Theme 4: How will we measure success?

Committee members: Alice Aguiar   Jane King
Vincent Balasco   Bill LeBlanc
Pranab Banerjee   Jeanne Mullaney
Marjorie Briody   Jaime Nash
Lee Chartier   Michelle O’Brien
Bill Ferland   Holly Susi
Joanne Galliano

Strategic goal #1: Initiate the design and implementation of a structured, comprehensive, flexible measurement process to support ongoing strategic planning initiatives and evaluation. The overall criteria (architecture) for the recommended measurement process follow, while specific design (blueprint) must await submission of final reports by other committees.

Rationale: Key to the success of our Strategic Plan will be its execution, i.e., actual performance in achieving critical goals and initiatives. The college’s strategic goals, standards, and criteria which will be established by Committees 1, 2 and 3 will form the strategic targets towards which our progress must be assessed. Thus, an ongoing measurement process is essential to gauge performance against plan, with data available presented in a consistent, informative and easily accessible manner to all appropriate constituents. Such a process, properly implemented, can also serve as the basis for a more integrated information resource for statistical reports of institutional status, progress, achievements, etc.

Responsible areas: Primary: Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Contributing: Applicable divisions/departments.

Performance indicators: Structured, periodic review of the measurement process and a client satisfaction survey.

Strategic goal #2: Implement a revised Strategic Planning Peer Group, per Attachment C, irrespective of the degree to which Recommendation One is approved and implemented.

Rationale: A comparison to other colleges can serve to gauge our performance among both comparable and aspirational peers.

Responsible areas: Primary: Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Contributing: Advisory group made up of two or more members from Strategic Planning Committee 4

Performance indicators: Revised peer group (See attachment D).
Attachment A. Measurement Process (MP) Design Guidelines

Objectives:
- To serve as the principal quantitative resource for assessing the relationship between CCRI’s actual organizational performance and its Strategic Plan/direction. (To assist in answering “How will we measure success?”)
- To aid in providing a periodic public report of CCRI’s academic and economic impact on RI (To assist in answering “What is the return on the taxpayers’ investment?”)

Integration:
- The primary data source for the measurement system will likely be the college’s main computer application systems (currently Banner and related systems), but must also incorporate other applicable automated and manual, internal and external data systems and reporting processes.

Scope:
- The recommended measurement process should be designed to accommodate measurements of both academic effectiveness and organizational efficiency, with clear and direct linkage to specific goals and initiatives as identified in the Strategic Plan.

While measurement specifics must await final reports of other committees, the following theme areas and associated core indicators are anticipated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Areas</th>
<th>Potential Core Indicator Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to the college</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student progress and achievement</td>
<td>Completion rate (transfer rate + graduation rate),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retention rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving the community</td>
<td>Service hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce development</td>
<td>Total training hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational efficiency</td>
<td>Student/Faculty ratio, Cost/Credit hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, a small advisory group would be established for each theme area to ensure effective ongoing monitoring. Each group would be composed of faculty/staff members with responsibilities and expertise best suited to the specific theme area. Each group would be responsible for monitoring, assessment, and interpretation of its theme area and reporting accordingly to the Measurement Process Advisory Group.

Comparatives:
- A strategic planning peer group of other community colleges will be developed with both Comparable and Aspirational institutions included. This group will serve as a benchmark guideline to assess CCRI’s progress from an external viewpoint, both in terms of academic effectiveness as well as organizational efficiency. Composition of this group will be periodically reviewed and changed as deemed appropriate.
Deliverables:

- Measurement process deliverables would be implemented over three stages, with electronic delivery as the primary methodology, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Measurement Area</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | 2009/10    | Academic core indicators | Comparison of current period measures to:  
- specific strategic goals  
- Internal historical data  
- External peer group | Monthly summary of performance to plan  
Quarterly detail report of performance to plan  
Annual “State of the College” report | Primary: Electronic  
Secondary: Paper (as required) |
|       |            | Organizational efficiency core indicators | Comparison of current period measures to:  
- specific strategic goals  
- Internal historical data  
- External peer group | Monthly summary of performance to plan  
Quarterly detail report of performance to plan  
Annual “State of the College” report | Primary: Electronic  
Secondary: Paper (as required) |
| 2     | 2010/11    | Macro organizational performance | “Critical few” key organizational performance indicators such as  
- enrollment  
- retention  
- cost/credit hour | Daily | Primary: Electronic Dashboard |
| 3     | 2011/12    | CCRI impact on RI Economy | Impact of CCRI performance on State economy in terms of:  
- student perspective  
- taxpayer perspective  
- community impact  
- business perspective | Annual | Primary: Electronic  
Secondary: Paper (as required) |

Timeframe:

