Strategic Priorities Indicators Input Survey Results
Prepared for: Mission Fulfillment Committee
Survey administered: March 9, 2020

The indicators listed below for Academic Relevance & Innovation and Financial Sustainability reflect feedback gathered from Mission Fulfillment Committee members and from additional research into available data. Please indicate below whether you believe the drafted indicators adequately allow the college to measure progress for each of the strategic priorities.

Academic Relevance and Innovation

- · Percent of advisory board survey respondents who answer the following with "agree" or "strongly agree": Program is responsive to feedback and makes changes as appropriate (exists as 3.1.1)
- · Percent of advisory board survey respondents who answer the following with "agree" or "strongly agree": The program effectively prepares students for jobs in the industry (exists as 3.1.2)
- · Percent of assessment survey respondents who indicate that they "sought information/assistance about instructional best practices to address ideas raised by the assessment process." (exists as 3.2)
- · Number of applications received via the Foundation's innovation mini-grant program (exists as 3.3)
- · Students are ready to succeed at a four-year school based on graduation rates at transfer institutions within three years of transfer (Academic Transfer 1.3)
- · Rates of CTE concentrators employed at 2nd quarter after exiting program (CTE 2.4)
- · Percent of Customized Training employers who are satisfied with the value of the training (Lifelong Learning 4.5)

Response	%	Count
Yes	85.71%	6
No	14.29%	1
Total	100%	7

Please provide any comments you have regarding the above group of indicators for Academic Relevance and Innovation.

- · The list represents an incomplete, indirect view of ARI, and is not based on a shared set of criteria for quality in ARI. However, if we examine and discuss the results of these indicators as a group and perhaps engage the College community, we might, through that process gain a better understanding of what this strategic priority means to us and how to measure our progress.

- Yes, but... Can we have just one indicator for each of the objectives (academic transfer, CTE, essential skills, and lifelong learning), for a total of four indicators.
  Here are my thoughts:
  Bullet 1: Keep this or Bullet 2 (not both)
  Bullet 2: Keep this or Bullet 1 (not both). This one speaks better to the CTE objective.
  Bullet 3: If we have a fifth indicator that doesn't speak directly to the objectives, this would be a good one to keep.
  Bullet 4: I do not think this speaks to academic relevance or innovation. It's too specific, and a number is not telling if we do not know how much money is available for people to submit applications.
  Bullet 5: I like this indicator, but it doesn't quite fit the "leading" nature of strategic priorities.
  Bullet 6: I like this indicator, but it doesn't quite fit the "leading" nature of strategic priorities.
  Bullet 7: Keep We do not have an indicator that addresses essential skills.

- Is there a better way to assess innovation outside of the mini-grant process (very narrow in scope/lack of understanding about what "innovation" means/entails, etc.). Other than that, I think these are solid.

- Truthfully, I'm not sure I like any of these indicators for Innovation. I supposed they are OK for Relevance, but I have reservations about that too. Unfortunately, I don't have any better ideas.

- One of the largest Lifelong Learning enterprises at CCC is Community Education. I assume there is an assessment process for CE. Would it be appropriate to also include one of their variables?

Final indicators based on 4/29/2020 MFC discussion:

- Students are ready to succeed at a four-year school based on graduation rates at transfer institutions within three years of transfer (Academic Transfer 1.3)
- The percentage of CTE concentrators who, during the second quarter after program completion, remain enrolled in postsecondary education, are in advanced training, military service, or a service program that receives assistance under title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12511 et seq.), are volunteers as described in section 5(a) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2504(a)), or are placed or retained in employment (CTE 2.4 – updated Perkins language here)
- Percent of advisory board survey respondents who answer the following with "agree" or "strongly agree": The program effectively prepares students for jobs in the industry (exists as 3.1.2)
- Percent of Customized Training employers who are satisfied with the value of the training (Lifelong Learning 4.5)
- Percent of assessment survey respondents who indicate that they "worked with the CCC Center for Teaching & Learning on instructional best practices to address ideas raised by the assessment process." (exists as 3.2 – updated to reflect language used in revised assessment form)

Financial Sustainability

(No changes proposed)

- Percent of college budget that comes from other revenue sources (e.g. grants, donations, enterprise funds) (exists as 4.1)
- College's 3-year forecast, particularly the ending fund balance in year three of the forecast, equals $0 (exists as 4.2)

Response	%	Count
Yes	100.00%	7
No	0.00%	0
Total	100%	7

Please provide any comments you have regarding the above group of indicators for Financial Sustainability.

- A qualified "yes". Don't think I have the financial knowledge to judge this one.

- I'm not sure if this is possible, but can we add something about cost per student? While important to have a balanced forecast, what is our "efficiency"? Are our total expenses per FTES staying the same over the years or at least within the $ amount we are being allocated from the state?

- these are OK.

Final indicators based on 4/29/2020 MFC discussion:

(No changes proposed)

- Percent of college budget that comes from other revenue sources (e.g. grants, donations, enterprise funds) (exists as 4.1)
- College's 3-year forecast, particularly the ending fund balance in year three of the forecast, equals $0 (exists as 4.2)