2017-2018 Institutional Effectiveness Update

Prepared by Dr. Hannah Lawler, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness

Institutional Effectiveness (IE) is the systematic and continuous process of measuring the extent to which a college achieves its mission as expressed through the goals and strategic objectives developed in an educational master plan. Santa Monica College (SMC) has systematically assessed institutional effectiveness on an annual basis since 2011-2012. The current report provides an update of the 2017-2018 institutional effectiveness process.

Background on Institutional Effectiveness

The ultimate purpose of the IE process is to advance educational quality and institutional improvement. The process at SMC involves an analysis of longitudinal data related to the fundamental areas of the College (academic/instruction, student support, human resources, physical infrastructure, and fiscal) and identification and prioritization of the areas needing critical attention. College effectiveness is not achieved by simply reporting the College's performance on IE metrics. The process relies on dialogue and collaborative inquiry among campus constituents around institutional effectiveness performance. The process drives evidence-based college planning and supports decision-making processes.

The Institutional Effectiveness Process at SMC

The IE process at SMC relies on the following assumptions:

- The primary purpose of the IE process is self-review for college improvement and not to satisfy accountability requirements or comply with external mandates. However, when possible, the process is aligned with and integrated with statewide effectiveness efforts such as the Student Success Scorecard and the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) Framework of Indicators;

- The IE process does not replace ongoing assessment and planning efforts such as program review or strategic planning;

- IE data are not intended to fulfill all of the campus data needs and serve only as a starting point for assessment;

- The IE process aims to provide a picture of the college's effectiveness from the highest level and is not intended to evaluate specific courses, programs, or departments;

- The IE metrics are purely descriptive and do not provide a causal or scientific explanation for trends in college performance. Instead the goal of the IE process is to spark robust dialogue among campus constituents and encourage the College to engage in further inquiry; and,

- Institutional effectiveness is an ongoing and dynamic process that responnds to the changing needs of the College. Metrics are reviewed and refined to align with college goals and priorities on an ongoing basis.

The IE dashboard serves as a visual tool to help college practitioners monitor the college's performance and assess whether college goals are being met. The dashboard, a repository for dozens of metrics, are organized by the five supporting goals of the College. One dashboard houses metrics for each of the following goals: Academics, Student Support, Fiscal, College Infrastructure, and Collegiality. For access to a more detailed description of the goals, visit: http://www.smc.edu/ACG/Pages/Mission-Vision-Goals.aspx. A sixth dashboard is focused on monitoring student equity for outcomes measured in the "Academics" dashboard.

The IE process is coordinated through the Academic Senate Joint Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Committee. The committee members analyze the college's performance on the metrics against minimum standards (also called "institution-set standards") and target goals for improvement. The committee documents the results of the analyses in a report that is shared with the District Planning & Advisory Council (DPAC) and the Academic Senate. The report identifies areas of the College needing improvement and informs the development of annual action plans in the Master Plan for Education and the Academics Senate Goals and Objectives. In addition, the results of the analyses are shared directly with the central stakeholders to inform committee work and program review and planning.

The cycle for assessing institutional effectiveness spans five years. In the first year of the cycle, the College sets target goals for key metrics to be achieved in five years. Target goals for the current IE cycle were set in 2016-2017 for goals to be achieved by 2020-2021. In addition to evaluating SMC's performance on the metrics, the IE Committee reviews the usefulness, relevance, and appropriateness of the metrics, targets, and institution-set standards of performance each year.

For a more detailed description of the terms "institution-set standard" and "target", refer to the Appendix (Glossary of Terms).

2017-2018 Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Activities

Responding to the Changing Context of Institutional Effectiveness
Changes to state requirements and introduction of new system wide initiatives during the 2017-2018 year greatly impacted the institutional effectiveness process at SMC. The changes directly affected metrics on the Academics and Student Support Dashboards. The IE Committee attempted to align and integrate the changes into the 2017-2018 IE Dashboard in real time. The 2017-2018 IE Dashboard can be found at the end of the report.

