North Seattle College
Changes to Core Theme Indicators and Benchmarks
2011 to 2016

Through a highly participatory process conducted in the 2009-10 academic year, the college community identified its three core themes from which it then developed objectives and indicators of achievement, which were described in its Year One Report of March 2011. Based on its experience from 2011 through 2013, the college modified the original objectives and indicators and submitted those modifications in its Year Three Report of March 2013. The modifications involved reducing the number of objectives from twelve to three (one for each core theme), making the indicators more outcome-oriented than process-oriented, and establishing levels of desired performance—benchmarks—for each indicator. The process of revising the original objectives, indicators and benchmarks is outlined in Appendix 4 of the college's Year Three Report.

Each year the college monitored performance on the indicators. In doing so, it made further refinements to the indicators. It did so for a number of reasons:

- Data changes. At the end of each year, thousands of new student records are uploaded to the database used to track the student success indicators within Core Theme One. The new records represent student course-taking activity, completions, and transfers for that year. Once uploaded, a series of Access macro routines are executed to produce the reports used to track student progress. In a number of instances it was found that numbers from the previous year's data had changed, although only by a few percentage points. The differences are attributable to coding changes (e.g., a student changes from one program to another), grade changes (e.g., a student's grade is changed from an incomplete once s/he has handed in a final assignment), and/or clerical errors (transcribing a number incorrectly when preparing a performance summary report).
- Data availability. In some instances, data that SBCTC had been providing were no longer available. In these cases, the college substituted similar but somewhat different measures.
- Policy change. In July 2014, after a yearlong study by a committee of college presidents, the SBCTC changed the formula for how points were awarded under the Student Achievement Initiative. This change significantly changed the baseline for Indicator 1.01.
- More appropriate expectations. In one instance (Indicator 2.01), the college changed the indicator to focus on full-time and priority-hire faculty rather than all faculty. In another instance (Indicator 3.01), it focused on the measure within that indicator that represented the area where greatest growth was needed, namely training for search committees to ensure bias-free employment searches.
- Ineffective measures. The college found that some indicators simply were not effective in providing meaningful data. In these instances the decision was made to abandon the indicator in question.

The tables on the following pages provide information on the changes in indicators over time. The tables contain four columns.

- Column One: Year Three Report—March 2013: This column displays the indicator, the baseline, and the benchmark as reported in the college's Year Three Report.
- Column Two: Progress Report—July 2014: Through the use of ~~strikethrough formatting~~, this column displays any changes that were made to an indicator in July 2014 when the first progress report was prepared. Changes were made based on one or more of the reasons outlined above. In some cases, additional changes were made when the second progress report was prepared in 2015. Such changes are not shown with strikethrough, but are reflected by what is shown in column three.
- Column Three: Year Seven Report—March 2016: This column displays the indicator as it is being tracked and reported on for this report. One consistent change shown in this column was that in this current report, the benchmark year is shown simply as "2015-16" rather than a format such as "2015-16 for 2013-14 starts." This change was made both for the sake of simplicity and for tidier formatting.

- Column Four: Change and Rationale: This column identifies the type of change the indicator has experienced over the past three years, and provides a rationale for that change. Brief explanations in this column are complemented with more detailed explanations in the "Rationale" section that follows the tables, and in fuller discussions of the indicators within Standard Four.

<div style="text-align: center;">

Core Theme One*: Advancing Student Success*

</div>

Advancing Student Success means that we

- create a culture that intentionally places student learning and growth at the center of what we do
- promote student engagement with coursework, faculty and staff, and co-curricular activities
- foster active, collaborative, self-directed learning
- support student perseverance and goal completion

Objective 1: To significantly increase the percentage of students who successfully complete their educational goals including retention, progression, completion, transfer, and employment; and to increase the equity of academic outcomes among all student groups.

	Year Three Report—March 2013	**Progress Report--July 2014**	**Year Seven Report-- March 2016**	**Change [C] & Rationale [R]**
1.01	Annual Student Achievement points per student Baseline: 0.81 [2009-10] Benchmark 0.84 [2016]	Annual Student Achievement points per student Baseline: ~~0.81~~ 1.06 [2009-10] Benchmark ~~0.84~~ 1.10 [2016]	Annual Student Achievement points per student Baseline: 1.06 [2009-10] Benchmark 1.10 [2015-16]	[C] Baseline change. Benchmark recalculated to maintain original targeted percentage increase. [R] SBCTC changed methodology within SAI framework, including more points and reducing the types of students used to calculate points per student.
1.02	Q1 to Q2[1] for students intending to stay at least two quarters Baseline: 63% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 70% [2016 for 2013-14 starts]	Q1 to Q2 for students intending to stay at least two quarters Baseline: ~~63%~~ 64% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 70% [2013-14 starts]	Q1 to Q2 for students intending to stay at least two quarters Baseline: 62%[2009-10] Benchmark: 70% [2015-16]	[C] Baseline change. Benchmark recalculated to maintain original targeted percentage increase. [R] Baseline changes due to changes in student coding and/or grade changes within the baseline cohort.
1.03	Q1 to Q2 for students whose planned length of stay is "don't know" or "blank" Baseline: 50% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 59% [2016 for2013-14 starts]	Q1 to Q2 for students whose planned length of stay is "don't know" or "blank" Baseline: ~~50%~~ 49% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 59% [2013-14 starts]	Q1 to Q2 for students whose planned length of stay is "don't know" or "blank" Baseline: 48% [2009-10] Benchmark: 59% [2015-16]	[C] Baseline change. Benchmark recalculated to maintain original targeted percentage increase. [R] Baseline changes due to changes in student coding and/or grade changes within the baseline cohort.

