

North Seattle College Strategic Plan: Roadmap to 2016 Performance Report on Strategic Plan Indicators Fall 2015

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.

Even as the Strategic Initiative Teams continued their work during 2011-2013, the Executive Team developed revised objectives, key performance indicators and benchmarks (targeted levels of performance) for each indicator. After circulating them to the campus community for input and revision, in February 2013 the Executive Team adopted a revised version of the strategic plan. It was published and widely distributed in a document titled the [*Roadmap to 2016*](#).

The college monitored performance on each of its indicators, and in July 2014 the first Performance Report was produced. It was discussed at the Executive Team planning retreat in summer 2014, and presented at meetings of the College Council in Fall Quarter 2014. This current report was developed in Fall Quarter 2015 as part of the process of preparing the college’s [*Year Seven Self-Evaluation Accreditation Report*](#). The Year Seven Self-Evaluation Report presents the same data as are presented in this Performance Report, and in addition the self-evaluation report identifies the strategies the college employed to impact each indicator, and discusses what it learned in the process and how it might apply that learning to a new strategic plan being developed for 2016-2023.

This page intentionally left blank.

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.

Notes regarding tables on the following pages

The left-hand side provides information about the indicator.

- The indicator and its number are displayed. Indicators are numbered 1.01 through 3.13. The first numeral corresponds to the core theme with which the indicator is aligned.
- *Baseline* data for the indicator are shown, along with the year on which baseline data are based.
- The *benchmark* or the target performance the college aspires to by the end of the 2015-16 academic year is displayed. Data for 2015-16 will be available after the close of the academic year in June 2016, and therefore are not available for this report.

The right-hand side displays actual performance data in four columns.

- Column A displays the academic year.
- Column B displays performance data for that year.
- Column C displays the percent of benchmark (target performance) represented by the actual performance.

The formula is: *actual performance divided by benchmark equals percent of benchmark*. For example, if the benchmark for participation in an activity is set at 65%, and the actual participation is 55%, the percent of benchmark would be $55\% / 65\% = 85\%$. Similarly, if the benchmark for a satisfaction rating is set at 4.50, and the actual rating is 4.60, the percent of benchmark would be $4.60 / 4.50 = 102\%$.

- Column D represents a rating of the percent of benchmark using these color codes

< 70% of benchmark

70-89% of benchmark

≥ 90% of benchmark

Longitudinal tracking

- Most indicators for Core Theme One involve tracking cohorts of students over multiple quarters from an identified starting year. The number of years of available performance data varies, depending on the length of the tracking period for each indicator.
- Each student within a given year's cohort is tracked for the same number of quarters and his/her performance reported in the same year, regardless of which quarter of the cohort year a given student may have begun. For example, if the progress of the 2010-11 developmental English cohort is to be tracked for four quarters (Indicator 1.08), a student who started in Fall Quarter of 2010 will be tracked through Fall Quarter 2011, while a student starting in Spring Quarter 2011 will be tracked through Spring Quarter 2012. The progress of both students will be recorded at the end of each student's fourth quarter, and will be reported in the 2011-12 year.
- Quarters are counted regardless of whether a student maintains enrollment. For example, the eighth quarter for a student starting in Fall 2010 is Fall 2012, whether s/he is enrolled the entire time, stops out for one or more quarters, or discontinues entirely.

Indicator				Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]			
1.01	Annual Student Achievement points per student			A	B	C	D
	Baseline	1.06	2009-10	2010-11	1.13	103%	■
	Benchmark	1.10	2015-16	2011-12	1.15	105%	
				2012-13	1.11	99%	
				2013-14	1.15	105%	
				2014-15	1.10	110%	

Methodology

This measure includes all students enrolled in credit classes except International Students. It tracks each student’s [Student Achievement Initiative](#) (SAI) points on an annual basis. SAI data are provided by the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC or State Board), and calculations for this indicator are made locally by the college. The college uses this indicator as a broad overall measure of student success that is captured more specifically in additional measures of student retention (Indicator 1.01, 1.02), progression (Indicators 1.04-1.11) and completion (Indicators 1.12-1.15). Efforts to impact these indicators are ultimately reflected in this less-direct measure.

Indicator				Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]			
1.02	Q1 to Q2 for students intending to stay at least two quarters			A	B	C	D
	Baseline	62%	2009-10	2010-11	61%	87%	■
	Benchmark	70%	2015-16	2011-12	62%	89%	
				2012-13	64%	91%	
				2013-14	66%	94%	
1.03	Q1 to Q2 for students whose planned length of stay is “don’t know” or “blank”			A	B	C	D
	Baseline	48%	2009-10	2010-11	47%	80%	■
	Benchmark	59%	2015-16	2011-12	47%	80%	
				2012-13	48%	81%	
				2013-14	51%	86%	

Methodology

When students apply for admissions, they are asked for their “planned length of stay.” These measures track student retention from first to second quarter. The college targeted first-to-second quarter retention rates based on the large body of [student engagement](#) literature showing that, when engaged with faculty, staff, classes, an instructional program, and/or other students, students are more likely to persevere and complete their educational goal. Students who were not clear or did not indicate how long they intended to stay were presumed not to have a clear educational goal, and therefore at greater risk of dropping out. For that reason, the college focused on them in Indicator 1.03.

