

# SHORELINE COMMUNITY COLLEGE CORE THEMES SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE FOLLOW-UP REPORT

March 29, 2019

In Summer of 2018, Shoreline Community College submitted a substantive change proposal to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities with revised core themes, core theme objectives, and core theme indicators. This report describes revisions made based on feedback from an NWCCU review panel provided during a conference call on October 10, 2018. In addition, Shoreline completed an ad hoc self-study with visit October 30 – 31, and preliminary feedback from the ad hoc evaluator contributed to clarifying needed revisions to the proposed core theme indicators. This report is further informed by two trainings provided by NWCCU: *Successful Practices for Assessing Core Themes and Student Learning Outcomes for Mission Fulfillment* (Webinar, October 19, 2018); *Assessment Essentials Workshop* (In-person seminar, January 15, 2019).

This report is organized according to three categories of comments expressed by the panel as well as the ad hoc peer evaluator about what needs to be clarified with the proposed core theme indicators: (1) appropriate measures for student learning; (2) thresholds for determining whether objectives have been met; and (3) a mechanism for indicator data to inform actions.

## **1. Measures for student learning**

### ***General Education***

For three consecutive years, Shoreline has engaged in campus-wide studies of the College's general education learning outcomes. Faculty have worked closely with the Office of Institutional Assessment and Data Management in the design and implementation of these projects, with the goal of not only understanding how the Shoreline educational experience contributes to students' knowledge and skills related to the outcomes, but also sparking faculty conversation about how to make these outcomes more relevant to their course outcomes and to students themselves.

All of these studies involve direct evidence of student learning, with faculty evaluating either students' responses to standardized prompts or existing assignments. The design employed for this research is cross-sectional, meaning that a broad sample of student work is assessed, comparing results according to what Shoreline learning opportunities (i.e., types of classes) students have or have not experienced.

One advantage of this approach is that it accommodates the wide range of experiences students have while at Shoreline; while a longitudinal or pre- to post- method might be preferable, the nature of our students' enrollment does not lend itself to this methodology. Another advantage is that a cross-sectional approach provides flexibility in the timing of the assessment, and could potentially be scaled to multiple studies per year.

The disadvantage is that it can be challenging to control for potential confound variables in the analysis: how do we know if differences between groups is due to the Shoreline learning experience? Despite this limitation, faculty have been ready to engage in the results to try and understand the implications for Shoreline curriculum as well as their own teaching.

When considering how to include results from these general education as meaningful indicators, the original substantive change proposal included a correlation analysis. To clarify the purpose and rationale of the

analyses, and based on feedback from the substantive change panel, these results have been reframed as effect size (using Cohen's *d*), comparing students who have and have not had relevant learning opportunities at Shoreline. The proposed threshold for this indicator is an effect size that is at least moderate (See Appendix A).

### ***Program Level Outcomes***

Based on feedback from the substantive change panel and the ad hoc evaluator, the indicator related to program-level outcomes was modified to add clarity around the thresholds associated with these assessments. As noted, only two programs have engaged in a full assessment of a capstone project or signature assignment; the past two years have focused on familiarizing professional-technical faculty with rubric-based assessment of program outcomes.

This year, four more program (Visual Communications Technology, Film, Business Administration, and Music Technology) will engage in an assessment of program-level outcomes. This work will be facilitated by Shoreline's Director of Employer Engagement as well as the Associate Dean for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment. Both of these are relatively new positions at Shoreline (introduced in 2017-18 and 2016-17, respectively).

## **2. Thresholds**

During discussion with the substantive change panel, the question was raised about minimum thresholds indicating the College might not be meeting its mission. As discussed, Shoreline has been using baseline data as a minimum threshold. To clarify and systematize threshold definition, definitions of four possible levels ("At Target", "Promising," "Monitor," and "Concern"), to identify areas in which the College may not be meeting its mission (See Appendix A).

