
Evaluation Study

**Betty Gray
Community
College
Scholarship
Program
Evaluation**

*Roberta B. Weber
Deana Grobe
Shannon T. Lipscomb*

Acknowledgments

This paper was commissioned by The Oregon Community Foundation. We are indebted to the Community College representatives who shared information and participated in in-depth interviews. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of college representative or the Foundation.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Introduction.....	1
Evaluation Study Methodology	2
Findings.....	3
Research Question 1. Has the scholarship program been implemented as planned, and how does the scholarship program vary between the participating community colleges?.....	4
Research Question 2. What are the characteristics of scholarship recipients? What are the characteristics of college ECE programs and students?.....	7
Research Question 3. How do outcomes (defined as educational attainment) vary by individual college scholarship program characteristics (size of scholarship, eligibility guidelines, etc.)?	10
Research Question 4. To what extent did the scholarship program contribute to the growth of the community college early education teacher training program (including enrollment in early childhood programs, number of early childhood classes, and additions of certificate programs)?	13
Additional Research Question: To what extent are colleges enrolling BGCCS recipients in the Oregon Registry Online?	15
Discussion	16
Recommendations.....	18
References	21
Appendix A	22
Appendix B.....	24
Appendix C.....	29
Appendix D	34
Appendix E.....	38

Executive Summary

Oregon and the nation have identified support for the early years of a child's life as essential to meeting a range of societal goals including education reform and breaking the poverty cycle. President Obama's *Preschool for All* and Oregon's P-20 Education initiatives exemplify public commitments to investments in the early years. A critical component of national and state early childhood initiatives is a requirement that children be taught by an educated early care and education workforce. The demand for an educated workforce is based on years of research linking education and training with child care quality (Burchinal, Cryer, & Clifford, 2002; Burchinal, Howes, & Kontos, 2002). Although the field lacks clarity on how much education is required, research has consistently suggested that higher levels of provider education and training, particularly that which is child-specific, predict quality in child care settings (Early, Bryant, Pianta, Clifford, Burchinal, Ritchie, Howes, & Barbarin, 2006; National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, Early Child Care Research Network, 1996; Vandell & Wolfe, 2000).

The demand for more educated early childhood teachers and caregivers comes from multiple sources including the proposed federal/state *Preschool for All* initiative, Oregon's Race to the Top Early Childhood Challenge grant¹, and Oregon's new Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS). Training and educating the early care and education workforce is a vital investment in Oregon's children and families.

The Oregon Community Foundation (the Foundation) plays a critical role in meeting the demand for an educated and degreed early care and education workforce in Oregon. The Foundation's Betty Gray Community College Scholarship (BGCCS) and Early Childhood Training and Certification Scholarship programs provide a critical piece of Oregon's efforts to improve early childhood outcomes. At the request of the Foundation, Oregon State University (OSU) is evaluating both the Community College Scholarship program operating in 16 of Oregon's 17 community colleges and the Training and Certification Scholarship program administered by the Oregon Center for Career Development in Childhood Care and Education at Portland State University. In this paper we report findings of the Community College Scholarship program evaluation. Findings from the evaluation of the Training and Certification Scholarship program are reported separately.

The overall goal of this evaluation study is identification of factors associated with educational attainment in individual BGCCS programs operated by local colleges. The Foundation posed the following questions in its request for the evaluation of the BGCCS program:

1. *Has the scholarship program been implemented as planned, and how does the scholarship program vary between the participating community colleges?*
2. *What are the characteristics of scholarship recipients?*
3. *How do outcomes vary by individual college scholarship program characteristics (size of scholarship, eligibility guidelines, etc.)?*

¹ The federal Department of Education, in collaboration with the Administration for Children and Families, offered competitive grants known as Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge grants to states to improve early childhood. Oregon was awarded a grant in 2012.

4. *To what extent does the scholarship program contribute to the growth of the community college early education teacher training program (including enrollment in early childhood programs, number of early childhood classes, and additions of certificate programs)?*

The evaluation study addresses all four questions but focuses heavily on answering the third.

Evaluation Study Methodology

Data came from two primary sources: college annual reports to the Foundation and in-depth interviews with college representatives conducted by OSU. In October 2012, The Oregon Community Foundation provided copies of annual reports for the years 2004-2005 through 2011-2012 that had been submitted by community colleges that operated BGCCS programs. In spring of 2013, OSU conducted hour-long interviews with a person involved in administration of a BGCCS program in each of the 16 participating community colleges. Data were analyzed with both statistical and qualitative methods and results from both methods were compared. Having only 16 unique programs limited the confidence we could have in findings from the statistical analyses so we relied heavily on the qualitative analysis.

Findings and Discussion

The following section contains findings along with a brief discussion of implications when appropriate. The section is organized by the four research questions.

Research Question 1. Has the scholarship program been implemented as planned, and how does the scholarship program vary between the participating community colleges?

The Foundation provided colleges flexibility in creating BGCCS programs that fit the needs of citizens and organizations in their district. Colleges reported that scholarship programs operated as planned with limited changes over the 8 years. The flexibility provided by the Foundation resulted in programs that varied greatly from college to college. We found substantial variation in the college ECE programs as well as in their BGCCS programs.

The variation found in BGCCS programs is captured in differences on the following set of characteristics:

- Average size of annual recipient award—from \$100 to \$2,458.
- BGCCS program goals—goals include completion, access, helping students, and no goal.
- College unit with primary responsibility for administration of the program—college foundation, ECE program, financial aid office, and shared responsibility.
- Level of ECE program involvement in BGCCS program administration—from not involved to highly involved.
- Allowed usage of awarded funds—from books only to a wide range of purposes.
- Student mixing of BGCCS funds with state/federal financial aid—from no mixing to mixing is common.
- Requiring completion of ECE credits for eligibility—from no credits required to completion of first year in the program.
- Requiring some level of GPA for eligibility—from no requirement to a 3.0 GPA.

Research Question 2. What are the characteristics of scholarship recipients? What are characteristics of college ECE teacher training programs and students?

The BGCCS programs successfully reached targeted audiences. Almost two-thirds of scholarship recipients were the first in their family to attend college. About a quarter of recipients were minorities, whereas only 18% of Oregonians over 18 years of age were minorities (U.S. Census, 2011). The vast majority of recipients were female.

College ECE programs varied widely in number of courses and sections offered, number of students served, presence of ECE leadership, and attendance status of students. Number of courses ranged from 14 to 66 and the number of students from 7 to 460. Twelve colleges had a designated ECE leader. Colleges were pretty evenly divided as to whether the majority of students attended full or part time.

Research Question 3. How do outcomes vary by individual college scholarship program characteristics (size of scholarship, eligibility guidelines, etc.)?

Overall, the BGCCS fund enabled almost 900 students to study ECE at the college level and 370 (42%) of those students to earn a certificate or degree in ECE by the end of the 2012 academic year. For each college we used the percentage of scholarship recipients who were awarded a certificate or degree in ECE as the outcome measure. We called this “recipient educational attainment”. Educational attainment for recipients at seven colleges was 20% or less. For another four colleges it was over 20% but less than 60%. A final group of five colleges had levels over 60%, three of that group had over 70% of scholarship recipients attain an ECE degree or certificate. The group of five colleges that had educational attainment over 60% was considered the higher performing group. Those with attainment levels of less than 20% were considered part of the low performing group.

A set of BGCCS policies and practices appear to be associated with higher educational attainment.

- Having a goal that scholarship recipients earn a certificate or degree in ECE provides a foundation for other practices designed to support educational attainment. What seems essential is that the program has a clear goal to which it holds itself accountable.
- Requiring successful completion of some ECE credits appears to increase the likelihood that the student will complete a certificate or degree.
- Requiring a GPA of some level as a requirement also appears to increase the likelihood that the student will complete a certificate or degree.
- Allowing scholarship funds to be used for a wide array of purposes allows students to reduce the specific barrier that interferes with educational attainment.
- Encouraging students to mix scholarship funds with state/federal financial aid appears to support attainment of an ECE certificate or degree.
- Having either the ECE program or the community college foundation carry primary responsibility for the scholarship program appears to encourage better educational attainment than having multiple college departments or the financial aid office carry primary responsibility.

- Having a strong working relationship between the ECE program and the college unit administering the BGCCS program seems important in colleges in which a unit other than the ECE program manages the BGCCS program. The day-to-day relationship with scholarship recipients available to ECE program staff provides opportunities for coaching, monitoring, and tracking.

Research Question 4. To what extent does the scholarship program contribute to the growth of the community college early education teacher training program (including enrollment in early childhood programs, number of early childhood classes, and additions of certificate programs)?

Colleges reported that the BGCCS program gave status and stature to recipients and to college ECE programs. Over half of teacher training programs have grown and all but one has been maintained over the 8 years included in this evaluation. Additional forces that affected growth included demand for degreed teachers, economic health of the community (negatively associated), and college budgets.

The colleges' goals for their ECE and BGCCS programs appear to be aligned. For the most part, ECE programs aiming to bring large numbers into college level ECE course work have BGCCS programs that focus on providing access or recruiting students into ECE. Those colleges are the most likely to see effects of the BGCCS program on enrollment. BGCCS programs with a goal of completion note that they restrict use of funds to those who need the funds to reach their educational goal. They also tend to offer fewer ECE courses, serve smaller numbers of ECE students, and have more scholarship recipients attain certificates or degrees.

Recommendations

The following recommendations flow from findings of the evaluation study.

Recommendation 1. Clarify goal(s) for BGCCS Fund and require colleges to clearly state goal(s) for their BGCCS program.

The finding of the close relationship between the college's goals for its ECE and its BGCCS programs adds insight into the observed differences in BGCCS program goals. External factors such as the demographic makeup of persons in the district and the business practices of child care and education programs in the college geographic area are likely to affect what type of ECE and BGCCS programs will be effective in a college district. The strength of the demand for degreed teachers is an example of differences respondents reported. Colleges may be reluctant to aim for degree completion in communities with little demand for degreed teachers. It may be that aiming for completion of ECE certificates would better fit these areas.

Based on the evaluation study findings we recommend clarity on the Foundation's goal(s) for the BGCCS Program. Having a completion goal and counting both degree and certificate completion may fit both state and local conditions.