The external conditions that influenced or will influence the IE Dashboard include:
- **California Community Colleges Vision for Success**
  In July 2017, a report titled *Vison for Success: Strengthening Community Colleges to Meet California's Needs* was released by the Foundation for California Community Colleges. The report outlines the strategic vision for the system, including ambitious goals for student success and equity to be achieved by 2020 through a guided pathways framework. The 2017-2018 IE Dashboard includes new metrics that align with key guided pathways outcomes, including completion of college units and attempt in program of study courses.

- **Assembly Bill 705**
  In October 2017, the Governor signed AB 705 into legislation which requires that community colleges maximize the probability that entering students will be able to complete transfer-level

English and math courses within one year of entry. The IE metrics related to basic skills English and math were eliminated and replaced with metrics focused on college-level English and math completion in one year.

- **The Simplified Metrics Initiative**
  In December 2017, Chancellor Eloy Oakley approved the Metrics Simplification Initiative. The new initiative attempts to integrate, simplify, and align existing data reporting systems related to student outcomes, including SSSP, Equity, Basic Skills, Strong Workforce, Adult Ed, and Guided Pathways. The new set of proposed metrics will align with the *Vision for Success* goals and replace the existing state accountability system, the Student Success Scorecard and goals framework (Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative or IEPI). Lastly, the proposed metrics will align to the new funding formula. The new Simplified Metrics data portal will be unveiled sometime in 2019.

  Future versions of the IE Dashboard will be affected by the implementation of the Simplified Metrics Initiative.

- **Suspension of the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) Goals Framework**
  IEPI is a state-wide initiative designed to advance institutional effectiveness at California community colleges. The initiative was an outcome of legislation (Senate Bill 860, 2014-15 Higher Education Trailer Bill) aimed to reduce the number of accreditation sanctions and audit findings at local colleges, to increase student access and success, and to ultimately improve institutional effectiveness at colleges. Pursuant to Education Code section 84754.6, the Board of Governors (BOG) adopted a framework of indicators. A framework of indicators help the system and local colleges monitor the ongoing conditions of a college's operational environment. The legislation requires that colleges develop, adopt, and post a goals framework.

  In February 2018, the Chancellor's Office suspended the requirement of college's to report and adopt the IEPI goals for 2017-2018. The target goals of the SMC IE Dashboard are aligned with goals set in the IEPI Goals Framework. In addition, the IEPI Goals Framework serves as the data source for many metrics on the IE Dashboard. As a result of the suspension, the 2017-2018 IE Dashboard does not include target goals and data for one metric (Median Time to Degree) is missing for the most recently reported year.

Administration of the College Employee Satisfaction Survey

One of the supporting goals of Santa Monica College is to provide a supportive collegial environment, to "employ decision-making and communication processes that respect the diverse needs of the entire college community". Up until 2017-2018, there were no systematic processes in place to comprehensively and directly assess whether the College was meeting this goal. As a result, it has been challenging to determine whether the SMC is "effective" in providing a supportive collegial environment.

In its 2015-2016 report summarizing the findings of the IE Dashboard, the IE Committee made a recommendation to DPAC to investigate and implement tools to reliably and systematically assess whether the College is providing a supportive collegial environment. In response to this recommendation, the DPAC Human Resources Planning Subcommittee reviewed several employee satisfaction instruments and ultimately voted to administer the Ruffalo Noel Levitz College Employee Satisfaction Survey. The survey includes items in five areas, including campus culture and policies,

institutional goals, involvement in planning and decision making, work environment, and employee demographics.

The Office of Institutional Research is currently working to produce a summary report describing the results of the College Employee Satisfaction Survey to be shared with the campus community. The report will be included in the 2018-2019 report of institutional effectiveness.

Report of Significant Data Trends, Observations, and Recommendations of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Based on its comprehensive review of the College's performance on the 2017-2018 IE Dashboard, the IE Committee presented three recommendations to the DPAC for consideration in the identification of the 2018-2019 Master Plan for Education annual action plans:

1. The College's efforts in redesigning the student experience (implementation of the guided pathways framework) is informed by student equity data;
2. The College explore actions to improve the collegial environment; and,
3. The College engage in further inquiry to identify and address factors that impact facilities staffing.

The IE Committee DPAC Report can be found here.

