q69. There is a good variety of courses provided on this campus.
Q31. The campus is safe and secure for all students.
Q58. Nearly all of the faculty are knowledgeable in their fields.
Q68. On the whole, the campus is well-maintained.
Q79. The college issued student email account makes it easy to communicate with my instructor(s).
Q51. There are convenient ways of paying my school bill.
Q61. Faculty are usually available after class and during office hours.
Q21. There are a sufficient number of study areas on campus.
Q14. Library resources and services are adequate.
Q36. Students are made to feel welcome on this campus.
Q34. Computer labs are adequate and accessible.
Q42. The equipment in the lab facilities is kept up to date.

- Of the above 14 strengths, 13 were also noted in the 2014 survey and one (Item 51) was a new strengths identified in the 2017 survey.
The following five items were identified in the 2014 survey as strengths, however, in the 2017 survey they are neither strengths or challenges:

- Q15. I am able to register for classes I need with few conflicts.
- Q27. The campus staff are caring and helpful.
- Q28. It is an enjoyable experience to be a student on this campus.
- Q43. Class change (drop/add) policies are reasonable.
- Q45. This institution has a good reputation within the community.

The following item was identified in the 2014 survey as strength, however, in the 2017 survey it was identified as a challenge:

- Q18. The quality of instruction I receive in most of my classes is excellent.

**COD Challenges** (in descending order of high to low significance)

- Q18. The quality of instruction I receive in most of my classes is excellent.
- Q39. The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate.
- Q29. Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students.
- Q32. My academic advisor is knowledgeable about my program requirements.
- Q40. My academic advisor is knowledgeable about the transfer requirements of other schools.
- Q52. This school does whatever it can to help me reach my educational goals.
- Q72. When I need advising assistance, advisors are available in the Counseling and Advising Office.
- Q23. Faculty are understanding of students' unique life circumstances.
- Q7. Adequate financial aid is available for most students.
- Q65. Students are notified early in the term if they are doing poorly in a class.
- Q46. Faculty provide timely feedback about student progress in a course.
- Q24. Parking lots are well-lighted and secure.
- Q37. Faculty take into consideration student differences as they teach a course.
- Q74. The counseling faculty member provides necessary information to help me determine my career choice.

Of the above 14 challenges, nine were also noted in the 2014 survey and five (Questions 18, 23, 24, 29 and 37) were new challenges identified in the 2017 survey.

The following three items were identified in the 2014 survey as challenges, however, in the 2017 survey they are neither strengths or challenges:

- Q6. My academic advisor is approachable.
- Q25. My academic advisor is concerned about my success as an individual.
- Q48. Counseling staff care about students as individuals.

As previously noted, Noel-Levitz rates the students’ **perception of importance** of each item. Following in descending order of importance (≥ 6.0) are the items identified by COD students and if these items are identified as a strengths and challenges. Ideally, you would want high importance items to be identified also as a strength.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Strength or Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Classes are scheduled at times that are convenient for me.</td>
<td>Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. I am able to experience intellectual growth here.</td>
<td>Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. There is a good variety of courses provided on this campus.</td>
<td>Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The quality of instruction I receive in most of my classes is excellent.</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am able to register for classes I need with few conflicts.</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate.</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The campus is safe and secure for all students.</td>
<td>Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Nearly all of the faculty are knowledgeable in their fields.</td>
<td>Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students.</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Program requirements are clear and reasonable.</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. My academic advisor is knowledgeable about my program requirements.</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. On the whole, the campus is well-maintained.</td>
<td>Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. The college issued student email account makes it easy to communicate with my instructor.</td>
<td>Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. There are convenient ways of paying my school bill.</td>
<td>Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Faculty are usually available after class and during office hours.</td>
<td>Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. There are a sufficient number of study areas on campus.</td>
<td>Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. My academic advisor is knowledgeable about the transfer requirements of other schools.</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. This school does whatever it can to help me reach my educational goals.</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. When I need advising assistance, advisors are available in the Counseling and Advising Office.</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Adequate financial aid is available for most students.</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Faculty are understanding of students' unique life circumstances.</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Library resources and services are adequate.</td>
<td>Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. The College’s “MyAccess” Student Portal is a convenient place to learn about College announcements and news.</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My academic advisor is approachable.</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Students are notified early in the term if they are doing poorly in a class.</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Policies and procedures regarding registration and course selection are clear and well-publicized.</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Students are made to feel welcome on this campus.</td>
<td>Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The personnel involved in registration are helpful.</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Computer labs are adequate and accessible.</td>
<td>Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Faculty provide timely feedback about student progress in a course.</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. The equipment in the lab facilities is kept up to date.</td>
<td>Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Adequate financial aid information for COD students is available online at the COD website.</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Security staff respond quickly in emergencies.</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Parking lots are well-lighted and secure.</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Admissions staff are knowledgeable.</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Class change (drop/add) policies are reasonable.</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Billing policies are reasonable.</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. It is an enjoyable experience to be a student on this campus.</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Faculty take into consideration student differences as they teach a course.</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Nearly all classes deal with practical experiences and applications.</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Counseling staff care about students as individuals.</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. The counseling faculty member provides necessary information to help me determine my career choice.</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. The Student Financial Aid Office is open during hours that are convenient.</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Of the above 43 high importance items (≥6.0), 31 were consistent with the 2014 survey and the following 12 were newly identified as high importance on the 2017 survey:
  6. My academic advisor is approachable.
  11. Security staff respond quickly in emergencies.
  24. Parking lots are well-lighted and secure.
  37. Faculty take into consideration student differences as they teach a course.
  48. Counseling staff care about students as individuals.
  64. Nearly all classes deal with practical experiences and applications.
  65. Students are notified early in the term if they are doing poorly in a class.
  72. When I need advising assistance, advisors are available in the Counseling and Advising Office.
  74. The counseling faculty member provides necessary information to help me determine my career choice.
  77. Adequate financial aid information for COD students is available online at the COD website.
  78. The Student Financial Aid Office is open during hours that are convenient.
  80. The College’s “MyAccess” Student Portal is a convenient place to learn about College announcements and news.

