

Mission Fulfillment: Minimal: 70% performance within/across core themes. Target: 90% performance within/across core themes			
Needs discussion	90-100% of Benchmark	70-89 Percent of Benchmark	Less than 70% of Benchmark

North Seattle College Strategic Plan: Roadmap to 2016 Progress Report on Strategic Plan Indicators July 2014

Background on the Strategic Plan

Through a campus-wide participatory process throughout the 2009-10 academic year, North Seattle College (until Spring 2014 North Seattle Community College) identified the three core themes—*Advancing Student Success*, *Excelling in Teaching and Learning*, and *Building Community*—that form the basis of its 2011-2016 strategic plan. The themes were adopted in March 2011, and an initial set of objectives and “indicators of achievement” were developed for each theme. Three “Strategic Initiative Teams” were formed, and for the next two years (June 2011 through June 2013) each team focused on developing and implementing strategies to impact one of the core themes.

The Strategic Initiative Teams contributed in important ways to achieving the core theme objectives, yet even early on it was obvious that their work by itself could not address all of the objectives and impact all of the indicators in the original version of the strategic plan. This realization led to the decision to revisit the plan, not to alter the core themes, but to streamline the objectives and indicators, to develop baselines and specific targets (i.e., “benchmarks”) for each indicator, and to engage more segments of the campus community in the work of achieving the benchmarks set for each indicator. Thus, even as the Strategic Initiative Teams continued their work during 2011-2013, the Executive Team developed revised objectives, indicators and benchmarks and circulated them to the campus community for input and revision. By February 2013 a revised version of the strategic plan—titled the *Roadmap to 2016*—was adopted and widely disseminated. In order to involve a greater share of the campus community in working directly to achieve the benchmarks, as part of the 2013-14 budget process, units were asked to tie their budget requests to benchmarks within the strategic plan. The college continues to look for ways to focus existing work and/or develop specific sustainable initiatives that effectively impact the strategic plan benchmarks.

Notes on This Progress Report

As the plan was being revised (October 2011 through December 2012), benchmarks were set and baselines were established. In cases where no baseline data were available, a timeframe was identified for collecting them. This current report provides progress on the benchmarks using data available as of summer 2014. Similar annual reports will be produced in summers 2015 and 2016. Depending on need and data availability, mid-year reports may also be produced for selected benchmarks. When the Year Seven Accreditation Self-Study report is submitted in March 2016, the last full academic year of data available for that report will be 2014-15. Nonetheless, the work of achieving the benchmarks and monitoring progress on that achievement will continue until the end of 2015-16 academic year, which is the final year of the current strategic plan. A new strategic plan will be developed for the 2016-2021 time period.

Note that strikethroughs shown in this report reflect changes made in summer 2014. This reflects the living nature of the plan and/or changes in the data or the college environment.

Mission Fulfillment: Minimal: 70% performance within/across core themes. Target: 90% performance within/across core themes

Needs discussion	90-100% of Benchmark	70-89 Percent of Benchmark	Less than 70% of Benchmark
------------------	----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

Core Theme One: Advancing Student Success

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.

Strategic Plan Indicator		Performance Data	Variation from Benchmark	Percent of Benchmark
1.01	Annual Student Achievement points per student Baseline: 0.84 1.06 [2009-10] Benchmark 0.84 1.10 [2016]	2010-11: 1.13 2011-12: 1.15 2012-13: 1.09	2010-11: +.03 2011-12: +.05 2012-13: -.01	2010-11: 103% 2011-12: 105% 2012-13: 99%
1.02	Q1 to Q2 for students intending to stay at least two quarters Baseline: 63% 64% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 70% [2016 for 2013-14 starts]	2010-11 starts: 62% 2011-12 starts: 63%	2010-11: -8 percentage points 2011-12: -7 percentage points	2010-11: 89% 2011-12: 90%
1.03	Q1 to Q2 for students whose planned length of stay is “don’t know” or “blank” Baseline: 50% 49% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 59% [2016 for 2013-14 starts]	2010-11 starts: 49% 2011-12 starts: 54%	2010-11: -10 percentage points 2011-12: -5 percentage points	2010-11: 83% 2011-12: 92%
1.04	Percent of students completing developmental math sequence within six four quarters Baseline: 31% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 43% [2016 for 2013-14 starts]	2010-11 starts: 33% 2011-12 starts: 32%	2010-11: -10 percentage points 2011-12: -11 percentage point	2010-11: 77% 2011-12: 74%
1.05	Percent of students who start three levels below college-level and complete developmental math sequences within six four quarters Baseline: 6% 5% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 20% [2016 for 2013-14 starts]	2010-11 starts: 8% 2011-12 starts: 7%	2010-11: -12 percentage points 2011-12: -13 percentage points	2010-11: 40% 2011-12: 35%