Recommendation 2. Create a set of best practices for colleges operating BGCCS programs. These include the following:

- Requiring successful completion of a set number of ECE credits,
- Requiring a GPA of some level,
- Allowing scholarship funds to be used for a wide array of purposes,
- Allowing students to mix scholarship funds with state/federal financial aid,
- Having one college unit carry primary responsibility for administration of the BGCCS program,
- Ensuring a close link with the ECE program if another college unit carries primary responsibility, and
- Having clarity on which college department has responsibility for each management task (marketing, answering applicant questions, reviewing applications, selecting recipients, and tracking student progress).

Recommendation 3. Require colleges with BGCCS programs use standardized forms and definitions. Specifically, require that colleges do the following:

- Use the *Recipient Survey and Enrollment* form provided by the Foundation,
- Submit enrollment forms on all recipients to the Oregon Center for Career Development in Childhood and Education so that the long-term impact of the BGCCS Fund can be measured, and
- Use standardized definitions in reports to the Foundation to enable valid comparisons across programs.

Recommendation 4. Require that community colleges maintain cumulative lists of scholarship recipients in order to measure the level of educational attainment.

A cumulative list is needed for two reasons: (a) to avoid double counting a recipient who receives a scholarship in more than one year, and (b) to accurately capture educational attainment that typically does not occur in the year in which a scholarship is received. BGCCS recipients often are employed in early childhood and some take years to earn certificates and degrees.

Eleven colleges have already created a cumulative list of scholarship recipients with some of the required information. Those colleges could use that list as a base, although we recommend that they add more individual student data going forward. Colleges unable to create a cumulative list through 2011-12 could begin a list and keep it updated going forward.

Betty Gray Community College Scholarship Program Evaluation

Introduction

Oregon and the nation have identified support for the early years of a child's life as essential to meeting a range of societal goals including education reform and breaking the poverty cycle. President Obama's *Preschool for All* and Oregon's P-20 Education initiatives exemplify public commitments to investments in the early years. A critical component of national and state early childhood initiatives is a requirement that children be taught by an educated early care and education workforce. The demand for an educated workforce is based on years of research linking education and training with child care quality. Interactions with teacher/caregivers are "the primary mechanism" through which experiences affect the child who participates in an early childhood program (Pianta, 2006, p. 233). The amount of sensitivity to children's needs and involvement with them is linked with higher levels of education (Burchinal, Cryer, & Clifford, 2002; Clarke-Stewart, Vandell, Burchinal, Marion, & McCartney, 2002). Although the field lacks clarity on how much education is required, research has consistently suggested that higher levels of provider education and training, particularly that which is child-specific, predict program quality in child care settings (Arnett, 1989; Burchinal, Howes, & Kontos, 2002; Cost, Quality, and Child Outcomes Study Team, 1995; Early, Bryant, Pianta, Clifford, Burchinal, Ritchie, Howes, & Barbarin, 2006; National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, Early Child Care Research Network, 1996; Vandell & Wolfe, 2000; Whitebook, 2003). See the literature review by Weber and Trauten (2008) for a more complete discussion of the research on professional development of the early care and education workforce.

The demand for more educated early care and education teachers and caregivers comes from multiple sources. Based on the body of evidence on the importance of education and training, policy makers have put degree requirements in place for Early Head Start, Head Start and many public prekindergarten programs. Degree requirements are part of the proposed federal/state *Preschool for All* initiative. A goal of Oregon's Race to the Top Early Childhood Challenge grant² includes increasing the early care and education workforce's level of education and training. An early care and education program's rating in Oregon's new Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) is linked to the level of their teachers' education and training. Oregon's ability to have highly rated early programs is dependent on those programs having access to a workforce that has earned certificates and degrees. Mainly though, training and educating the early care and education workforce is a vital investment in Oregon's children and families.

The Oregon Community Foundation (the Foundation) plays a critical role in meeting the demand for an educated and degreed early care and education workforce in Oregon. The Foundation's Betty Gray Community College and Early Childhood Training and Certification scholarship

² The federal Department of Education, in collaboration with the Administration for Children and Families, offered competitive grants known as Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge grants to states to improve early childhood. Oregon was awarded a grant in 2012.

programs provide a critical piece of Oregon's efforts to improve early childhood outcomes. At the request of the Foundation, Oregon State University (OSU) is evaluating both the Community College Scholarship Program operating in 16 of Oregon's 17 community colleges and the Training and Certification Scholarship Program administered by the Oregon Center for Career Development in Childhood Care and Education at Portland State University. In this paper we report findings of the Community College Scholarship Program evaluation. Findings from the evaluation of the Training and Certification Scholarship Program are reported separately.

The overall goal of this evaluation study is identification of factors associated with levels of recipient educational attainment in individual Betty Gray Community College Scholarship (BGCCS) programs operated by local colleges. The Foundation posed the following questions in its request for the evaluation of the BGCCS program:

1. *Has the scholarship program been implemented as planned, and how does the scholarship program vary between the participating community colleges?*
2. *What are the characteristics of scholarship recipients?*
3. *How do outcomes vary by individual college scholarship program characteristics (size of scholarship, eligibility guidelines, etc.)?*
4. *To what extent does the scholarship program contribute to the growth of the community college early education teacher training program (including enrollment in early childhood programs, number of early childhood classes, and additions of certificate programs)?*

The evaluation study addresses all four questions but focuses heavily on answering the third.

Evaluation Study Methodology

The evaluation study was designed to answer each of the Foundation questions. Data came from two primary sources: college annual reports to the Foundation and in-depth interviews with college representatives conducted by OSU. In October 2012 The Foundation provided copies of annual reports for the years 2004-2005 through 2011-2012 that had been submitted by community colleges that operated BGCCS programs. Most colleges had submitted reports each year. The Foundation shared redacted information (student identifying information was not shared). In addition, the Foundation shared data on educational attainment of scholarship recipients that had been reported by the colleges in 2012. The OSU team placed the data into Excel spreadsheets to facilitate analysis.

OSU conducted in-depth interviews with a representative of each college. The Foundation had identified the most appropriate respondent, the ECE program leader in all but three of the colleges. We created an interview protocol and provided forms to the colleges for sharing more detailed information. Two problems that had emerged in the analysis of annual report data (lack of standardized definitions and limited data on scholarship recipient attainment) were addressed in the design of the in-depth interview protocol. Preliminary review of the annual report data showed that it was important to include characteristics of ECE programs and students because individual BGCCS programs could best be understood with the context in which they were embedded. Reported noncompliance with the Foundation's request to enroll BGCCS recipients in the Oregon Registry (Oregon's early childhood professional development repository) led us to include questions that identified the extent of and reasons for noncompliance.

Foundation representatives reviewed the interview protocol and forms. These instruments were field tested in February 2013 and shortly thereafter the Foundation e-mailed an invitation to participate (Appendix A) to each college representative. Using the final version of the interview protocol (Appendix B) we interviewed college representatives. We also asked colleges to (a) report the feasibility of using standardized definitions in their annual reports (Appendix C), and (b) provide an unduplicated list of those who had received a scholarship since 2004-2005, a list that included date(s) of scholarship receipt and any certificates or degrees awarded by the college along with the date on which the certificate/degree was awarded (Appendix E).

All 16 colleges with BGCCS programs participated and interviews were completed in Spring 2013. Interviews averaged an hour in length and the same interviewer conducted all interviews. Although all colleges completed interviews and provided information on the feasibility of standardization of data, not all provided cumulative data on scholarship recipients. Colleges received up to six e-mails and/or phone calls requesting their participation and submission of cumulative data. Eleven of the 16 colleges did provide a cumulative list of scholarship recipients (students were given unique identifiers and identifying information was not reported). The educational attainment data provided by the Foundation differed from that collected through this evaluation in a number of ways. For example, we asked for dates of scholarship award and certificate/degree attainment through 2012. Educational attainment data reported to the Foundation in 2012 were used for the five colleges that did not provide cumulative lists.

At the time of the interviews, respondent data were input into an online survey and then downloaded for analysis. Variables were created using data from the annual reports, educational attainment reports, and the in-depth interviews. In addition to educational attainment and BGCCS program characteristics, we captured characteristics of ECE programs and ECE students. Variables fell into one of three categories:

- Educational attainment level,
- BGCCS program characteristics, and
- College ECE program and student characteristics.

We used two complementary analytic strategies to identify associations of characteristics with educational attainment (Question 3). First we created categorical variables for all key variables, divided the colleges into groups based on the percentage of BGCCS recipients who had attained a certificate or degree in ECE, and examined the data for patterns. Second, we employed statistical tests for correlation or association. Application of both qualitative and quantitative methods led to a list of characteristics associated with levels of educational attainment. Finally, we compared the results from the two methods as a test of the robustness of findings. Having only 16 unique programs limited the confidence we could have in findings from the statistical analyses so we relied heavily on the qualitative analysis.

Findings

Study findings are organized around The Foundation research questions:

1. *Has the scholarship program been implemented as planned, and how does the scholarship program vary between the participating community colleges?*
2. *What are the characteristics of scholarship recipients?*

3. *How do outcomes vary by individual college scholarship program characteristics (size of scholarship, eligibility guidelines, etc.)?*
4. *To what extent does the scholarship program contribute to the growth of the community college early education teacher training program (including enrollment in early childhood programs, number of early childhood classes, and additions of certificate programs)?*

As noted in the methods section, we expanded the second question to include characteristics of college ECE programs and students in addition to those of scholarship recipients. In addition we added a question about the extent of and reasons for noncompliance with the Foundation request to colleges to enroll BGCCS recipients in the Oregon Registry, Oregon's early childhood professional development repository.

Research Question 1. Has the scholarship program been implemented as planned, and how does the scholarship program vary between the participating community colleges?

The Foundation gave community colleges the ability to develop Betty Gray Community College Scholarship (BGCCS) programs that fit their college and community. Colleges reported that scholarship programs operated as planned although that varied greatly from college to college. We found substantial variation in the college Early Child Education (ECE) programs as well as in their BGCCS programs. The substantial amount of variation emerged from both the reviews of both annual reports and the in-depth interviews with college representatives.

The BGCCS programs created by the community colleges varied substantially on eight characteristics:

- Average size of annual recipient award,
- BGCCS program goals,
- College unit with primary responsibility for administration of the program,
- Level of ECE program involvement in BGCCS administration,
- Allowed usage of awarded funds,
- Student mixing of BGCCS funds with state/federal financial aid,
- Requiring successful completion of some ECE credits before awarding the BGCCS, and
- Requiring a GPA of some level as a scholarship requirement.