Indicator				Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]			
1.04	Percent of students completing developmental math sequence within four quarters			A	B	C	D
				2010-11	33%	77%	Yellow
				2011-12	32%	74%	
				2012-13	34%	79%	
				2013-14	35%	81%	
	Baseline	31%	2009-10				
	Benchmark	43%	2015-16				
1.05	Percent of students who start three levels below college-level and complete developmental math sequences within four quarters			A	B	C	D
				2010-11	8%	40%	Red
				2011-12	7%	35%	
				2012-13	8%	40%	
				2013-14	10%	50%	
	Baseline	6%	2009-10				
	Benchmark	20%	2015-16				
1.06	Percent of students who start two levels below college-level and complete developmental math sequences within four quarters			A	B	C	D
				2010-11	42%	84%	Yellow
				2011-12	37%	74%	
				2012-13	35%	70%	
				2013-14	39%	78%	
	Baseline	36%	2009-10				
	Benchmark	50%	2015-16				
1.07	Percent of students who earn QSR* within eight quarters			A	B	C	D
				2010-11	20%	80%	Yellow
				2011-12	23%	92%	
				2012-13	26%	100%	Green
	Baseline	18%	2009-10				
	Benchmark	25%	2015-16				
	*Quantitative/Symbolic Reasoning = college-level math or equivalent course						

Methodology

This set of indicators addresses the well-documented challenge that many students experience in math by tracking student progress through developmental math to successful completion of a college-level math course. The indicators track all students who place into developmental math, whether one, two or three course levels below college-level math. Tracking begins from the student's first quarter in the developmental sequence. Students are tracked for either four or eight quarters, excluding summer quarter.

Indicator				Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]			
1.08	Percent of students completing developmental English sequence within four quarters			A	B	C	D
				2010-11	72%	101%	■
				2011-12	71%	100%	
				2012-13	73%	103%	
				2013-14	80%	113%	
	Baseline	62%	2009-10				
	Benchmark	71%	2015-16				
1.09	Percent of developmental English students passing ENG101 within eight quarters			A	B	C	D
				2010-11	52%	93%	■
				2011-12	59%	105%	
				2012-13	60%	107%	
			Baseline	49%	2009-10		
	Benchmark	56%	2015-16				

Methodology

Any student who places into developmental English is tracked from her/his initial quarter to see whether s/he successfully completes the developmental sequence within four quarters and English 101 within eight quarters.

Indicator				Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]			
1.10	Percent of upper-level ESL students (Levels 4-6) transitioning to college-level courses within twelve quarters			A	B	C	D
				2009-10	23%	82%	■
				2010-11	24%	96%	■
				2011-12	24%	96%	
			Baseline	20%	2008-09		
	Benchmark	25%	2015-16				
1.11	Percent of lower-level ESL students (Levels 1-3) transitioning to upper-level ESL coursework within twelve quarters			A	B	C	D
				2009-10	19%	83%	■
				2010-11	23%	100%	■
				2011-12	26%	113%	
			Baseline	18%	2008-09		
	Benchmark	23%	2015-16				

Methodology

Students are tracked based on their first English as a Second Language course—whether Lower Levels (1-2-3) or Upper Levels (4-5-6). They are tracked for a full twelve quarters.

Indicator				Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]			
1.12	Percent of degree-seeking students earning degree/certification within three years			A	B	C	D
				2010-11	21%	64%	
				2011-12	21%	64%	
	Baseline	22%	2009-10				
	Benchmark	33%	2015-16				

Methodology

This indicator focuses exclusively on students who, based on information in their student records, are believed to be degree-seeking students. It tracks the percentage who earn a degree or certificate within twelve quarters. The indicator is confounded by imprecise data concerning which students are truly degree-seeking.

Indicator				Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]			
1.13	Percent of students reporting that they are “definitely meeting” their educational goals at the college			CCSSE Supplemental Question			
				A	B	C	D
				2013-14	54%	102%	
	Baseline	48%	2010-11	NSC Annual Surveys of Current Students			
	Benchmark	53%	2015-16	A	B	C	D
				2013-14	82%	155%	
				2014-15	86%	162%	
				NSC Annual Surveys of Graduates and Transfers			
				A	B	C	D
				2012-13	74%	139%	
				2013-14	73%	138%	
				2014-15	82%	155%	

Methodology

Self-report data for this indicator are collected through student surveys. The baseline was established from a supplemental question added to the 2011 Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), which the college administered again in 2014. The CCSSE is administered to students in classes randomly selected by CCSSE. To gather this information more frequently, the college began asking the question of graduates, students who transfer before graduating, and students who are enrolled in Spring Quarter. The CCSSE is administered through an in-class paper/pencil survey; the college’s annual surveys are administered through an online survey. All surveys are anonymous.

Indicator		Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]			
1.14	Percent of degree-seeking students who earn 45 college-level credits within three years	A	B	C	D
		2010-11	23%	92%	■
		2011-12	24%	96%	
	Baseline	23%	2009-10		
	Benchmark	25%	2015-16		

Methodology

This indicator tracks the percentage of degree-seeking students who earn 45 college-level credits within three years of their first class at the college. As noted in Chapter One, because of changes made at the state level, both in data collection and in the Student Achievement Initiative, the indicator changed from its original focus on transfer students achieving “transfer readiness” to all degree-seeking students achieving 45 credits. The lack of precision associated with identifying degree-seeking students, as discussed earlier, impacts this indicator as well.

Indicator		Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]			
1.15	Percent of professional technical completers who are employed within one year of leaving NSC	A	B	C	D
		2010-11	74%	97%	■
		2011-12	70%	92%	
		2012-13	74%	97%	
		2013-14	77%	101%	
	Baseline	73%	2007-10*		
	Benchmark	76%	2015-16		
	* Average over three years				

Methodology

Students are included in this indicator if they are officially enrolled in and complete at least 45 credits of a professional technical program, leave the college and are enrolled in that program during their last quarter, and do not return to higher education within a year of leaving North Seattle College. Data are collected by SBCTC through a process known as Data Linking for Outcomes Assessment ([DLOA](#)). This process involves inter-agency agreements whereby student social security numbers are matched to Unemployment Insurance and [National Student Clearinghouse](#) database. Only those students with a valid social security number in their registration or completions records are included, since only those students have the possibility of matching to external databases. Within the context of DLOA, students earning 45 credits are considered program “completers” even if they do not complete a degree or certificate.