Summary Questions
As previously noted, the Noel-Levitz survey has three “summary” questions that address how well the student’s expectations have been met, their overall satisfaction with their college experience and if they would enroll at COD again. The following charts shows the responses to those question for each of the five surveys (2004, 2007, 2010, 2014 and 2017).
Detailed Findings
The following graphs and tables show the questions that make up each Scale and student responses.

Table Legend (based on 2017 survey analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Importance and Low Performance Gap (difference between importance and satisfaction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Importance and High Performance Gap (difference between importance and satisfaction)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Academic Advising/Counseling**

![Graph showing academic advising/counseling](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Items Related to Academic Advising/Counseling</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. My academic advisor is approachable.</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My academic advisor helps me set goals to work toward.</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My academic advisor is concerned about my success as an individual.</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. My academic advisor is knowledgeable about my program requirements.</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. My academic advisor is knowledgeable about the transfer requirements of other schools.</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Counseling staff care about students as individuals.</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. This school does whatever it can to help me reach my educational goals.</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. When I need advising assistance, advisors are available in the Counseling and Advising Office.</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. The college does a good job of providing information about what services advisors can provide.</td>
<td>Not Asked</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. The counseling faculty member provides necessary information to help me determine my career choice.</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items 32, 40, 52, 72 and 73 were identified by students as being high in importance and having a high performance gap.
Items 14, 21, 34, 42 and 79 were identified by students as being high in importance and having a low performance gap.
Item 7 was identified by students as being high in importance and having a high performance gap.
Individual Items Related to Campus Climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Most students feel a sense of belonging here.</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty care about me as an individual.</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The college shows concern for students as individuals.</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. People on this campus respect and are supportive of each other.</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The campus staff are caring and helpful.</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. It is an enjoyable experience to be a student on this campus.</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The campus is safe and secure for all students.</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Students are made to feel welcome on this campus.</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. I generally know what’s happening on campus.</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. This institution has a good reputation within the community.</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. This school does whatever it can to help me reach my educational goals.</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Administrators are approachable to students.</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. New student orientation services help students adjust to college.</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. I seldom get the “run-around” when seeking information on this campus.</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Channels for expressing student complaints are readily available.</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. The New Student Orientation program provides new students with useful information.</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. The college provides extracurricular enhancement activities to supplement my education.</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items 31 and 36 were identified by students as being high in importance and having a low performance gap, whereas item 52 was identified as being high in importance and having a high performance gap.
Campus Support Services