## **3. Use of data**

For ongoing monitoring of these indicators, Shoreline has introduced a Lean Management tool referred to as the "A3-X," to demonstrate alignment between an organization's initiatives and goals. Appendix B has included Shoreline's version of this tool as the primary mechanism for the Board of Trustees to monitor mission fulfillment.

The focus of this tool is the top left-hand corner showing assessment, collapsing data within each category of indicator, across the Core Themes. Symbols indicate the percentage of measures within each category that are either "at target" or making progress (i.e., "promising"). When fewer than 35% of measures are not showing progress, the College can describe actions taken or planned to address those aspects of mission.

## **4. Additional updates**

In addition to the revisions described above, the indicators, measures, and monitoring tool (A3-X) have been refined based on review by the Board of Trustees, Executive Team, and strategic steering committees. In addition, many of the measures have been revised because updated information has become available from the Washington State Board of Community and Technical Colleges.

## Appendix B: Board Monitoring Tool (A3-X)

### DEFINITIONS

Term	Notes		
<i>Enrolled in transfer programs</i>	Students who indicate, at registration, that their purpose for attending is “Transferring to a four-year University” OR have no purpose listed and have an “Intent” listed as transfer. This definition may need to be refined based on course-taking.		
<i>Enrolled in professional-technical programs</i>	Students who indicate, at registration, that their purpose for attending is either “taking courses related to current or future work” or “explore career direction” or have no purpose listed and have “Intent” as professional-technical. Enrollment in a competitive program is defined as taking the first course in the curriculum sequence of the program.		
<i>Enrolled in basic skills courses</i>	Students who indicate, at registration, that their purpose for attending is to obtain a high school diploma or GED certificate OR who are enrolled in a basic skills course (CIP code starts with 32) and NOT in an academic or prof-tech course.		
<i>Community-based offerings</i>	<p>Classes or events that may or may not be credit-bearing that serve an educational or cultural need for a Shoreline community. To be included, sign-in sheets need to be used and all audience members need to be offered a survey to be returned at exit, including three questions that are common to all the surveys. Community education is a subset of Community Engagement, which is a broader term and not necessarily part of assessing our core theme, but part of our strategic plan and vision. (revised 2/20/18)</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top; width: 50%;"> <p><u>Community Education</u>                      Parent Education courses                      Continuing education classes                          - Skill-builders                          - Hobby classes                      Senior waiver students                      Community music ensembles                      Global Affairs Center events                      Seattle International Film Festival                      Performances that include educational component (lecture, meet-the-artist)                      Solar Fest                      Music department events                      Camps</p> </td> <td style="vertical-align: top; width: 50%;"> <p><u>Community Events</u>                      Party like its 1965, 1975 &amp; 1985                      Rotary club meetings                      Event rentals                      Athletic Events                      Performances without additional lecture</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p><u>Community Education</u>                      Parent Education courses                      Continuing education classes                          - Skill-builders                          - Hobby classes                      Senior waiver students                      Community music ensembles                      Global Affairs Center events                      Seattle International Film Festival                      Performances that include educational component (lecture, meet-the-artist)                      Solar Fest                      Music department events                      Camps</p>	<p><u>Community Events</u>                      Party like its 1965, 1975 &amp; 1985                      Rotary club meetings                      Event rentals                      Athletic Events                      Performances without additional lecture</p>
<p><u>Community Education</u>                      Parent Education courses                      Continuing education classes                          - Skill-builders                          - Hobby classes                      Senior waiver students                      Community music ensembles                      Global Affairs Center events                      Seattle International Film Festival                      Performances that include educational component (lecture, meet-the-artist)                      Solar Fest                      Music department events                      Camps</p>	<p><u>Community Events</u>                      Party like its 1965, 1975 &amp; 1985                      Rotary club meetings                      Event rentals                      Athletic Events                      Performances without additional lecture</p>		
<i>Historically under-represented and under-served groups</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender in non-traditional professional-technical programs (access indicators only)</li> <li>• Socio-economic status, defined by Pell eligibility (access indicators only)</li> <li>• First generation status (access indicators only)</li> </ul>		