Summary data on BGCCS program characteristics other than average award are found in Table 1. Each characteristic is described in more detail following the table.

Average annual recipient award. Based on an analysis of annual reports it became clear that there was variation in the size of scholarships awarded not only across colleges but also within colleges from year to year. We asked college representatives how award amounts were determined. Some based it on tuition and books for a single class while others based it on costs associated with a full credit load. Many respondents reported that the amount was based on available dollars and the number of students likely to need the scholarship. Others simply did not know on what basis the amount was determined. To capture the variation within colleges over the years we calculated an average of the average award for each college. That amount varied from \$100 to \$2,458 per year. One college's awards averaged less than \$500, eight averaged between \$500 and \$1,000, three averaged between \$1,000 and \$1,500, and four averaged \$1,500 or more. By 2011-12 the highest average award had increased to \$4,500.

Table 1. Characteristics of Betty Gray Community College Scholarship Programs

Characteristic	Responses	# Colleges that Reported Each Response
BGCCS Program Goals	Completion/persistence	7
	Recruitment/access	3
	Help students	2
	Did not know or no articulated goal	4
Primary Responsibility	Foundation	8
	ECE coordinator	6
	Financial Aid office	1
	Shared Responsibility	1
ECE Involvement	Highly involved	10
	Somewhat involved	2
	Not involved	4
Allowed Usage	Books only	1
	Educational expenses (tuition, fees, books)	6
	Anything educational (e.g., educational expenses, transportation, child care, substitute pay).	9
Eligibility Requirement—ECE Credits	No requirement—0 credits	5
	>0 and <12 credits	5
	12 credits	3
	20 credits or 1 st year	3
Eligibility Requirement—GPA Level	Not required	4
	2.0 GPA	3
	2.5 GPA	3
	3.0 GPA	3
	Don't know	3
BGCCS Combined with Federal/ State Financial Aid	Mix common	8
	Some mix	1
	Mix not common	4
	Don't know	3

BGCCS program goals. We asked college representatives to describe the goals for their BGCCS program. Some respondents replied immediately but others lacked a ready answer to this open-ended question. Most were able to articulate their goals upon reflection. Responses fell into three major categories:

- Supporting certificate/degree completion (persistence),
- Recruiting students into college-level ECE coursework (access), or
- Helping students who had multiple needs.

Four respondents were not able to articulate the program goal; two of those respondents were new to their position.

BGCCS program administration. We asked the college representative who was responsible for the following tasks related to BGCCS program administration:

- Marketing,
- Answering applicant questions,
- Reviewing applications,
- Selecting recipients, and
- Tracking student progress.

The following units were identified as responsible for one or more tasks:

- ECE coordinator,
- Scholarship office,
- Financial Aid office,
- Student services,
- Foundation,
- Foundation board members, and
- Community professionals.

We then asked which college unit carried primary responsibility for the BGCCS program three administrative units emerged:

- College foundation,
- ECE program, and
- Financial aid office.

In half of the colleges the foundation carried primary responsibility while in another six colleges the ECE program did. In one college Financial Aid carried primary responsibility and in another responsibility was shared across multiple administrative units. The ECE programs were highly involved in 10 of the colleges while in four the ECE program was not involved in scholarship administration.

Allowed usage of scholarship funds. Nine colleges allowed scholarship funds to be used for any educational purpose including transportation, child care, and paying for substitutes as well as for tuition and fees. Another six colleges allowed funds to be used only for tuition, fees, and books while one college allowed usage only for books.

Eligibility requirements. The college BGCCS programs varied widely in two eligibility requirements used to determine who would receive a scholarship: completion of ECE credits and GPA level. Six colleges required that students had completed 12 or more credits in ECE while five had no requirement for completion of ECE credits. The remaining five colleges required less than 12 credits be successfully completed in order to be eligible for a scholarship. There was a similar range in the GPA requirement. Of the 13 colleges that were able to answer this question, three required a 3.0 or higher, three a 2.5 or higher, and another three required a 2.0 or higher. Four colleges reported having no GPA requirement. There was little variation in other requirements such as financial need (a little over half did require it), requiring a student identify as an ECE major (all but one required it), or requiring that a student attend at least half time (four colleges required).

BGCCS funds and state/federal financial aid. Many students did not qualify for federal/state financial aid for a variety of reasons including: (a) they could not carry the required six credits due to responsibilities related to employment and/or family, (b) their parents were undocumented, or (c) their parents' earnings were too high. First-generation students often had not been aware of financial aid calendars and thus missed deadlines. They could not have started school without a BGCCS. One respondent shared, *"First generation college students are a large part of who take advantage of Betty Gray—might be living with own family who earn too much or not documented or the parent does not want the student to take classes (wants them to work instead) or family needs money."* A substantial portion of available federal and state financial aid was in the form of loans that students perceived as unwise given the low wages they would be earning.

Some colleges required students to apply for financial aid (submit the FAFSA— Free Application for Federal Student Aid). Colleges varied in the likelihood that students combined BGCCS funds with other forms of state and federal financial aid. In half of colleges, representatives reported that it was common for students to combine a BGCCS with other forms of financial aid. One college representative reported some mixing and another four reported it was not common. Four did not know.

Colleges also varied in how they talked with students about combining BGCCS and other forms of financial aid. The majority encouraged students with financial need to combine the two. College representatives talked about how critical receipt of BGCCS funds were to completion for many students, even those with other financial aid. State/federal assistance did not cover all costs and the flexibility of BGCCS funds enabled students to reduce or eliminate barriers that would have prevented them from achieving their educational goal. One college representative described how transportation threatened course and degree completion for a student. She told the story of a married student with two children who lived a distance from the college. *"The family had two old cars and could not keep the two gas tanks filled. Lack of money to fill the gas tank caused the student to miss classes and threatened her ability to stay in college"*. The college representative described the flexibility of the BGCCS program as key to getting students through to degree completion.

Research Question 2. What are the characteristics of scholarship recipients? What are the characteristics of college ECE programs and students?

Description of Betty Gray Community College Scholarship Recipients

Based on the sum of scholarships awarded annually, over 1,100 students received a Betty Gray Scholarship for one or more quarters in the years between 2004-2005 and 2011-2012³. Students typically received a scholarship for more than one quarter so the count of scholarships awarded would be greater. At the same time, students commonly received a scholarship for more than one year. Based on lists of unduplicated scholarship recipients, over 875 unique individuals received a Betty Gray scholarship over the 8 years.

³ The count included the 12 students awarded scholarships by Oregon Coast Community College in the 2 years in which they participated. Reports were missing for four colleges in 2004-2005 and another 2 colleges did not report the number of recipients in a later year. The sum of students reported in annual reports by one college was less than was reported in their unduplicated list.

Table 2 provides a description of key characteristics of scholarship recipients. Detailed information on each characteristic follows.

Table 2. Number and Characteristics of Betty Gray Community College Scholarship Recipients 2004-2005—2011-2012

Characteristic	Total number and/or (Percent) for all BGCCS Recipients	Range in Number (Percent) of BGCCS Recipients Across Colleges
Sum of annual BGCCS recipients ^a	1,166	16-196
Sum of Unique BGCCS recipients ^b	876	22-151
Age of Recipients in 2011-12 ^c		
18-24	33%	0% to 100%
25-34	29%	0% to 50%
35-44	19%	0% to 40%
45-54	18%	0% to 40%
55+	2%	0% to 29%
First-generation college students ^{a,d}	577 (61%)	1-115 (37% - 89%)
Male Recipients ^{a,d}	49 (4%)	0-6 (0%-19%)
Nonwhite and/or Hispanic Recipients ^{a,d}	251 (24%)	1-72 (3% - 51%)

Notes: ^a Based on 8 years of annual reports.

^b Based on unduplicated list of all recipients from 2004-15 through 2011-12 for the 11 colleges that submitted cumulative and unduplicated lists of scholars. Data from annual reports were used for the five colleges that did not submit unduplicated lists.

^c Based on the 2 years of age data reported (2010-11 & 2011-12).

^d For first-generation, gender, and race/ethnicity, no percentage was calculated if data were missing for 25% or more of recipients.

Age. Data on ages of scholarship recipients were reliably available only for the last 2 years. The mix of ages served by individual colleges varied across the 2 years. For example, in 2010-2011 52% of recipients were under age 35 but in 2011-2012 62% of recipients were under age 35. Therefore we could not be sure that the observed age distribution accurately described ages of those served over the 8 years. That said, in both years the majority of scholarship recipients were under age 35 and a substantial portion of recipients was older.

First generation. Data on first-generation status, gender, and race/ethnicity were reported in each of the 8 years of annual reports by most of the colleges. The majority of BGCCS recipients (61%) were first-generation college students. Although all colleges were reaching this population, the percentage of students who were first-generation ranged from 37% to 89% of all scholarship recipients at a college.

Gender. The vast majority of scholarship recipients were female with only 4% male recipients. The highest percentage of males served at any one college was 19% and males comprised 5% or fewer of recipients in nine colleges.

Race/ethnicity. About a quarter (24%) of all BGCCS recipients were either nonwhite or Hispanic. In two colleges minority students made up approximately half of recipients, whereas in five colleges minority students comprised less than 20% of all recipients.

Description of Early Childhood Education Programs and Students

The community college Early Childhood Education (ECE) programs varied widely on all characteristics measured. From the many ECE program characteristics we examined, we selected five that captured basic program elements:

- Number of courses,
- Number of sections,
- Number of students,
- Presence of ECE leadership within the college, and
- Attendance status of ECE students.

A summary of college ECE program characteristics is found in Table 3. Detailed information on each characteristic follows.

Table 3. Characteristics of Community College ECE Programs with BGCCS Programs

ECE Program Characteristic	Number	Average	Range or # Colleges that Reported Each Response
Number ECE Courses	352	22	14-66
Number of ECE Course Sections	645	40	3-124
Number ECE Students	2,301	144	7-460
Recognized ECE Leadership	NA	NA	All years=12 Some years=1 No years=3
Majority of Students Full Time	NA	NA	Majority FT=8 Majority PT=7 Don't know=1

Courses offered. Together the colleges offered 352 different ECE courses in 2011-2012 for an average of 22 courses per college. Offerings ranged from as few as 14 courses to 66 courses at a single college. Ten colleges reported that the number of courses had grown over the 8 years. The other respondents either did not know (two) or reported the number of courses remained about the same (four). Colleges offered almost double the number of sections as they did courses. Section offerings ranged from 0 to 124 and averaged 40.