Academics Dashboard

College goal: continuously develop curricular programs, learning strategies, and services to meet the evolving needs of students and the community

IE Indicator	Related to Other Metrics	IE REPORT YEAR					Institution-set Standard
		2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	
MOMENTUM POINTS							
1.1 Term-to-Term Persistence	GP	--	--	68.0%	68.0%	67.4%	64%
1.2 Completion of 15+ College Units in Year One	GP	--	--	34.7%	37.3%	38.0%	35%
1.3 Completion of 30+ College Units in Year One	GP	--	--	6.7%	9.1%	9.5%	8%
1.4 Completion of College-Level Math in Year One	GP	--	--	11.6%	12.9%	13.2%	12%
% Eligible*		--	--	42.6%	42.1%	42.0%	NA
% Attempted of Eligible*		--	--	55.8%	55.4%	53.5%	NA
1.5 Completion of College-Level English in Year One	GP	--	--	30.0%	31.4%	33.6%	30%
% Eligible*		--	--	26.9%	25.7%	25.1%	NA
% Attempted of Eligible*		--	--	88.6%	88.3%	84.1%	NA
1.6 Attempt in Program of Study Courses	GP	10.0%	14.1%	12.2%	11.7%	12.6%	12%
ACHIEVEMENT/COMPLETION							
1.7 Degrees Awarded	IEPI VS	1,207	1,434	2,222	3,362	2,636	1,796
1.8 Certificates Awarded	IEPI VS	1,373	1,528	1,515	1,499	1,456	1,410
1.9 Number of Transfer to Four-Year Institutions	IEPI VS	2,637	2,782	3,113	3,019	2,992	2,618
1.10 Completion Rate	SSC IEPI	48.4%	48.2%	49.6%	50.3%	47.8%	47%
1.11 Employment Rate	SWP VS	60%	61%	63%	63%	62%	59%
1.12 CTE Skills Builders	SSC IEPI VS	--	+16.5%	+15.2%	+30.8%	+33.3%	+23%
1.13 Median Time to Degree	IEPI VS	3.4	3.8	3.6	4.3	NA	4.0
COURSE-LEVEL OUTCOMES							
1.14 Course Success Rate	IEPI	68.3%	68.1%	68.0%	67.7%	67.7%	65%
1.15 ILO Mastery Rates	ACCJC	82.7%	82.3%	84.6%	85.5%	86.0%	80%
LICENSE EXAM PASS RATES							
1.16 Cosmetology License Exam Pass Rate	ACCJC	86.7%	84.2%	89.1%	88.8%	88.2%	83%
1.17 Registered Nursing License Exam Pass Rate	ACCJC	98.2%	87.0%	100%	85.1%	96.5%	89%
1.18 Respiratory Therapy License Exam Pass Rate	ACCJC	100%	100%	97.2%	94.4%	92.3%	94%

*Collected from different data source (SMC IR) versus the metric (Chancellor's Office)

Academics Dashboard (continued)

IE Indicator	Related to Other Metrics	IE REPORT YEAR					Institution-set Standard
		2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	
OTHER							
1.19 SMMUSD Graduates to SMC Rate		33.1%	31.9%	30.1%	37.1%	37.2%	NA
1.20 Percentage of WTH Taught by Full-time Instructional Faculty		--	--	--	49.3%	50.6%	NA
1.21 Percentage of Counseling Hours Fulfilled by Full-time Counselors (Non-Teaching)		--	--	--	42.9%	47.4%	NA

Key: Other Metrics

GP: Guided Pathways
VS: Vision for Success Goals
IEPI: Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Goals Framework
SSC: Student Success Scorecard
SWP: Strong Workforce Program
ACCJC: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Definitions and Defined Cohort Years