Individual Items Related to Campus Support Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Child care facilities are available on campus.</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Personnel in the Veterans’ Services program are helpful.</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. This campus provides effective support services for displaced homemakers.</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The career services office provides students with the help they need to get a job.</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The student center is a comfortable place for students to spend their leisure time.</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. There are adequate services to help me decide upon a career.</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. New student orientation services help students adjust to college.</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. The New Student Orientation program provides new students with useful information.</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. The Career Services Office provides help needed to get internships, co-op, or service learning experience.</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No items in this Scale were identified by students as being high in importance.
Concern for the Individual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty care about me as an individual.</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The college shows concern for students as individuals.</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My academic advisor is concerned about my success as an individual.</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students.</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Counseling staff care about students as individuals.</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 29 was identified by students as being high in importance and having a high performance gap.
Items 18, 23, 29, 37, 46 and 65 were identified by students as being high in importance and having a high performance gap, whereas items 58, 61 and 70 were identified as being high in importance and having a low performance gap.
### Individual Items Related to Registration Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. The personnel involved in registration are helpful.</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Classes are scheduled at times that are convenient for me.</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am able to register for classes I need with few conflicts.</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Policies and procedures regarding registration and course selection are clear and well-publicized.</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Class change (drop/add) policies are reasonable.</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. There are convenient ways of paying my school bill.</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. The business office is open during hours which are convenient for most students.</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Billing policies are reasonable.</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Bookstore staff are helpful.</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items 8 and 51 were identified by students as being high in importance and having a low performance gap.
Responsiveness to Diverse Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Items Related to Diverse Populations</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81. Institution’s commitment to part-time students.</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Institution’s commitment to evening students.</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Institution’s commitment to older, returning learners.</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Institution’s commitment to underrepresented populations.</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Institution’s commitment to commuters.</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Institution’s commitment to students with disabilities.</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items in this Scale (81 through 86) are not rated for importance by the students.
Safety and Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Security staff are helpful.</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Security staff respond quickly in emergencies.</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Parking lots are well-lighted and secure.</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td><strong>4.96</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The campus is safe and secure for all students.</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td><strong>5.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate.</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td><strong>3.76</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 31 was identified by students as being high in importance and having a low performance gap, whereas items 24 and 39 were identified as being high in importance and having a high performance gap.
Service Excellence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. The personnel involved in registration are helpful.</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td><strong>5.18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. People on this campus respect and are supportive of each other.</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td><strong>5.30</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Library staff are helpful and approachable.</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td><strong>5.51</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The campus staff are caring and helpful.</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td><strong>5.40</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. I generally know what’s happening on campus.</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td><strong>4.53</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Administrators are approachable to students.</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td><strong>5.08</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Bookstore staff are helpful.</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td><strong>5.56</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. I seldom get the “run-around” when seeking information on this campus.</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td><strong>4.99</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Channels for expressing student complaints are readily available.</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td><strong>4.72</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. The college’s Student Portal is a convenient place to learn about college announcements and news.</td>
<td>Not Asked</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td><strong>5.30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No items in this Scale were identified by students as being high in importance.
Student Centeredness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Items Related to Student Centeredness</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Most students feel a sense of belonging here.</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The college shows concern for students as individuals.</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The campus staff are caring and helpful.</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. It is an enjoyable experience to be a student on this campus.</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Students are made to feel welcome on this campus.</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Administrators are approachable to students.</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 36 was identified by students as being high in importance and having a low performance gap.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017 Results</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Most students feel a sense of belonging here.</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>-0.26***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty care about me as an individual.</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>-0.28***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The quality of instruction in the vocational/technical programs is excellent.</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>-0.25***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Security staff are helpful.</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>-0.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The personnel involved in registration are helpful.</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>-0.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My academic advisor is approachable.</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>-0.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Adequate financial aid is available for most students.</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>-0.44***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Classes are scheduled at times that are convenient for me.</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Internships or practical experiences are provided in my degree/certificate program.</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>-0.47***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Child care facilities are available on campus.</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Security staff respond quickly in emergencies.</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>-0.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My academic advisor helps me set goals to work toward.</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>-0.48***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Financial aid awards are announced to students in time to be helpful in college planning.</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>-0.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Library resources and services are adequate.</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am able to register for classes I need with few conflicts.</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>-0.23***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The college shows concern for students as individuals.</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>-0.37***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Personnel in the Veterans’ Services program are helpful.</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>-0.44***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The quality of instruction I receive in most of my classes is excellent.</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>-0.35***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. This campus provides effective support services for displaced homemakers.</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>-0.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Financial aid counselors are helpful.</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>-0.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. There are a sufficient number of study areas on campus.</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. People on this campus respect and are supportive of each other.</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>-0.22***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Faculty are understanding of students’ unique life circumstances.</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>-0.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Parking lots are well-lighted and secure.</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>-0.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My academic advisor is concerned about my success as an individual.</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>-0.64***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Library staff are helpful and approachable.</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>-0.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The campus staff are caring and helpful.</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>-0.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. It is an enjoyable experience to be a student on this campus.</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>-0.37***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students.</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>-0.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The career services office provides students with the help they need to get a job.</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>-0.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The campus is safe and secure for all students.</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>-0.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>2017 Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COD</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. My academic advisor is knowledgeable about my program</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Admissions counselors accurately portray the campus in their</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recruiting practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Computer labs are adequate and accessible.</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Policies and procedures regarding registration and course</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selection are clear and well-publicized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Students are made to feel welcome on this campus.</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Faculty take into consideration student differences as they</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teach a course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The student center is a comfortable place for students to</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spend their leisure time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate.</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. My academic advisor is knowledgeable about the transfer</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirements of other schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Admissions staff are knowledgeable.</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. The equipment in the lab facilities is kept up to date.</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Class change (drop/add) policies are reasonable.</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. I generally know what’s happening on campus.</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. This institution has a good reputation within the community.</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Faculty provide timely feedback about student progress in a</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. There are adequate services to help me decide upon a career.</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Counseling staff care about students as individuals.</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Admissions counselors respond to prospective students’</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unique needs and requests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Tutoring services are readily available.</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. There are convenient ways of paying my school bill.</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. This school does whatever it can to help me reach my</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. The assessment and course placement procedures are</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reasonable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Faculty are interested in my academic problems.</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Academic support services adequately meet the needs of</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. The business office is open during hours which are</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convenient for most students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Administrators are approachable to students.</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Nearly all of the faculty are knowledgeable in their fields.</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>2017 Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COD</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. New student orientation services help students adjust to college.</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Billing policies are reasonable.</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Faculty are usually available after class and during office hours.</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Bookstore staff are helpful.</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. I seldom get the “run-around” when seeking information on this campus.</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Nearly all classes deal with practical experiences and applications.</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Students are notified early in the term if they are doing poorly in a class.</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Program requirements are clear and reasonable.</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Channels for expressing student complaints are readily available.</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. On the whole, the campus is well-maintained.</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. There is a good variety of courses provided on this campus.</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. I am able to experience intellectual growth here.</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Difference statistically significant at the .05 level
** Difference statistically significant at the .01 level
*** Difference statistically significant at the .001 level
## Demographics (self-reported by student)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Class Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>47.70%</td>
<td>1 year or less</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>47.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>52.30%</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>32.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>761</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7.48%</td>
<td>4 or more years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Current GPA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and under</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>15.11%</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 to 24</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>71.62%</td>
<td>No credits earned</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8.02%</td>
<td>1.99 or below</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
<td>2.0 – 2.49</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 and over</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>2.5 – 2.99</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>18.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>761</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>3.0 – 3.49</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>33.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.94%</td>
<td>3.5 or above</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>28.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity/Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Educational Goal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>45.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian or Alaskan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>Vocational/tech program</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13.21%</td>
<td>Self-improvement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>55.35%</td>
<td>Job-related training</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Race</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.89%</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to respond</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.28%</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>43.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>757</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6.49%</td>
<td>Self-improvement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Enrollment Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Job-related training</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>93.93%</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.94%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Class Load</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>64.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8.69%</td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>35.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>755</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own house</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10.66%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent off campus</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9.87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents home</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>75.66%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other residence</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.81%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes – Disability</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No – Disability</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>90.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Institution Was My 1st choice | 459 | 60.32% |
| Institution Was My 2nd choice | 174 | 22.86% |
| Institution Was My 3rd choice or lower | 128 | 16.82% |
| Total                   | 761  | 100.00% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time off campus</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>18.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time off campus</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>56.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time on campus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time on campus</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No employed</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>22.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of colleges that have used the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory Survey