---

[1] Quarter 1 to Quarter 2

Year Three Report—March 2013	Progress Report--July 2014	Year Seven Report-- March 2016	Change [C] & Rationale [R]
1.04 Percent of students completing developmental math sequence within six quarters Baseline: 31% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 43% [2016 for 2013-14 starts]	Percent of students completing developmental math sequence within ~~six~~ four quarters Baseline: 31% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 43% [2013-14 starts]	Percent of students completing developmental math sequence within four quarters Baseline: 31% [2009-10] Benchmark: 43% [2015-16]]	[C] Timeframe for students to achieve the indicator was changed. [R] Timeline changed to align with comparable SAI momentum point.
1.05 Percent of students who start three levels below college-level and complete developmental math sequence within six quarters Baseline: 6% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 20% [2016 for 2013-14 starts]	Percent of students who start three levels below college-level and complete developmental math sequence within ~~six~~ four quarters Baseline: ~~6%~~ 5% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 20% [2013-14 starts]	Percent of students who start three levels below college-level and complete developmental math sequence within four quarters Baseline: 6% [2009-10] Benchmark: 20% [2015-16]]	[C] Baseline change. Benchmark recalculated to maintain original targeted percentage increase. Timeline for students to achieve the indicator was changed. [R] Baseline changes due to changes in student coding and/or grade changes within the baseline cohort. Timeline changed to align with comparable SAI momentum point.
1.06 Percent of students who start two levels below college-level and complete developmental math sequence within six quarters Baseline: 36% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 50% [2016 for 2013-14 starts]	Percent of students who start two levels below college-level and complete developmental math sequence within six four quarters Baseline: 36% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 50% [2013-14 starts]	Percent of students who start two levels below college-level and complete developmental math sequence within four quarters Baseline: 36% [2009-10] Benchmark: 50% [2015-16]	[C] Timeline for students to achieve the indicator was changed. [R] Timeline changed to align with comparable SAI momentum point
1.07 Percent of students who earn QSR (Quantitative/Symbolic Reasoning) within eight quarters Baseline: 15% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 21% [2016 for 2012-13 starts]	Percent of students who earn QSR within eight quarters Baseline: ~~15%~~ 26% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: ~~21%~~ 36% [2012-13 starts]	Percent of students who earn QSR within eight quarters Baseline: 18% [2009-10] Benchmark: 25% [2015-16]	[C] Baseline change. Benchmark recalculated to maintain original targeted percentage increase. [R] Changes in student coding, grade changes, and presumed clerical error in July 2014.
1.08 Percent of students completing developmental English sequence within six four quarters	Percent of students completing developmental English sequence within six four quarters	Percent of students completing developmental English sequence within four quarters	[C] Timeline for students to achieve the indicator was changed.

Year Three Report—March 2013	Progress Report--July 2014	Year Seven Report-- March 2016	Change [C] & Rationale [R]
Baseline: 62% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 71% [2016 for 2013-14 starts]	Baseline: 62% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 71% [2013-14 starts]	Baseline: 62% [2009-10]] Benchmark: 71% [2015-16]	[R] Timeline changed to align with comparable SAI momentum point.
1.09 Percent of developmental English students passing ENG101 in their second year Baseline: 47% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 54% [2016 for 2013-14 starts]	Percent of developmental English students passing ENG101 ~~in their second year~~ within eight quarters Baseline: ~~47%~~ 49% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: ~~54%~~ 56% [2013-14 starts]	Percent of developmental English students passing ENG101 within eight quarters Baseline: 49% [2009-10] Benchmark: 56% [2015-16]	[C] Timeline for students to achieve the indicator was clarified. [R] "In their second year" was judged too vague. "Within eight quarters" is clearer and aligns with comparable SAI momentum point.
1.10 Percent of upper-level ESL students transitioning to college-level courses within three years Baseline: 20% [2008-09 starts] Benchmark: 25% [2016 for 2012-13 starts]	Percent of upper-level ESL students transitioning to college-level courses within ~~three years~~ twelve quarters Baseline: 20% [2008-09 starts] Benchmark: 25% [2012-13 starts]	Percent of upper-level ESL students transitioning to college-level courses within twelve quarters Baseline: 20% [2008-09] Benchmark: 25% [2015-16]	[C] Timeline for students to achieve the indicator was clarified. [R] "Within three years" was judged too vague. "Within twelve quarters" is clearer.
1.11 Percent of lower-level ESL students (Levels 1-3) transitioning to upper-level ESL coursework within three years Baseline: 18% [2008-09 starts] Benchmark: 23% [2016 for 2012-13 starts]	Percent of lower-level ESL students (Levels 1-3) transitioning to upper-level ESL coursework within ~~three years~~ twelve quarters Baseline: 18% [2008-09 starts] Benchmark: 23% [2012-13 starts]	Percent of lower-level ESL students (Levels 1-3) transitioning to upper-level ESL coursework within twelve quarters Baseline: 18% [2008-90] Benchmark: 23% [2015-16]	[C] Timeline for students to achieve the indicator was clarified. [R] "Within three years" was judged too vague. "Within twelve quarters" is clearer.
1.12 Percent of degree-seeking students earning degree/certification within three years Baseline: 22% [2016 for 2008-09 starts] Benchmark: 33% [2016 for 2012-13 starts]	Percent of degree-seeking students earning degree/certification within three years Baseline: 22% [2008-09 starts] Benchmark: 33% [2012-13 starts]	Percent of degree-seeking students earning degree/certification within three years Baseline: 22% [2009-10] Benchmark: 33% [2015-16]	[C] Corrected typographical error in original baseline year. Should have been 2009-10.