Indicator	Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]						
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 <table border="1" data-bbox="282 443 769 537"> <tr> <td>Baseline</td> <td>Varies</td> <td>2009-10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Benchmark</td> <td>≥ 95% of mean for all students</td> <td>2015-16</td> </tr> </table>	Baseline	Varies	2009-10	Benchmark	≥ 95% of mean for all students	2015-16	<i>Please see data in the tables following the Methodology discussion.</i>
Baseline	Varies	2009-10					
Benchmark	≥ 95% of mean for all students	2015-16					

Methodology

The tables that follow present data on Indicators 1.01 through 1.15 disaggregated by racial/ethnic subgroups. For multiple academic years, results for each subgroup are compared to the results for students as a whole (“all” students). Most indicators involve tracking cohorts of students over multiple quarters from an identified starting year. The years that appear at the top of the tables are the years in which the results are available, not the starting year for the student cohort in question. For example, for a cohort that started in 2009-10 and is tracked for two years (eight quarters), performance data will be reported in the 2011-12 column since Spring Quarter of 2012 will have allowed a full eight quarters for students who started in spring 2010.

Indicator 1.16: Data for Student Success Indicators Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity Subgroups

Data not available	< 10 cases	< 70% of benchmark	70-89% of benchmark	≥ 90% of benchmark
--------------------	------------	--------------------	---------------------	--------------------

Data are not available if tracking occurs over multiple quarters (i.e. from the student's first quarter through his/her four, eight, or twelve quarters) and an insufficient number of quarters have elapsed. Racial/ethnic data are not available for Indicator 1.13 because the annual student surveys collecting the data did not include a race/ethnicity question. Data are not reported when a cell represents fewer than 10 students.

All Students

Indicator			Benchmark	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
SAI	1.01	Points per student	1.10	1.13	1.15	1.11	1.15
Retention Q1 to Q2	1.02	Intend to stay two: or more quarters	70%	61%	62%	64%	66%
	1.03	Intend to stay: don't know/blank	59%	47%	47%	48%	51%
Math Progression	1.04	All levels: complete developmental sequence	43%	33%	32%	34%	35%
	1.05	3 levels below: complete sequence	20%	8%	7%	8%	10%
	1.06	2 levels below: complete sequence	50%	42%	37%	35%	39%
	1.07	All levels: complete QSR	25%	20%	23%	26%	
English Progression	1.08	All levels: complete development sequence	71%	72%	71%	73%	80%
	1.09	All levels: complete ENG101	56%	52%	59%	60%	
ESL Progression	1.10	Upper levels: transition to college work	25%	24%	24%		
	1.11	Lower levels: transition to upper levels	23%	23%	26%		
Degree	1.12	Degree seekers: complete within three years	33%	21%	21%		
Goal Attainment	1.13	Self report: "definitely meeting goals"	53%			73%	82%
45 credits	1.14	Degree seekers: complete within three years	25%	23%	24%		
Job Placement	1.15	Employed within a year of leaving NSC	76%	74%	70%	74%	77%

African American Students

Indicator			Benchmark	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
SAI	1.01	Points per student	1.10	1.27	1.21	1.18	1.15
Retention Q1 to Q2	1.02	Intend to stay two: or more quarters	70%	55%	61%	59%	51%
	1.03	Intend to stay: don't know/blank	59%	48%	46%	47%	49%
Math Progression	1.04	All levels: complete developmental sequence	43%	15%	11%	18%	20%
	1.05	3 levels below: complete sequence	20%	8%	5%	8%	6%
	1.06	2 levels below: complete sequence	50%	15%	20%	25%	48%
	1.07	All levels: complete QSR	25%	7%	7%	13%	
English Progression	1.08	All levels: complete development sequence	71%	81%	66%	60%	78%
	1.09	All levels: complete ENG101	56%	60%	43%	59%	
ESL Progression	1.10	Upper levels: transition to college work	25%	41%	35%		
	1.11	Lower levels: transition to upper levels	23%	27%	22%		
Degree	1.12	Degree seekers: complete within three years	33%	17%	12%		
Goal Attainment	1.13	Self report: "definitely meeting goals"	53%				
45 credits	1.14	Degree seekers: complete within three years	25%	19%	19%		
Job Placement	1.15	Employed within a year of leaving NSC	76%	82%	52%	78%	72%

Asian/Pacific Islander Students

Indicator			Benchmark	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
SAI	1.01	Points per student	1.10	1.17	1.28	1.18	1.23
Retention Q1 to Q2	1.02	Intend to stay two: or more quarters	70%	60%	61%	59%	65%
	1.03	Intend to stay: don't know/blank	59%	46%	49%	47%	54%
Math Progression	1.04	All levels: complete developmental sequence	43%	30%	32%	38%	37%
	1.05	3 levels below: complete sequence	20%	6%	11%	13%	6%
	1.06	2 levels below: complete sequence	50%	43%	35%	37%	40%
	1.07	All levels: complete QSR	25%	17%	27%	28%	
English Progression	1.08	All levels: complete development sequence	71%	65%	63%	76%	86%
	1.09	All levels: complete ENG101	56%	49%	63%	53%	
ESL Progression	1.10	Upper levels: transition to college work	25%	36%	43%		
	1.11	Lower levels: transition to upper levels	23%	36%	38%		
Degree	1.12	Degree seekers: complete within three years	33%	21%	27%		
Goal Attainment	1.13	Self report: "definitely meeting goals"	53%				
45 credits	1.14	Degree seekers: complete within three years	25%	26%	25%		
Job Placement	1.15	Employed within a year of leaving NSC	76%	82%	69%	76%	85%