Mission Fulfillment: Minimal: 70% performance within/across core themes. Target: 90% performance within/across core themes

Needs discussion	90-100% of Benchmark	70-89 Percent of Benchmark	Less than 70% of Benchmark
------------------	----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

Strategic Plan Indicator		Performance Data	Variation from Benchmark	Percent of Benchmark
1.06	Percent of students who start two levels below college-level and complete developmental math sequences within six four quarters Baseline: 36% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 50% [2016 for 2013-14 starts]	2010-11 starts: 42% 2011-12 starts: 37%	2010-11: -8 percentage points 2011-12: -13 percentage points	2010-11: 84% 2011-12: 74%
1.07	Percent of students who earn QSR within eight quarters Baseline: 45% 26% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 24% 36% [2016 for 2012-13 starts]	2010-11 starts: 27% 2011-12 starts: 27%	2010-11: -9 percentage points 2011-12: -9 percentage points	2010-11: 75% 2011-12: 75%
1.08	Percent of students completing developmental English sequence within six four quarters Baseline: 62% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 71% [2016 for 2013-14 starts]	2010-11 starts: 72% 2011-12 starts: 71%	2010-11: +1 percentage point 2011-12: 0 percentage points	2010-11: 101% 2011-12: 100%
1.09	Percent of developmental English students passing ENG101 in their second year within eight quarters Baseline: 47% 49% [2009-10 starts] Benchmark: 54% 56% [2016 for 2013-14 starts]	2010-11 starts: 52% 2011-12 starts: 50%	2010-11: -4 percentage points 2011-12: -6 percentage points	2010-11: 93% 2011-12: 89%
1.10	Percent of upper-level ESL students transitioning to college level courses within three years twelve quarters Baseline: 20% [2008-09 starts] Benchmark: 25% [2016 for 2012-13 starts]	2009-10 starts: 23% 2009-10 starts: 23%	2009-10: -2 percentage points 2010-11: -2 percentage points	2009-10: 92% 2010-11: 92%
1.11	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% [2016 for 2012-13 starts]	2009-10 starts: 19% 2010-11 starts: 22%	2009-10: -4 percentage points 2010-11: -1 percentage points	2009-10: 83% 2010-11: 96%
1.12	Percent of degree-seeking students earning degree/certification within three years	2009-10 starts: 22% 2010-11 starts: 23%	2009-10: -11 percentage points 2010-11: -10 percentage points	2009-10: 67% 2010-11: 70%

Mission Fulfillment: Minimal: 70% performance within/across core themes. Target: 90% performance within/across core themes

Needs discussion	90-100% of Benchmark	70-89 Percent of Benchmark	Less than 70% of Benchmark
------------------	----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

Strategic Plan Indicator		Performance Data	Variation from Benchmark	Percent of Benchmark
	Baseline: 22% [2008-09 starts] Benchmark: 33% [2016 for 2012-13 starts]			
1.13	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% [2016]	2012-13: • NSC surveys:73% 2013-14 • CCSSE: 54% • NSC surveys: 74%	2012-13: • NSC surveys:+20 percentage pts 2013-14 • CCSSE: +1 percentage point • NSC surveys: +21 percentage pts	2012-13: • NSC surveys:137% 2013-14: • CCSSE: 102% • NSC surveys: 140%
1.14	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% [2016 for 2013-14 starts]	2010-11 starts: 20% 2011-12 starts: 20%	2010-11: -5 percentage points 2011-12: -5percentage points	2010-11: 80% 2011-12: 80%
1.15	Percent of professional-technical completers who are employed within one year of leaving NSCC. Baseline: 73% [2007-10 overall] Benchmark: 76% [2016 for '13-14 completers]	2009-10 leavers: 74% 2010-11 leavers: 70%	2009-10: -2 percentage points 2010-11: -6 percentage points	2009-10: 97% 2010-11: 92%
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. Baseline: Varies by group by student success measure [2009-10]. Benchmark: All groups within five percentage points of the mean [2016]			See following page.

