

SKYLINE COLLEGE

Balanced Scorecard

Outcome Measures Trend Analysis & Benchmark

2016-2017 Academic Year

Prepared in Fall 2017



Office of Planning, Research & Institutional Effectiveness

Table of Content

Outcome Code	Outcome Measure	Page
ES1	Retention Rate (1.2)	3
ES2	Term Persistence Rate (1.2)	4
ES3	All Course Success Rate (1.2)	5
ES4	Basic Skills Course Success Rate (1.2)	6
ES5	Student Success Scorecard Completion Rate (1.2)	7
ES6	Student Right to Know (SRTK) Completion Rate (1.2)	8
ES7	Student to Counselor Ratio (1.2)	9
ES8	Financial Aid Recipient Rate (1.2)	10
ES9	Student Satisfaction Overall Rating	11
ES10	Community Events (3.2)	12
IS1	Percentage of Program Reviews Completed (2.1)	13
IS2	Employee Overall Satisfaction Rating (2.2)	14
IS3	Student Right to Know (SRTK) Crime Statistics (# Offenses) (2.3)	15
FBO1	FTES Trend - All Courses (4.1)	16
FBO2	Load (4.1)	17
FBO3	Fill Rates (4.1)	18
FBO4	Ending Balance (4.1)	19
IG1	Number of New Courses Approved (1.1)	20
IG2	Percentage of of Technology-Mediated Instruction (1.1)	21
IG3	President's Innovation Funds Granted (1.1)	22
IG4	Amount of Grant Allocations (1.1)	23
IG5	Amount of Professional Development Funds (5.1)	24

Perspective: External Stakeholders (ES)
Outcome Measure ES1: Retention Rate

Effectiveness Indicator: Retention
Strategy: 1.2, 8.3 Student Access, Success & Equity in Outcomes
 1.4 Assessment of Student Learning

Year	Retention Rate	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	82%	84.0%	●	
2008/09	84%	84.0%	●	
2009/10	85%	84.0%	●	Goal initially set using 5-year average
2010/11	83%	84.0%	●	
2011/12	84%	84.0%	●	
2012/13	85%	84.0%	●	
2013/14	85%	84.0%	●	
2014/15	85%	84.5%	●	Goal initially set using 5-year average
2015/16	86%	84.5%	●	
2016/17	87%	84.5%	●	

The percentage of students who enrolled in a course on census date and stayed through the end of the term to receive a letter grade (A, B, C, D, F), Pass (P), Not Pass (NP) or an incomplete (I).

Data Source: SMCCCD Data Warehouse

Perspective: External Stakeholders (ES)
Outcome Measure ES2: Term Persistence Rate

Effectiveness Indicator: Persistence ¹
Strategy: 1.2 Student Access, Success & Equity in Outcomes
 1.4 Assessment of Student Learning

Year	Persistence Rate	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	54%	51.0%	●	
2008/09	54%	51.0%	●	
2009/10	54%	51.0%	●	Goal initially set using 5-year average
2010/11	57%	51.0%	●	
2011/12	53%	51.0%	●	
2012/13	56%	51.0%	●	
2013/14	57%	51.0%	●	
2014/15	59%	55.3%	●	Goal initially set using 5-year average
2015/16	58%	55.3%	●	
2016/17	57%	55.3%	●	

¹ Previous editions of the Balanced Scorecard included all students in the calculation of the term persistence rate. The definition on page 44 of the dictionary specifies that the calculation be based on first-time students only. Thus, a recalculation was performed for previous years as well as the goal value. Those values are included here.

Data Source: SMCCCD Data Warehouse

Perspective: External Stakeholders (ES)
Outcome Measure ES3: All Course Success Rate

Effectiveness Indicator: Success

Strategy: 1.2 Student Access, Success & Equity in Outcomes
 1.4 Assessment of Student Learning

Year	All Success Course Completion Rates	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	68%	70.0%	●	
2008/09	69%	70.0%	●	
2009/10	70%	70.0%	●	Goal initially set using 5-year average
2010/11	68%	70.0%	●	
2011/12	70%	70.0%	●	
2012/13	70%	70.0%	●	
2013/14	70%	70.0%	●	
2014/15	71%	69.5%	●	Goal initially set using 5-year average
2015/16	72%	69.5%	●	
2016/17	74%	69.5%	●	

The percentage of students who enrolled in a course on census date and stayed through the end of the term to receive a letter grade (A, B, C) or Pass (P).

