
2017 Institutional Effectiveness Report

OVERVIEW

The following *Institutional Effectiveness Report* has been prepared for South Seattle College's Campus Community and represents an overview of our performance towards our Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)¹. The KPIs in this report were initially developed as a way to measure Mission Fulfillment, and are directly linked to our Core Theme Objectives. As can be seen in the alignment map (page 5), each of the Strategic Directions aligns with specific Core Theme Objectives, which then ties the Directions to multiple KPIs. This report serves as a performance dashboard and will be updated annually and made available each winter based on available data, assessment and evaluation.

**Please note, slight changes in the methodology may be made in order to align with the State Board and/or the Seattle Colleges District new strategic planning efforts, which may result in changes to the actual numbers.*

¹Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are not intended to provide an at-a-glance snapshot of the institution. Instead, their purpose is to gauge the effectiveness of the college at meeting its mission by tracking meaningful, measurable, and verifiable data points. We assume that an adequate KPI provides a high-level overview of the college's performance in certain areas that are key to the fulfillment of its mission. A fluctuation in one or more KPIs should prompt deeper inspection, so KPIs need to support closer analysis. Furthermore, KPIs should: be institutional in scope; be within the college's ability to control or influence; reflect the *results* of actions taken by the college, not the actions themselves; and, connect to one or more Core Theme Objectives as well as to the Mission and Strategic Goals of both South Seattle and the Seattle College District.

2017 Institutional Effectiveness Report

STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS AND GOALS

STRATEGIC DIRECTION A: PROVIDE CURRENT, HIGH QUALITY INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

- ✓ Goal A1. Improve the program review process so that it ensures currency and identifies new programs.
- ✓ Goal A2. Develop and assess pathways to transfer, degrees, and certificates leading to student success.

STRATEGIC DIRECTION B: CREATE A STRUCTURED STUDENT EXPERIENCE

- ✓ Goal B1. Create a consistent and clear step-by-step pathway making it easy for students to enroll, continue and complete their educational goals.
- ✓ Goal B2. Design reliable, current, and consistent digital and traditional resources that will guide students through their enrollment, progression and completion experiences.

STRATEGIC DIRECTION C: BUILD A CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PLAN INTO ALL COLLEGE ACTIVITIES

- ✓ Goal C1. Create institutional infrastructure to support systematic professional development for South employees.
- ✓ Goal C2. Develop specific and college-wide processes to support the collection, analysis, dissemination, and use of data for decision-making and assessment.

STRATEGIC DIRECTION D: DEEPEN AND EXPAND OUR CONNECTIONS TO OUR COMMUNITY

- ✓ Goal D1. Build systems to assess and prioritize the changing needs and interests of our community.
- ✓ Goal D2. Foster and nurture partnerships that promote and establish smooth transitions between South Seattle College, the workforce, and other educational opportunities.

STRATEGIC DIRECTION E: PROCURE AND ALLOCATE SUFFICIENT RESOURCES TO MEET OUR MISSION

- ✓ Goal E1. Establish and disseminate criteria and systems for assessing value, cost, and feasibility, and of current and prospective programs, services and initiatives.
- ✓ Goal E2. Develop and support strategies for investing in institutional priorities.

STRATEGIC DIRECTION F: FOSTER AND STRENGTHEN EQUITY, INCLUSION, AND CULTURAL COMPETENCY

- ✓ Goal F1. Develop a five-year iterative college-wide equity, diversity, and inclusion action plan with measureable outcomes and ongoing assessment.
 - ✓ Goal F2. Continue to ensure that recruitment and hiring processes consider equity and inclusion.
-

2017 Institutional Effectiveness Report

SOUTH SEATTLE COLLEGE CORE THEMES

CORE THEME 1: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

- 1.1 Students accomplish their educational objectives.
- 1.2 South facilitates progression through various levels.
- 1.3 Students navigate the system successfully.

CORE THEME 2: TEACHING AND LEARNING

- 2.1 Instructional programs are effective.
- 2.2 Students learn requisite knowledge and skills.
- 2.3 Students are actively engaged in learning.

CORE THEME 3: COLLEGE CULTURE AND CLIMATE

- 3.1 South increases cultural competency; hires/retains diverse staff.
- 3.2 South encourages employee growth and contribution to community.
- 3.3 South uses its resources efficiently and effectively.