- It is recommended that the measurement process be implemented as an accelerated, evolutionary development of current measurement processes, principally originating in the office of IR, in a new section known as Institutional Measurement (IM) or Institutional Effectiveness (IE).
- The measurement process will be best implemented over a three year period beginning in 2009, and ending in 2012.
- The initial system should provide essential specific measurement indicators as deemed necessary by final reports of other strategic planning committees. It is recommended that subsequent year upgrades include such accessibility improvements as “dashboard” quick indicators, increased integration of the measurement process with the college’s main application systems and reports for public consumption as to institutional impact on local economy.
Resources:
- Allocation of the following resources is recommended to enable realization of these recommendations:
  - Office of Institutional Research and Planning – initially ½ FTE, to increase to 1 FTE
  - IT – High priority and allocation of data, software, resources, etc.
  - Subscription/license fees for external data and/or software resources

Sustainability:
- It is recommended that Committee #4, with some change in membership, serve as an ongoing advisory group to the Office of Institutional Research. It is also recommended that periodic, structured review (and modification as necessary) of the measurement process be conducted to ensure its continued value and relevance, including a regular assessment or survey of the college community to serve as a performance indicator of the measurement process itself.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Purpose/Description</th>
<th>Comment/Amplification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Objective               | • To assist in assessing the relationship between CCRI’s actual organizational performance (and execution) and its Strategic Plan/Direction  
• To aid in providing a public report of CCRI’s academic and economic impact on RI | • To provide data, information, and analysis of CCRI’s execution of its Vision, Mission, Strategy.  
• Enable adjustment/adaptation as may be required  
• Provide informational basis for continuous improvement  |
| Drivers                 | • Goals and Initiatives as developed by Committees 1, 2, 3.  
• Requests/Directives of Executive Mgt  
• Req. of BOG | • As specified in Committee reports re Enrollment, Demographics, Curriculum, Resource allocation etc  
• Interim and/or tactical initiatives  
• Legislative, regulatory, policy directives  |
| Data Sources            | As inclusive as practical, utilizing internal and external data and information, as appropriate, to accomplish MP objective. | Emphasis to be on quantitative data from internal sources (extant systems, reports, data repositories, etc), as well as external sources (industry norms, peer group, etc.)  
Qualitative data (research findings, surveys, focus groups, etc) which contributes to MP objective to also be included, as appropriate.  |
| Characteristics         | The MP must be:  
• Informative  
• Timely  
• Adaptive  
• Relevant  
• Integrated | Data which are current, meaningful & instructive  
Updated continually  
Can quickly adjust to new req.  
Information is tightly linked to Vision/Mission/Strategy (VMS), including such potential core indicators as: Institutional Growth/Change, College Access, Student Achievement, Community/Economic Impact, Workforce Dev, Org Effectiveness/Efficiency, etc.  
Data from disparate sources is blended into meaningful whole  |
| Accessibility           | • On Line Reports, Dashboard, Reference Data  
• Paper Reports  
• Targeted specialty pieces | On line via CCRI normal network as well as Internet via website.  
Appropriate security and access controls for various constituencies, especially re internal vs. external.  
Minimal paper reporting  |
| Org Positioning         | Primary: Office of IR  
Secondary: Applicable Div/Depts | The MP is best managed by a single org. unit for purposes of consistency and integration, with participative support and contribution from other applicable organizational Divisions and Departments  |
| Context                 | • Performance re Strategy  
• Comparison to Peers  
• Economic impact | Specific linkage of performance data to goals and initiatives  
Performance against selected peers (comparable & aspirational) for both academic effectiveness and organizational efficiency  
RI Economic impact of CCRI’s application of resources, performance, etc  |
| Data Presentation       | • Current (or most recent) period data  
• Perspectives  
• Historical context  
• Projection  
• Scope | Totals, Calculations, etc. based on latest data.  
Graphical representations of trends & patterns over time  
Previous time period(s) as applicable with relation to current period.  
Basic “modeling” of anticipated data directions, patterns, etc  
Brevity and Detail, per user selection  |
| Implementation          | Staged Phases over planned timeframe | To occur over multiple stages (2-3 yrs) to accommodate realities of time and other resource restrictions, with each stage introducing successively more features and function  
Initial system will provide essential specific measurement indicators as deemed necessary by final reports of other Strategic Planning Committees. It is recommended that subsequent year upgrades include such accessibility improvements as “dashboard” quick indicators, increased integration of MP with College main application systems, and reports for public consumption as to institutional impact on local economy.  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>No. of Sites</th>