Data Source: SMCCCD Data Warehouse



The Skyline College 2016/17 Balanced Scorecard

Perspective: External Stakeholders (ES) Outcome Measure ES4: Basic Skills Course Success Rate

Effectiveness Indicator: Success

Strategy: 1.2 Student Access, Success & Equity in Outcomes
1.4 Assessment of Student Learning

Year	Basic Skills Successful Course Completion Rates	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	67%	55%	●	
2008/09	58%	55%	●	
2009/10	60%	55%	●	Goal initially set using 5-year average
2010/11	61%	55%	●	
2011/12	64%	55%	●	
2012/13	65%	55%	●	
2013/14	60%	55%	●	
2014/15	64%	62%	●	Goal initially set using 5-year average
2015/16	65%	62%	●	
2016/17	68%	62%	●	

The percentage of students who enrolled in pre-collegiate basic skills in English, Math or Reading courses on census date and received a letter grade (A, B, C) or Pass (P).

Data Source: SMCCCD Data Warehouse

Perspective: External Stakeholders (ES)
Outcome Measure ES5: ARCC Achievement Rate

Effectiveness Indicator: Success

Strategy: 1.2 Student Access, Success & Equity in Outcomes
 1.4 Assessment of Student Learning

Year	Student Success Scorecard Completion Rates	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	58%	59%	●	
2008/09	57%	60%	●	
2009/10	54%	61%	●	Goal initially set using 5-year average
2010/11	59%	53%	●	
2011/12	53%	49%	●	
2012/13	48%	48%	●	
2013/14	N/A	N/A	-	
2014/15	N/A	N/A	-	
2015/16	N/A	N/A	-	
2016/17	N/A	N/A	-	

Percentage of cohort of first-time students with minimum of 12 units earned who attempted a degree/certificate/transfer threshold course within six years and who are shown to have achieve any of the following outcomes within six year of entry:

- ~ Earned an AA/AS or Certificate (18 units or more)
- ~ Actual transfer to four-year institution
- ~ Achieved "Transfer-directed" (student successfully completed both transfer-level Math and English courses)
- ~ Achieved "Transfer Prepared" (student successfully completed 60 UC/CSU transferable units with a GPA 2.0 or above)

Data Source: ARCC Report (until 2012/13); Data source is not available 2012/13 onward.

Perspective: External Stakeholders (ES)
Outcome Measure ES6: Student Right to Know (SRTK) Completion Rate

Effectiveness Indicator: Success

Strategy: 1.2 Student Access, Success & Equity in Outcomes
 1.4 Assessment of Student Learning

Year	Completion Rates	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	33%	25%	●	Fall 2004 Cohort through Spring 2007
2008/09	27%	24%	●	Fall 2005 Cohort through Spring 2008
2009/10	35%	25%	●	Fall 2006 Cohort through Spring 2009
2010/11	31%	25%	●	Fall 2007 Cohort through Spring 2010
2011/12	20%	25%	◐	Fall 2008 Cohort through Spring 2011
2012/13	17%	25%	○	Fall 2009 Cohort through Spring 2012
2013/14	17%	25%	○	Fall 2010 Cohort through Spring 2013
2014/15	16%	25%	○	Fall 2011 Cohort through Spring 2014
2015/16	21%	25%	◐	Fall 2012 Cohort through Spring 2015
2016/17	23%	25%	◐	Fall 2013 Cohort through Spring 2016

*Percentage of Completion Rates, aka SRTK Rates, are derived and reported yearly on the IEPDS-GRS (Integrated Postsecondary Educational Data System Graduation Rate Survey).
<http://srtk.cccco.edu/index.asp>*

Perspective: External Stakeholders (ES)
Outcome Measure ES7: Student to Counselor Ratio