Year Three Report—March 2013	Progress Report--July 2014	Year Seven Report-- March 2016	Change [C] & Rationale [R]
1.13 Percent of students reporting that they are "definitely meeting" their educational goals at the college Baseline: 48.3% [CCSSE Supplemental #13, 2011][2] Benchmark: 53.0% [2016]	Percent of students reporting that they are "definitely meeting" their educational goals at the college Baseline: 48.3% [CCSSE Supplemental #13, 2011] Benchmark: 53.0%	Percent of students reporting that they are "definitely meeting" their educational goals at the college Baseline: 48% [2010-11] Benchmark: 53.0% [2015-16]	[C] No change
1.14 Percent of transfer students who achieve "transfer ready" status within three years of their first college-level course Baseline: 26% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 28% [2016 for 2013-14 starts]	Percent of ~~transfer~~ students who ~~achieve "transfer ready" status~~ earn 45 college-level credits within three years ~~of their first college-level course.~~ Baseline: ~~26%~~ 23% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: ~~28%~~ 25% [2013-14 starts]	Percent of degree-seeking students who earn 45 college-level credits within three years Baseline: 23% [2009-10] Benchmark: 25% [2015-16]	[C] Indicator changed from a focus on "transfer ready" for transfer-bound students to a focus on 45 college-level credits for all degree-seeking students. Timeline changed. [R] SBCTC ceased to provide data on "transfer ready" and instead emphasized the 45-credit milestone. College changed accordingly. Tracking from time of "first college-level course" proved impossible within existing data structures.
1.15 Percent of professional technical completers who are employed within one year of leaving NSCC Baseline: 73% [2007-10 overall] Benchmark: 76% [2016]	Percent of professional technical completers who are employed within one year of leaving NSCC Baseline: 73% [2007-10 overall] Benchmark: 76% [2013-14 completers]	Percent of professional technical completers who are employed within one year of leaving NSC Baseline: 73% [2007-10 average] Benchmark: 76% [2015-16]	[C] No change
1.16 For each of the above student success indicators, the percent difference in achievement levels of disaggregated student groups from the achievement of all students	For each of the above student success indicators, ~~the percent difference in~~ achievement levels ~~of~~ disaggregated ~~student groups from the achievement of all students~~ by racial/ethnic subgroups.	For each of the above student success indicators, achievement levels disaggregated by racial/ethnic subgroups.	[C] Benchmark wording was changed to clarify the college's intent to assess the achievement of each racial/ethnic subgroup. [R] Comparing subgroup performance to the mean for all

---

[2] To what extent are you achieving (have you achieved) your educational goals at the college?

Year Three Report—March 2013	Progress Report--July 2014	Year Seven Report-- March 2016	Change [C] & Rationale [R]
Baseline: Varies by group by student success measure [2009-10]. Benchmark: For disaggregated groups whose success is below the overall mean, an increase to within five percentage points of the mean [2016]	Baseline: Varies by group by student success measure [2009-10].Benchmark: ~~All groups within five percentage points of the mean~~ Same as set or all students.	Baseline: Varies [2009-10]. Benchmark: Same as set for all students [2015-16]	students, rather than to the benchmark, was found to provide misleading information and masked the true performance of the groups.

This page intentionally left blank.

Core Theme Two: *Excelling in Teaching and Learning*

Excelling in Teaching and Learning means that we
- engage in the work of teaching and learning with passion, vision, and creativity
- adapt to the needs of our rapidly changing world by changing ourselves, our curriculum, our services, and our practices
- ensure the effectiveness and quality of our work through ongoing assessment and professional development

Objective 2: To deepen a college-wide culture of inquiry in which evidence-based assessment leads to improved teaching, learning, student support, and student success.