1.1: Enrolled in at least one credit course in a subsequent spring semester at SMC / Number of first-time students enrolled in at least one credit course in the fall of the selected year (students who enrolled in a community college for the first time in the summer of fall of the selected year, including those who had previously received concurrent enrollment credit). IE Report Year 2018: 2015-2016.
1.2: Enrolled 15 or more degree applicable credit units (excludes concurrent and summer units) in Year One / Number of first-time students enrolled in at least one credit course in the fall of the selected year (students who enrolled in a community college for the first time in the summer of fall of the selected year, including those who had previously received concurrent enrollment credit). IE Report Year 2018: 2015-2016.
1.3: Enrolled 30 or more degree applicable credit units (excludes concurrent and summer units) in Year One / Number of first-time students enrolled in at least one credit course in the fall of the selected year (students who enrolled in a community college for the first time in the summer of fall of the selected year, including those who had previously received concurrent enrollment credit). IE Report Year 2018: 2015-2016.
1.4: Completed with C or better in at least one transfer-level math course in Year One / Number of first-time students enrolled in at least one credit course in the fall of the selected year (students who enrolled in a community college for the first time in the summer of fall of the selected year, including those who had previously received concurrent enrollment credit). IE Report Year 2018: 2015-2016.
1.5: Completed with C or better in at least one transfer-level English course in Year One / Number of first-time students enrolled in at least one credit course in the fall of the selected year (students who enrolled in a community college for the first time in the summer of fall of the selected year, including those who had previously received concurrent enrollment credit). IE Report Year 2018: 2015-2016.
1.6: Enrolled in 9 or more degree applicable units of same 4-digit TOP code within 1 year of enrollment / Credit first-time freshmen with credential goal. IE Report Year 2018: Fall 2016 cohort. *Same as 2.2.*
1.7: # Associate Degrees awarded. IE Report Year 2018: 2016-2017.
1.8: # Certificates of Achievements awarded (does not include departmental certificates). IE Report Year 2018: 2016-2017.
1.9: # transferred to a UC, CSU, out-of-state, or in-state private institution. IE Report Year 2018: 2016-2017.
1.10: Transferred to a four-year institution, earned a certificate or AA/AS, or achieved transfer prepared status (completed 60 UC/CSU transferable units with 2.0 GPA or higher) within 6 years / First-time freshmen completed 6 units during first three years of enrollment with C/P or better & attempted any math or English course in first three years. IE Report Year 2018: 2011-2012 cohort.
1.11: Employed two fiscal quarters after exit / Enrolled in 0.5+ non-introductory course units in a CTE program and exited college following year: IE Report Year 2018: 2015-2016.
1.12: The median percentage change in wages for students who completed higher level CTE coursework in a given year and left the system without transferring or earning a degree or certificate. IE Report Year 2018: 2014-2015.
1.13: The median number of years from the time of a student's first enrollment in a CCC until the time they received an AA, AS, or ADT degree in the selected year at SMC. IE Report Year 2018: 2016-2017.
1.14: A, B, C, P grades / A, B, C, D, DR, F, I, NC, NP, P, W grades. IE Report Year 2018: Fall 2016.
1.15: Assessed as "mastered" SLO mapped to all five ILOs / Total SLO assessments in all five ILO (each SLO was counted once for each student for each section, even in cases where an SLO mapped to more than one core competency and/or ILO). IE Report Year 2018: Fall 2017.
1.16: Pass events / Test (written and practical) event by student who completed cosmetology coursework at SMC. IE Report Year 2018: 2017.
1.17: Passed NCLEX exam on first attempt / Earned an RN associate degree at SMC. IE Report Year 2018: 2016-2017.
1.18: Passed low cut CRT exam on first attempt / Earned a respiratory therapy associate degree at SMC/ELAC. IE Report Year 2018: 2017.
1.19: Enrolled in credit course at SMC within 1 year of HS graduation (summer to spring) / Graduated from public HS in SMMUSD. IE Report Year 2018: Class of 2016.
1.20: Sum weekly teacher hours taught by full-instructional faculty (includes overload, courses taught by counselors and librarians, reassigned time, leaves and sabbaticals) / Sum weekly teacher hours total. IE Report Year 2018: 2017-2018.
1.21: Sum counseling hours fulfilled by full-time counselors (excludes non-teaching) / Sum counseling hours total for semester. IE Report Year 2018: 2017-2018.

Student Support Dashboard

College goal: Provide access to comprehensive student learning resources such as library, tutoring, and technology; Provide access to comprehensive and innovative student support services such as admissions and records, counseling, assessment, outreach, and financial aid.