Anne Arundel Community College (MD)
Austin Community College (TX)
Brookdale Community College (NJ)
Bucks County Community College (PA)
Butler Community College (KS)
Canada College (CA)
Cape Cod Community College (MA)
Cascadia Community College (WA)
Catawba Valley Community College (NC)
Central Maine Community College (ME)
Central Ohio Technical College (OH)
City University of New York (NY)
Cuyahoga Community College (OH)
De Anza College (CA)
Delta College (MI)
Eastern New Mexico University-Roswell (NM)
De Anza College (CA)
Delta College (MI)
Eastern New Mexico University-Roswell (NM)
Edgecombe Community College (NC)
Galveston College (TX)
Glendale Community College (AZ)

Horry-Georgetown Technical College (SC)
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana (IN)
Jackson Community College (MI)
Jefferson Community College (NY)
John A. Logan College (IL)
Johnson County Community College (KS)
Kirkwood Community College (IA)
Luzerne County Community College (PA)
Macomb Community College (MI)
New Mexico Junior College (NM)
Normandale Community College (MN)
North Central State College (OH)
Oakton Community College (IL)
Pratt Community College (KS)
Red Rocks Community College (CO)
Spartanburg Community College (SC)
University of Hawaii Kauai Community College (HI)
Vermilion Community College (MN)
Volunteer State Community College (TN)
Warren County Community College (NJ)
Washington County Community College (ME)
Yavapai College (AZ)
Zane State College (OH)
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### Institutional Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The extent to which...</th>
<th>COD</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>NILIE Normbase</th>
<th>Very Large 2-year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 the actions of this institution reflect its mission</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>3.959</td>
<td>3.597</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 decisions are made at the appropriate level at this institution</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>3.338</td>
<td>3.144</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 the institution effectively promotes diversity in the workplace</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>3.770</td>
<td>3.671</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 administrative leadership is focused on meeting the needs of students</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>3.743</td>
<td>3.377</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 information is shared within the institution</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>3.332</td>
<td>3.231</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 institutional teams use problem-solving techniques</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>3.514</td>
<td>3.394</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 I am able to appropriately influence the direction of this institution</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>3.179</td>
<td>2.981</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>3.492</td>
<td>3.124</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 this institution has been successful in positively motivating my performance</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>3.499</td>
<td>3.321</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 a spirit of cooperation exists at this institution</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>3.473</td>
<td>3.153</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 institution-wide policies guide my work</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>3.851</td>
<td>3.630</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 this institution is appropriately organized</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>3.449</td>
<td>3.253</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 I have the opportunity for advancement within this institution</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>3.095</td>
<td>3.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 I receive adequate information regarding important activities at this institution</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>3.892</td>
<td>3.782</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 my work is guided by clearly defined administrative processes</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>3.562</td>
<td>3.452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The extent to which...</th>
<th>COD</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>NILIE Normbase</th>
<th>Very Large 2-year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 student needs are central to what we do</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>3.986</td>
<td>3.702</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I feel my job is relevant to this institution’s mission</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>4.481</td>
<td>4.378</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 faculty meet the needs of students</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>4.133</td>
<td>4.185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 student ethnic and cultural diversity are important at this institution</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>4.092</td>
<td>3.896</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 students’ competencies are enhanced</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>4.081</td>
<td>4.022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 non-teaching professional personnel meet the needs of students</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>4.149</td>
<td>4.053</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 classified personnel meet the needs of students</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>4.190</td>
<td>4.136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 students receive an excellent education at this institution</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>4.418</td>
<td>4.346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 this institution prepares students for a career</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>4.313</td>
<td>4.282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 this institution prepares students for further learning</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>4.370</td>
<td>4.286</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 students are assisted with their personal development</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>4.069</td>
<td>3.945</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 students are satisfied with their educational experience at this institution</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>4.127</td>
<td>4.003</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Supervisory Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The extent to which...</th>
<th>COD</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>NILIE Normbase</th>
<th>Very Large 2-year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 my supervisor expresses confidence in my work</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>4.145</td>
<td>4.071</td>
<td>4.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 my supervisor is open to the ideas, opinions, and beliefs of everyone</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>4.042</td>
<td>3.946</td>
<td>4.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 positive work expectations are communicated to me</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>3.780</td>
<td>3.666</td>
<td>3.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 unacceptable behaviors are identified and communicated to me</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>3.768</td>
<td>3.653</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 I receive timely feedback for my work</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>3.753</td>
<td>3.646</td>
<td>3.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 I receive appropriate feedback for my work</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>3.741</td>
<td>3.692</td>
<td>3.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 my supervisor actively seeks my ideas</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>3.671</td>
<td>3.638</td>
<td>3.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 my supervisor seriously considers my ideas</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>3.772</td>
<td>3.741</td>
<td>3.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 work outcomes are clarified for me</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>3.787</td>
<td>3.628</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 my supervisor helps me to improve my work</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>3.724</td>
<td>3.701</td>
<td>3.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 I am given the opportunity to be creative in my work</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>4.062</td>
<td>3.911</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 I have the opportunity to express my ideas in appropriate forums</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>3.711</td>
<td>3.469</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 professional development and training opportunities are available</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>3.001</td>
<td>3.728</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teamwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The extent to which...</th>
<th>COD</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>NILIE Normbase</th>
<th>Very Large 2-year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 there is a spirit of cooperation within my work team</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>3.923</td>
<td>3.902</td>
<td>3.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 my primary work team uses problem-solving techniques</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>3.885</td>
<td>3.912</td>
<td>3.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 there is an opportunity for all ideas to be exchanged within my work team</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>3.784</td>
<td>3.728</td>
<td>3.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 my work team provides an environment for free and open expression of ideas, opinions and beliefs</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>3.857</td>
<td>3.744</td>
<td>3.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 my work team coordinates its efforts with appropriate individuals and teams</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>3.855</td>
<td>3.844</td>
<td>3.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 a spirit of cooperation exists in my department</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3.804</td>
<td>3.794</td>
<td>3.853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Custom Item Mean Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custom Items</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which</td>
<td>N Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 the college involves employees in planning for the future</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>3.341</td>
<td>2.984</td>