	Year Three Report—March 2013	**Progress Report--July 2014**	**Year Seven Report-- March 2016**	**Change [C] & Rationale [R]**
2.01	Percent of FTF (full-time faculty) and PTF (part-time faculty) submitting Assessment Loop Forms annually Baseline: [2011-12] • FTF: 84% • PTF: 54% Benchmark: [2016] • FTF: 100% • PFT: 85%	Percent of FTF and PTF submitting Assessment Loop Forms annually Baseline: [2011-12] • FTF: 84% • PTF: 54% Benchmark: [2016] • FTF: 100% • PFT: 85%	Percent of full-time and priority-hire faculty submitting Teaching Improvement Practice (TIP) forms annually Full-Time Faculty Baseline: 84% [2011-12] Benchmark: 100% [2015-16] Priority Hire Faculty Baseline: 59% [2011-12] Benchmark: 85% [2015-16]	[C] "Target group" for the indicator was changed from all faculty to full-time and priority hire faculty (PHL)3 only. The Assessment Loop Form was renamed TIP. [R] Because FT and PHL faculty have a long term contractual connection to North that non-PHL faculty do not, they are in a better position to evaluate their teaching in a particular course over time and make improvements. Many non-PHL faculty also complete TIPs but because of their more contingent status it was concluded that it was unreasonable to expect it of them. The name of the form was changed to emphasize its value in improving teaching practice.
2.02	Percent of programs completing assigned portions of program review annually	Percent of programs completing assigned portions of program review annually	Percent of programs completing assigned portions of program review	[C] The word "annually" removed from the indicator.

---

3 Priority-hire are those faculty who have been employed at an average of 50 percent time or more for nine of the last twelve quarters, excluding summer quarter, and who have received satisfactory evaluations (Section 10.7, Faculty Agreement).

Year Three Report—March 2013	Progress Report--July 2014	Year Seven Report-- March 2016	Change [C] & Rationale [R]
Baseline: 34% [2011-12] Benchmark: 100% [2016]	Baseline: ~~34%~~ 90% [2011-12] Benchmark: 100%	Baseline: 90% [2011-12] Benchmark: 100% [2015-16]	[R] As originally written, the indicator implied that late submittals of program review sections would be disqualified. Submittal was judged more important than timing.
2.03 Percent of potential faculty[4] participating in assessment of identified Essential Learning Outcome each year Baseline: 19% [2011-12] Benchmark: 80% [2016]	Percent of potential faculty participating in assessment of identified Essential Learning Outcome each year Baseline: 19% [2011-12] Benchmark: 80%	Percent of potential faculty participating in assessment of identified Essential Learning Outcome each year Baseline: 19% [2011-12] Benchmark: 80%	[C] No change
2.04 Annual survey of graduates asking how much the college contributed to learning the skills listed in CCSSE Question #12a through #12o[5] Baseline: 2.49 [CCSSE 2011] Benchmark: 2.69 [2016]	Annual survey of graduates asking how much the college contributed to learning the skills listed in CCSSE Question #12a through #12o Baseline: 2.49 [CCSSE 2011] Benchmark: 2.69	Annual survey of graduates asking how much the college contributed to learning the skills listed in CCSSE Question #12a through #12o Baseline: 2.49 [CCSSE 2010-11] Benchmark: 2.69 [2015-16]	[No change]
2.05 Survey of students in courses selected for ELO assessment Baseline: Set baseline in 2012-13 Benchmark: 4% increase [2016]	Survey of students in courses selected for ELO assessment On 5-point scale, percent of ratings at 4 or 5 Baseline: ~~Set baseline in~~ 64% [2012-13] Benchmark: ~~4% increase~~ 70% [2016]	Survey of students in courses selected for ELO assessment On 5-point scale, percent of ratings at 4 or 5 Baseline: 64% [2012-13] Benchmark: 70% [2015-16]	[C] Benchmark was set after the March 2013 report had been submitted.

[4] "Potential faculty" refers to the subset of faculty (full- and part-time) who regularly teach a course that includes the targeted Essential Learning Outcome (e.g. all faculty teaching courses that include "Information Literacy" as an ELO).

[5] This CCSSE question lists 15 general education skills that were judged comparable enough to the college's Essential Learning Outcomes to serve as a surrogate measure of those outcomes. See discussion of Indicator 2.04 in Chapter Four for a side-by-side comparison of the two lists.

Year Three Report—March 2013	Progress Report--July 2014	Year Seven Report-- March 2016	Change [C] & Rationale [R]
2.06 Percent of administrative offices and support services completing an assessment project annually Baseline: Set baseline in 2012-13 Benchmark: 100% [2016]	Percent of administrative offices and support services completing an assessment project annually Baseline: ~~Set baseline in 2012-13~~ 26% [2012-13] Benchmark: 100% [2016]	Percent of administrative offices and support services completing an assessment project annually Baseline: 26% [2012-13] Benchmark: 100% [2015-16]	[C] Baseline added after March 2013 report was submitted.
2.07 Percent of employees participating in professional development activities annually Baseline: Set baseline in 2012-13 Benchmark: 5% increase [2016]	Percent of employees participating in professional development activities annually Baseline: ~~Set baseline in 2012-13~~ 85% [2012-13] Benchmark: 5% increase (89%)	Percent of employees participating in professional development activities annually Baseline: 85% [2012-13] Benchmark: 89% [2015-16]	[C] Baseline added after March 2013 report was submitted.
2.08 Employee ratings of professional development activities Baseline: Set baseline in 2012-13 Benchmark: 5% increase [2016]	Employee ratings of professional development activities Baseline: Mean rating: 4.04 [2012-13] Benchmark: ~~5% increase :~~ 4.24	Employee ratings of professional development activities On a five-point rating scale, a mean rating of Baseline: 4.04 [2012-13] Benchmark: 4.24 [2015-16]	[C] Value of the benchmark was recalculated. [R] An initial calculation error had been made. It was corrected.