Mission Fulfillment: Minimal: 70% performance within/across core themes. Target: 90% performance within/across core themes

Needs discussion	90-100% of Benchmark	70-89 Percent of Benchmark	Less than 70% of Benchmark
------------------	----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

1.16: For each student success indicator, achievement for disaggregated groups will be within five percentage points of the mean for all students.

Cohort year: 2010-11		SAI	Retention			Progression							Completion			
		1.01	1.02	1.03	1.04	1.05	1.06	1.07	1.08	1.09	1.10	1.11	1.12	1.13	1.14	1.15
	All students	1.13	62%	49%	33%	8%	42%	27%	72%	52%	23%	22%	23%		20%	70%
Credit Load	Full-time													In process		
	Part-time		53%	41%						44%	14%		12%			
Intent	Transfer												15%			
	Vocational															
	Basic Skills															
Placement	Dev Math															
	CL Math															
	Dev English												15%			
	CL English															
Dev Math	3 levels below CL				8%	8%	42%	10%								
	2 levels below CL															
	1 level below CS															
Dev English	3 levels below CL															
	2 levels below CL									46%						
	1 level below CL															
Basic Skills	3 levels below CL										14%	4%				
	2 levels below CL															
	1 level below CL															
Ethnicity	API							17%	66%							
	African American		55%		15%			17%	66%				16%			
	Native American			43%	15%			15%		25%		0%	11%			
	Hispanic				27%				60%			11%				
	Other/Mix/Blank				19%				62%	43%	13%		16%			
	SOC															
	White								63%							
	International															

Mission Fulfillment: Minimal: 70% performance within/across core themes. Target: 90% performance within/across core themes

Needs discussion	90-100% of Benchmark	70-89 Percent of Benchmark	Less than 70% of Benchmark
------------------	----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

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.

Strategic Plan Indicator		Performance Data	Variation from Benchmark	Percent of Benchmark
2.01	Percent of FTF and PTF submitting Assessment Loop Forms annually Baseline: FTF: 84%, PTF: 54% [2011-12] Benchmark: FTF: 100%; PTF: 85% [2016]	2012-13: FTF 32%, PTF: 15% 2013-14: FTF 63%; PTF: 21%	2012-13: FTF -68 PP, PTF: -70 PP 2013-14: FTF -37%; PTF: -64 PP	2012-13: FTF 32%, PTF: 18% 2013-14: FTF 63%; PTF: 25%
2.02	Percent of programs completing assigned portions of Program Review annually Baseline: 34% [2011-12] Benchmark: 100% [2016]	2012-13: ??? 2013-14: ???	2012-13: ??? 2013-14: ???	2012-13: ??? 2013-14: ???
2.03	Percent of potential faculty ¹ participating in assessment of identified Essential Learning Outcome each year. Baseline: 19% [2011-12] Benchmark: 80% [2016]	2012-13: 49% (Ethical Awareness) 2013-14: 61% (Intercultural Comp)	2012-13: -31 percentage points 2013-14: -19 percentage points	2012-13: 61% 2013-14: 76%

¹ “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).

Mission Fulfillment: Minimal: 70% performance within/across core themes. Target: 90% performance within/across core themes

Needs discussion	90-100% of Benchmark	70-89 Percent of Benchmark	Less than 70% of Benchmark
------------------	----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

Strategic Plan Indicator	Performance Data	Variation from Benchmark	Percent of Benchmark
2.04 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 [2016]	2012-13 • NSC surveys: 2.72 (weighted) 2013-14 • CCSSE: 2.55 • NSC surveys: 2.88 (weighted)	2012-13 • NSC surveys: +.03 2013-14 • CCSSE: -.14 • NSC surveys: +.19	2012-13 • NSC surveys: 101% 2013-14 • CCSSE: 95% • NSC surveys: 107%
2.05 Survey of students in courses selected for ELO assessment Baseline: On 5-point scale, 64% of ratings were 5 or 4 [2012-13]. 190/1139 students responding; MoE +/- 6.4 pct pts Benchmark: 70% of ratings 5 or 4; MoE 3-4 PP [2016]	2013-14: No survey conducted		
2.06 Percent of administrative offices and support services completing an assessment project annually. Baseline: 9/40=23% [2012-13] • President 2/8 = 25% • VPI: 2/12 = 17% • VPSDS: 6/13 = 46% • VPAS: 0/7 = 0% Benchmark: 100% [2016]	2013-14: 18/40 = 45% • President 1/8 = 13% • VPI: 4/12 = 33% • VPSDS: 10/13 = 77% • VPAS: 0/7 = 0%	2013-14: -55% • President -87% • VPI: -67% • VPSDS: -77% • VPAS: -100%	2013-14: 45% • President: 13% • VPI: 33% • VPSDS: 77% • VPAS: 0%
2.07 Percent of employees participating in professional development activities annually. Baseline: 85% [2012-13] Benchmark: 5% increase (89%) [2016]	2013-14: 79%	2013-14: -10 percentage points	2013-14: 89%
2.08 Employee ratings of professional development activities. Baseline: Mean rating of 4.04 [2012-13] Benchmark: + 5% increase [2016]: 4.20	2013-14: 4.18	2013-14: -.02	2013-14: 99%