Effectiveness Indicator: Success

Strategy: 1.2 Student Access, Success & Equity in Outcomes
 1.4 Assessment of Student Learning

Year	Credit Student Count	Counselor Count	Ratio	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	12,920	15.24	848:1	900:1	●	
2008/09	14,171	17.41	814:1	900:1	●	
2009/10	14,945	14.35	1,041:1	900:1	◐	
2010/11	14,286	15.37	929:1	900:1	◐	
2011/12	14,859	14.60	1,018:1	900:1	◐	
2012/13	14,285	13.53	1,055:1	900:1	○	
2013/14	14,323	15.53	922:1	900:1	◐	
2014/15	14,208	18.56	757:1	900:1	●	
2015/16	13,867	19.39	715:1	900:1	●	
2016/17	13,385	20.53	652:1	900:1	●	

The Ratio of number of counselors per credit student enrolled in fall and spring. All full and part-time general counseling are included. (Special program faculty, such as DSPS and EOPS are not included)
 Data Source: Counseling Division

Perspective: External Stakeholders (ES)
Outcome Measure ES8: Financial Aid Recipient Rate

Effectiveness Indicator: Success

Strategy: 1.2 Student Access, Success & Equity in Outcomes
 1.4 Assessment of Student Learning

Year	Financial Aid Recipient Count	Student Headcount	Financial Aid Recipient Rate	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	5,750	15,490	37%	28%	●	
2008/09	6,634	16,847	39%	28%	●	
2009/10	8,593	18,020	48%	28%	●	
2010/11	9,449	17,307	55%	28%	●	
2011/12	9,885	17,851	55%	28%	●	
2012/13	11,909	17,553	68%	28%	●	
2013/14	12,506	17,461	72%	28%	●	
2014/15	10,193	17,460	58%	28%	●	
2015/16	13,239	17,054	78%	28%	●	
2016/17	12,427	16,089	77%	28%	●	



The Skyline College 2016/17 Balanced Scorecard

Perspective: External Stakeholders (ES) Outcome Measure ES9: Student Satisfaction Overall Rating

Effectiveness Indicator: Satisfaction/ Perception
Strategy: 1.2 Student Access, Success & Equity in Outcomes

Year	Satisfaction Overall Rating	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	NA	79%	NA	
2008/09	NA	79%	NA	
2009/10	74%	79%	●	
2010/11	NA	79%	NA	
2011/12	NA	79%	NA	
2012/13	NA	79%	NA	
2013/14	NA	79%	NA	
2014/15	NA	79%	NA	
2015/16	84%	79%	●	Refer to Community Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) Q # 27
2016/17	NA	79%	NA	

The percentage of students who selected "Very Satisfied" or "Satisfied" on the question(s) that ask about overall satisfaction with the college from the student climate survey.

Perspective: External Stakeholders (ES)
Outcome Measure ES10: Community Events

Effectiveness Indicator: Marketing & Public Relations
Strategy: 3.2, 6.3, 8.2 Marketing, Outreach, and Connections to Academic & Business Communities

Year	Number of Events	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	61	60	●	
2008/09	45	60	○	
2009/10	60	60	●	
2010/11	50	60	○	
2011/12	71	60	●	
2012/13	60	60	●	
2013/14	65	60	●	
2014/15	152	60	●	
2015/16	744	60	●	
2016/17	746	60	●	

Perspective: Internal Stakeholders (IS)
Outcome Measure IS1: Percentage of Program Reviews Completed

Effectiveness Indicator: Program and Service Quality
Strategy: 1.4 Assessment of Student Learning
 2.1, 7.1 Integrated Planning & Institutional Performance

Year	Number of Program Reviews Scheduled	# of Program Reviews Completed	Percentage Completed	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	13	9	69%	75%	●	
2008/09	16	11	69%	75%	●	
2009/10	12	10	83%	75%	●	
2010/11	8	7	88%	75%	●	
2011/12	10	8	80%	75%	●	
2012/13	11	9	82%	75%	●	
2013/14	12	12	100%	75%	●	
2014/15	9	7	78%	75%	●	
2015/16	11	8	73%	75%	●	
2016/17	10	10	100%	75%	●	

The number of completed program reviews in a given year, as a percentage of the number scheduled. The program review are schedule on a six year cycle. All instructional and non-instructional departments are expected to participate in a comprehensive self-study using the pre-determined Program Review evaluation instrument. Programs begin the self-study during the fifth year of the program review cycle. This is 12-14 month process involving planning, data acquisition, analysis, and writing of the final report. Program Review results are showcased via formal presentations to the college community and a report of the self-study submitted to the Curriculum Committee.