Hispanic/Latino Students

Indicator			Benchmark	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
SAI	1.01	Points per student	1.10	1.21	1.21	1.15	1.19
Retention Q1 to Q2	1.02	Intend to stay two: or more quarters	70%	58%	62%	60%	62%
	1.03	Intend to stay: don't know/blank	59%	42%	47%	37%	33%
Math Progression	1.04	All levels: complete developmental sequence	43%	27%	28%	20%	29%
	1.05	3 levels below: complete sequence	20%	5%	11%	3%	6%
	1.06	2 levels below: complete sequence	50%	38%	35%	20%	39%
	1.07	All levels: complete QSR	25%	16%	22%	19%	
English Progression	1.08	All levels: complete development sequence	71%	65%	64%	75%	87%
	1.09	All levels: complete ENG101	56%	47%	64%	75%	
ESL Progression	1.10	Upper levels: transition to college work	25%	15%	21%		
	1.11	Lower levels: transition to upper levels	23%	11%	31%		
Degree	1.12	Degree seekers: complete within three years	33%	22%	11%		
Goal Attainment	1.13	Self report: "definitely meeting goals"	53%				
45 credits	1.14	Degree seekers: complete within three years	25%	24%	20%		
Job Placement	1.15	Employed within a year of leaving NSC	76%	72%	73%	77%	81%

Native American Students

Indicator			Benchmark	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
SAI	1.01	Points per student	1.10	1.33	0.96	0.88	0.92
Retention Q1 to Q2	1.02	Intend to stay two: or more quarters	70%	54%	42%	60%	71%
	1.03	Intend to stay: don't know/blank	59%				
Math Progression	1.04	All levels: complete developmental sequence	43%	15%			29%
	1.05	3 levels below: complete sequence	20%	0%			
	1.06	2 levels below: complete sequence	50%				
	1.07	All levels: complete QSR	25%	8%			
English Progression	1.08	All levels: complete development sequence	71%				
	1.09	All levels: complete ENG101	56%				
ESL Progression	1.10	Upper levels: transition to college work	25%				
	1.11	Lower levels: transition to upper levels	23%				
Degree	1.12	Degree seekers: complete within three years	33%	11%	30%		
Goal Attainment	1.13	Self report: "definitely meeting goals"	53%				
45 credits	1.14	Degree seekers: complete within three years	25%	11%	33%		
Job Placement	1.15	Employed within a year of leaving NSC	76%		60%		

Mixed Race Students

Indicator			Benchmark	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
SAI	1.01	Points per student	1.10	1.04	1.15	1.07	1.18
Retention Q1 to Q2	1.02	Intend to stay two: or more quarters	70%	54%	55%	69%	63%
	1.03	Intend to stay: don't know/blank	59%	44%	48%	44%	49%
Math Progression	1.04	All levels: complete developmental sequence	43%	21%	27%	27%	33%
	1.05	3 levels below: complete sequence	20%	3%	3%	6%	12%
	1.06	2 levels below: complete sequence	50%	23%	32%	27%	41%
	1.07	All levels: complete QSR	25%	14%	16%	17%	
English Progression	1.08	All levels: complete development sequence	71%	55%	79%	80%	
	1.09	All levels: complete ENG101	56%	40%	63%	60%	
ESL Progression	1.10	Upper levels: transition to college work	25%	25%			
	1.11	Lower levels: transition to upper levels	23%	45%	40%		
Degree	1.12	Degree seekers: complete within three years	33%	23%	10%		
Goal Attainment	1.13	Self report: "definitely meeting goals"	53%				
45 credits	1.14	Degree seekers: complete within three years	25%	20%	19%		
Job Placement	1.15	Employed within a year of leaving NSC	76%	68%	77%	76%	77%

White Students

Indicator			Benchmark	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
SAI	1.01	Points per student	1.10	1.01	1.08	1.05	1.07
Retention Q1 to Q2	1.02	Intend to stay two: or more quarters	70%	64%	63%	65%	67%
	1.03	Intend to stay: don't know/blank	59%	43%	45%	50%	55%
Math Progression	1.04	All levels: complete developmental sequence	43%	41%	36%	41%	38%
	1.05	3 levels below: complete sequence	20%	11%	8%	6%	10%
	1.06	2 levels below: complete sequence	50%	48%	38%	41%	40%
	1.07	All levels: complete QSR	25%	22%	26%	31%	
English Progression	1.08	All levels: complete development sequence	71%	73%	82%	68%	83%
	1.09	All levels: complete ENG101	56%	51%	55%	52%	
ESL Progression	1.10	Upper levels: transition to college work	25%	26%	36%		
	1.11	Lower levels: transition to upper levels	23%	30%	60%		
Degree	1.12	Degree seekers: complete within three years	33%	22%	24%		
Goal Attainment	1.13	Self report: "definitely meeting goals"	53%				
45 credits	1.14	Degree seekers: complete within three years	25%	24%	26%		
Job Placement	1.15	Employed within a year of leaving NSC	76%	71%	69%	70%	72%

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.

Indicator				Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]				
2.01	Percent of full-time and priority-hire faculty submitting Assessment Loop Forms annually	Full-Time Faculty		A	B	C	D	
		Baseline	84%	2011-12	2012-13	32%	32%	■
		Benchmark	100%	2015-16	2013-14	63%	63%	
					2014-15	20%	20%	
		Priority Hire Faculty		A	B	C	D	
		Baseline	59%	2011-12	2012-13	35%	41%	■
		Benchmark	85%	2015-16	2013-14	31%	36%	
					2014-15	31%	38%	




Methodology

Beginning in 2006-07, as a means of documenting faculty assessment practices at the classroom level, the college asked full-time and part-time faculty to submit an Assessment Loop Form (ALF) once each year. Designed by the Assessment Committee, the ALF provided faculty a structured format for documenting a change they had made to their teaching and/or course design in response to evidence of a need to improve student learning. In 2014-15 it was decided to narrow the request to full-time and priority-hire faculty rather than all part-time faculty. Priority hire faculty are not full-time, but have taught at the college for at least 50 percent time in nine of twelve consecutive quarters. This measure calculates the percent of faculty submitting an ALF each year.