This page intentionally left blank.

Core Theme Three: *Building Community*

Building Community means that we
- create a diverse, inclusive, and safe environment accessible to all;
- strengthen our college community through open communication, civility, accountability, and mutual respect;
- reach outside our institution to form local and global partnerships and pursue civic engagement;
- work in ways that are environmentally, socially and fiscally sustainable.

Objective 3: To sustain and enhance an inclusive environment in which diverse students, employees, and community partners engage with the college, experience a sense of belonging, and derive mutual benefit.

	Year Three Report—March 2013	Progress Report--July 2014	Year Seven Report-- March 2016	Change [C] & Rationale [R]
3.01	Number of search processes meeting each of these criteria: A. Position announcement includes the approved affirmative action statement B. Position requires skills to increase the success of underrepresented students C. Distribution to venues reaching non-traditional and underrepresented communities is documented D. Training is held for the search committee Baseline: 0% [0/28 2011-12] Benchmark: 100% [2016]	Number of search processes meeting each of these criteria: A. Position announcement includes the approved affirmative action statement B. Position requires skills to increase the success of underrepresented students C. Distribution to venues reaching targeted non-traditional and underrepresented communities is documented D. Training is held for the search committee Baseline: 0% [0/28 2011-12] Retain baseline for D and calculate baseline for C Benchmark: 100% on each measure Targeted Distribution Baseline: 50% [2011-12] Benchmark: 100% [2015-16] Committee Training Baseline: 0% [2011-12] Benchmark: 100% [2015-16]	Number of search processes meeting each of these criteria: C. Distribution to venues reaching targeted non-traditional and underrepresented communities is documented D. Training is held for the search committee Targeted Distribution Baseline: 50% [2011-12] Benchmark: 100% [2015-16] Committee Training Baseline: 0% [2011-12] Benchmark: 100% [2015-16]	[C] Measures A, and B were eliminated. The original baseline identified in the 2013 report was relevant only for Measure D. Baseline was calculated for Measure C based on estimates from the human resources director. [R] The eliminated measures have been standard operating procedure and in place for several years. As such, they did not represent a growth area for the college. Measure C was retained because there was a need to make the practice more effective. Measure D, on the other hand, is a new practice and represents an area wherein the college is challenging itself to improve.

Year Three Report—March 2013	Progress Report--July 2014	Year Seven Report-- March 2016	Change [C] & Rationale [R]
3.02 Percent of employees participating in specified activities to build community and develop understanding, respect and appreciation for diversity Baseline: Set baseline in 2012-13 Benchmark: 15% increase [2016]	Percent of employees participating in specified activities to build community and develop understanding, respect and appreciation for diversity Community-Building Baseline: 80% [2012-13] Benchmark: 92% [2015-16] Diversity Baseline: 68% [2012-13] Benchmark: 78% [2015-16]	Percent of employees participating in specified activities to build community and develop understanding, respect and appreciation for diversity Community-Building Baseline: 80% [2012-13] Benchmark: 92% [2015-16] Diversity Baseline: 68% [2012-13] Benchmark: 78% [2015-16]	[C] No change
3.03 Percent of students participating in activities to build community and develop understanding, respect, and appreciation for diversity. Include CCSSE items 4s, 4t, and 9c[6] Baseline: Set baseline in 2012-13 Benchmark: 5% increase [2016]	Percent of students participating in activities to build community and develop understanding, respect, and appreciation for diversity. Include CCSSE items 4s, 4t, and 9c Community-Building Baseline: 40% [2012-13] Benchmark: 42% [2015-16] Diversity Baseline: 29% [2012-13] Benchmark: 30% [2015-16] CCSSE items Baseline: 82% [2012-13] Benchmark: 86 [2015-16]	Percent of students participating in activities to build community and develop understanding, respect, and appreciation for diversity. Include CCSSE items 4s and 4t. Community-Building Baseline: 40% [2012-13] Benchmark: 42% [2015-16] Diversity Baseline: 29% [2012-13] Benchmark: 30% [2015-16] CCSSE items Baseline: 82% [2012-13] Benchmark: 86 [2015-16]	[C] CCSSE question 9c was eliminated from the indicator. [R] This indicator is measured by an annual student survey. Largely developed by the college, the survey also includes selected items from the CCSSE survey. Question 9c was eliminated because it concerns college practices rather than student behavior.

[6] 4s: Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity other than your own. 4t: Had serious conversations with students who differ from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values. 9c: The college encourages contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds.