Perspective: Internal Stakeholders (IS)
Outcome Measure IS2: Employee Overall Satisfaction Rating

Effectiveness Indicator: Employee Satisfaction
Strategy: 2.2 Effective Communication

Year	Overall Satisfaction	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	74%	70%	●	
2008/09	NA	NA	NA	
2009/10	NA	NA	NA	
2010/11	NA	NA	NA	
2011/12	82%	70%	●	
2012/13	NA	NA	NA	
2013/14	NA	NA	NA	
2014/15	NA	NA	NA	
2015/16	NA	NA	NA	
2016/17	NA	NA	NA	

Perspective: Internal Stakeholders (IS)
Outcome Measure IS3: Student Right to Know (SRTK) Crime Statistics (Number of Offenses)

Effectiveness Indicator: Campus Safety
Strategy: 2.3 Safety and Secure Campus

Year	Number of Offenses	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	7	10	●	
2008/09	4	10	●	
2009/10	8	10	●	
2010/11	3	10	●	
2011/12	6	10	●	
2012/13	6	10	●	
2013/14	7	10	●	
2014/15	8	10	●	
2015/16	12	10	●	
2016/17	5	10	●	

Perspective: Financial Business Operations (FBO)
Outcome Measure FBO1: FTES Trend (All Courses)

Effectiveness Indicator: Productivity
Strategy: 4.1 Integrated and Evidence-Based Resource Planning System

Year	FTES Trend (All Course)	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	7.7%	2.0%	●	
2008/09	10.7%	4.5%	●	
2009/10	8.5%	0%	●	
2010/11	-4.8%	0%	○	
2011/12	1.5%	0%	●	
2012/13	-3.5%	0%	●	
2013/14	-2.9%	0%	◐	
2014/15	0.1%	0%	●	
2015/16	-3.7%	0%	◐	
2016/17	-3.9%	0%	○	

Perspective: Financial Business Operations (FBO)
Outcome Measure FBO2: Load

Effectiveness Indicator: Efficiency
Strategy: 4.1 Integrated and Evidence-Based Resource Planning System

Year	Load	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	559	525	●	
2008/09	589	525	●	
2009/10	647	525	●	
2010/11	636	525	●	
2011/12	603	525	●	
2012/13	584	525	●	
2013/14	552	525	●	
2014/15	551	525	●	
2015/16	551	525	●	
2016/17	513	525	●	

Perspective: Financial Business Operations (FBO)
Outcome Measure FBO3: Fill Rates

Effectiveness Indicator: Efficiency
Strategy: 4.1 Integrated and Evidence-Based Resource Planning System

Year	Fill Rates	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	82%	83%	●	
2008/09	87%	83%	●	
2009/10	94%	83%	●	
2010/11	95%	83%	●	
2011/12	87%	83%	●	
2012/13	85%	83%	●	
2013/14	81%	83%	●	
2014/15	80%	83%	●	
2015/16	80%	83%	●	
2016/17	80%	83%	●	

Perspective: Financial Business Operations (FBO)
Outcome Measure FBO4: Ending Balance

Effectiveness Indicator: Budget Efficiency
Strategy: 4.1 Integrated and Evidence-Based Resource Planning System

Year	Actual Expenditures to Total Budget Ratio	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	3.0%	2.5%	●	
2008/09	5.1%	2.5%	●	
2009/10	7.3%	2.5%	●	
2010/11	6.3%	2.5%	●	
2011/12	5.0%	2.5%	●	
2012/13	3.2%	2.5%	●	
2013/14	4.24%	2.5%	●	
2014/15	2.8%	2.5%	●	
2015/16	2.4%	2.5%	◐	
2016/17	1.9%	2.5%	○	