<th>Fall 2007 Full-Time UCs</th>
<th>Fall 2007 Part-Time UCs</th>
<th>Fall 2007 Total HC Enroll.</th>
<th>Full-time HC Enroll. (Full Time + Part Time Div.) (By 3)</th>
<th>FTE Calc. based on Fall 2007 (Full Time + Part Time Div.) (By 3)</th>
<th>FTE Calc. for FY 2008-2009 (12 month credit hour activity)</th>
<th>Min. Percentage (Data from College Navigator 7/08)</th>
<th>Full-time Ret. Rate Fall 2007</th>
<th>Part-time Ret. Rate Fall 2007</th>
<th>12 Month Undep. Credit Head Count 2006-07</th>
<th>12 Month Instruct. Activity Credit Hours</th>
<th>06-07 CUPA Survey Faculty Coll., Bing, and Web Sites</th>
<th>Total Revenue and other Additions (2005-2007)</th>
<th>Total Operating Expenses (2006-2007)</th>
<th>Cost of Instruction 2006-2007</th>
<th>IPEDS Cohort 2004 Transfer Out Rate in 2007-08</th>
<th>Rate of Graduation within 100% or Normal Time in 2007-08</th>
<th>Compliance Rate (TRQ + Grad)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bergen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>7,047</td>
<td>15,297</td>
<td>10,246</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>20,769</td>
<td>283,271</td>
<td>FT Only</td>
<td>19,427,513</td>
<td>85,909,146</td>
<td>37,615,328</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,341</td>
<td>11,350</td>
<td>18,691</td>
<td>11,124</td>
<td>12,113</td>
<td>12,841</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>FT Only</td>
<td>117,138,180</td>
<td>141,264,690</td>
<td>62,171,514</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,107</td>
<td>11,118</td>
<td>18,525</td>
<td>11,113</td>
<td>12,841</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>FT Only</td>
<td>117,138,180</td>
<td>141,264,690</td>
<td>62,171,514</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,660</td>
<td>12,766</td>
<td>19,426</td>
<td>10,115</td>
<td>11,763</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27,817</td>
<td>352,865</td>
<td>FT Only</td>
<td>119,779,551</td>
<td>153,587,107</td>
<td>63,775,426</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,685</td>
<td>11,676</td>
<td>17,334</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>13,570</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>26,173</td>
<td>407,160</td>
<td>FT Only</td>
<td>118,010,350</td>
<td>117,539,198</td>
<td>48,457,156</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,292</td>
<td>7,449</td>
<td>14,741</td>
<td>9,775</td>
<td>10,251</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22,466</td>
<td>306,342</td>
<td>FT Only</td>
<td>145,057,362</td>
<td>84,775,679</td>
<td>24,250,195</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,344</td>
<td>8,680</td>
<td>14,994</td>
<td>9,227</td>
<td>9,418</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>19,866</td>
<td>283,411</td>
<td>FT Only</td>
<td>114,163,774</td>
<td>108,839,885</td>
<td>53,480,733</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,310</td>
<td>10,501</td>
<td>16,811</td>
<td>9,610</td>
<td>9,560</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22,268</td>
<td>329,082</td>
<td>FT Only</td>
<td>18,972,322</td>
<td>96,803,722</td>
<td>42,852,120</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer AVG</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,956</td>
<td>10,011</td>
<td>16,967</td>
<td>10,293</td>
<td>11,344</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24,983</td>
<td>366,370</td>
<td>FT Only</td>
<td>12,340,710</td>
<td>115,326,942</td>
<td>47,741,973</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirational Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookdale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,893</td>
<td>6,132</td>
<td>14,025</td>
<td>9,837</td>
<td>10,033</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>20,314</td>
<td>301,584</td>
<td>FT Only</td>
<td>18,096,324</td>
<td>98,541,236</td>
<td>36,185,574</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidewater</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9,161</td>
<td>16,576</td>
<td>25,852</td>
<td>14,740</td>
<td>16,312</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>37,771</td>
<td>499,361</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>146,999,094</td>
<td>109,006,250</td>
<td>53,320,445</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirational Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,432</td>
<td>7,050</td>
<td>17,482</td>
<td>12,782</td>
<td>13,513</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30,976</td>
<td>405,865</td>
<td>FT Only</td>
<td>115,405,867</td>
<td>123,016,395</td>
<td>42,727,026</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,291</td>
<td>14,575</td>
<td>23,866</td>
<td>14,149</td>
<td>15,110</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>29,148</td>
<td>453,068</td>
<td>FT Only</td>
<td>240,753,264</td>
<td>224,728,580</td>
<td>62,525,372</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparable Sub Groups:**
Those institutions which are reasonably similar to CCRI in Type (size, structure, etc) and Performance (Academic and Efficiency Indicators).

**Aspirational Efficiency:** Colleges whose organizational efficiency indicators are at a point we wish to reach, such as cost/credit hour, student/faculty ratio, etc.

**Aspirational Academic:** Colleges whose academic performance measurements are at a point we wish to reach, such as Completion rate, Retention rate, etc.