IE Indicator	Related to Other Metrics	IE REPORT YEAR				
		2014	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
2.1 First-time Freshmen Education Plan Rate	SSSP	--	--	62.4%	59.4%	86.6%
2.2 Attempt in Program of Study Courses	GP	10.0%	14.1%	12.2%	11.7%	12.6%
2.3 Student-Counseling Ratio	SSC	373:1	361:1	330:1	306:1	296:1
2.4 Probation Rate	NA	13.7%	13.6%	14.1%	12.5%	12.9%

Key: Other Metrics
GP: Guided Pathways
SSC: Student Success Scorecard
SSSP: Student Success and Support Program

Definitions and Defined Cohort Years

2.1: Completed an abbreviated and/or comprehensive education plan within 1 year of enrollment / Credit first-time freshmen not exempted from developing an education plan. IE Report Year 2018: Fall 2016 cohort.
2.2: Enrolled in 9 or more degree applicable units of same 4-digit TOP code within 1 year of enrollment / Credit first-time freshmen with credential goal. IE Report Year 2018: Fall 2016 cohort. ***Same as 1.6.***
2.3: Student headcount / Counseling faculty FTE (excluding EOPS & DSPS student and counseling FTE). IE Report Year 2018: Fall 2016 cohort.
2.4: On probation/disqualification / Credit students. IE Report Year 2018: Fall 2017.

Fiscal Dashboard

College goal: Respond to dynamic fiscal conditions through ongoing evaluation and reallocation of existing resources and the development of new resources.

IE Indicator	Related to Other Reports	FISCAL YEAR				
		2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3.1 Structural Surplus/(Deficit) ($)		(5,382,904)	736,115	(1,851,658)	(769,146)	(8,446,816)
3.2 Operating Excess/(Deficit) ($)	IEPI	(4,616,562)	3,450,969	(190,202)	10,144,014	(2,553,817)
Revenue		133,916,853	144,945,575	150,456,338	176,032,586	170,106,597
Expenditures		138,533,415	141,494,606	150,646,540	165,888,572	172,660,414
3.3 Cash Balance ($)	IEPI	30,696,724	18,053,394	29,518,129	43,529,169	38,605,671
3.4 Fund Balance ($)	IEPI	10,520,810	13,971,779	13,781,577	23,925,591	21,371,774
3.5 Fund Balance Ratio (%)	IEPI	7.59%	9.87%	9.15%	14.42%	12.38%
3.6 Percentage of Expenditures Spent on Academic Salaries		46.9%	47.7%	48.6%	45.8%	45.5%
Faculty		43.0%	43.5%	44.3%	41.8%	41.5%
Academic Administrators		4.0%	4.2%	4.3%	4.0%	4.1%
3.7 Percentage of Expenditures Spent on Classified Salaries		21.2%	20.7%	20.1%	19.8%	20.1%
Staff		18.2%	17.8%	17.2%	16.7%	16.8%
Managers		3.0%	2.9%	2.9%	3.2%	3.3%
3.8 Percentage of Expenditures Spent on Benefits		21.2%	20.4%	20.5%	22.9%	23.7%
3.9 Percentage of Expenditures Spent on Supplies		0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.7%	0.6%
3.10 Percentage of Expenditures Spent on Contract		9.7%	10.4%	10.1%	10.0%	10.0%
3.11 Percentage of Expenditures Spent on Capital		0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%
3.12 Revenue: Non-Resident Tuition ($)		24,731,024	27,182,917	31,065,989	33,038,107	33,434,401
3.13 Revenue: State Apportionment ($)		97,760,511	107,612,255	108,863,088	116,902,982	121,723,796
3.14 Revenue: Other ($)		11,320,648	10,043,497	10,419,522	26,015,769	14,870,972
3.15 Non-Resident FTES		4049.22	4277.62	4625.63	4746.20	4797.47
3.16 FTES Served	IEPI	21,265.24	21,414.86	21,686.49	21,715.13	21,258.92
3.17 FTES Claimed (Funded)		20,729.83	21,201.17	21,686.49	22,028.41	22,023.83