<td>** .300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 information about the planning process is communicated to me</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>3.331</td>
<td>3.064</td>
<td>** .231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 a sense of family or community exists within the college</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>3.354</td>
<td>3.004</td>
<td>** .284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 different divisions at the college cooperate and communicate with each other</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>3.136</td>
<td>3.063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 efforts to improve quality are paying off at the college</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>3.695</td>
<td>3.483</td>
<td>** .192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 the college uses quality improvement tools and methods to solve problems</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>3.512</td>
<td>3.394</td>
<td>* .108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 employee ethical and cultural diversity are important in this institution</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>3.821</td>
<td>3.652</td>
<td>** .170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I understand the direction the college wants to take</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>3.617</td>
<td>3.330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 I am proud to work at College of DuPage</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>4.264</td>
<td>4.154</td>
<td>* .109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 I am satisfied overall with my employment here at College of DuPage</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>4.080</td>
<td>3.914</td>
<td>** .152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional Structure Item Means by Personnel Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Structure</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 the actions of this institution reflect its mission</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>3.959</td>
<td>3.969</td>
<td>3.977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 decisions are made at the appropriate level at this institution</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>3.336</td>
<td>3.364</td>
<td>3.260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 the institution effectively promotes diversity in the workplace</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>3.770</td>
<td>3.741</td>
<td>3.812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 administrative leadership is focused on meeting the needs of students</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>3.743</td>
<td>3.652</td>
<td>3.820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 information is shared within the institution</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>3.335</td>
<td>3.440</td>
<td>3.202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 institutional teams use problem-solving techniques</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>3.514</td>
<td>3.547</td>
<td>3.493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 I am able to appropriately influence the direction of this institution</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>3.179</td>
<td>3.110</td>
<td>3.202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>3.492</td>
<td>3.527</td>
<td>3.433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 this institution has been successful in positively motivating my</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>3.499</td>
<td>3.518</td>
<td>3.468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 a spirit of cooperation exists at this institution</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>3.473</td>
<td>3.515</td>
<td>3.405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 institution-wide policies guide my work</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>3.851</td>
<td>3.856</td>
<td>3.805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 this institution is appropriately organized</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>3.449</td>
<td>3.519</td>
<td>3.345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 I have the opportunity for advancement within this institution</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>3.095</td>
<td>3.103</td>
<td>3.045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 I receive adequate information regarding important activities at</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>3.892</td>
<td>3.903</td>
<td>3.759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 any work is guided by clearly defined administrative processes</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>3.562</td>
<td>3.583</td>
<td>3.472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Focus Item Means by Personnel Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Focus</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The extent to which...</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 student needs are central to what we do</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>3.986</td>
<td>3.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I feel my job is relevant to this institution’s mission</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>4.481</td>
<td>4.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 faculty meet the needs of students</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>4.133</td>
<td>4.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 student ethnic and cultural diversity are important at this institution</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>4.092</td>
<td>4.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 students’ competencies are enhanced</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>4.081</td>
<td>4.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 non-teaching professional personnel meet the needs of students</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>4.149</td>
<td>4.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 classified personnel meet the needs of students</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>4.190</td>
<td>4.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 students receive an excellent education at this institution</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>4.418</td>
<td>4.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 this institution prepares students for a career</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>4.313</td>
<td>4.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 this institution prepares students for further learning</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>4.370</td>
<td>4.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 students are assisted with their personal development</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>4.069</td>
<td>4.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 students are satisfied with their educational experience at this institution</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>4.127</td>
<td>4.158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teamwork Item Means by Personnel Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teamwork</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The extent to which...</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 there is a spirit of cooperation within my work team</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>3.923</td>
<td>3.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 my primary work team uses problem-solving techniques</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>3.885</td>
<td>3.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 there is an opportunity for all ideas to be exchanged within my work team</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>3.784</td>
<td>3.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 my work team provides an environment for free and open expression of ideas, opinions and beliefs</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>3.857</td>
<td>3.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 my work team coordinates its efforts with appropriate individuals and teams</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>3.855</td>
<td>3.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 a spirit of cooperation exists in my department</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3.804</td>
<td>3.842</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Supervisory Relationships Item Means by Personnel Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Relationships</th>
<th>Overall N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Faculty Mean</th>
<th>Staff Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  my supervisor expresses confidence in my work</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>4.145</td>
<td>4.148</td>
<td>4.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  my supervisor is open to the ideas, opinions, and beliefs of everyone</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>4.042</td>
<td>4.081</td>
<td>3.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 positive work expectations are communicated to me</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>3.789</td>
<td>3.819</td>
<td>3.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 unacceptable behaviors are identified and communicated to me</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>3.768</td>
<td>3.783</td>
<td>3.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 I receive timely feedback for my work</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>3.753</td>
<td>3.714</td>
<td>3.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 I receive appropriate feedback for my work</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>3.741</td>
<td>3.688</td>
<td>3.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 my supervisor actively seeks my ideas</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>3.671</td>
<td>3.550</td>
<td>3.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 my supervisor seriously considers my ideas</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>3.772</td>
<td>3.714</td>
<td>3.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 work outcomes are clarified for me</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>3.787</td>
<td>3.809</td>
<td>3.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 my supervisor helps me to improve my work</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>3.724</td>
<td>3.703</td>
<td>3.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 I am given the opportunity to be creative in my work</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>4.062</td>
<td>4.246</td>
<td>3.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 I have the opportunity to express my ideas in appropriate forums</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>3.711</td>
<td>3.776</td>
<td>3.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 professional development and training opportunities are available</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>3.901</td>
<td>3.873</td>
<td>3.892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G.
Community “Pulse” Survey
COLLEGE OF DUPAGE
2018 Community “Pulse” Survey