Mission Fulfillment: Minimal: 70% performance within/across core themes. Target: 90% performance within/across core themes

Needs discussion	90-100% of Benchmark	70-89 Percent of Benchmark	Less than 70% of Benchmark
------------------	----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

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.

Strategic Plan Indicator		Performance Data	Variation from Benchmark	Percent of Benchmark
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% on each measure [2016]	2012-13: 2013-14:		
3.02	Percent of employees participating in specified activities to build community and develop understanding, respect and appreciation for diversity. Baseline: [2012-13] • Community Building: 80% • Diversity: 68% Benchmark: +15% • Community Building: 92% • Diversity: 78%	2013-14 • Community Building 74% • Diversity: 86%	2013-14 • Community Building -18 PP • Diversity: +8 percentage points	2013-14 • Community Building 80% • Diversity: 110%
3.03	Percent of students participating in activities to build community and develop understanding, respect, and	2013-14 • Community Building 65%	2013-14 • Community Building +23 PP	2013-14 • Community Building 155%

Mission Fulfillment: Minimal: 70% performance within/across core themes. Target: 90% performance within/across core themes

Needs discussion	90-100% of Benchmark	70-89 Percent of Benchmark	Less than 70% of Benchmark
------------------	----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

Strategic Plan Indicator	Performance Data	Variation from Benchmark	Percent of Benchmark
<p>appreciation for diversity. Include CCSSE items 4s, 4t, and 9e²</p> <p>Baseline: [2012-13]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Building 40% Diversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Participation in activities: 29% b. Never had serious discussions: 18% <p>Benchmark: +5% [2016]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Building: + 5% [2016]:42% Diversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Participation: +5% [2016]: 30% b. No serious discussion: -5% [2016]: 17% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Participation: 49% b. No discussion: 21% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. +19 percentage points b. + 4 percentage points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 163% b. 80%
<p>3.04 Employee and student ratings of the activities</p> <p>Employees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Building <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Baseline [2012-13] 3.89 mean rating b. Benchmark 5% increase [2016]: 4.08 Diversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Baseline [2012-13] 3.16 mean rating b. Benchmark 5% increase [2016]: 3.32 <p>Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Building <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Baseline [2012-13] 3.39 mean rating b. Benchmark 5% increase [2016]: 3.56 Diversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Baseline [2012-13]: 3.16 mean rating b. Benchmark 5% increase [2016]: 3.32 	<p>2013-14 Employees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Building 3.82 Diversity 3.89 <p>2013-14 Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Building 3.50 Diversity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Participation: 3.74 	<p>2013-14 Employees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Building -.26 Diversity: +.67 <p>2013-14 Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Building -.06 Diversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Participation: +.42 	<p>2013-14 Employees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Building 94% Diversity: 117% <p>2013-14 Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Building 98% Diversity: 113%
<p>3.05 Employee ratings on annual climate survey, disaggregated by employee type, gender and ethnicity.</p>	<p>2012-13</p> <p>All: 3.68</p> <p>Women:3.69</p>	<p>2012-13</p> <p>All: +.07</p> <p>Women:+.08</p>	<p>2012-13</p> <p>All: 102%</p> <p>Women:102%</p>

² 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.