Key: Other Metrics

IEPI: Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Goals Framework

Definitions

3.1: Net increase or decrease in unrestricted general fund balance (**excludes** one-time items)
3.2: Net increase or decrease in unrestricted general fund balance (**includes** one-time items)
3.3: Unrestricted and restricted general fund cash balance, excluding investments
3.4: Ending unrestricted general fund balance ($)
3.5: Ending unrestricted general fund balance as a percentage of total expenditures
3.6: Percentage of unrestricted general fund expenditures (excluding other outgoing expenditures) spent on salaries of academic personnel (management and faculty)
3.7: Percentage of unrestricted general fund expenditures (excluding other outgoing expenditures) spent on salaries of Classified personnel (management and staff)
3.8: Percentage of unrestricted general fund expenditures (excluding other outgoing expenditures) spent on benefits
3.9: Percentage of unrestricted general fund expenditures (excluding other outgoing expenditures) spent on supplies
3.10: Percentage of unrestricted general fund expenditures (excluding other outgoing expenditures) spent on contracts
3.11: Percentage of unrestricted general fund expenditures (excluding other outgoing expenditures) spent on capital
3.12: Fees paid by international and out-of-state residents and Intensive English Program students
3.13: Total revenue generated through state apportionment (based on FTES claimed)
3.14: Total revenue generated by other sources
3.15: Total hours of non-resident enrollments (credit and non-credit) divided by 525
3.16: FTES generated through course enrollment
3.17: FTES paid for through state apportionment

College Infrastructure Dashboard

College goal: Apply sustainable practices to maintain and enhance the College's facilities and infrastructure including grounds, buildings, and technology.

IE Indicator	FISCAL YEAR				
	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
4.1 Electricity Usage (kWh) by Sq. Foot	12.59	12.38	11.81	11.92	13.66
4.2 Gas Usage (BTU) by Sq. Foot	15,567	13,899	11,409	13,570	14,791
4.3 Average Vehicle Ridership (AVR) - Employees	1.53	1.51	1.52	1.51	1.58
4.4 Central IT FTEs per 1000 Institutional FTEs	NA	NA	NA	NA	3.55
4.5 Maintenance APPA Standard Level (1 – best; 5 – worst)	NA	NA	NA	NA	3
4.6 Operations APPA Standard Level (1 – best; 5 – worst)	NA	NA	NA	NA	3

Definitions

4.1: Annual electricity usage in kilowatt-hour (kWh) by the gross square footage from space inventory (not including space that does not meter electricity)
4.2: Annual natural gas usage in British Thermal Unit (BTU) by the gross square footage from space inventory (not including space that does not use or meter gas)
4.3: Employees worked per week day in survey week / Vehicles used to commute to work per week day in survey week (2016-2017: Fall 2016)
4.4: Central IT FTEs / [(Employee FTE + Student Worker FTE + Student FTES)/1000] (2016-2017: Fall 2016)
4.5: Standard level assessed by the Association of Physical Plant Administrators (APPA) based on a formula including maintenance technician staffing levels, maintenance square feet, staffing factors, age of facilities, variation of facilities, campus mission, and facilities maintenance levels criteria. Level 1 (best) to Level 5; APPA recommends level 1 or 2
4.6 Standard level assessed by the Association of Physical Plant Administrators (APPA) based on a formula including custodian staffing levels, cleaning square feet (CSF), types of facilities, usages of facilities, flooring types, tasks performed, and cleaning levels.
Level 1 (best) to Level 5; APPA recommends level 1 or 2

Collegiality Dashboard

College goal: Employ decision-making and communication processes that respect the diverse needs of the entire college community.

IE Indicator	IE REPORT YEAR				
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
5.1 Average Length of Service	NA	NA	NA	12.21	11.80
5.2 Faculty Diversity Gap (% Faculty URM - % Students URM)	-27.1%	-27.2%	-26.4%	-26.2%	-24.7%
5.3 Diversity in Faculty Hiring	NA	38.1%	26.0%	20.0%	48.5%
5.4 Employee Satisfaction: Campus Culture & Policies	NA	NA	NA	NA	3.29
5.5 Employee Satisfaction: Work Environment	NA	NA	NA	NA	3.56

Definitions

5.1: Full-time employees only employed in Spring semester. IE Report Year 2018: Spring 2018.

5.2: (% of full and part-time faculty from an underrepresented minority group or URM) – (% of credit students from an URM group). URM includes Black, Hispanic, and Native American/Alaskan Native. Data reflect fall terms (IE Report Year 2018: Fall 2017)

5.3: Percentage of full-time faculty hired who were from an URM group (IE Report Year 2018: 2017-2018)

5.4: Average satisfaction scores on 30 items related to campus culture and policies (1 = not satisfied at all; 2 = not very satisfied; 3 = somewhat satisfied; 4 = satisfied; 5 = very satisfied). IE Report Year 2018: Fall 2017.