Term	Notes														
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Race-ethnicity: Based on students' self-identification in response to any race or ethnicity questions, historically under-represented minority groups include Native American, Alaska Native, Hispanic/Latino/a, Black/African-American, Pacific Islander</li> </ul>														
<i>Shoreline educational experience</i>	In the context of learning outcomes assessment, this term refers to the learning opportunities students have had related to the general education outcomes; for example, is students' ability to write effectively (as demonstrated in an assessment tool) correlated with the number of writing-intensive classes they have taken.														
<i>Gender non-traditional programs</i>	<p>Programs that train students for fields that are historically dominated (75% or more) by one gender. For Shoreline, these programs include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Automotive - Women</li> <li>• Nursing - Men</li> <li>• Nursing Assistant Certified - Men</li> <li>• Manufacturing- Women</li> <li>• Clean Energy Technology- Women</li> <li>• Music Technology-Women</li> <li>• Digital Film Production-Women</li> <li>• Health Informatics and Information Management-Men</li> <li>• Dental Hygiene-Men</li> <li>• Education-Men</li> </ul>														
<i>Competitive programs</i>	Shoreline programs that require, at least, completion of a set of prerequisites with a minimum GPA to be admitted to the program. These programs include Biotechnology, Dental Hygiene, Health Informatics and Information Management, Medical Laboratory Technology, and Nursing														
<i>Status</i>	<p>The status of each measure is assessed as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="512 818 1883 1065"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="512 818 674 862">At target</td> <td data-bbox="674 818 1883 862">Current data at or above target threshold or convincing evidence of mission fulfillment</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="512 862 674 930">Promising</td> <td data-bbox="674 862 1883 930">Substantial improvement from baseline OR close to target (e.g., w/in 2 percentage points) OR strong evidence of mission fulfillment</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="512 930 674 998">Monitor</td> <td data-bbox="674 930 1883 998">Minimal deviations above or below baseline (e.g., w/in 2 percentage points) OR fairly far from target (e.g., 3 – 6 percentage points) OR mixed evidence of mission fulfillment</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="512 998 674 1065">Concern</td> <td data-bbox="674 998 1883 1065">Substantial decline from baseline (more than 3 percentage points), large gap from target (more than 6 percentage points), or concern of not meeting mission fulfillment</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Each category of indicator is combined as a holistic assessment within the Board Monitoring tool (A3-X), as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="512 1149 1262 1273"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="512 1149 562 1193"><input type="radio"/></td> <td data-bbox="562 1149 1262 1193">0 - 35% of measures at target or promising</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="512 1193 562 1237"><input type="radio"/></td> <td data-bbox="562 1193 1262 1237">35 - 75% of measures at target or promising</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="512 1237 562 1273"><input type="radio"/></td> <td data-bbox="562 1237 1262 1273">75 - 100% of measures at target or promising</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	At target	Current data at or above target threshold or convincing evidence of mission fulfillment	Promising	Substantial improvement from baseline OR close to target (e.g., w/in 2 percentage points) OR strong evidence of mission fulfillment	Monitor	Minimal deviations above or below baseline (e.g., w/in 2 percentage points) OR fairly far from target (e.g., 3 – 6 percentage points) OR mixed evidence of mission fulfillment	Concern	Substantial decline from baseline (more than 3 percentage points), large gap from target (more than 6 percentage points), or concern of not meeting mission fulfillment	<input type="radio"/>	0 - 35% of measures at target or promising	<input type="radio"/>	35 - 75% of measures at target or promising	<input type="radio"/>	75 - 100% of measures at target or promising
At target	Current data at or above target threshold or convincing evidence of mission fulfillment														
Promising	Substantial improvement from baseline OR close to target (e.g., w/in 2 percentage points) OR strong evidence of mission fulfillment														
Monitor	Minimal deviations above or below baseline (e.g., w/in 2 percentage points) OR fairly far from target (e.g., 3 – 6 percentage points) OR mixed evidence of mission fulfillment														
Concern	Substantial decline from baseline (more than 3 percentage points), large gap from target (more than 6 percentage points), or concern of not meeting mission fulfillment														
<input type="radio"/>	0 - 35% of measures at target or promising														
<input type="radio"/>	35 - 75% of measures at target or promising														
<input type="radio"/>	75 - 100% of measures at target or promising														