Number of ECE students. In 2011-12, the colleges taught 2,301 ECE students and again the number ranged widely from 7 to 460 students with an average of 144 students per college. This number was somewhat inflated, as three colleges could not produce an unduplicated number of students served, that is, they summed the number of registrants for each quarter. Summing registrations could have a single student counted up to four times.

The number of courses, sections, and students was not associated with the size of the college itself but rather reflected the mission and goals of the ECE program. Some ECE programs aimed primarily to introduce large portions of the early care and education workforce to college-level ECE courses. They offered lots of courses and sections of those courses and reached large

numbers of students. Other college ECE programs focused on students' completing certificate and degrees. They offered a limited number of courses and sections and served smaller numbers. Many colleges did not fall neatly into one or the other group.

ECE program administration. The administration of community college ECE programs also varied. Some college ECE programs were headed by a department chair or coordinator, in others a faculty person was the recognized program leader, and in yet others no person was designated as a program leader. In 12 colleges a leader (chair, coordinator, or designated faculty member) was present for all 8 years, although in some of these colleges the individual in that role had changed. In one college a leader was designated some of the years and three colleges operated without a designated ECE leader.

Faculty described the challenges of managing the program with little or no paid time to do the work. Of the six college representatives who reported having some administrative support, four described it as access to a person who was shared by many programs. One described the support as “*very shared—in a pinch*”. Some program leaders described tracking students and their progress. Those with easy working relationships within the college described being able to access the data needed to know how well students progressed.

Attendance status of ECE students. There was wide variation in whether the majority of students attended college on a full- or part-time basis. All but two colleges reported serving a mix of full- and part-time students and they were pretty evenly divided by whether the larger portion attended full or part time. A community college student was considered full time if they carried 12 or more credits. In half of colleges, representatives reported that all or a majority of students attended full time while almost half (seven) reported that all or the majority of students attended part time. One college did not know. Students must carry six or more credits a quarter to be eligible for most forms of federal and state financial aid. The aid was prorated for those carrying less than 12 credits.

Research Question 3. How do outcomes (defined as educational attainment) vary by individual college scholarship program characteristics (size of scholarship, eligibility guidelines, etc.)?

Given the Foundation's goal of educational attainment for the BBCCS program, we used the percentage of scholarship recipients who were awarded a certificate or degree in ECE as the outcome measure. The rich variation in ECE programs, in how the colleges' BGCCS programs operated, and in educational attainment associated with each college program helped us identify program characteristics associated with higher levels of educational attainment. In effect, colleges have experimented with a range of policies and practices and this variation helped identify factors likely to be associated with higher levels of attainment.

Educational Attainment

Overall 370 or 42% of BGCCS recipients received a certificate or degree in ECE over the 8 years that the program has operated. Our analysis of the cumulative lists of students provided by the colleges showed that the time from scholarship receipt to certificate/degree attainment ranged from 1 to 8 years, although students averaged from 1 to 2.5 years to complete. All students who received a BGCCS were included in the calculation of the percentage who attained a degree, so

that percentage will increase over time. Some recipients who had not yet attained a certificate or degree would do so in the coming years.

Educational attainment for seven colleges was 20% or less. For another four colleges it was over 20% but less than 60%. A final group of five colleges had levels over 60%, three of that group had over 70% of scholarship recipients attain an ECE certificate or degree. These three groups were compared throughout the analysis on both characteristics of ECE students and ECE programs as well as characteristics of the colleges' BGCCS programs. We were interested in which characteristics were associated with high levels of educational attainment as represented by the different groups. The group of five colleges that had educational attainment levels over 60% was considered the higher performing group. Those with attainment levels of less than 20% were referred to as the low-performing group.

	Number (Percent) of All BGCCS Recipients	Range in Number (Percent) of BGCCS Recipients Across Colleges
Students Who Earned ECE certificate or degree ^a	370 (42%)	0-62 (0% -77%)

Notes: ^a A cumulative number of recipients was not available from one college. They did not submit a cumulative report to OSU and reported attainment only for a single year to The Oregon Community Foundation. We included the number that received an ECE degree in that single year in the count of scholarship recipients but could not calculate a measure educational attainment.

Characteristics of Community College ECE Programs and Students Associated with Educational Attainment

Two characteristics of college ECE programs were found to be associated with certificate/degree attainment: (a) having a designated ECE leader, and (b) attendance status of ECE students.

ECE program leadership. Having a recognized ECE program leader was associated with higher levels of ECE certificate/degree attainment. It was also associated with having BGCCS program goals of completion and with having the majority of students attending on a full-time basis. The three programs without ECE leadership had either no goal or a general goal of helping students. Those three programs were in the low-performance group. Having an ECE leader did not by itself put programs into the higher performing groups.

Attendance status. Having a majority of students in the ECE program attending school full time was associated with higher levels of ECE certificate/degree attainment. Only one of the mid- or high-performing BGCCS programs was in a college that had a majority of its ECE students attending part time and all of the low-performing programs had all or a majority of students attending part time.

As noted above having a majority of students attend full time was associated with having an ECE leader. It was also associated with higher scholarship awards on average and more mixing of BGCCS funds and other financial aid. Attendance status was related to financial aid, as a student must carry six or more credits to be eligible for state and federal financial aid.

Colleges shared the reasons that students attended part time even though it takes longer to get a degree when doing so. Respondents told of students working and raising children while

attending part time. One college representative shared that “*most are working.*” An important unanswered question is whether or not these students did complete eventually. It was not clear if given enough time part-time students would be as likely as full-time students to earn certificates or degrees. What was clear was that given the 8-year time frame for this evaluation, the scholarship recipients in colleges with a predominance of part-time students had lower levels of completion.

Characteristics of the Colleges’ Individual BGCCS Programs Associated with Educational Attainment

The Foundation allowed each community college to design a BGCCS program that fit the needs of citizens and organizations in their geographic area. Characteristics of the BGCCS programs created by the colleges varied substantially. The wide variation in college scholarship program characteristics made it possible to identify how program characteristics were associated with educational attainment. The associations between BGCCS program characteristic and educational attainment are described below.

Requiring ECE credit completion for scholarship eligibility. The BGCCS program characteristic most strongly associated with educational attainment was requiring completion of ECE credits in order to be eligible for a BGCCS. All of the high-performing programs required a student to have completed some credits in ECE in order to be eligible for a scholarship, although the number of credits required ranged from less than 12 to as many as 20 or completion of the first year of the ECE program. Four of the seven low-performing BGCCS programs had no credit completion requirement but one did require 20 completed ECE credits. Requiring completion of ECE credits was associated with higher GPA eligibility requirements, allowing a wide use of scholarship funds, having a BGCCS program goal of completion, and mixing Betty Gray with other forms of financial aid.

BGCCS program goals. Having a goal of completion for a BGCCS program was associated with higher levels of educational attainment. With the exception of one program, the seven BGCCS programs with a goal of completion had over half of their scholars earn certificates or degrees. Similarly, all but two of the colleges with 50% or higher education attainment levels had completion as their goal. The two colleges with high-performance programs (over 50%) who did not report a completion goal were new to their role in the ECE program and did not know what the BGCCS goal had been. The educational attainment of those programs whose goal was recruitment or helping students had between 12% and 23% of scholarship recipients earn ECE certificates or degrees.

A pattern emerged in which the number of enrolled students and having a completion goal were related. For the most part, BGCCS programs located in ECE programs with a smaller number of students had completion goals; all but one of the seven with a completion goal served fewer than a hundred students in 2011-12. All but one of the BGCCS programs with goals of recruitment or helping students was in an ECE program that served over 100 students in that same year. We explored whether or not the BGCCS program goal was associated with who the program served. Race/ethnicity or first-generation status of scholarship recipients was not associated with the BGCCS program goal.

Other associations. The average amount of the scholarship award was not associated with degree of educational attainment but how the student could use the award was. All of the high-

performing scholarship programs allowed students to use their award for an array of needs including such things as transportation, child care, or paying for substitutes. Numerous colleges reported that BGCCS allowed students to reduce barriers that were preventing them from completing their degree. Only one of the low-performing programs allowed wide usage of scholarship funds. In a similar vein, the high-performing scholarship programs had students mixing BGCCS funds with state or federal financial aid.

Either the community college Foundation or the ECE program was the primary administrator of high-performing scholarship programs. The low-performing programs included a program with no primary administrator and one in which Financial Aid was the primary administrator. ECE programs were typically involved in scholarship program administration. They were somewhat or highly involved in all of the high-performing programs. There was no ECE involvement in three of the low-performing programs. Successful management required the ability to share information and many colleges reported struggling to get data from other parts of the college. Finally, there was variation in how colleges carried out tasks associated with BGCCS program management. Tasks such as tracking of scholarship recipient progress as they moved through the ECE program required sharing of information from different parts of the college. This was mentioned as a challenge in many colleges and the ability to monitor appeared related to educational attainment.

It is worth noting that we found no association between the percentage of scholarship recipients who were either first-generation students or minorities and the programs' educational attainment.

Research Question 4. To what extent did the scholarship program contribute to the growth of the community college early education teacher training program (including enrollment in early childhood programs, number of early childhood classes, and additions of certificate programs)?

The Foundation's BGCCS program has given status and stature to the community college early education teacher training programs as well as to those who received a scholarship. As one respondent explained, ". . . a statewide effort is an esteem builder. The student believes that I am getting involved in something that is important." Another shared, "Having the Scholarship program continues to maintain the profile of the Early Education program. . . [Its existence is] Published at the college and keeps reminding people the program is there and valuable." Yet another said that BGCCS "has been a life saver and we use it for multiple purposes. . . It makes them [students] able to get through school." Still another talked about the BGCCS statewide impact of people moving into college coursework. One college representative talked of the transformative power of BGCCS, "[BGCCS] Can change people's lives. Some people would not have considered going to college if they did not have these funds. Brings an excitement. Breaks isolation, depression is turned around. Feel like a professional and are treated like one." Another shared that by having a BGCCS, students believed, "I can do this and can afford to do it because I have this scholarship where they might not have seen themselves moving ahead. Never envisioned themselves as college students." The colleges could tell students, "We have this resource and you don't have to do it on your own—it made a big difference." As one representative said, "It honors a particular profession."

BGCCS program's impact on the growth of the ECE program was complicated. First, over half of college representatives (10) reported that programs had grown in students, courses, certificates, or degrees. Four reported that their programs stayed about the same size. One of these four reported that college budget constraints had kept the program from growing even though demand was high. Two college representatives did not know if the program had grown; one because of being new to the program.