Perspective: Innovation and Growth (IG)
Outcome Measure IG1: Number of New Courses Approved

Effectiveness Indicator: Program and Services Enhancements
Strategy: 1.1 Innovative Programs, Services and Modes of Delivery

Year	Number of New Courses Approved	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	50	37	●	
2008/09	49	37	●	
2009/10	9	37	○	
2010/11	17	37	○	
2011/12	31	37	○	
2012/13	259	37	●	
2013/14	130	37	●	
2014/15	55	37	●	
2015/16	97	37	●	
2016/17	35	37	◐	

Perspective: Innovation and Growth (IG)
Outcome Measure IG2: Percentage of Technology-mediated Instruction

Effectiveness Indicator: Program and Service Enhancements
Strategy: 1.1 Innovative Programs, Services and Modes of Delivery

Year	# of Tech-Mediated Instruction Sections	# of Total Sections	% of Technology-Mediated Instruction	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	131	2,291	5.7%	4.0%	●	
2008/09	162	2,452	6.6%	4.0%	●	
2009/10	183	2,403	7.6%	4.0%	●	
2010/11	182	2,243	8.1%	4.0%	●	
2011/12	183	2,136	7.7%	4.0%	●	
2012/13	172	2,148	7.2%	4.0%	●	
2013/14	222	2,857	7.8%	4.0%	●	
2014/15	250	2,900	8.6%	4.0%	●	
2015/16	245	1,963	12.5%	4.0%	●	
2016/17	256	2,060	12.4%	4.0%	●	

Perspective: Innovation and Growth (IG)
Outcome Measure IG3: President's Innovation Funds Granted

Effectiveness Indicator: Program and Services Enhancements
Strategy: 1.1 Innovative Programs, Services and Modes of Delivery

Year	PIF Funding Granted	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	\$46,440	\$75,000	○	
2008/09	\$71,000	\$75,000	◐	
2009/10	\$69,704	\$75,000	◑	
2010/11	\$61,380	\$75,000	○	
2011/12	\$79,840	\$75,000	●	
2012/13	\$70,895	\$75,000	◐	
2013/14	\$82,314	\$75,000	●	
2014/15	\$191,958	\$75,000	●	
2015/16	\$230,419	\$75,000	●	
2016/17	\$414,595	\$75,000	●	

Perspective: Innovation and Growth (IG)
Outcome Measure IG4: Amount of Grant Allocations

Effectiveness Indicator: Grant Procurement
Strategy: 1.1 Innovative Programs, Services and Modes of Delivery

Year	Amount of Grant Allocations	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	\$7,124,075	\$4,244,133	●	
2008/09	\$7,610,234	\$4,244,133	●	
2009/10	\$7,054,041	\$4,244,133	●	
2010/11	\$11,971,807	\$4,244,133	●	
2011/12	\$6,166,883	\$4,244,133	●	
2012/13	\$6,427,885	\$4,244,133	●	
2013/14	\$4,065,394	\$4,244,133	◐	
2014/15	\$11,247,074	\$4,244,133	●	
2015/16	\$13,915,799	\$4,244,133	●	
2016/17	\$19,278,080	\$4,244,133	●	

Perspective: Innovation and Growth (IG)
Outcome Measure IG5: Amount of Professional Development Funds

Effectiveness Indicator: Staff and Development Opportunities
Strategy: 5.1 Comprehensive Staff Development Program

Year	Amount of Professional Development Funds	Goal	Indicator	Notes
2007/08	\$78,475	\$78,475	●	
2008/09	\$77,367	\$77,367	●	
2009/10	\$78,475	\$78,475	●	
2010/11	\$86,272	\$78,745	●	
2011/12	\$83,766	\$78,475	●	
2012/13	\$89,595	\$85,576	●	
2013/14	\$86,544	\$86,221	●	
2014/15	\$171,138	\$86,887	●	
2015/16	\$204,592	\$86,528	●	
2016/17	\$229,171	\$96,364	●	