## INDICATOR: ACCESS FOR LEARNERS

Core Theme	Measures	Baseline (2015-2016)	Current (2017-2018)	Target (2021-2022)	Status	Definitional Notes
Combined	Total annual full-time equivalent	5467	5606	5812	Promising	Source: Shoreline enrollment data Due to definition of cohorts, total FTE does not represent a sum of the total FTE from each core theme Numbers reported BEFORE conversion of spring quarter international contract to state FTEs in spring 2018 In 2015-2016 International was not reported as contract for state-wide allocation purposes, but is included in the contract FTE for that year.
	State-Supported	3735	3972	4172	Promising	
	International Contract	1173	1019	1025	Monitor	
	Other	559	615	615	At target	
Transfer	Total annual full-time equivalent from students <u>enrolled in transfer programs</u>	2530	2761	2854	Promising	Based on student intent; cohort definition still under discussion; includes <b>all types</b> of FTE
Professional-Technical	Total annual full-time equivalent from <u>students enrolled in professional-technical programs</u>	1839	2137	2230	Promising	Based on student intent; cohort definition still under discussion; includes all types of FTE
Professional-Technical	% of Shoreline students, self-identified as applicants for competitive programs, who are accepted or persist at Shoreline in other programs.	60% (52% - 84%)	60% (47 - 84%)	65%	Monitor	Status is assessed six quarters after first quarter with intended program. Ranges represent differences across programs. Target would mean an increase of 20 students
Basic Education for Adults	Total annual full-time equivalent from basic skills courses	476	431	452	Concern	Based on student intent; cohort definition still under discussion; includes all types of FTE Includes students taking ESL courses
Community Education	Number of participants in community education classes	582	622	702	Promising	Source: Shoreline enrollment data Headcount, not FTE (some not credit-bearing) Does NOT include Parent Education (in professional-technical), considering cohort definition
	Number of participants in community education events	**	**	**		Tracking data being collated, additional information collected starting fall 2018

## INDICATOR: EQUITY IN ACCESS

Core Theme	Measures	Baseline (2015-2016)	Current (2017-2018)	Target (2021-2022)	Status	Definitional Notes
Transfer	% of students from <u>historically under-represented and under-served groups</u> enrolled in transfer programs	35%	36%	40%	Monitor	Based on headcount, not FTE Total % is any one of the factors for ALL students
	Historically Under-represented: Race/Ethnicity	19%	21%	23%	Promising	Target based on census data from King County
	Historically Under-represented: Pell Eligibility	26%	27%	30%	Promising	Due to availability of data, International and Running Start students are not included in this analysis. 61 - 62% of students have no data (did not complete FAFSA). Definition under review.
	Historically Under-represented: First Generation	15%	15%	18%	Monitor	
Professional-Technical	% of students from <u>historically under-represented and under-served groups</u> enrolled in professional-technical programs	38%	35%	40%	Concern	Total % represents students under-represented in any one of the categories
	Historically Under-represented: Race/Ethnicity	19%	20%	23%	Promising	
	Historically Under-represented: Pell Eligibility	22%	22%	25%	Monitor	Due to availability of data, Running Start and International students are not included in this analysis. 65% of students have no data (did not complete FAFSA). Definition under review
	Historically Under-represented: First Generation	14%	14%	17%	Monitor	
	% of gender non-traditional students in historically imbalanced programs	19%	19%	21%	Promising	SBCTC Perkins Outcomes dashboard Target based on best-performing schools with similar programs
Basic Education for Adults	% of students from <u>historically under-represented and under-served groups</u> enrolled in basic skills	38%	39%	39%	At target	