Indicator				Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]			
2.02	Percent of programs completing assigned portions of program review			A	B	C	D
	Baseline	90%	2011-12	Section A 2011-12	90%	90%	
	Benchmark	100%	2015-16	Section B 2012-13	61%	61%	
				Section C 2013-14	63%	63%	

Methodology

The percentage of programs submitting each assigned section of the three-year program review process was calculated.¹ Although each section was assigned to a given academic year (e.g. Section A in 2011-12), the timeliness of submittal was not considered when calculating percentages. For example, if Section A were submitted in 2012-13, it was considered as complete as one submitted in the designated year of 2011-12.

Indicator				Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]			
2.03	Percent of potential faculty ² participating in assessment of identified Essential Learning Outcome each year			A	B	C	D
	Baseline	19%	2011-12	2012-13	49%	61%	
	Benchmark	80%	2015-16	2013-14	64%	80%	
				2014-15	28%	35%	

Methodology

In spring 2009, the Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee adopted twelve Essential Learning Outcomes (ELOs) for North Seattle College. Since their adoption, the Assessment Committee has assessed one ELO each year. Courses that include the chosen outcome are identified, and faculty teaching those courses are invited to participate in that year’s assessment. This indicator measures the percentage of faculty who choose to participate each year.

¹ Programs submitting each section of program review can be seen within this document: [Tracking Indicator 2.02](#).

² “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).

Indicator	Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]															
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 2010-11* Benchmark 2.69 2015-16 *CCSSE, March 2011	CCSSE, March 2014															
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>A</th> <th>B</th> <th>C</th> <th>D</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2013-14</td> <td>2.55</td> <td>95%</td> <td style="background-color: #008000;"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	A	B	C	D	2013-14	2.55	95%								
	A	B	C	D												
	2013-14	2.55	95%													
	NSC Annual Student Surveys															
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>A</th> <th>B</th> <th>C</th> <th>D</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2012-13</td> <td>2.72</td> <td>101%</td> <td style="background-color: #008000;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013-14</td> <td>2.88</td> <td>107%</td> <td style="background-color: #008000;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014-15</td> <td>2.49</td> <td>93%</td> <td style="background-color: #008000;"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	A	B	C	D	2012-13	2.72	101%		2013-14	2.88	107%		2014-15	2.49	93%	
A	B	C	D													
2012-13	2.72	101%														
2013-14	2.88	107%														
2014-15	2.49	93%														

Methodology

Question #12 from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement ([CCSSE](#)) was used to establish a baseline for this indicator, since it asks about knowledge and skills that the college judged to be comparable to its own list of ELOs, and because using the question made comparisons possible with other colleges Nationwide. The college administers the CCSSE every three years, but asks the same question in annual surveys of currently-enrolled students, graduates, and students transferring to other institutions before graduating. Students use a four-point scale to rate the extent to which the college contributed to their learning in each of 14 knowledge or skill items. A mean is calculated for each item and from the individual means an overall mean is calculated.

The following table illustrates the close alignment between the CCSSE items and the college’s ELOs.

CCSSE Item	Essential Learning Outcome
12a Acquiring a broad general education	Methodologies, facts, theories, and perspectives within and across disciplines
12b Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills	Methodologies, facts, theories, and perspectives within and across disciplines
12c Writing clearly and effectively	Communication and self-expression
12d Speaking clearly and effectively	Communication and self-expression
12e Thinking critically and analytically	Critical thinking and problem solving
12f Solving numerical problems	Quantitative reasoning
12g Using computing and information technology	Information literacy Technological proficiency
12h Working effectively with others	Collaboration: group and team work
12i Learning effectively on your own	Lifelong learning and personal well-being
12j Understanding yourself	Ethical awareness and personal integrity
12k Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds	Intercultural knowledge and competence
12l Developing a person code of values and ethics	Ethical awareness and personal integrity
12m Contributing to the welfare of our community	Civic engagement: local, global, and environmental
12n Developing clearer career goals	<i>No ELO equivalent</i>
12o Gaining information about career opportunities	<i>No ELO equivalent</i>
<i>No CCSSE equivalent</i>	Synthesis and application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities to new settings and problems

Indicator	Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]
2.05 Survey of students in courses selected for ELO assessment On a five-point rating scale, percent of ratings at 4 or 5 Baseline 64% 2012-13 Benchmark 70% 2015-16	<i>No surveys were conducted beyond the baseline year. See discussion below.</i>





Methodology

As described earlier in the discussion of Indicator 2.04, the intent was to survey students in the classes that taught whatever ELO was being assessed in a given year. AAC&U [VALUE](#) rubrics were used to construct the survey about the knowledge and skills reflected in the rubric. Using a five-point scale, students rated the extent to which the class engaged them in learning the knowledge and skills, as well as how much it increased their ability to understand and apply them.

Indicator	Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]																
2.06 Percent of administrative offices and support services completing an assessment project annually Baseline 26% 2012-13 Benchmark 100% 2015-16	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>A</th> <th>B</th> <th>C</th> <th>D</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2013-14</td> <td>47%</td> <td>47%</td> <td style="background-color: red;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014-15</td> <td colspan="3"><i>Transition year. See below.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015-16</td> <td>100%</td> <td>100%</td> <td style="background-color: green;"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	A	B	C	D	2013-14	47%	47%		2014-15	<i>Transition year. See below.</i>			2015-16	100%	100%	
A	B	C	D														
2013-14	47%	47%															
2014-15	<i>Transition year. See below.</i>																
2015-16	100%	100%															

Methodology

To “ensure the effectiveness and quality of our work through ongoing assessment and professional development” is integral to what the college embraces in Core Theme Two: *Excelling in Teaching and Learning*. To extend an assessment culture and assessment practices beyond instruction into all areas of the college, this indicator was adopted when core theme objectives and indicators were revised in March 2013. Baseline data were gathered in spring 2013, when a form was sent to 38 administrative/support offices asking whether they had conducted any type of assessment project in the 2012-13 year (the academic year just then ending).