Survey Methodology

• A quantitative study was conducted in April 2018 among 500 District 502 residents, yielding an error margin ± 5%.

• All surveys were conducted by telephone. Marketing research shows that telephone surveys have several advantages over web or mail surveys. These advantages include:
  o Higher or targeted response rates
  o Greater quality control and more detailed comments
  o Avoiding non-response or skipped questions
  o Respondents often feel more free to say what’s on their mind
  o Easier to confirm that the respondent is the right contact (i.e., in District 502)

• The psychometric literature suggests that having more scale points is better, but there is a diminishing return after around 11 points (Nunnally 1978).

• Since a major objective of this study was to determine strong agreement or strong opposition of respondents, a 7-point scale tested and used in many industries for decades was chosen.

• Respondents answering:
  o “6” or “7” are considered TOP BOX - indicating strong agreement
  o “1” or “2” are considered BOTTOM BOX - indicating strong opposition,
  o “3”, “4” or “5” are ambivalent or do not have strong feelings about the topic.

• Respondent answering “1” or “2” were asked to provide a reason for their rating.

Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years Lived in District</th>
<th>Ethnicity/Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>Caucasian 80%</td>
<td>Male 46%</td>
<td>&lt; High School 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Black/African Am. 5%</td>
<td>Female 54%</td>
<td>High School 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino 6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some College 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Asian 6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Associate’s Degree 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Other or Refused 3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>College Graduate 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced Degree 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74-84</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions

Respondents were asked a series of questions to assess their attitudes and perceptions about the College’s

• Image
• Academic Reputation
• Cost and Value
• Loyalty (to the College)
• Strengths and Weaknesses
Analysis
Analysis included determining statistically significant differences between questions (e.g., image, cost, etc.) and demographics (e.g., age, years lived in district, etc.).