## INDICATOR: STUDENT LEARNING

Core Theme	Measures	Baseline (2015-2016)	Current (2017-2018)	Target (2021-2022)	Status
Transfer	Effect of the <u>Shoreline educational experience</u> on general education learning outcomes, based on evaluation of student work using a rubric scaled 1- 9 with 4 or higher being “meeting expectations.”	<b>Global Awareness</b> Group 1 (took < 3 GA classes) $\bar{M} = 4.72$ Group 2 (too 3 or more GA classes) $\bar{M} = 5.69$ Effect size (Cohen’s <i>d</i> ) = <b>0.46 (moderate)</b>  Note: Scale was 1 – 12	<b>Communication (2016-17)</b> Group 1 (took < 60% writing classes): $\bar{M} = 3.76$ Group 2 (took 60% or more writing classes): $\bar{M} = 4.39$ Effect size (Cohen’s <i>d</i> ) = <b>0.58 (moderate)</b>  <b>Multicultural Understanding (2017-18)</b> Group 1 (did not take MCU requirement): $\bar{M} = 3.22$ Group 2 (took MCU requirement): $\bar{M} = 4.08$ Effect size (Cohen’s <i>d</i> ) = <b>0.49 (moderate)</b>	At least moderate effect size between comparison groups appropriate to each general education outcome.	Monitor
Professional-Technical	Proportion of students meeting program-level outcomes as demonstrated in capstone, portfolio, or other key assignments	No program-level outcomes assessed	Nine program reviews completed; two full portfolio assessments completed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Business Technology (2015-16):</b> 57% meeting expectations</li> <li>• <b>Music Technology &amp; Visual Communications Technology (2016-17):</b> Norming process completed to ensure consistent assessment of general design principles across instructors, courses, and assignments</li> <li>• <b>Biotechnology (2017-2018):</b> 100% of students meeting expectations</li> </ul>	80% of students completing each program meet expectations  All programs engage in a program-level outcome assessment  All programs develop curriculum maps and evaluate program feasibility	Monitor
Professional-Technical	Percent of students who succeed in industry-recognized exams (as applicable), range across programs shown un parentheses	89% (2014-15) (89 – 91%)	90% (2016-17), range (86 – 91%) Program include Nursing, Nursing Assistant Certified, Dental Hygiene, Automotive, Medical Laboratory Technology, and Health Informatics and Information Management	All programs above 90%	Monitor
Basic Education for Adults	% of students who made any federal level gains, based on CASAS testing, within one year	57%	59% (2016-2017)	60%	Promising

Core Theme	Measures	Baseline (2015-2016)	Current (2017-2018)	Target (2021-2022)	Status
Community Education	Proportion of students who self-report attainment of learning outcomes	To date, data have been collected sporadically. Systematic collection to begin winter 2019.			

### INDICATOR: STUDENT PROGRESS

Core Theme	Measures	Baseline (2015-16)	Current (2017-18)	Target (2021-22)	Status	Definitional Notes
Transfer	% of transfer students who complete quantitative and symbolic reasoning requirement within one year	26%	31%	40%	Promising	Source: SBCTC SAI 3.0 Dashboard May need to re-evaluate to include students excluded from this dashboard (i.e., International Students) Data need to be updated Baseline is 2014-2015, Current is 2016-17 Targets based on best performing colleges in the state
	% of transfer students who complete 15 college-level credits within one year	60%	55%	69%	Concern	
	% of transfer students who persist across academic years (i.e., SAI retention point)	50%	53%	60%	Monitor	
Basic Education for Adults	% of basic skills students completing high school/GED	5%	4%	10%	Monitor	Source: SBCTC Basic Skills SAI dashboard. Data need to be updated for 2017-2018. Baseline here is 2014-2015; Current is 2016-2017 (from 2015-16 cohort) Need to check high school completion coding & data