CORE THEME 4: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND PARTNERSHIPS

- 4.1 South's programs support industry workforce development.
 - 4.2 South partners with schools/colleges to create a seamless pipeline.
 - 4.3 South engages its community for mutual enrichment.
-

2017 Institutional Effectiveness Report

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (KPIs)

- KPI 1 Percentage of all new degree-seeking students retained fall to winter
- KPI 2 Number of Points per Student as defined by the Student Achievement Initiative (SAI)
- KPI 3 Percentage of all new degree-seeking students who earn a certificate/degree or transfer within 4 years
- KPI 4 Actual Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs) in comparison to the State’s allocation enrollment target
- KPI 5 Percentage of all Professional Technical graduates who are employed within 9 months of graduation
- KPI 6 Percentage of students who achieve level 3 (on a 4-level scale) of mastery as defined by master rubrics for each Student Learning Outcome (SLO)
- KPI 7 Percentage of students who achieve level 3 (on a 5-level scale) of mastery as defined by the master course outcome rubric for Course Outcomes (CO)
- KPI 8 Graduating students’ self-report of instructional effectiveness
- KPI 9 Ethnic composition of South’s student population
- KPI 10 Percentage of South’s employees who represent a diverse workforce
- KPI 11 Number of activities on the South campuses that are aimed at increasing cultural competence and awareness
- KPI 12 Maintenance of the financial reserve as mandated by district policy
-

2017 Institutional Effectiveness Report

STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS-CORE THEME OBJECTIVES-OUTCOME MEASURES ALIGNMENT MAP

Strategic Direction A: Provide current, high quality instructional programs

Core Theme Objectives

- 2.1 Instructional programs are effective.
- 2.2 Students learn requisite knowledge and skills.
- 2.3 Students are actively engaged in learning.

Outcome Measures

SAI points; Completion/transfer; Employment; Student Learning Outcomes; Course Outcomes; Instructional effectiveness

Strategic Direction D: Deepen and expand our connections to our community

Core Theme Objectives

- 4.1 South's programs support industry workforce development.
- 4.2 South partners with schools/colleges to create a seamless pipeline.
- 4.3 South engages its community for mutual enrichment.

Outcome Measures

Completion/transfer; Employment; Student diversity

Strategic Direction B: Create a structured student experience

Core Theme Objectives

- 1.1 Students accomplish their educational objectives.
- 1.2 South facilitates progression through various levels.
- 1.3 Students navigate the system successfully.

Outcome Measures

Retention; SAI points; Completion/transfer; Employment

Strategic Direction E: Procure and allocate sufficient resources to meet our mission

Core Theme Objectives

- 3.3 South uses its resources efficiently and effectively.

Outcome Measures

Fiscal reserve; Enrollment

Strategic Direction C: Build a continuous improvement plan into all college activities

Core Theme Objectives

This Direction isn't tied to specific Core Theme Objectives; it is influenced by and is an influencer of all of the other directions.

Outcome Measures

Accomplishment of the other directions will be used as the indicator.

Strategic Direction F: Foster and strengthen equity, inclusion, and cultural competency

Core Theme Objectives

- 3.1 South increases cultural competency; hires/retains diverse staff.
- 3.2 South encourages employee growth and contribution to community.

Outcome Measures

Employee diversity; Cultural competence/awareness

2017 Institutional Effectiveness Report

OUTCOME MEASURE (INDICATOR) GUIDELINES

Baseline

- 2010-2011 (where available)

Benchmark/target

- Increase of 10% from baseline for most cases

Performance Rating	Performance Criteria	Symbol
Exceeds Expectations	Above 90% of benchmark	
Meets Expectations	Between 75-90% of benchmark	
Below Expectations	Below 75% of Benchmark	

The numbers in these dashboards represent the general student population as a whole. Indicators will be being disaggregated to provide additional information and insight.

DEFINITION OF MISSION FULFILLMENT

- At least 8 of the 12 KPIs will be at 80% of the benchmark, or above, and
 - No more than 4 of the 12 KPIs will be below 75% of the benchmark.
-

2017 Institutional Effectiveness Report

KPI 1: Percentage of all new degree-seeking students retained fall to winter¹

Baseline (2010-2011):	Benchmark (2021):
75%	85%

Year	Retention Rate	Change from BSL	% of Target	Performance
2011-2012	72%	↓	85%	!
2012-2013	81%	↑	95%	✓
2013-2014	77%	↑	91%	✓
2014-2015	79%	↑	93%	✓
2015-2016	70%	↓	82%	!