Second, respondents reported that forces in addition to the BGCCS program had affected enrollment during these eight years. These included the economic downturn that increased community college enrollment in general. Another was an increase in employer demand for credentialed staff that motivated staff to enroll and complete their degree. Similarly, several respondents described the increase in educational requirements for Head Start and Early Head Start and how these requirements became drivers of growth. Colleges in more rural parts of the state shared that the lack of employer interest in having an educated workforce was a challenge for their program, a challenge that affected both enrollment and completion.

Third, how much the program played in the role of increasing enrollment or size of the ECE program was related to the college's goal for BGCCS. Those who used the program to recruit or provide access had seen a direct impact on enrollment. When asked if having BGCCS impacted student enrollment a respondent whose program had reported a goal of access responded, *"Absolutely! Have tripled the program in last 3.5 years. . . Betty Gray plays a significant role in growth. It empowers people to try college and be successful at it - access to colleges."* Respondents with BGCCS programs focused on completion noted that they restricted use of funds to those who needed the funds to reach their educational goal. They did not see the program as a tool for building enrollment but as one representative shared, *"it is a deciding factor in completion because top students (e.g., older students) often have the most demands made upon them. It is not a recruiting tool but a completion support."* Another college representative whose program goal was completion reported, *"Absolutely helps students because they are struggling. Incredibly helpful. Lots of single mothers, young families, lots of variety. Absolutely know that it helps the most for those students who are trying to continue to get the degree. Helps them survive and make it through—especially in second year. Good use of the money because it goes to people known to be committed."* Another reported, *"Has kept students who would have not completed a credential."* In a similar vein a college representative shared, *"Students, even good students, who do not receive the [BGCCS funds] drop out at a much higher rate."* One college reported that the BGCCS helped with recruitment and completion. BGCCS *"does bring students into [the] program and really helps with completion."* Similarly, another shared that students *"Were just going to take one class but Betty Gray made it possible to go with a certificate or even a degree. We couldn't make it without it."* Several college representatives reported that having a scholarship affected student motivation.

About half of college respondents (nine) reported that BGCCS had leveraged additional funds. One reported, *"Receiving these funds allowed the . . . Foundation to leverage a \$50,000 award from [another] Foundation this past year. In the past we partnered with . . . programs—BGCCS and [other] programs working together is the most powerful tool in getting students into and through the program."* Another reported that having BGCCS leveraged college in-kind support in the form of a faculty coordinator and secretarial assistance. One college foundation was considering matching BGCCS. Having BGCCS was key to getting a federal grant and other scholarship funds in one college. In another, *"Carl Perkins funding was leveraged to support an*

advisor as well as expanded advising and recruitment activities in our area high schools.”

Another used receipt of BGCCS funds when applying for vocational ECE grants. Yet another reported bringing in a grant of \$25,000 to support BGCCS certificate completion.

Additional Research Question: To what extent are colleges enrolling BGCCS recipients in the Oregon Registry Online?

The Foundation created the *Recipient Survey and Enrollment* form and directed colleges to have each BGCCS recipient complete the form which would be used to (a) provide colleges basic demographic data for reporting, and (b) enroll BGCCS recipients in the Oregon Registry Online (ORO), the state’s centralized professional development repository. The colleges were instructed to collect the forms and send them along with a cover letter in a packet to the Oregon Center for Career Development in Childhood Care and Education (OCCD) at Portland State University that manages ORO. OCCD staff would then input the data with fields indicating that the person received a BGCCS from that college in that year. Enrollment of BGCCS recipients in ORO would support evaluation of the long-term impacts of scholarship receipt. As of 2012 ORO has included data on all persons working in regulated early care and education facilities. Having BGCCS recipients enrolled in ORO would make it possible to answer questions such as:

- What percentage of BGCCS recipients work in regulated early care and education facilities?
- To what extent do BGCCS recipients work with low-income children (defined as participants in either Oregon Head Start or the Employment Related Day Care programs)?
- How do the educational attainments (certificates, degrees, and steps) of scholarship recipients compare with the attainments of all members of the early care and education workforce employed in regulated facilities?
- To what extent do levels of educational attainment vary by college?

OCCD had reported that many colleges had not complied with the requirement so OSU included in the survey instrument questions about the percentage of the college’s BGCCS recipients they had enrolled in ORO and the college’s understanding of the requirement.

Eight colleges reported that they had submitted forms on all recipients, although at least one college had packaged those forms with ones from every major regardless of whether or not they received a BGCC scholarship. Two colleges had submitted forms on most of their students. Six colleges reported being unclear about what was required or not knowing of the requirement (two because they were new to their position). Multiple reasons for noncompliance were reported. The diversity of college units involved in administering a college’s BGCCS program was an issue for some colleges. One reported that the “. . . *notice had been sent to a different unit of the college and the foundation was so short staffed that only dealing with the most critical issues.*” Several mentioned the challenges of communicating effectively within the college. One respondent reported that the “*Process is not intuitive. Tried to sort it out with students*”. Another thought that students had to pay the ORO registration fee and had difficulty collecting the money. (The Foundation had actually had the fee waived.) Colleges that required all ECE majors to enroll in the Registry expressed confusion about separating out scholarship recipients. Another respondent struggled with not knowing when to submit the packet since students entered the scholarship program over the year. At the same time, some colleges reported that meeting the requirement was easy. For example, one college required completion of the *Recipient Survey and Enrollment* form as a part of the scholarship application and had clearly designated the person responsible for submitting the completed forms to OCCD.

Discussion

The Foundation created the Betty Gray Community College Scholarship program as a critical piece of a statewide effort to improve the well-being and school readiness of young children. Growing awareness of the importance of the early years has been accompanied by increased documentation of the critical role of the early education workforce in achieving early childhood outcomes. Educated and highly skilled teachers are an essential component of a strategy to improve child outcomes. Community colleges play a critical role in educating these teachers, as they are the major provider of certificates and degrees in ECE. Most Oregon community college ECE teacher training programs are relatively young and face challenges from within and without. College budgets are not adequate to meet demands and the low wages paid to early care and education workforce (average only slightly above the minimum (Weber & Finders, 2013)) challenge not only those in the profession but colleges that feel pressure to focus their limited resources on higher-wage careers. College representatives reported that a BGCCS program strengthens their ability to meet these challenges in diverse ways. Having a scholarship designated for ECE has given status and stature to recipients and to college ECE programs. Over half of programs have grown and all but one has been maintained over the eight years included in this evaluation. One college stopped offering ECE classes and returned its BGCCS grant in 2010-11. Colleges perceive the BGCCS as key for maintaining and growing ECE teacher training in Oregon. Yet they describe it as working in consort with other forces such as the demand for certificated and degreed teachers, college budgets, and the health of the economy rather than operating independently.

The BGCCS program has increased the professionalization of Oregon's early care and education workforce. The program has helped a significant number of individuals achieve a community college certificate or degree in ECE, both important milestones in the state's new QRIS. The BGCCS program has enabled almost 900 students to study ECE at the college level and 370 (42%) of those students to earn a certificate or degree in ECE. BGCCS programs are successfully reaching targeted audiences. Almost two-thirds of scholarship recipients are the first in their family to attend college. About a quarter of recipients are minorities, whereas only 18% of Oregonians over 18 years of age are minorities (U.S. Census, 2011). Having a BGCCS program not only supports the growth of the college's ECE program but also increases the status and stature of ECE programs within the colleges and the communities they serve. Similarly, receipt of a scholarship increases students' sense of self-worth and their perception of the importance of the work they are preparing to do.

The analysis of how characteristics of the colleges' individual BGCCS programs are associated with educational attainment provides insight into the role of policies and practices in achieving high levels of educational attainment. The most complicated finding of this evaluation study deals with goals for BGCCS programs. The finding that programs with a completion goal have higher levels of educational attainment than do those with an access goal would seem to make it clear that all programs should aim for certificate/degree completion. Two considerations make getting to a conclusion more complicated. First, in Oregon and the nation, policy makers aim to both increase the supply of certificated or degreed ECE professionals and engage the broader workforce in college-level ECE course work. Achieving both goals is needed to improve early childhood outcomes. Clarifying the Foundation's goals for the BGCCS program seems important. Following are policy questions relevant to clarifying goals for the BGCCS program. Do

Oregon policy makers prioritize one goal over the other? Does the Foundation want to direct its resources to one or the other goal? Is there some desirable mix of the two main goals and if so, what is it? If an access goal is warranted, what is a measurable outcome for a college program whose goal is access or recruitment?

The second complicating factor is that the scholarship programs are embedded in ECE programs and it would appear that the goals of the BGCCS program and ECE program are aligned. BGCCS programs with recruitment goals typically are housed in ECE programs that serve large numbers of students; all reported enrolling over 100 students in 2011-12 (ranged to over 225). ECE enrollments in the seven colleges whose BGCCS program goal was completion enrolled fewer students; all but one had enrollments of less than 100 students in 2011-12 (ranged to as small as 40). Not only are the ECE and BGCCS programs' goals aligned in these colleges, their communities may not have sufficient job opportunities for certificated/degreed teachers. Both state and local agenda seem relevant to a discussion of BGCCS program goals.

A set of best practices for scholarship programs emerged from the study. Following is a summary of BGCCS program practices we find associated with high levels of educational attainment:

- Having a goal that scholarship recipients earn a certificate or degree in ECE provides a foundation for other practices designed to support educational attainment. What seems essential is that the program has a clear goal to which it holds itself accountable.
- Requiring successful completion of some ECE credits before awarding the BGCCS appears to increase the likelihood that the student will complete a certificate or degree.
- Requiring a GPA of some level as a scholarship requirement also appears to increase the likelihood that the student will complete a certificate or degree.
- Allowing scholarship funds to be used for a wide array of purposes allows students to reduce the specific barrier that interferes with educational attainment.
- Encouraging students to mix scholarship funds with state/federal financial aid appears to support attainment of an ECE certificate or degree.
- Having either the ECE program or the community college foundation carry primary responsibility for the scholarship program appears to encourage better educational attainment than having multiple college departments or the financial aid office carry primary responsibility.
- Having a strong working relationship between the ECE program and the college unit administering the BGCCS program seems important in colleges in which a college unit other than the ECE program manages the BGCCS program. The day-to-day relationship with scholarship recipients available to ECE program staff provides opportunities for coaching, monitoring, and tracking.