### INDICATOR: EQUITY IN STUDENT PROGRESS

Core Theme	Measures	Baseline (2015-16)	Current (2017-18)	Target (2021-22)	Status	Definitional Notes
Transfer	% of transfer students from historically <u>under-represented and under-served groups</u> who complete quantitative and symbolic reasoning requirement within one year	19%	26%	40%	Promising	Source: SBCTC SAI 3.0 Dashboard May need to re-evaluate to include students excluded from this dashboard (i.e., International Students)



	% of transfer students from historically <u>under-represented and under-served groups</u> who complete 15 college-level credits within one year	55%	54%	69%	Monitor	Data need to be updated Baseline is 2014-2015, Current is 2016-17 Targets based on best performing colleges in the state
	% of transfer students from historically <u>under-represented and under-served groups</u> who persist across academic years (i.e., SAI retention point)	44%	49%	60%	Promising	
Basic Education for Adults	% of under-represented basic skills students completing high school/GED	5%	2%	10%	Concern	Source: SBCTC Basic Skills SAI dashboard. Definition for under-represented is based on race/ethnicity, with students reporting Native American, Pacific Islander, Hispanic, or African-American, or two or more races. Need to check high school completion coding & data

### INDICATOR: COMPLETION/TRANSITION

Core Theme	Measures	Baseline (2015-16)	Current (2017-18)	Target (2021-22)	Status	Definitional Notes
Transfer	% of first-time cohort who complete an associate degree within three years (150% time)	17%	19%	33%	Monitor	Source: SBCTC SAI 3.0 Dashboard May need to re-evaluate to include students excluded from this dashboard (i.e., International Students) Data need to be updated Baseline is 2014-2015, Current is 2016-17 Targets based on best performing colleges in the state.
	% of first-time students who transfer within <u>four</u> years	27%	29%	39%	Monitor	
Professional-Technical	% of students who complete a certificate or degree within three years	33%	37%	42%	Promising	
Basic Education for Adults	% who complete six college-level credits	41%	33%	45%	Concern	Source: SBCTC Basic Skills SAI dashboard. Data need to be updated for 2017-2018. Baseline here is 2014-2015; Current is 2016-2017 (from 2015-16 cohort), Target based on highest rate in the state.
	% who complete college-level English & math	8% English 7% Math	9% English 3% Math	10% English 10% Math	Monitor	

## INDICATOR: EQUITY IN COMPLETION/TRANSITION

Core Theme	Measures	Baseline (2015-16)	Current (2017-18)	Target (2021-22)	Status	Definitional Notes
Transfer	% of students from <u>historically under-represented and under-served groups</u> who complete an associate's degree within three years (150% time)	13%	16%	31%	Monitor	Source: SBCTC SAI 3.0 Dashboard May need to re-evaluate to include students excluded from this dashboard (i.e., International Students) Data need to be updated Baseline is 2014-2015, Current is 2016-17 Definition for under-represented is based on race/ethnicity, with students reporting Native American, Pacific Islander, Hispanic, or African-American, or two or more races. Targets based on cutting equity gap in half and meeting top performing colleges
	% of students from <u>historically under-represented and under-served groups</u> who transfer within four years.	23%	21%	35%	Monitor	
Professional-Technical	% of students from <u>historically under-represented and under-served groups</u> who complete a certificate or degree within 4 years	26%	33%	40%	Promising	
Basic Education for Adults	% of students from historically under-represented groups who complete six college-level credits	23%	22%	40%	Monitor	
	% of students from historically under-represented groups who complete college-level English & math	5% English 4% Math	5% English 4% Math	8% English 8% Math	Monitor	