5.5: Average satisfaction scores on 21 items related to work environment (1 = not satisfied at all; 2 = not very satisfied; 3 = somewhat satisfied; 4 = satisfied; 5 = very satisfied). IE Report Year 2018: Fall 2017.

Equity Dashboard

Based on data reported in the SMC Equity Plan: http://www.smc.edu/EnrollmentDevelopment/InstitutionalResearch/Pages/Student-Equity.aspx

EQUITY METRIC	TARGET POPULATION	IE Report Year				MOST CURRENT YEAR'S PERFORMANCE	COMPARISON GROUP PERFORMANCE	EQUITY GAP (Most Recent Year)
		2015	2016	2017	2018			
A. ACCESS	**MALE**	2.5%	3.3%	3.7%	3.9%	**45.6%** of credit population in Fall 2016 is male	**49.5%** of service area population is male	**3.9%**
	BLACK	1.4%	1.6%	1.8%	1.8%	**10.5%** of credit population in Fall 2016 is Black	**12.3%** of service area population is Black	**1.8%**
	HISPANIC	2.2%	1.0%	0.5%	0.4%	**43.9%** of credit population in Fall 2016 is Hispanic	**43.5%** of service area population is Hispanic	**0.4%**
B. COURSE SUCCESS	**FOSTER YOUTH**	19.1%	10.3%	26.7%	16.4%	**53.0%** Course success rate of Foster Youth (2015-2016)	**69.4%** Overall course success – all students	**16.4%**
	BLACK	14.3%	13.6%	13.6%	13.9%	**55.5%** Course success rate of Black students (2015-2016)	**69.4%** Overall course success – all students	**13.9%**
	HISPANIC	5.8%	6.6%	6.9%	6.6%	**62.7%** Course success rate of Hispanic students (2015-2016)	**69.4%** Overall course success – all students	**6.6%**
	VETERAN	3.8%	3.2%	3.6%	3.5%	**65.9%** Course success rate of Veteran students (2015-2016)	**69.3%** Overall course success – all students	**3.5%**
	LOW-INCOME	9.2%	4.5%	4.7%	5.1%	**64.6%** Course success rate of low-income students (2015-2016)	**69.3%** Overall course success – all students	**5.1%**
C. BASIC SKILLS ENGLISH COMPLETION	**BLACK**	26.9%	27.3%	28.2%	32.4%	**30.9%** Completion rate of Black Students (2010-2011)	**63.3%** Completion rate of highest performing group (Asian)	**32.4%**
	HISPANIC	16.8%	14.3%	13.8%	16.6%	**46.7%** Completion rate of Hispanic Students (2010-2011)	**63.3%** Completion rate of highest performing group (Asian)	**16.6%**
	LOW-INCOME	1.8%	1.7%	2.1%	0%	**46.6%** Completion rate of low-income students (2010-2011)	**45.5%** Completion rate of not low income students	**0%**

EQUITY METRIC	TARGET POPULATION	2015	2016	2017	2018	MOST CURRENT YEAR'S PERFORMANCE	COMPARISON GROUP PERFORMANCE	EQUITY GAP
C. ESL COMPLETION	**BLACK**	**NA**	**21.8%**	**17.8%**	**15.2%**	**50.0%** Completion rate of Black Students (2010-2011)	**65.2%** Completion rate of highest performing group (Asian)	**15.2%**
	HISPANIC	**17.9%**	**17.8%**	**14.4%**	**22.5%**	**42.6%** Completion rate of Hispanic Students (2010-2011)	**65.2%** Completion rate of highest performing group (Asian)	**22.5%**
C. BASIC SKILLS MATH COMPLETION	**BLACK**	**27.2%**	**29.6%**	**21.3%**	**26.0%**	**16.4%** Completion rate of Black Students (2010-2011)	**42.4%** Completion rate of highest performing group (Asian/White)	**26.0%**
	HISPANIC	**16.7%**	**19.8%**	**9.3%**	**12.8%**	**29.6%** Completion rate of Hispanic Students (2010-2011)	**42.4%** Completion rate of highest performing group (Asian/White)	**12.8%**
D. CTE COMPLETION					No groups were identified as target groups for in the Student Equity Plan			
E. TRANSFER	**BLACK**	**10.5%**	**19.8%**	**15.7%**	**5.7%**	**76.8%** Completion rate of Black Students (2010-2011)	**82.5%** Completion rate of highest performing group (White)	**5.7%**
	HISPANIC	**14.9%**	**16.6%**	**14.0%**	**15.8%**	**66.7%** Completion rate of Hispanic Students (2010-2011)	**82.5%** Completion rate of highest performing group (White)	**15.8%**