TOP OF MIND - When you think of colleges and universities in Illinois, which ones come to mind?

*Question asked prior to identifying that College of DuPage was conducting the survey.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top of Mind</th>
<th>2018 Results</th>
<th>2016 Results</th>
<th>2014 Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U of I at Champaign</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of I at Chicago</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Northern 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>COD 10%</td>
<td>COD 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois State</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Illinois State 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePaul</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>DePaul 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmhurst</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Southern - Carbondale 4%</td>
<td>Southern - Carbondale 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern - Carbondale</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Elmhurst 3%</td>
<td>Elmhurst 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Western 3%</td>
<td>North Central 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Eastern 2%</td>
<td>Benedictine 2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted above, in all three PULSE surveys COD was identified as the number four “top of mind” institution after the University of Illinois at Champaign, the University of Illinois at Chicago and Northern Illinois University.

SELECT TO ATTEND - If you were to select one Illinois college or university to attend, which would you select?

*Question asked prior to identifying that College of DuPage was conducting the survey.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select to Attend</th>
<th>2018 Results</th>
<th>2016 Results</th>
<th>2014 Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U of I at Champaign</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>COD 10%</td>
<td>U of I at Champaign 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of I at Chicago</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>COD 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Northern 5%</td>
<td>Northern 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois State</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Illinois State 3%</td>
<td>Illinois State 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePaul</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Wheaton 2%</td>
<td>Elmhurst 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Elmhurst 2%</td>
<td>DePaul 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheaton</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>DePaul 2%</td>
<td>North Central 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Louis</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Chamberlain 1%</td>
<td>Southern - Carbondale 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlain</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Western 1%</td>
<td>Wheaton 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted above, in 2014 COD was identified as the number three institution to attend after the University of Illinois at Chicago and the University of Illinois at Champaign. In 2016 and again
in 2018, COD was identified as the number two institution to attend after the University of Illinois at Champaign.

RETURNING TO SCHOOL - Are you interested in returning to school in the next five years to take credit or non-credit courses or to obtain training in a specific field? Question asked prior to identifying that College of DuPage was conducting the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES – Returning in Next Five Years</th>
<th>2018 Results</th>
<th>2016 Results</th>
<th>2014 Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20% (n=100)</td>
<td>23% (n=115)</td>
<td>Not asked in 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIELD OF STUDY - If you are interested in returning to school in the next five years, in what specific field of study? Question asked prior to identifying that College of DuPage was conducting the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Study</th>
<th>2018 Results</th>
<th>2016 Results</th>
<th>2014 Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences/Healthcare</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Finance/Economics</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science/IT</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Teaching</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Design</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Non-Credit</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (single responses)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both the 2016 and 2018 PULSE surveys, of those who responded they were considering returning to school in the next five years identified either nursing, natural sciences, healthcare (other than nursing) or business (inclusive of finance and economics) as their top for credit interests.

IMAGE - Using a 7-point scale where 7 means very good and 1 means very bad, or you can choose any number in between, how do you perceive College of DuPage's image?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>2018 Results</th>
<th>2016 Results</th>
<th>2014 Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOP BOX</td>
<td>7 Very Good</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Strong Feelings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTTOM BOX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Very Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following are respondent’s reasons for rating Image as a “1” or “2” (Bottom Box).

- Problem with board a few years ago, grads haven’t been hired after graduating from school.
- I think of them as just a community College of DuPage.
- The reputation of the past president and staff.
- I was actually attending COD when the president at the time was running his scam with the college funds as well as the culinary department. At that time, I considered them shady.
- The governess.
- They seemed to be unable to acquire a competent management team.
- Limited to an associate degree.
- They were doing real good until that last president, the board of director didn't watch what was going on.
- Because I have a friend who taught there and they treated her unfairly and badly.

Statistically Significant Differences

- The percent of individuals living in the district 11 or more years and indicating a Top Box rating for Image is higher than the percent of Top Box ratings of individuals living in the district less than 11 years at a statistically significant level of 0.0027.
- The percent of females indicating a Top Box rating for Image is higher than the percent of Top Box ratings by males at a statistically significant level of 0.0048.
- When considering Image, there were no statistically significant differences in the age, ethnicity/race, or educational level demographics.

ACADEMIC REPUTATION - Using a 7-point scale where 7 means excellent and 1 means very poor or you can choose any number in between, how do you perceive College of DuPage's academic reputation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Reputation</th>
<th>Responses - Academic</th>
<th>2018 Results</th>
<th>2016 Results</th>
<th>2014 Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOP BOX</td>
<td>7 Very Good</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Strong Feelings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTTOM BOX</td>
<td>2 Very Bad</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following are respondent’s reasons for rating Academic Reputation as a “1” or “2” (Bottom Box).