Indicator				Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]			
2.07	Percent of employees participating in professional development activities annually			A	B	C	D
				2013-14	79%	89%	
				2014-15	94%	94%	
		Baseline	85%	2012-13			
	Benchmark	89%	2015-16				
2.08	Employee ratings of professional development activities			A	B	C	D
				2013-14	4.18	99%	
				2014-15	4.09	97%	
		On a five-point rating scale, a mean rating of					
	Baseline	4.04	2012-13				
	Benchmark	4.20	2015-16				

Methodology

Data for this indicator are collected in an annual Spring Quarter survey that was initiated in 2013. This same survey collects employee data for Indicators 3.02 and 3.04. The online anonymous survey asks employees to indicate how many college-sponsored or college-supported professional development activities they have participated in during the current academic year. Choices range from zero to ten or more activities. The survey also asks respondents to rate the value of those activities. A related survey—the Employee Climate Survey—is conducted each Winter Quarter. It includes a general question about employee satisfaction with the college’s support for their professional development. Overall and disaggregated results of that survey question are presented within the discussion of Indicator 3.05 later in this chapter.

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.

Indicator		Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]			
3.01	Number of search processes meeting each of these criteria: A. Distribution to venues reaching targeted non-traditional and underrepresented communities is documented B. 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	Targeted Distribution			
		A	B	C	D
		2012-13	100%	100%	■
		2013-14	100%	100%	■
		2014-15	100%	100%	■
		Committee Training			
		A	B	C	D
		2012-13	15%	15%	■
		2013-14	15%	15%	■
		2014-15	33%	33%	■

Methodology

This indicator is focused on hiring processes for full-time, permanent positions. The college hires for approximately 80-100 such positions each year. Because of medical leave and turnover in the director of human resources position, performance figures for committee training are estimates.

Indicator				Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]				
3.02	Percent of employees participating in specified activities to build community and develop understanding, respect and appreciation for diversity			<u>Employees</u>				
		Community-building						
				A	B	C	D	
		Baseline		80%	2012-13	74%	80%	
		Benchmark		92%	2015-16	85%	92%	
		Diversity						
				A	B	C	D	
		Baseline		68%	2012-13	86%	110%	
		Benchmark		78%	2015-16	61%	78%	
		3.03	Percent of students participating in activities to build community and develop understanding, respect, and appreciation for diversity; include CCSSE items 4s, 4t ³			<u>Students</u>		
Community-building								
				A	B	C	D	
Baseline				40%	2012-13	NA	NA	
Benchmark				42%	2015-16	38%	90%	
Diversity								
				A	B	C	D	
Baseline				29%	2012-13	49%	163%	
Benchmark				30%	2015-16	22%	73%	
CCSSE items on local surveys								
		A	B	C	D			
Baseline		82%	2012-13	79%	92%			
Benchmark		86%	2015-16	79%	92%			
3.04	Employee and student ratings of the activities	On a five-point scale, a mean rating of:		<u>Employees</u>				
				Community-building				
				A	B	C	D	
		Baseline		3.89	2012-13	3.82	94%	
		Benchmark		4.08	2015-16	3.91	96%	
		Diversity						
				A	B	C	D	
		Baseline		3.93	2012-13	3.89	94%	
		Benchmark		4.13	2015-16	3.92	95%	
		<u>Students</u>						
Community-building								
		A	B	C	D			
Baseline		3.39	2012-13	3.50	98%			
Benchmark		3.56	2015-16	3.30	93%			
Diversity								
		A	B	C	D			
Baseline		3.16	2012-13	3.74	113%			
Benchmark		3.32	2015-16	3.18	96%			

³ 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.

Methodology

Annual Spring Quarter surveys of employees are conducted specifically for the purpose of collecting data for this indicator. The survey are anonymous, and administered online by sending a survey link to each employee through the campus e-mail system. The survey is open for approximately two weeks, with reminders sent two or three times during that period.

Indicator	Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]						
<p>3.05 Employee ratings on annual climate survey, disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, and employee type</p> <p>On a five-point scale, a mean rating of</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Baseline</td> <td>3.44</td> <td>2011-12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Benchmark</td> <td>3.61</td> <td>2015-16</td> </tr> </table>	Baseline	3.44	2011-12	Benchmark	3.61	2015-16	<p><i>Disaggregated data are displayed in tables that follow the Methodology discussion.</i></p>
Baseline	3.44	2011-12					
Benchmark	3.61	2015-16					

Methodology

North Seattle College’s Employee Climate Survey has been administered for many years. It measures eight dimensions of campus climate: cooperation, responsiveness to suggestions, resource adequacy, professional development, hospitable environment, physical safety, social/emotional safety, and pride as an employee. It is administered anonymously in Winter Quarter in an online format, with a survey link sent through campus e-mail. The survey is available for approximately two weeks, with periodic reminders sent during that time period.

Indicator 3.05: Employee Ratings of Campus Climate

Employee Survey Questions Concerning Campus Climate

Question	Response Options
How satisfied are you with the spirit of cooperation across campus?	Five-point scale from “Very satisfied” (5) to “Very dissatisfied” (1)
How satisfied are you with the extent to which your suggestions are heard and acted upon?	Five-point scale from “Very satisfied” (5) to “Very dissatisfied” (1)
How satisfied are you that resources are adequate for faculty, staff and administrative support?	Five-point scale from “Very satisfied” (5) to “Very dissatisfied” (1)
How satisfied are you with the extent to which the college supports your professional development?	Five-point scale from “Very satisfied” (5) to “Very dissatisfied” (1)
In your experience, how hospitable is the campus environment to all persons, free of discrimination of any kind?	Five-point scale from “Very hospitable”(5) to “Very inhospitable” (1)
How physically safe do you feel on campus?	Five-point scale from “Very safe” (5) to “Not safe” (1)
How safe do you feel in other ways on campus (e.g., in ways other than physical)?	Five point scale from “Very safe” (5) to “Not safe” (1)
How much pride do you feel being an employee of North Seattle College?	Five-point scale from “A great deal (5) to “None at all” (1)