*Absolute value of gap; decreasing trends in gap values suggest improvement on the metric.

Definitions

A: Equity gap = (Percentage of demographic group represented in the community) – (Percentage of same demographic group represented among credit students)

B: Equity gap = (Overall course success rate) – (Course success rate of target group)

C: Equity gap = (Percentage of students who began English, ESL, math sequence in basic skills and successfully completed a degree-applicable English, ESL, math course within six years for the highest performing group) – (Percentage of students who began English, ESL, math sequence in basic skills and successfully completed a degree-applicable English, ESL, math course within six years for the target group)

D: NA

E: Equity gap = (Percentage of transfer directed students who completed transferable English and math course who transferred to a four-year institution within six years for the highest performing group) – (Percentage of transfer directed students who completed transferable English and math course who transferred to a four-year institution within six years for the target group)

Appendix: Glossary of Terms

Metric: a quantitative indicator identified as being important in informing institutional effectiveness.

The set of metrics on the IE Dashboard was purposefully designed to measure the College's supporting goals. The indicators rely only on data that are systematically and regularly collected as they need to be monitored and tracked on an annual basis.

Institutional effectiveness is not intended for reporting to external agencies such as ACCJC and the California Community College Chancellor's Office. Instead, institutional effectiveness primarily functions as an internal tool for the College to engage in self-evaluation. However, when possible and appropriate, ,metrics were aligned with and/or built on metrics in federal and statewide accountability and research reports and requirements, including the Student Success Scorecard, the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI), the Vision for Success Goals, and Guided Pathways Framework.

Institutional effectiveness metrics are:
- ✓ **Stable, consistent, and fair:** Focuses on measures that can be at least somewhat influenced by the College;

- ✓ **Aggregated and institution-focused:** Includes aggregated student and institutional data on major college milestones and outcomes. The key indicators avoid data that are too narrow or focus on evaluating specific programs or departments;

- ✓ **Purely descriptive:** Does not provide a causal (scientific) explanation (the "whys?") for trends in performance. They do not help us understand the relationship between inputs and outcomes, they simply describe the performance; and,

- ✓ **Purposeful:** Are meaningful to stakeholders. Indicators are not simply a "fact book" collection of data.

The set of IE metrics reported do not depict a complete picture of the College but provides a starting point for building a functional framework for monitoring institutional effectiveness. The metrics are useful in providing meaningful feedback for informing the institutional goals and objectives.

Dashboard: a visual tool monitoring the college's performance on the key indicators which highlights trends and patterns. The dashboards, when reviewed together, provide a balanced view of institutional effectiveness.

Institution-Set Standard: standards reflecting satisfactory performance of student learning and achievement. Institution-set standards are defined for each indicator directly measuring student performance, such as course success, transfer, and degree completion. Institution-set standards were reported for the first time in the 2013 Institutional Effectiveness Report in response to new US Department of Education regulations requiring colleges to set standards for student success metrics.

Target: a measurable outcome expressed either as a quantifiable value (for example, a target of 75%) or a trend (for example, year-over-year decrease), when achieved, will meaningfully move the needle on institutional effectiveness by the end of the five-year cycle by 2020-2021.

Performance Year: the indicator value of the most recently reported year of institutional effectiveness.

Central Stakeholders: campus personnel or groups directly responsible for or impacted by an IE indicator. For example, the central stakeholders for the metrics related to transfer may include the Redesign (Guided Pathways) inquiry groups, the Senior Administrative Dean of Counseling, the Counseling Department Chair, and the Transfer Center Faculty Leader.