KPI 2: Number of Points per Student as defined by the Student Achievement Initiative (SAI)²

Baseline (2010-2011)	Benchmark (2021):
1.36	1.50

Year	Points Per Student	Change from BSL	% of Target	Performance
2011-2012	1.45	↑	97%	✓
2012-2013	1.49	↑	99%	✓
2013-2014	1.48	↑	99%	✓
2014-2015	1.38	↑	92%	✓

¹ Aligns with the Proposed District-Wide Strategic Plan Objective: Student Retention

² Aligns with the Proposed District-Wide Strategic Plan Objective: Student Achievement Points

2017 Institutional Effectiveness Report

KPI 3: Percentage of students who earn a certificate/degree or transfer within 4 years³

Baseline (2010-2011)	Benchmark (2021)
30%	38%

Year	% Earning a Degree, Certificate, or Transferring	Change from BSL	% of Target	Performance
2011-2012	32%	↑	84%	!
2012-2013	38%	↑	100%	✓
2013-2014	36%	↑	95%	✓
2014-2015	40%	↑	105%	✓

KPI 4: Actual Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs) in comparison to the State's allocation enrollment target⁴

Baseline (2010-2011)	Benchmark (2021):
98%	100%

Year	FTEs	Change from BSL	% of Target	Performance
2011-2012	98%	→	98%	✓
2012-2013	93%	↓	93%	✓
2013-2014	98%	→	98%	✓
2014-2015	93%	↓	93%	✓
2015-2016	95%	↓	95%	✓

³ Aligns with the Proposed District-Wide Strategic Plan Objective: Completion Rates

⁴ Aligns with the Proposed District-Wide Strategic Plan Objective: Enrollment

2017 Institutional Effectiveness Report

KPI 5: Percentage of all Professional Technical graduates who are employed within 9 months of graduation⁵

Baseline (2010-2011)	Benchmark (2021)
71%	80%

Year	% Employed after Graduation	Change from BSL	% of Target	Performance
2011-2012	77%	↑	96%	✓
2012-2013	74%	↑	93%	✓
2013-2014	74%	↑	93%	✓
2014-2015	69%	↓	86%	!

KPI 6: Percentage of students who achieve level 3 (on a 4-level scale) of mastery as defined by master rubrics for each Student Learning Outcome (SLO)

Baseline (2015-2016)	Benchmark (2021)
77%	85%

Note: Because this is a new indicator, no historical data is available.

⁵ Aligns with the Proposed District-Wide Strategic Plan Objective: Employment

2017 Institutional Effectiveness Report

KPI 7: Percentage of students who achieve level 3 (on a 5-level scale) of mastery as defined by the master course outcome rubric for Course Outcomes (CO)

Baseline (2015-2016)	Benchmark (2021)
94%	95%

Note: Because this is a new indicator, no historical data is available.

KPI 8: Graduating students' self-report of instructional effectiveness⁶

Baseline (2013)	Benchmark (2021)
5.83	6.4

Year	Mean Satisfaction	Change from BSL	% of Target	Performance
2013	5.83		91%	✓
2014	5.91	↑	92%	✓
2015	5.87	↑	92%	✓

⁶ Aligns with the Proposed District-Wide Strategic Plan Objective: Student Engagement

2017 Institutional Effectiveness Report

KPI 9: Ethnic composition of South’s student population

Baseline (2010-2011)	Benchmark (2021)
-15%	-5%

Year	% Faculty of Color	Change from BSL	% of Target	Performance
2011-2012	19%	→	76%	!
2012-2013	20%	↑	80%	!
2013-2014	23%	↑	92%	✓
2014-2015	26%	↑	104%	✓

Note: This KPI is currently being assessed for measurement value

KPI 10: Percentage of South’s employees who represent a diverse workforce

Baseline (2010-2011)	Benchmark (2021):
19%	25%

Year	% Faculty of Color	Change from BSL	% of Target	Performance
2011-2012	19%	↑	76%	!
2012-2013	20%	↑	80%	!
2013-2014	23%	↑	92%	✓
2014-2015	26%	↑	104%	✓

2017 Institutional Effectiveness Report

KPI 11: Number of activities on the South campuses that are aimed at increasing cultural competence and awareness

Baseline (2015-2016)	Benchmark (2021):
50	100

Note: Because this is a new indicator, no historical data is available.

KPI 12: Maintenance of the financial reserve as mandated by district policy

Baseline (2010-2011)	Benchmark (2021):
7.7%	8.5% of annual operating budget

Year	Fiscal Reserve	Change from BSL	% of Target	Performance
2011-2012	8.2%	↑	96%	✓
2012-2013	10.6%	↑	125%	✓
2013-2014	9.8%	↑	115%	✓
2014-2015	9.5%	↑	112%	✓
2015-2016	9.3%	↑	109%	✓