Year Three Report—March 2013		Progress Report--July 2014	Year Seven Report-- March 2016	Change [C] & Rationale [R]
3.04	Employee and student ratings of the activities Baseline: Set baseline in 2012-13 Benchmark: 5% increase [2016]	Employee and student ratings of the activities On a five-point scale, a mean rating of: Employees Community-Building Baseline: 3.89 [2012-13] Benchmark: 4.08 [2015-16] Diversity Baseline: 3.93 [2012-13] Benchmark: 4.13 [2015-16] Students Community-Building Baseline: 3.39 [2012-13] Benchmark: 3.56 [2015-16] Diversity Baseline: 3.16 [2012-13] Benchmark: 3.32 [2015-16]	Employee and student ratings of the activities On a five-point scale, a mean rating of: Employees Community-Building Baseline: 3.89 [2012-13] Benchmark: 4.08 [2015-16] Diversity Baseline: 3.93 [2012-13] Benchmark: 4.13 [2015-16] Students Community-Building Baseline: 3.39 [2012-13] Benchmark: 3.56 [2015-16] Diversity Baseline: 3.16 [2012-13] Benchmark: 3.32 [2015-16]	[C] No change
3.05	Employee ratings on annual climate survey, disaggregated by employee type, gender and ethnicity Baseline: From Spring 2012 survey Benchmark: A 5% increase in overall satisfaction. For disaggregated groups whose satisfaction is below the overall mean, an increase to within five percentage points of the mean [2016]	Employee ratings on annual climate survey, disaggregated by employee type, gender and ethnicity Baseline: ~~From Spring 2012 survey~~ Benchmark: ~~A 5% increase in overall satisfaction. For disaggregated groups whose satisfaction is below the overall mean, an increase to within five percentage points of the mean [2016]~~ On a five-point scale, a mean rating of	Employee ratings on annual climate survey, disaggregated by employee type, gender and ethnicity On a five-point scale, a mean rating of Baseline: 3.44 [2011-12] Benchmark: 3.61 [2015-16]	[C] Benchmark wording was changed to clarify the college's intent to assess the ratings of each disaggregated group. [R] Comparing subgroup performance to the mean for all respondents, rather than to the benchmark, was found to provide misleading information and masked the true ratings of each separate subgroup.

Year Three Report—March 2013	Progress Report--July 2014	Year Seven Report-- March 2016	Change [C] & Rationale [R]
	Baseline: 3.44 [2011-12] Benchmark: 3.61 [2015-16]		
3.06 Student ratings on annual climate survey, disaggregated by gender and ethnicity Baseline: Set baseline in 2012-13. Benchmark: A 5% increase in overall satisfaction. For disaggregated groups whose satisfaction is below the overall mean, an increase to within five percentage points of the mean [2016]	Student ratings on annual climate survey, disaggregated by gender and ethnicity Baseline: Set baseline in 2012-13. 4.00 [2012-13 Benchmark: A 5% increase in overall satisfaction. For disaggregated groups whose satisfaction is below the overall mean, an increase to within five percentage points of the mean [2016] 4.20 [2015-16]	Student ratings on annual climate survey, disaggregated by gender and ethnicity On a five-point scale, a mean rating of Baseline: 4.00 [2012-13] Benchmark: 4.20 [2015-16]	[C] Benchmark wording was changed to clarify the college's intent to assess the ratings of each disaggregated group. [R] Comparing subgroup performance to the mean for all respondents rather than to the benchmark was found to provide misleading information and masked the true ratings of each separate subgroup.
3.07 Annual survey of employees to measure number, type, scope and benefits of partnerships Baseline: Set baseline in 2012-13 Benchmark: 5% increase [2016]	Annual survey of employees to measure number, type, scope and benefits of partnerships Baseline: Set baseline in 2012-13 Did not conduct survey Benchmark: 5% increase [2016] Indicator eliminated	Annual survey of employees to measure number, type, scope and benefits of partnerships Baseline: Did not conduct survey Benchmark: Indicator eliminated.	[C] This indicator was eliminated. [R] It was judged to be an ineffective measure of partnerships. See further discussion below and in Standard Four.
3.08 Annual survey of employees to identify outreach activities to diverse communities Baseline: Set baseline in 2012-13 Benchmark: 5% increase [2016]	Annual survey of employees to identify outreach activities to diverse communities Baseline: Set baseline in 2012-13 Did not conduct survey Benchmark: 5% increase [2016] Indicator eliminated	Annual survey of employees to identify outreach activities to diverse communities Baseline: Did not conduct survey Benchmark: Indicator eliminated	[C] This indicator was eliminated. [R] It was judged to be an ineffective measure of partnerships. See further discussion below and in Standard Four.