## INDICATOR: CONTRIBUTION TO WORKFORCE

Core Theme	Measures	Baseline (2015-16)	Current (2017-18)	Target	Status	Definitional Notes
Professional-Technical	% of students employed one year post-completion (or enrolled in higher education)	79%	80%	84%	Promising	Source SBCTC After College Outcomes dashboard Shoreline is higher than the rest of the colleges as a whole; data are one year behind, baseline is from those departing 2014-2015, outcome at 2015-16; Current is those who departed 2016-2017, employed in 2017-2018
	Difference in median hourly wage between those who complete a certificate or degree and those who do not.	+ \$5.27 (\$20.77 vs. \$15.50)	+\$3.44 (\$22.20 vs. \$18.76)	\$6.00 difference	Monitor	Dollar amount adjusted for inflation. Shoreline completers' wages are much higher than all WA colleges as a whole (\$18.02). Decrease in 2017-2018 was due to increase in non-completers' wage (from \$16.51 to \$18.76)

Level 1 - Strategic Goal Matrix

Owner(s): Cheryl Roberts and the Executive Team

Sponsor: Board of Trustees

<p><b>Vision - We are recognized for inclusive excellence in teaching and learning, student success and community engagement.</b></p> <p><b>Mission - We serve the educational, workforce, and cultural needs of our diverse students and communities.</b></p>																												
ASSESSMENT								ASSESSMENT								Assessment Key												
CORRELATION								KEY INITIATIVE S								CORRELATION / CONTRIBUTION		SPONSOR										
Goal 1 Student Success																0 - 35%		35-75%		75% +								
●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	A. Learning Outcomes Assessment	●				●				✓	✓										
◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	B. Strategic Enrollment Management	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆		✓				✓						
	◆		◆	◆	◆			C. Physical Spaces and Technology	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆		✓				✓						
◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	D. Intellectual and Cultural Vitality	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆		✓	✓			✓						
◆	◆		◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	E. College Identity	◆		◆	◆							✓									
Goal 2 Disciplined Excellence																✓												
		◆	◆		◆		◆	A. Program Review	◆			◆	◆	◆	◆	◆		✓										
◆	◆		◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	B. Streamline Processes	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆						✓						
			◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	C. Professional Learning	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆				✓								
◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	D. High Impact Teaching & Learning	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆		✓										
◆	◆		◆	◆	◆		◆	E. Internal and External Communications	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆		✓	✓									
◆		◆	◆					F. Innovation	◆				◆					✓				✓						
Goal 3 Sustainability - The Three (3) E's																✓												
◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	A. Social Equity: Mindful Discovery	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆				✓		✓						
		◆					◆	B. Ecological Integrity Framework	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	✓					✓						
◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	C. Social Equity: Multicultural Competencies	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆				✓		✓						
◆		◆						D. Economic Viability: Resource Management	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆						✓						
Access for learners	Equity in access	Student learning	Student progress	Equity in student progress	Completion	Equity in student success	Contribution to workforce	<p><b>5-Year Goals Improvement Initiatives</b></p> <p><b>Core Theme Indicators</b>      <b>Strategic Indicators</b></p> <p><b>Core Themes</b></p>								Student engagement & satisfaction	Inclusive Excellence: Employee Learning	Employee engagement & satisfaction	Community engagement	Process improvement	Resource utilization, including ecological integrity operations	General Fund Financial Resources/Health	President	EVP for Student Learning & Success	VP of Advancement	Exec. Dir. of Employee Engagement, Equity, and Organizational Dev.	VP for Students, Equity & Success	Senior Executive Director & CFO
✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		1. Basic Education for Adults	Strategic indicators assess the success of Shoreline's key strategies, which, as a whole, contribute to the College's Core Themes								<b>Correlation Key</b>											
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		2. Transfer Education									◆	Strong Impact										
✓	✓	✓		✓		✓		3. Professional-Technical Education									◆	Moderate Impact										
✓		✓				✓	✓	4. Community Education & Training									◆	Some Impact										
CORRELATION								CORRELATION / CONTRIBUTION																				
<b>Values - Respect, Inclusion &amp; Student Engagement</b>																												