Mission Fulfillment: Minimal: 70% performance within/across core themes. Target: 90% performance within/across core themes

Needs discussion	90-100% of Benchmark	70-89 Percent of Benchmark	Less than 70% of Benchmark
------------------	----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

Strategic Plan Indicator	Performance Data	Variation from Benchmark	Percent of Benchmark
<p>Baseline:[2011-12] Mean satisfaction index rating</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All: 3.44 <p>Benchmark: [2016] 5% overall increase; all subgroups within five percentage points five one-hundredths of mean.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All: 3.61 Subgroups: GE 3.56 	<p>Persons of Color:3.53 FTF:3.57 PTF:3.77 CL:3.73 EX:3.89 H,WS,V:4.13</p> <p>2013-14 All: 3.79 Women:3.75 Persons of Color:3.66 FTF:3.68 PTF:3.80 CL:3.90 EX:3.92 H,WS,V:3.81</p>	<p>Persons of Color:-.08 FTF:-.04 PTF:+.16 CL:+.12 EX:+.28 H,WS,V:+.52</p> <p>2013-14 All: +.18 Women: +.14 Persons of Color: +.05 FTF: +.07 PTF: +.19 CL: +.29 EX: +.31 H,WS,V: +.20</p>	<p>Persons of Color:98% FTF:99% PTF:104% CL:103% EX:108% H,WS,V:114%</p> <p>2013-14 All: 105% Women: 104% Persons of Color: 101% FTF: 102% PTF: 105% CL: 108% EX: 109% H,WS,V: 106%</p>
<p>3.06 Student ratings on annual climate survey, disaggregated by gender and ethnicity.</p> <p>Baseline: [Spring 2013] Mean satisfaction index rating</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All: 4.00 <p>Benchmark: [Spring 2016] 5% overall increase; all subgroups within five percentage points five one-hundredths of mean</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All: 4.20 Women: GE 4.15 Persons of Color: GE 4.15 	<p>Spring 2014</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ALL:4.27 Women: 4.29 Persons of Color: 4.25 	<p>Spring 2014</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ALL: +.07 Women: +09 Persons of Color: +.05 	<p>Spring 2014</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ALL:102% Women: 102% Persons of Color: 101%
<p>3.07 Annual survey of employees to measure number, type, scope and benefits of partnerships.</p> <p>Baseline: Did not conduct survey Benchmark:5% increase [2016]</p>	<p>Set baseline in 2012-13.</p>	<p>5% increase [2016]</p>	

Mission Fulfillment: Minimal: 70% performance within/across core themes. Target: 90% performance within/across core themes

Needs discussion	90-100% of Benchmark	70-89 Percent of Benchmark	Less than 70% of Benchmark
------------------	----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

Strategic Plan Indicator	Performance Data	Variation from Benchmark	Percent of Benchmark
3.08 Annual survey of employees to identify outreach activities to diverse communities Baseline: Did not conduct survey Benchmark: 5% increase [2016]	Set baseline in 2012-13.	5% increase [2016]	
3.09 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 [2016]	Set baseline in 2012-13.	5% increase [2016]	
3.10 State-funded, contract-funded, and continuing education enrollments State-funded FTES as percent of annual allocation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline: 99% [2002-2012] Benchmark: 100% [yearly 2013-2016] Running Start Annualized FTES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline: 156 [2009-12 avg] Benchmark: 200 [2016] International Student Spring Headcount <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline: 695 [2009-12 avg] Benchmark: 1000 [2016] Continuing Education Annual Registrations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline: 5524 4833 [2009-12 avg] Benchmark: 6500 5655 [2016] 	State-funded FTES 2012-13: 95% 2013-14: 98% Running Start 2012-13: 155 2013-14: 198 International Students Spring 2013: 1047 Spring 2014: 999 Continuing Education 2012-13: 4608 2013-14: 5490	State-funded FTES 2012-13: -5% 2013-14: -2% Running Start 2012-13: -45 2013-14: -2 International Students Spring 2013: +47 Spring 2014: -1 Continuing Education 2012-13: -1047 2013-14: -165	State-funded FTES 2012-13: 95% 2013-14: 98% Running Start 2012-13: 78% 2013-14: 99% International Students 2013: 105% 2014: 100% CE annual registrations 2012-13: 81% 2013-14: 97%
3.11 Formal reserve account balance as percent of operating budget. Baseline: 5.2% [June 30, 2012]	June 30, 2013: 5.2% June 30, 2014: 6.2%	June 30, 2013: +.2% June 30, 2014: +1.2%	June 30, 2013: 100% June 30, 2014: 124%

Mission Fulfillment: Minimal: 70% performance within/across core themes. Target: 90% performance within/across core themes

Needs discussion	90-100% of Benchmark	70-89 Percent of Benchmark	Less than 70% of Benchmark
------------------	----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