Year Three Report—March 2013	Progress Report--July 2014	Year Seven Report-- March 2016	Change [C] & Rationale [R]
3.09 Annual survey of partners from Technical Advisory Committees, OCE&E[7], and Opportunity Council to identify value of and enhancements to partnerships Baseline: Set baseline in 2012-13 Benchmark: 5% increase [2016]	Annual survey of partners from Technical Advisory Committees, OCE&E, and Opportunity Council to identify value of and enhancements to partnerships Baseline: No useful data collected for baseline Benchmark: ~~5% increase~~ Indicator eliminated	Annual survey of partners from Technical Advisory Committees, OCE&E, and Opportunity Council to identify value of and enhancements to partnerships Baseline: No useful data collected for baseline Benchmark: ~~5% increase~~ Indicator eliminated	[C] This indicator was eliminated. [R] It was judged to be an ineffective measure of partnerships. See further discussion below and in Standard Four.
3.10 State-funded, contract-funded, and continuing education enrollments State-funded FTES as percent of annual allocation Baseline: 99% [2002-12 average] Benchmark: 100% yearly [2013-16] Running Start Annualized FTEs Baseline: 156 [2009-12 average] Benchmark: 200 [2016] International Student Spring Headcount Baseline: 695 [2009-12 average] Benchmark: 1000 [2016] Continuing Education Annual Registrations Baseline: 5,524 [2009-12 average] Benchmark: 6,500 [2016]	State-funded, contract-funded, and continuing education enrollments State-funded FTES as percent of annual allocation Baseline: 99% [2002-12 average] Benchmark: 100% yearly [2013-16] Running Start Annualized FTEs Baseline: 156 [2009-12 average] Benchmark: 200 [2015-16] International Student Spring Headcount Baseline: 695 [2009-12 average] Benchmark: 1000 [2015-16] Continuing Education Annual Registrations Baseline: ~~5524~~ 4833 [2009-12 average] Benchmark: ~~6500~~ 5687 [2015-16]	State-funded, contract-funded, and continuing education enrollments State-funded FTES as percent of annual allocation Baseline: 99% [2002-12 average] Benchmark: 100% yearly [2013-16] Running Start Annualized FTEs Baseline: 156 [2009-12 average] Benchmark: 200 [2015-16] International Student Spring Headcount Baseline: 695 [2009-12 average] Benchmark: 1000 [2015-16] Continuing Education Annual Registrations Baseline: 4833 [2009-12 average] Benchmark: 5687 [2015-16]	[C] Baseline and benchmark data for Continuing Education annual registrations were changed. [R] The initial figures for both baseline and benchmark had been developed in 2013 by the continuing education director using her own methodology. She left soon after to take a new position, and when the new director began, she was unable to replicate the previous director's figures. New baseline figures were calculated using a methodology agreed-upon by the director and the research office. The benchmark was changed to reflect the same growth percentage as the previous set of figures.
3.11 Formal reserve account balance as percent of operating budget	Formal reserve account balance as percent of operating budget	Formal reserve account balance as percent of operating budget	[C] The baseline was adjusted when a clerical error was discovered.

---

[7] The Opportunity Center for Employment and Education is a multi-service center co-located on the North Seattle College campus.

Year Three Report—March 2013	Progress Report--July 2014	Year Seven Report-- March 2016	Change [C] & Rationale [R]
Baseline: 5.2% [June 30, 2012] Benchmark: 5% minimum [2013-16]	Baseline: ~~5.2%~~ 5.0% [06/30/12] Benchmark: ≥ 5% [June 30, 2012]	Baseline: 5.0% [June 30, 2012] Benchmark: ≥ 5% [June 30, 2012]	
3.12 STARS© (Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System) rating Baseline: Bronze Rating Benchmark: Maintain Bronze Rating	STARS© (Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System) rating Baseline: Bronze Rating Benchmark: Maintain Bronze Rating	STARS© (Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System) rating Baseline: Bronze Rating Benchmark: Maintain Bronze Rating	No change
3.13 Annual non-state revenue from selected operations A. Grants, contracts, customized training Baseline: 25% over costs [2009-12] Benchmark: 50% over costs [2016] B. Rentals Baseline: $76,990 [2009-12] Benchmark: $84,690 [2016] C. Food Services Baseline: ($100,200) [2008-12] Benchmark: Cover costs [2016]	Annual non-state revenue from selected operations A. Grants, contracts, customized training Baseline: 25% over costs [2009-12] Benchmark: 50% over costs B. Rentals Baseline: $76,990 [2009-12] Benchmark: $84,690 C. Food Services Baseline: ($100,200) [2008-12] Benchmark: Cover costs	Annual non-state revenue from selected operations A. Grants, contracts, customized training Baseline: Indicator eliminated Benchmark: Indicator eliminated B. Rentals Baseline: $76,990 [2009-12] Benchmark: $84,690 C. Food Services Baseline: ($100,200) [2008-12] Benchmark: Cover costs	[C] Measure A. eliminated. [R] Several personnel and organizational changes impacted this measure. The president who established the office left for another position. With his departure, the office was reorganized with grants and contracts moving into the Office of Advancement. The administrator responsible for customized training was transferred to the district office and given district-wide responsibilities for such training. The focus of contracts was shifted from revenue generation to FTE generation when enrollments softened.

Rationale for Indicators

Core Theme One: Advancing Student Success
Indicator 1.01: This Student Achievement Initiative indicator provides a "big picture" view of whether students are achieving their educational goals by monitoring the average momentum points per student.

Indicators 1.02 and 1.03: These indicators focus on student retention from first to second quarters and are based on research that early "student engagement" is critical to their perseverance. Students who are unclear about their goals were judged particularly vulnerable, and an indicator targets them specifically.

Indicators 1.04 through 1.12: These indicators track student progression through developmental math and English, and ESL into college-level work and degree completion. These areas have historically proven challenging for students. Math education and degree completion are state and national priorities.

Indicator 1.13: Students enroll for a wide range of reasons, many of which are not captured in institutional data systems. Asking them directly is another important measure student goal achievement.