- Back in the day, people graduating could not get jobs.
- They have lower academic standards than universities and other colleges.
- Professors (at other institutions) teach at a higher level.
- It’s perceived by me that a 4-year is a better value, (COD) is more of a transfer type college.
- I was comparing to 4-year school, I consider it (COD) a stepping-stone.
Statistically Significant Differences

- The percent of individuals living in the district 11 or more years and indicating a Top Box rating for *Academic Reputation* is higher than the percent of Top Box ratings of individuals living in the district less than 11 years at a statistically significant level of 0.05.
- The percent of females indicating a Top Box rating for *Academic Reputation* is higher than the percent of Top Box ratings by males at a statistically significant level of 0.0035.
- When considering *Academic Reputation*, there were no statistically significant differences in the age, ethnicity/race, or educational level demographics.

**VALUE** - Using a 7-point scale where 7 means you strongly agree and 1 means you strongly disagree or you can choose any number in between, College of DuPage's cost for tuition is a good value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Responses - Value</th>
<th>2018 Results</th>
<th>2016 Results</th>
<th>2014 Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOP BOX</td>
<td>7 Very Good</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Strong Feelings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTTOM BOX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Very Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following are respondent’s reasons for rating **Value** as a “1” or “2” (Bottom Box).

- The amount of money they charge each student. They are sucked into a game school, take kids knowing that they probably won’t get jobs, encourage them to get loans. The whole financial thing is a scam.
- They are not reasonably priced, even for in district students.
- COD is not for me.
- No value when you cannot finish because they no longer offer classes you need.
- I have no perception of what they cost.

Statistically Significant Differences

- The percent of individuals living in the district 11 or more years and indicating a Top Box rating for *Cost/Value* is higher than the percent of Top Box ratings of individuals living in the district less than 11 years at a statistically significant level of 0.005.
- The percent of Caucasians indicating a Top Box rating for *Cost/Value* is higher than the percent of Top Box ratings by non-Caucasians at a statistically significant level of 0.0042.
- When considering *Cost/Value*, there were no statistically significant differences in the age, gender, or educational level demographics.
RECOMMEND (Loyalty Question) - Using a 7-point scale where 7 means you would highly recommend and 1 means you would definitely not recommend, or you can choose any number in between, to what degree would you recommend College of DuPage to a friend or family member?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses - Recommend</th>
<th>2018 Results</th>
<th>2016 Results</th>
<th>2014 Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOP BOX</td>
<td>7 Very Good</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Strong Feelings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTTOM BOX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Very Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following are respondent’s reasons for rating Recommend as a “1” or “2” (Bottom Box).

- Their academic level is not up to my standards. I did take one course there and was not impressed.
- There are other that have a better pedigree.
- Close by.
- I would not attend, so why recommend to others.
- It’s not a college that would come to mind.
- I would be more apt for a four year to a friend, campus life etc.
- I haven’t known anyone to come out of COD with a four year degree.
- I would recommend Elmhurst College to friends and family. My wife attended there (Elmhurst). I have a good friend who is head of their soccer team. I am partial to Elmhurst College.
- Because I do not know enough about COD to recommend.
- I don’t know anything about it really.
- I am 80 years old and just moved to the district three years ago and I do not know anything about COD.
- I don’t have anything to base it on.
- Because among more relative employers, there are questions marks or red flags in my mind.
- They have a poor reputation and I don’t think they can live that down.
- I attempted to put my 14 year old into classes at cod and it was very difficult. It should not be that way.
- Don't think very highly of it.
- Their academic reputation is not comparable to others.

Statistically Significant Differences

- The percent of individuals living in the district 11 or more years and indicating a Top Box rating for Recommend is higher than the percent of Top Box ratings of individuals living in the district less than 11 years at a statistically significant level of 0.0022.
• The percent of females indicating a Top Box rating for *Recommend* is higher than the percent of Top Box ratings by males at a statistically significant level of 0.0373.
• When considering *Recommend*, there were no statistically significant differences in the age, ethnicity/race, or educational level demographics.

**STRENGTHS** - What would you say is *College of DuPage's most significant strength*?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>2018 Results</th>
<th>2016 Results</th>
<th>2014 Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location/Accessibility</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of Classes and Programs</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/Value</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Place to Start (College)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Academics/Faculty</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Comments from Others</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports/Performing Arts</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance of Campus</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (single responses)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both the 2016 and 2018 PULSE surveys, over fifty percent of the respondents noted that location/accessibility, variety of classes and programs, cost/value and being a good place to start a college career were the main strengths of the College. The percent of respondents who did not or could not identify a significant strength of the College remained relatively the same from the 2016 to the 2018 survey.

**WEAKNESSES** - What would you say is *College of DuPage's most significant weakness*?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>2018 Results</th>
<th>2016 Results</th>
<th>2014 Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know/Nothing</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image/Past Management &amp; Board</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stigma/No Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Academics/Faculty</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/Name Recognition</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/Value</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety/Flexibility of Classes/Programs</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Accessibility</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (single responses)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 2018 PULSE survey, 58.5 percent of the respondents did not or could not identify a significant weakness of the College. This is up from 37 percent from the 2016 survey. In addition, 37 percent of the respondents in 2016 noted Image/past management and the Board as significant weaknesses; this percent was down to 15 in the 2018 survey.