Responses by Disaggregated Employee Groups

Mean Responses: All Employees

Climate Dimension	Benchmark	2013-13	2013-14	2014-15
Number of respondents		95	159	211
Cooperation		3.61	3.72	3.64
Suggestions		3.34	3.46	3.36
Resources		2.88	3.21	3.24
Professional Development		3.63	3.78	3.74
Hospitable Environment		3.85	3.80	3.84
Physical Safety		4.16	4.20	4.13
Other safety		3.88	4.01	4.03
Pride		4.14	4.18	4.14
Overall	3.61	3.69	3.79	3.77

Mean Responses: Female Employees

Climate Dimension	Benchmark	2013-13	2013-14	2014-15
Number of respondents		53	98	128
Cooperation		3.73	3.72	3.61
Suggestions		3.31	3.40	3.38
Resources		2.81	3.21	3.25
Professional Development		3.74	3.77	3.75
Hospitable Environment		3.78	3.72	3.83
Physical Safety		4.08	4.12	4.07
Other safety		3.84	3.93	4.02
Pride		4.23	4.15	4.12
Overall	3.61	3.69	3.75	3.75

Mean Responses: Employees of Color

Climate Dimension	Benchmark	2013-13	2013-14	2014-15
Number of respondents		25	35	50
Cooperation		3.52	3.40	3.59
Suggestions		3.16	3.20	3.44
Resources		2.80	3.31	3.35
Professional Development		3.52	3.97	3.88
Hospitable Environment		3.67	3.50	3.69
Physical Safety		4.00	4.14	4.10
Other safety		3.60	3.76	3.73
Pride		4.04	4.03	4.22
Overall	3.61	3.54	3.66	3.75

Mean Responses: Classified Employees

Climate Dimension	Benchmark	2013-13	2013-14	2014-15
Number of respondents		16	32	39
Cooperation		3.69	3.69	3.46
Suggestions		3.31	3.69	3.21
Resources		3.06	3.38	3.03
Professional Development		3.93	3.59	3.49
Hospitable Environment		3.87	4.03	3.77
Physical Safety		3.94	4.16	3.95
Other safety		4.00	4.27	3.87
Pride		4.19	4.41	4.03
Overall	3.61	3.75	3.90	3.60

Mean Responses: Exempt Employees

Climate Dimension	Benchmark	2013-13	2013-14	2014-15
Number of respondents		16	35	40
Cooperation		3.69	4.03	3.51
Suggestions		3.63	3.76	3.49
Resources		2.94	3.23	3.26
Professional Development		4.00	4.03	3.98
Hospitable Environment		3.69	3.83	3.97
Physical Safety		4.63	4.54	4.43
Other safety		4.27	3.91	4.29
Pride		4.31	4.03	4.26
Overall	3.61	3.89	3.92	3.90

Mean Responses: Full-Time Faculty

Climate Dimension	Benchmark	2013-13	2013-14	2014-15
Number of respondents		19	38	43
Cooperation		3.42	3.46	3.67
Suggestions		3.21	3.21	3.33
Resources		2.63	3.08	3.74
Professional Development		3.58	3.70	3.67
Hospitable Environment		3.74	3.74	4.23
Physical Safety		3.95	4.21	4.23
Other safety		3.74	4.03	4.19
Pride		4.26	4.05	4.28
Overall	3.61	3.57	3.68	3.92

Mean Responses: Part-Time Faculty

Climate Dimension	Benchmark	2013-13	2013-14	2014-15
Number of respondents		26	35	49
Cooperation		3.84	3.91	3.82
Suggestions		3.44	3.26	3.62
Resources		2.88	3.32	3.35
Professional Development		3.65	3.86	3.90
Hospitable Environment		4.12	3.80	4.27
Physical Safety		4.08	3.97	3.96
Other safety		3.92	3.97	4.06
Pride		4.24	4.34	4.20
Overall	3.61	3.77	3.80	3.90

Mean Responses: Hourly Employees

Climate Dimension	Benchmark	2013-13	2013-14	2014-15
Number of respondents		5	6	22
Cooperation		4.00	4.00	3.90
Suggestions		3.80	3.83	3.45
Resources		3.40	3.00	3.64
Professional Development		3.50	3.17	3.55
Hospitable Environment		4.25	3.83	3.76
Physical Safety		4.60	4.33	4.23
Other safety		4.60	4.33	4.23
Pride		4.00	4.00	4.14
Overall	3.61	4.02	3.81	3.86

Indicator	Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]
3.06 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	<i>Disaggregated data are presented in the tables that follow the Methodology Discussion.</i>

Methodology

Annual surveys of students enrolled in for-credit classes in Spring Quarter were begun in 2012-13 to collect data for this and other indicators (1.13, 3.03, and 3.04). An online, anonymous survey is created, and the link is e-mailed to the address on file in the student management system. Lower-level ESL students (levels 1-3) and students taking exclusively online or off-campus classes are not included. The campus climate section of the survey measures five dimensions of campus climate: welcoming atmosphere, hospitable and discrimination-free environment, physical safety, emotional-social safety, and whether students “similar to me” succeed at the college.

Indicator 3.06: Student Ratings of Campus Climate

Student Survey Questions Concerning Campus Climate

Question	Response Options
Students are made to feel welcome at the college.	Five point scale from “Strongly agree” (5) to “Strongly disagree” (1)
In your experience, how hospitable is the campus environment to all students, free of discrimination of any kind?	Five-point scale from “Very hospitable”(5) to “Very inhospitable” (1)
How physically safe do you feel on campus?	Five-point scale from “Very safe” (5) to “Not safe” (1)
How safe do you feel in other ways on campus (e.g., in ways other than physical)?	Five point scale from “Very safe” (5) to “Not safe” (1)
I see students similar to me achieving their educational goals at North Seattle College.	Five point scale from “Strongly agree” (5) to “Strongly disagree” (1)