Indicator 1.14: Originally this indicator focused on "transfer readiness" because it measured the college's effectiveness at preparing students to transfer and was not dependent on four-year institutions' fluctuating admissions policies. However, when SBCTC switched from tracking "transfer ready" for transfer-bound students, to tracking degree-seeking students' completion of 45 credits, the college followed suit.

Indicator 1.15: Job placement is a key measure of how well the college's professional technical programs are preparing students for the workplace. It is an imperfect measure because (1) in difficult economic times jobs are scarce even for well-prepared graduates, (2) the state-level process for collecting the data does not include self-employed graduates, and (3) data are not available until 12-24 months after a student exits the program. Even with these limitations, this indicator has been retained because it leads to productive conversations with faculty about the data and how to supplement them.

Indicator 1.16: Local and national data show that some groups of students—African American, Hispanic, Native American, and some communities of Asian/Pacific Islander students—do not experience the same level of success as students in general. This indicator focuses attention on reducing achievement gaps.

Core Theme Two: Excelling in Teaching and Learning
Indicators 2.01-2.03: Building a culture of evidence-based inquiry is the objective of this core theme. These three indicators track faculty assessment of learning outcomes at three levels: (1) at the classroom level through the annual Assessment Loop Form (ALF, renamed in 2014 to Teaching Improvement Practice or TIP form), (2) at the program level through the program review process, and (3) at the institutional level through annual assessment of a selected Essential Learning Outcome. As will be discussed in Standard Four, none of these processes has been completely successful. During the current 2015-16 academic year two committees—Assessment and Program Review—are incorporating what the college has learned into revised assessment processes for implementation beginning in 2016-17.

Indicators 2.04-2.05: These two indicators were chosen to provide the college with direct student feedback about how much the college has contributed to their learning the outcomes the college has identified as important. CCSSE items 12a through 12o were chosen for Indicator 2.04 because they correspond well to the college's Essential Learning Outcomes and allow the college to compare its student ratings with those of students at peer institutions. Indicator 2.05 was designed to complement Indicator 2.03 by providing a student perspective on the Essential Learning Outcome that faculty were assessing in a given year. As the annual assessment of ELOs faltered (see discussion in Standard Four), this indicator was not implemented beyond the baseline year.

Indicator 2.06: The rationale for this indicator is to extend the practice of "evidence-based assessment" into all areas of the college. As will be discussed in Standard Four, success to date has been marginal. Still, the college values the indicator and in 2015-16 is renewing efforts to improve its implementation.

Indicators 2.07-2.08: Core Theme Two, *Excelling in Teaching and Learning*, includes learning on the part of college employees. These two indicators track whether employees are availing themselves of professional development experiences as well as the value they find in them.

Core Theme Three: Building Community
Indicator 3.01: This indicator includes four measures of the college's efforts to attract and hire employees with the skills and commitment to work effectively in a diverse environment and to support the success of a diverse student body. After one year's implementation, it was decided that the fourth measure—training for search committees in conducting bias-free inclusionary searches—was the most important measure to track. The other measures were long-standing practices and did not represent the same challenge and opportunity to advance the college's commitment to diversity as did the training measure.

Indicators 3.02-3.04: At the heart of Core Theme Three is building a community that supports one another in the work of *Changing Lives through Education.* Each year, the college provides some forty campus-based activities with the explicit intention of "building community." These three indicators enable the college to assess participation in and value found in the activities for creating the inclusive, safe, respectful and supportive community they are meant to foster.

Indicators 3.05-3.06: Employee climate surveys have been a regular part of the college's institutional assessment efforts for several years. Parallel surveys of students had not been as frequent, but under this indicator have become so. Data for both employees and students are disaggregated by identified subgroupings because in previous surveys such data revealed areas of concern among some subgroups.

Indicators 3.07-3.08: Partnerships with diverse community-based groups are an important indicator of the college's involvement with and responsiveness to its communities. Many areas of the college are involved in partnerships—big/small, formal/informal, and ongoing/ad-hoc. This indicator was chosen because tracking such partnerships is important for assessing and encouraging strong, mutually beneficial partnerships. Important as the concept was and is, however, these indicators were abandoned because the college was unable to develop a clear operational definition of "community partnerships" to use in surveying employees. This issue is being revisited for the 2016-23 strategic plan.

Indicator 3.09: Feedback from active partners is an important indicator, and three partnerships were chosen for an annual survey because they represent the broad range of partnerships across businesses, labor, state agencies, community-based organizations, and grass-roots community groups. Initial surveys in 2012-13 yielded low return rates and unusable data. In light of that and changes in key leadership positions—the college president, the executive dean for career and workforce education, and the OCE&E integration manager—the college put this indicator "on hold," to be revisited in the new Strategic Plan.

Indicators 3.10-3.13: A crucial aspect of Core Theme Three is to "work in ways that are environmentally, socially and fiscally sustainable." These four indicators provide important measures of sustainability. Indicators 3.10, 3.11, and 3.13 pertain to maintaining financial stability and sustainability through strong enrollments, fiscal reserves, and revenue centers (which are becoming increasingly important as state resources for higher education continue to decline). Indicator 3.12 is a broader measure of sustainability based on the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education's STARS© rating system that measures sustainability in four areas: academics, engagement, operations, and planning and administration.