Long-term evaluation of the BGCCS program will be greatly strengthened by having all scholarship recipients enrolled in ORO and identified as a BGCCS recipient from a specific college. Many respondents reported either lack of knowledge or confusion about expectations for enrolling scholarship recipients in ORO. Communication within colleges was identified as an issue in meeting this requirement. Yet some colleges had integrated the requirement into their processes and found it easy to comply.

Recommendations

The following recommendations flow from findings of the evaluation study.

Recommendation 1. Clarify goals for BGCCS Program.

Some community colleges with BGCCS programs do not seem to be aware of the goal(s) that the Foundation has for the BGCCS program. In addition, some colleges lack clearly articulated goals for their BGCCS program. It would seem important to clarify OCF goals and require colleges to clearly state the goal(s) they have for their BGCCS program. Options could include the Foundation clarifying the goals and communicating them to the colleges or requiring colleges to propose clearly stated goals.

The lack of clarity amongst state partners about broad goals for the ECE workforce provides context for the Foundation's decision. As noted, the need for a highly skilled workforce is broadly acknowledged. Beyond that fundamental agreement lie differences in focus. Degree and certificate completion, increases in steps on the Oregon Registry, engagement in higher education, any increase in training, or engagement in professional behavior are each considered a goal by at least one partner.

The finding of the close relationship between the college's goals for its ECE and its BGCCS programs adds insight into the observed differences in BGCCS program goals. External factors such as the demographic makeup of persons and the business practices of early childhood programs in the college geographic area are likely to affect what type of ECE and BGCCS programs will be effective in a college district. The strength of the demand for degreed teachers is an example of differences respondents reported. Colleges may be reluctant to aim for degree completion in communities with little demand for degreed teachers. It may be that aiming for completion of ECE certificates would better fit these areas.

Based on the evaluation study finding we recommend that clarity on the Foundation's goal or goals for the BGCCS program will be helpful at this stage of the program's development. Having a completion goal and counting both degree and certificate completion may fit with both state and local conditions.

Recommendation 2. Consider a set of best practices for colleges operating BGCCS Programs.

The evaluation identified a set of practices that were associated with higher levels of ECE certificate and degree completion. These include the following:

- Having a clear BGCCS program goal,
- Requiring successful completion of some ECE credits before awarding the BGCCS,
- Requiring a GPA of some level as a scholarship,
- Allowing scholarship funds to be used for a wide array of purposes,
- Allowing students to mix scholarship funds with state/federal financial aid,
- Having one college department carry primary responsibility for administration of the BGCCS program,

- Ensuring a close link with the ECE program if another college department carries primary responsibility,
- Having clarity on which college department has responsibility for each management task (marketing, answering applicant questions, reviewing applications, selecting recipients, and tracking student progress), and
- Ensuring efficient communication of relevant data on scholarship recipients within the college.

As noted above, flexibility benefits the BGCCS programs given the wide variation across colleges. The recommended best practices set program parameters without defining how colleges administer the BGCCS program.

Recommendation 3. Require that colleges with BGCCS programs use standardized definitions for reporting.

We find wide variation in terminology used in annual reports as well as missing data. In addition, use of the *Recipient Survey and Enrollment* form was inconsistent. Many colleges did not have scholarship applicant's use the form provided by the Foundation and hence did not have a source for vital information about students. We recommend requiring use of standardized forms and definitions and completion of reports.

We asked colleges the feasibility of using a set of standardized definitions (see form in Appendix C). Appendix D includes standardized definitions that colleges reported being able to use.

The foundation's revised report format for the 2010-2011 academic year and beyond made a substantial difference in learning about how the college programs operated. Requiring colleges to have students complete the application form developed by the Foundation will facilitate standardized reporting. Further, completing the annual report using standardized definitions will support assessment of program effectiveness and comparability across college programs.

We recommend that the Foundation require that colleges enroll BGCCS recipients as directed and share successful strategies used by colleges that are already complying with this requirement. Enrolling scholarship recipients in ORO as directed by the Foundation is essential to measuring long-term outcomes of BGCCS receipt. Answering questions such as the percentage of recipients who work in regulated child care facilities and how recipients compare to other members of the early education workforce can best be answered by having the recipients enrolled in ORO.

Recommendation 4. Require community colleges maintain cumulative lists of scholarship recipients.

The ability to evaluate the effectiveness of the BGCCS program requires measurement of scholarship recipient education attainment. In order to have accurate outcome data, we recommend that the foundation require that colleges maintain a cumulative list of BGCCS recipients that at a minimum includes:

- A unique identifier for each scholarship recipient,
- Year(s) in which scholarship was granted,
- Number of quarters that a scholarship was granted, and
- Name of all certificates and degrees earned along with the date each was awarded.

If colleges were also able to capture recipient characteristics, over time the colleges and Foundation could learn more about which students had the most difficulty achieving certificates and degrees. They could use that data to develop strategies to increase completion. The list of demographic characteristics that seem the most relevant are captured in the Foundation's *Recipient Survey and Enrollment* form and includes gender, age, and race/ethnicity. This information will be captured on each student if the college uses the enrollment form created by the Foundation. With this information the colleges can maintain a cumulative list of scholarship recipients.

A cumulative list is needed for two reasons: (a) to avoid double counting a recipient who receives a scholarship in more than one year, and (b) to accurately capture educational attainment that typically does not occur in the year in which a scholarship is received. BGCCS recipients often are employed in early childhood and some take years to earn certificates and degrees.

Eleven colleges have already created a cumulative list of scholarship recipients with some of the required information. Those colleges could use that list as a base, although we recommend that they add more individual student data going forward. As long as the college uses the enrollment form provided by the Foundation, they would have the information needed on the cumulative list form (Appendix E). Colleges unable to create a cumulative list through 2011-2012 could begin a list and keep it updated going forward.

References

- Arnett, J. (1989). Caregivers in day-care centers: Does training matter? *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 10, 541–552.
- Burchinal, M. R., Cryer, D., & Clifford, R. M. (2002). Caregiver training and classroom quality in child care centers. *Applied Developmental Science*, 6(1), 2–11.
- Burchinal, M., Howes, C., & Kontos, S. (2002). Structural predictors of child care quality in child care homes. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 17, 87–105.
- Clarke-Stewart, A. K., Vandell, D. L., Burchinal, M. R., Marion, M. O., & McCartney, K. (2002). Do regulable features of child-care homes affect children’s development? *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 17, 52–86.
- Cost, Quality, and Child Outcomes Study Team. (1995). Cost, quality, and child outcomes in child care centers: Key findings and recommendations. *Young Children*, 50(4), 40–44.
- Early, D. M., Bryant, D. M., Pianta, R.C., Clifford, R. M., Burchinal, M. R., Ritchie, S., Howes, C., & Barbarin, O. (2006). Are teachers’ education, major, and credentials related to classroom quality and children’s academic gains in pre-kindergarten? *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 21(2), 174–195.
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, Early Child Care Research Network. (1996). Characteristics of infant child care: Factors contributing to positive caregiving. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 11, 269–306.
- Pianta, R. C. (2006). Standardized observation and professional development: A focus on individualized implementation and practices. In M. Zaslow & I. Martinez-Beck (Eds.), *Critical issues in early childhood professional development* (pp.231–254). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.
- U.S. Census, American Community Survey, (2011). Table S01, 2011 3-year estimate for Oregon.
- Vandell, D. L., & Wolfe, B. (2000). *Child care quality: Does it matter and does it need to be improved?* Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Weber, R.B. & Trauten, M. (2008, October). *Investments in the child care and education profession: A review of the literature*. Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University, Family Policy Program. Downloaded on September 18, 2013 from health.oregonstate.edu/sites/default/files/sbhs/pdf/Lit-Review.pdf
- Weber, R. B.& Finders, J. (2013, May). *Child care and education in Oregon and its counties: 2012*. Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University, Family Policy Program. Downloaded on September 18, 2013 from <http://health.oregonstate.edu/sites/default/files/occrp/pdf/state-profile-child-care-and-education-in-oregon-and-its-counties-2012.pdf>
- Whitebook, M. (2003b). *Early education quality: Higher teacher qualifications for better learning environments—a review of the literature*. Retrieved September 16, 2013 from <http://www.irle.berkeley.edu/cscce/?s=higher+teacher+qualifications+for+better+learning+environments>.

Appendix A

Invitation to Participate in Survey

[E-mailed to all 16 ECE contacts by Mary Louise McClintock on or before 02/20/2013]

Dear (Community College Representative),

The Betty Gray Community College Scholarship Program continues to be an important part of The Foundation's commitment to early childhood education in Oregon. In line with that commitment we have contracted with the Family Policy Program at Oregon State University to conduct an evaluation of the program. Bobbie Weber, Deana Grobe, and Shannon Lipscomb of OSU are conducting the study.

Bobbie and Deana have analyzed the data that you and your colleagues have submitted in your annual reports. In addition, in order to answer the questions that are of interest to OCF, Bobbie will be interviewing a representative of each college's early childhood education program. She will not be asking you questions you have already answered in your annual reports. Rather, she will be adding to that information.

I would like to note two other things about Bobbie's interviews: First, the OSU team will share aggregated information with OCF; information and comments will not be attributed to a person or college. Second, your participation is voluntary and the status of your grant will not be affected by your decision to not participate. However, I encourage you to make time to do the interview with Bobbie; the information this report generates will be tremendously valuable to OCF as well as to the community college sector in assessing the impact of the Gray Scholarship and guiding future scholarship strategies.

We hope to simplify reporting and make it easier to summarize data by using the same terminology across the colleges. The OSU team has drafted a table of terms and their definitions. Bobbie will be asking you to share how easy it would be for you to use these terms. She will send you the draft table at the time that she schedules your interview.

Bobbie will be contacting you to find a time that will be convenient for you to talk with her. It will be helpful if you have copies of past reports, especially the 2011-12 report, with you at the time of the interview. Attached to this letter is a list of the topics that will be addressed in the interview.

We at OCF are pleased to be documenting the important work that you and all of your colleagues do. We trust that all of us will gain an increased understanding of what is working well and areas that we can improve, and we are excited that we will have an evaluation study to share with you.