Strategic Plan Indicator	Performance Data	Variation from Benchmark	Percent of Benchmark
	Benchmark: 5% minimum [June 30, 2016]		
3.12	<p>STARS (Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System™) rating</p> <p>Baseline: Bronze Rating Benchmark: Maintain Bronze Rating [2016]</p>	Silver Rating Awarded Sep 2013 (AASHE)	Surpassed
3.13	<p style="background-color: #00b0f0; color: white;">Annual non-state revenue from selected operations</p> <p>Grants, contracts, customized training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline: 25% over costs [2009-12] • Benchmark: 50% over costs [2016] <p>Rentals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline:\$76,990 [2009-12] • Benchmark: \$84,690 [2016] <p>Food Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline: (\$100,200) [2008-12] • Benchmark: Cover costs [2016] 	<p>Grants, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2012-13: • 2013-14: <p>Rentals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2012-13: • 2013-14: <p>Food Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2012-13: • 2013-14: 	<p>Grants, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2012-13: • 2013-14: <p>Rentals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2012-13: • 2013-14: <p>Food Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2012-13: • 2013-14:

Mission Fulfillment: Minimal: 70% performance within/across core themes. Target: 90% performance within/across core themes

Needs discussion	90-100% of Benchmark	70-89 Percent of Benchmark	Less than 70% of Benchmark
------------------	----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

Data Sources

1.01	Revised SAI data using metrics introduced in 2013-14. Previous year's figures were recalculated using SBCTC's new system. North's methodology for points per student includes all SAI students. SBCTC, on the other hand, includes only degree-seeking students in its calculation of points per student.
1.02	Seattle Colleges Retention Study (SCRS). Using data extracted from SBCTC data warehouse files and from other sources, this study employs a cohort track model. It was created and has been maintained by researcher Jerry Wood. It is update annually, usually in late summer/early fall when final data from the previous academic year are available.
1.03	Seattle Colleges Retention Study (SCRS)
1.04	Math Cohort Study (J. Woodard)
1.05	Math Cohort Study (J. Woodard)
1.06	Math Cohort Study (J. Woodard)
1.07	Math Cohort Study (J. Woodard)
1.08	English Cohort Study (J. Woodard)
1.09	English Cohort Study (J. Woodard)
1.10	ESL Cohort Study (J. Woodard)
1.11	ESL Cohort Study (J. Woodard)
1.12	Seattle Colleges Retention Study (SCRS)
1.13	CCSSE and annual student surveys
1.14	SAI revised data
1.15	Data Linking for Outcomes Assessment (DLOA)
1.16	Various as identified earlier
2.01	ALF on-line form and alternative formats. Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • state-funded courses • Full-time faculty • Part-time faculty teaching two2 or more sections/year
2.02	Office of Instruction and Program Review webshare
2.03	Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Committee: ELO studies
2.04	Office of Institutional Effectiveness: Question 12 from CCSSE and included in annual student surveys
2.05	Office of Institutional Effectiveness: Surveys of students in classes teaching ELO selected for assessment
2.06	Office of Institutional Effectiveness: Benchmark Action Plans
2.07	Office of Institutional Effectiveness: Spring Quarter Employee Survey
2.08	Office of Institutional Effectiveness: Spring Quarter Employee Survey
3.01	Human Resources Office
3.02	Office of Institutional Effectiveness: Spring Quarter Surveys of Employees and Students
3.03	Office of Institutional Effectiveness: Spring Quarter Surveys of Employees and Students
3.04	Office of Institutional Effectiveness: Spring Quarter Surveys of Employees and Students

Mission Fulfillment: Minimal: 70% performance within/across core themes. Target: 90% performance within/across core themes

Needs discussion	90-100% of Benchmark	70-89 Percent of Benchmark	Less than 70% of Benchmark
------------------	----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

3.05	Office of Institutional Effectiveness: Winter Quarter Climate Survey
3.06	Office of Institutional Effectiveness: Selected Questions from Spring Quarter Enrolled Student Survey Student ratings on these questions from Enrolled Student Survey <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are made to feel welcome at the college (strongly agree to strongly disagree) • I see student similar to me achieving their goals (strongly agree to strongly disagree) • In your experience, how hospitable is the campus environment to all persons? • How physically safe do you feel on campus? • How safe do you feel on campus in ways other than physical?
3.07	Survey was not conducted
3.08	Survey was not conducted
3.09	Survey conducted in 2012-13 and then discontinued
3.10	SMS database
3.11	Business Office
3.12	Sustainability Office
3.13	Business Office