Responses by Disaggregated Student Groups

Mean Responses: All Students

Climate Dimension	Benchmark	2013-14	2014-15
Number of Respondents		320	259
Welcoming		4.30	4.26
Hospitable		4.15	4.15
Physical safety		4.37	4.31
Other safety		4.29	4.21
Similar		4.23	4.07
Overall	4.20	4.27	4.20

Mean Responses: Female Students

Climate Dimension	Benchmark	2013-14	2014-15
Number of Respondents		188	156
Welcoming		4.31	4.26
Hospitable		4.23	4.26
Physical safety		4.34	4.22
Other safety		4.32	4.15
Similar		4.27	4.03
Overall	4.20	4.29	4.18

Mean Responses: Students of Color

Climate Dimension	Benchmark	2013-14	2014-15
Number of Respondents		159	94
Welcoming		4.32	4.36
Hospitable		4.05	3.87
Physical safety		4.34	4.29
Other safety		4.27	4.25
Similar		4.27	4.08
Overall	4.20	4.25	4.17

Indicator		Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]
3.07	Annual survey of employees to measure number, type, scope and benefits of partnerships	<i>Survey was not implemented. See discussion below.</i>
	Baseline	2012-13
	Benchmark	2015-16
3.08	Annual survey of employees to identify outreach activities to diverse communities	<i>Survey was not implemented. See discussion below.</i>
	Baseline	2012-13
	Benchmark	2015-16




Methodology

The college’s original intent was to survey employees about their involvement with community partners (Indicator 3.07), with a particular interest in partnerships with diverse communities (3.08). Baseline data were to be collected in 2012-13 and benchmarks set accordingly. The idea of a survey was abandoned because of the difficulty of defining “partnership” clearly enough so that respondents would know what to include and the resulting data would provide meaningful information.

Indicator		Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]
3.09	Annual survey of partners from Technical Advisory Committees, OCE&E, and Opportunity Council to identify value of and enhancements to partnerships	<i>Surveys were abandoned as an ineffective measure. However, efforts to enhance partnerships proceeded, as discussed below.</i>
	Baseline	2012-13
	Benchmark	2015-16


Methodology

Three surveys were conducted in 2012-13. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members were asked for their written response to open-ended survey questions during an annual appreciation dinner, OCE&E staff were asked to complete an online survey, and members of the Opportunity Council were sent open-ended questions in an e-mail. The surveys were not continued beyond 2012-13 because leadership changes impacted each of the three groups, and because the time and effort involved were judged to outweigh the benefits.

Indicator				Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]			
3.11	Formal reserve account balance as percent of operating budget			A	B	C	D
	Baseline	5.0%	06/30/2012	06/30/13	5.2%	104%	
	Benchmark	5.0%	06/30/2016	06/30/14	6.2%	124%	
				06/30/15	6.6%	132%	

Methodology

At the close of each fiscal year, the college budget office recalculates the percent of the budget, excluding trust and capital funds, which comprise its formal reserve. The minimum reserve amount is calculated according to procedures outlined for district [Policy 608](#). Reserve balances (by accounting fund) are summed and compared against the newly-calculated minimum requirement. The college endeavors to exceed the minimum if possible; hence the current balance of 6.6 percent.

Indicator				Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]			
3.12	STARS [®] (<i>Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System</i>) rating			A	B	C	D
	Baseline	Bronze	2011-12	2014-15	Silver Rating	+	
	Benchmark	Bronze	2015-16				
	Percent change		Maintain				

Methodology

[STARS[®]](#) is a self-reporting framework developed by the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education ([AASHE](#)) as a way for colleges and universities to measure their sustainability performance. Sustainability is measured in four categories: academics (curriculum and research), engagement (campus and public), operations (air, climate, grounds, water, buildings, energy, transport, purchasing, food services, waste and recycling) and planning and administration (coordination, planning and governance, diversity, health, well-being and work, and investment). The college submitted its first self-report in 2011 and a second report in 2013. Reports are rated by STARS[®].

Indicator	Year [A], Performance [B], Percent of Benchmark [C], and Rating [D]																																				
<p>3.13 Annual non-state revenue from selected operations</p> <p>Grants, contracts and customized training Baseline Cost + 25% 2009-12* Benchmark Cost + 50% 2015-16 * An estimated three-year average</p> <p>Rentals Baseline \$76,990 2009-12* Benchmark \$84,690 2015-16 * Three-year average</p> <p>Food Services Baseline (\$100,000) 2009-12* Benchmark Break even 2015-16 * Three-year average annual operating deficit</p>	<p>Grants, contracts and customized training <i>This measure was not tracked. See explanation below.</i></p> <p>Rentals</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>A</th> <th>B</th> <th>C</th> <th>D</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2012-13</td> <td></td> <td>\$127,543</td> <td>151%</td> <td rowspan="3">■</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013-14</td> <td></td> <td>\$138,638</td> <td>164%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014-15</td> <td></td> <td>\$167,791</td> <td>198%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Food Services</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>A</th> <th>B</th> <th>C</th> <th>D</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2012-13</td> <td></td> <td>(\$61,863)</td> <td></td> <td rowspan="3">■</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013-14</td> <td></td> <td>\$165,529)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014-15</td> <td></td> <td>(\$88,454)</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		A	B	C	D	2012-13		\$127,543	151%	■	2013-14		\$138,638	164%	2014-15		\$167,791	198%		A	B	C	D	2012-13		(\$61,863)		■	2013-14		\$165,529)		2014-15		(\$88,454)	
	A	B	C	D																																	
2012-13		\$127,543	151%	■																																	
2013-14		\$138,638	164%																																		
2014-15		\$167,791	198%																																		
	A	B	C	D																																	
2012-13		(\$61,863)		■																																	
2013-14		\$165,529)																																			
2014-15		(\$88,454)																																			

Methodology

At the close of each fiscal year, the budget office produces financial reports containing the figures that record progress on meeting the benchmarks set for each of these three measures. Rental revenue is measured by breaking out charges per rental contract per month and creating a record of those charges in monthly rentals billing reports.

This page intentionally left blank.