Don't hesitate to let me know if you have questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Mary Louise
Mary Louise McClintock
Early Childhood Program Director

THE OREGON COMMUNITY FOUNDATION

1221 SW Yamhill St.
Suite 100
Portland, OR 97205

503.227.6846 (T)
503.274.7771 (F)

oregoncf.org

Appendix B

Betty Grey Community College Scholarship Program: Community College Interview Protocol

Note: Responses to relevant questions from past reports submitted to OCF will be inserted into the protocol prior to the interviews. Faculty will not be asked for information that they already provided to OCF, although we will ask for more detail and clarifications.

1. Date
2. Community College name
3. Name of Respondent
4. Position of Respondent

INTRODUCTION

- Name & affiliation of interviewer
- Description of Evaluation/Purpose of call
 - BG represents a major investment of the OCF. They have asked OSU to assess the impact of that investment.
 - Have read your reports 2004-2005 through 2011-2012
 - Having individual conversations with CC representatives so that we can better understand how the program operates in colleges.
- Expect call to take about 60 minutes. Is now a good time or is there a better time for me to call back?

DESCRIPTION OF COLLEGE EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAM

5. Does your program offer certificates or degrees in Early Childhood Education or a related field?
 - a. *Yes in ECE*
 - b. *Yes in Related Field*
 - c. *No certificate or degree in ECE or a related field*[PLEASE LIST ALL THAT YOU CONSIDER RELATED TO ECE.]
6. Please tell us if you offer each of the following in ECE or a related field:
 - a. Certificate: *Yes/No*
 - b. AAS: *Yes/No*
 - c. AS: *Yes/No*
 - d. None: *Yes/No*
 - e. Other (please specify)
7. CHECK – Number of courses they report offering in 2011-12
 - a. Number of course they reported offering in 2011-12 - #
 - b. Number of sections they reported offering in 2011-12 - #
 - c. Other (please specify)
8. Of these courses, how many are:
 - a. Transfer Number - #
 - b. Career Technical (7.) - #
 - c. 9. Courses - #

9. CHECK- Number of student enrolled in ECE in 2011-12
 - a. Number of students enrolled in ECE in 2011-12 - #
10. Is this number of ECE student an unduplicated count? *Yes/No*
11. Does this number include person who come for one or more classes with no known intent to enter a certificate or degree program? *Yes/No, Comments(open-ended)*
12. Of those enrolled in a certificate or degree program are they almost all full time students, almost all part-time students, a mix of full- and part-time students with the majority full-time, a mix of full- and part-time students with the majority part-time or some other mix?
 - a. *Almost all full-time students*
 - b. *Almost all part-time students*
 - c. *A mix of full- and part-time students with the majority full time*
 - d. *A mix of full- and part-time students with the majority part-time*
 Comments (*open-ended*)
13. Do students typically move between being full- and part-time over quarters/years?
Open-ended
14. CHECK—We want to be sure we understand current staffing in your program. Please confirm the following: *job titles, number of person in that position, and associated FTE.*
 - a. Coordinator or chair
 - b. Administrative support
 - c. Contracted faculty
 - d. Part-time non-contracted (adjunct) faculty
 - e. Other, please specify
 Comments (*open-ended*)

DESCRIPTION OF COLLEGE BETTY GRAY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

15. Do you have specific goals for your scholarship program? Have these goals changed over time? [PROMPT: ARE THERE GOALS FOR STUDENTS, PROGRAM, AND/OR COLLEGE. FOR ANY ENTITY NOT MENTIONED, ASK IF THERE ARE GOALS FOR THAT ENTITY.]
Open-ended
16. Please describe the students you target for receipt of a scholarship. Who is eligible? [PROMPT: 1)AREA OF STUDY, 2) DESIRED EMPLOYMENT, 3) REGISTRERING FOR SPECIFIC COURSES, 4) HAS COMPLETED SPECIFIED COURSES OR NUMBER OF COURSES, 5) ENROLLING IN ECE-RELATED CERTIFICATE/DEGREE PROGRAM, 6) ENROLLED IN PRACTICUM.]
Open-ended
17. Does a person have to be enrolled in a certificate or degree program to be eligible for a scholarship?
 - a. *Yes*
 - b. *No*
18. Are some student given a higher priority than others? Please explain.
Open-ended
19. Has eligibility or prioritization changed over time? [PROMPT: DOES THIS CHANGE DEPEND ON YOUR APPLICANT POOL?]
Open-ended
20. CHECK—Over the years the amount of your scholarships has ranged from: [PROMPT: WAS THAT PER QUARTER OR PER YEAR?]
 - a. *Lowest*
 - b. *Highest*
 Comments (*open-ended*)

21. How did you decide how much scholarship assistance to give students? Has this changed over time? Please explain.

Open-ended

IMPACT OF BETTY GRAY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM ON STUDENTS AND PROGRAM

22. Do you have a list or unduplicated count of everyone who has received a Betty Gray Scholarship?

- a. *Yes*
- b. *No*
- c. *Other (please specify)*

23. If you cannot create an unduplicated list of all persons who have received a BG Scholarship, please share the challenges you face in creating such a list.

Open-ended

24. Would you be able and willing to share with OSU de-identified information on the characteristics of each scholarship recipient? I will list the characteristics that would be helpful, please let me know if you can provide each of the following basic characteristics of the student at the time they received their first BG Scholarship. Response for each is: *Yes, Some, or No*

- a. Age
- b. Gender
- c. Income
- d. Race/ethnicity
- e. Primary language
- f. First in family to attend higher education
- g. Educational goal
- h. Professional goal (i.e., ECE teacher/assistant, social services, K-12 teacher)
- i. Employment status (i.e., employed in ECE, employed other, not employed)
- j. Number of years employed in one or more types of early care and education including a center

25. Please share which of the following outcomes you would be able to report for each de-identified recipient? [PROMPT: BANNER, ADMISSIONS, FINANCIAL AID] For each response options are: *Yes, Some, No*

- a. Certificate or degree awarded by your college
- b. Transferred to a 4-year college
- c. Degree awarded by another college
- d. Step on ORO
- e. Employed in ECE without a receipt of a certificate or degree
- f. If still working toward a certificate or degree, the number of credits earned in the last year.

Comments (open-ended)

26. Please share the challenges in reporting educational attainments.

Open-ended

27. What is the feasibility of follow-up with each student upon completion of the scholarship? For example, in order for them to receive their last check can you require students to complete a short online survey about their academic progress and how to reach them in the future (e.g., e-mail addresses of parents or others with whom they are likely to stay in contact).

Open-ended

28. How does the number and/or type of courses offered in 2011-12 compare to the number offered in 2004-05? [PROMPT: HOW MUCH OF THIS CHANGE DO YOU THINK IS DUE TO THE BG PROGRAM? WHY/HOW DO YOU KNOW?]
Open-ended
29. How does your program's student 2011-12 FTE compare to 2004-05 FTE?
 a. *More*
 b. *Less*
 c. *About the same*
 d. *Not sure/don't know*
30. How much of this change do you think is due to the BG program? Why/how do you know?
Open-ended
31. Have the characteristics of your students changed at all as a result of receiving the BG program? How so? [PROMPT: ONE IMPORTANT IMPACT MAY BE INCREASED ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION FOR LOWER-INCOME OR RETURNING STUDENTS THAT HAVE BEEN IN THE WORKFORCE FOR MANY YEARS, ETC.]
Open-ended
32. CHECK- Do you have any information to add to what you shared about the extent to which BGS program has leveraged additional support within your college or from outside the institution? [PROMPT: WHY/HOW DO YOU KNOW?]
Open-ended
33. Do the attainments differ from what you expected to achieve with the programs?
Open-ended

ADMINISTRATION OF COLLEGE BETTY GRAY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

34. CHECK—Who is involved in administering the program for the college? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.]
- a. *ECE coordinator/faculty/program*
 - b. *Scholarship office*
 - c. *Financial aid office*
 - d. *Student services*
 - e. *Foundation*
 - f. *Foundation board members*
 - g. *Community professionals*
 - h. *Other (please specify)*
35. Which of these has primary responsibility?
- a. *ECE coordinator/faculty/program*
 - b. *Scholarship office*
 - c. *Financial aid office*
 - d. *Student services*
 - e. *Foundation*
 - f. *Foundation board members*
 - g. *Community professionals*
- Comments (*open-ended*)
36. Please describe how the program is administered at your college. Who is responsible for:
- a. *Deciding upon eligibility criteria – open-ended*
 - b. *Marketing – open-ended*
 - c. *Answering application questions - open-ended*
 - d. *Reviewing applications - open-ended*

- e. Selecting recipients - *open-ended*
 - f. Tracking students - *open-ended*
37. Please describe what financial aid is available to ECE students?
Open-ended
38. How does the BG Scholarship program fit into the mix of financial aid sources?
Open-ended
39. Do you have students with need that do not qualify for financial aid other than the BGSF?
a. *Yes, please describe the reasons they are not eligible for other financial aid.*
b. *No*
40. Is it common for student to receive both a BG scholarship and other financial aid? If so, please describe.
Open-ended
41. Are there students who would not be able to attend college/earn a certificate/degree without a BG scholarship? Please describe more fully.
Open-ended

OREGON REGISTRY ONLINE

OCF has a goal of having all BGSF recipients enrolled in the Oregon Registry online. In 2011 OCF instituted a requirement that all BGSF recipients complete and submit a combined Betty Gray Scholarship application form/ORO enrollment form [*Recipient Survey and Enrollment form*].

42. CHECK-Number of students who received BGS in 2011-12 - *# of students*
43. What number of forms did you submit to the Oregon Center for Career Development at PSU? - *# of forms submitted to PSU*
44. [IF RESPONSES TO THE TWO PREVIOUS QUESTIONS ARE EQUAL THEN SKIP TO THE Q45
Were the expectations for your program clear?
a. *Yes*
b. *No, if no, what was unclear? (open-ended)*
45. When and how did you communicate this new requirement to BGSF recipients?
Open-ended
46. Who on your staff was responsible for collecting the forms and mailing them in a packet to OCCD?
Open-ended
47. Are there any other insights or comments you would like to share at this point in the interview?
Open-ended

POSSIBLE STANDARDIZATION OF TERMINOLOGY USED IN REPORTING

Colleges differ in how they describe components of their program such as BGSF eligibility, students, courses, degrees, and certificates. These differences make it hard to understand key components of the BGSF such as who is being served and the impact the scholarship has on students and the program. We have attempted to create a list of terms that could be used in reporting. We are assessing the feasibility of creating a list of terms that would mean the same thing regardless of which college is reporting.

Using the table we have provide please share what would and would not work for you if use of these terms were adopted for reporting purposes: [TABLE OF POTENTIAL METRICS WILL HAVE BEEN SENT TO RESPONDENT PRIOR TO THE INTERVIEW.]

Appendix C

OCF Betty Gray Community College Scholarship (BGSF) Evaluation Feasibility of Standardized Reporting Form

Colleges differ in how they describe components of their program such as BGSF eligibility, students, courses, degrees, and certificates. These differences make it hard to understand key components of the BGSF such as who is being served and the impact the scholarship has on students and the program. We are assessing the feasibility of creating a list of terms that would mean the same thing regardless of which college is reporting. We have created a list of terms that could be used to standardize responses to questions on the Betty Gray Early Childhood Scholarship Program Annual Evaluation Report. For each variable, please assess the feasibility of reporting data using a scale of 1 for difficult and 10 for easy.

Descriptive— BGCC Scholarship Recipients

Characteristics	Values	Data Source	Feasibility of Collecting Data
Date of birth	Mm/dd/yyyy	Recipient Survey and Enrollment form	
Gender	M F	Recipient Survey and Enrollment Form	
Race/ethnicity	Race: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian Black or African American Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. White, Hispanic, Latino, Spanish Other __please list	Recipient Survey and Enrollment Form	
Professional goal	ECE Teacher/Assistant Child/Social Services K-12 Teacher/Aide Other	Recipient Survey and Enrollment Form	

Characteristics	Values	Data Source	Feasibility of Collecting Data
Educational goal	Certificate ECE or Related	Recipient Survey and Enrollment Form	
Status as student	Part-time Full-time Class level (# credits completed)	Recipient Survey and Enrollment Form or CC records	
First generation college	Have members of your family attended college in previous generations?	Recipient Survey and Enrollment Form	
Current position	See form	Recipient Survey and Enrollment Form	
Level of Education	Less than high school diploma High School Diploma General Education Development (GED) Certificate from college, school or professional association in 2-year college degree AA, AS, AAS or other in 4 year college degree-BA/BS or other in Master's degree—MA/MS/MED or other in PhD, EdD or other doctoral degree in Other (please list degree and field of study)	Recipient Survey and Enrollment Form	
Degrees &/or certificates	Career Pathway Certificate Certificate ECE or related field AAS ECE or related AS AAOT Other	CC records	
Increase in student self-esteem	Questions from OCCD Professional Development Survey—done prior to and after receipt of BGS	Add to Recipient Survey and Enrollment form?	

Characteristics	Values	Data Source	Feasibility of Collecting Data
Transfer to a 4-yr college in ECE or related field	Transferred to a 4-yr college/university	CC Program tracking	
Moved from school to employment in ECE w/out certificate/degree completion	Left for employment in ECE without completion of certificate/degree	CC Program tracking	
Working in ECE in the year after receipt of the BGS.	Employed in a regulated ECE facility in the year after receipt of the subsidy.		

Descriptive—Community College ECE program

Metric	Measure	Data Source	Feasibility of Collecting Data
Course	ECE Course that can be used to earn a certificate or degree Exclude noncredit or supplementary courses	Catalog	
Sections	Number of sections associated with above courses	CC schedules	
Certificates/degrees	Annual # of certificates/degrees awarded in most recent year	CC records	
Student FTE	Annual # FTE in ECE or related courses	CC records	
Enrollment-Unduplicated # students	Total :Annual # enrolled in ECE (sum of three groups listed below)	CC program	
	Annual # in ECE or related degree program		
	Annual # in ECE certificate program		
	Annual # taking classes and not in certificate or degree program		
Duplicated # students	Annual # registrations in ECE related	CC program	
Unduplicated # faculty	Annual # faculty teaching ECE/related (FT, PT)	CC program	
	Annual faculty FTE		
Staff FTE	Annual # support staff devoted to ECE/related (e.g., non-faculty coordinator or support staff)	CC program	
	Annual # FTE support staff devoted to ECE/related		

Descriptive—Administration of Betty Gray Scholarship Program

Metric	Measure	Data Source	Feasibility of Collecting Data
College Departments engaged in administering BGS Program	ECE coord/faculty/program Scholarship Office Financial Aid Office Student Services, Foundation Foundation Board members Community professionals	CC program	
Department responsible for BGS Program function (list responsible department)	Setting eligibility criteria Conducting marketing, Answering application questions, Reviewing applications Selecting recipients, Tracking students	CC program	
Eligibility requirements--- student status	Any cc student -only requirement is registration in a CC class Any students with a high school diploma or GED Only students enrolled in an ECE related course Only students with a declared major –certificate or degree Only students who have completed x number of ECE/related credits Only students enrolled in at least one practicum course Only students that have completed first year of AAS degree	CC program	Are the categories mutually exclusive?
Eligibility requirement-other	Goal of working in ECE/related field Experience working with children Currently employed in ECE (community-based or Head Start) Financial need	CC Program	

Metric	Measure	Data Source	Feasibility of Collecting Data
Allowable use of funds	Tuition Fees Books Materials and Supplies Any Educational Expense Emergency Professional Development Transportation Child Care Substitute Stipends	CC Program	

Potential Outcomes—Program

Metric	Measure	Data Source	Feasibility of Collecting Data
Increased/maintained ECE or related student FTE	Comparison of ECE/related student FTE this we with that of prior year	CC records	
Increased/maintained # of ECE or related degrees/certificates awarded	Comparison of # ECE/related certificates and degrees awarded with that of prior year.	CC records	
Increased # of ECE or related courses and sections	Comparison of ECE/related courses and sections with that of prior year.	CC records	
Increased # of students enrolled in ECE or related coursework	Comparison of # of students enrolled in ECE or related coursework with that of prior year	CC records	
Improved stakeholder perception of program more positive	Perceptions of key stakeholders within and outside college	Survey	

Appendix D

Standardized Reporting Recommendation

The Feasibility of Standardized Reporting Form (Appendix C) listed each data element that the Foundation has collected or that had been considered relevant for monitoring programs. For each data element a set of allowed values was listed. Where the college would find the information (data source) was also listed. For each data element, colleges were asked to rate the feasibility of reporting using the values as defined. For the data elements included in the table below, use of standardized definitions (use of listed values) was deemed feasible.

Data elements that colleges did not deem feasible to collect included:

- Income,
- Employment status of students,
- Years employed,
- Data collected from students after leaving program such as:
 - Transfers to another college or university,
 - Employment after program exit,
- Program outcome data such as changes in:
 - # ECE program FTE,
 - # ECE certificates and degrees awarded in past year,
 - # students enrolled in ECE coursework, or
 - Stakeholder perceptions of ECE or BGCCS programs.

Many colleges reported lacking the time and resources to collect and manage this data.

Description of Scholarship Recipients

Characteristics	Values	Data Source
Date of birth	Mm/dd/yyyy	Recipient Survey and Enrollment form
Gender	M F	Recipient Survey and Enrollment Form
Race/ethnicity	Race: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic, Latino, Spanish Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, Other __please list	Recipient Survey and Enrollment Form
Professional goal	ECE Teacher/Assistant Child/Social Services K-12 Teacher/Aide Other	Recipient Survey and Enrollment Form (revise to add list of options)

Characteristics	Values	Data Source
Educational goal	Certificate ECE or Related Associate degree	Recipient Survey and Enrollment Form
Status as student	Part-time Full-time Class level (# credits completed)	Recipient Survey and Enrollment Form or CC records
First generation college	Have members of your family attended college in previous generations?	Recipient Survey and Enrollment Form
Current position	See form	Recipient Survey and Enrollment Form
Level of Education	Less than high school diploma High School Diploma General Education Development (GED) Certificate from college, school or professional association in 2-year college degree AA, AS, AAS or other in 4 year college degree-BA/BS or other in Master's degree—MA/MS/MED or other in PhD, EdD or other doctoral degree in Other (please list degree and field of study)	Recipient Survey and Enrollment Form
Degrees &/or certificates	Career Pathway Certificate Certificate ECE or related field AAS ECE or related or not AS ECE or related or not AGS AAOT Other	CC records such as those maintained by the registrar's office
Increase in student self-esteem	Questions from OCCD Professional Development Survey—done prior to and after receipt of BGS	Add question to section 7 of Recipient Survey & Enrollment form

Description of Community College ECE program

Characteristic	Measure	Data Source
Number of ECE Courses	ECE Course that can be used to earn a certificate or degree Exclude noncredit or supplementary courses	Catalog
Sections	Number of sections associated with above courses	CC schedules

Characteristic	Measure	Data Source
Certificates/ degrees	Annual # awarded in most recent year: Degrees in ECE or related Degrees other than ECE ECE certificates	CC records such as those maintained by the registrar's office.
Student FTE	Annual # FTE in ECE or related courses	CC records
Enrollment- Unduplicated # students	Total # unduplicated persons enrolled in ECE	CC program
Duplicated # students	Annual # registrations in ECE related courses	CC program
Unduplicated # faculty	Annual # faculty teaching ECE/related # FT # PT	CC program
Administrative support	Does college provide administrative support to program: Yes or No	CC program

Descriptive—Administration of Betty Gray Scholarship Program

Characteristic	Measure	Data Source
College Departments engaged in administering BGS Program	Check all that apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECE coord/faculty/program • Scholarship Office • Financial Aid Office • Student Services, • Foundation • Foundation Board members • Community professionals • Other 	CC department completing annual report
Department responsible for BGS Program function (list responsible department)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting eligibility criteria • Conducting marketing, • Answering application questions, • Reviewing applications • Selecting recipients, • Tracking students 	CC department completing annual report
Eligibility requirements--- student status	Check all that apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of ECE credits—give number required • GPA—minimum required 	CC department completing annual report

Characteristic	Measure	Data Source
Eligibility requirement-other	Check all that apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal of working in ECE/related field • Experience working with children • Currently employed in ECE (community-based or Head Start) • Financial need • Other –please specify 	CC department completing annual report
Allowable use of funds	Check all that apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tuition • Fees • Books • Materials and Supplies • Any Educational Expense • Emergency • Professional Development • Transportation • Child Care • Substitute Stipends 	CC department completing annual report

For additional copies of this evaluation report, contact:

Oregon Child Care Research Partnership,
OSU Family Policy Program
Waldo Hall 304
Corvallis, Oregon 97331
Telephone: (541) 737-9243
Email: bobbie.weber@oregonstate.edu