



Section 5

Balanced Scorecard Data Dictionary



PERSPECTIVE:

External Stakeholders

ES1 Outcome Measure: Retention Rate

College Strategy: 1.2 Student Success and Access	College Goal: 1	Indicator: Retention
Description: The percentage of students who were 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), credit (CR), no credit (NC) or an incomplete (I).		
Lead/Lag: Lag	Frequency: End of Term	Unit Type: Percent
Polarity: High values are good		
Formula: Number of students who complete a course with a grade of A,B,C,D,F,CR,NC or I divided by total enrollments at first census.		
Data Source: Data for this measure are housed in the enterprise-wide resource and planning system, Banner, and accessed through Banner or the SMCCCD data warehouse.		
Data Quality: High – received from Banner	Data Collector: Dean of Enrollment Services	
	Owner: Dean of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness	
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is 1 to 5 percentage points below the benchmark. Well below benchmark is 6 or greater percentage points below the benchmark.	Benchmark: The benchmark was initially based on a five-year average; was continued at the same level for 2007/08 at 83%.	
	College-wide Initiatives Links	
Benchmark Rationale: Average provides for normalizing data over a period of five years. Adjustments may be made annually depending on new initiatives, resources and strategic direction set by the college.	1. Enrollment management	
	2. First Year Experience	
	3. SLOAC	

ES2 Outcome Measure: Term Persistence Rate

College Strategy: 1.2 Student Success and Access		College Goal: 1	Indicator: Persistence
Description: The percentage of first-time students who persist from a fall semester to a subsequent spring semester.			
Lead/Lag: Lag	Frequency: End of Term	Unit Type: Percent	Polarity: High values are good
Formula: Percentage of first-time students enrolled in at least one course in a fall term with an A, B, C, D, F, CR, NC, W or I grade notation who enroll in at least one course the following spring term with an A, B, C, D, F, CR, NC, W or I grade notation.			
Data Source: Data for this measure are housed in the enterprise-wide resource and planning system, Banner and accessed through Banner or the SMCCCD data warehouse. The data are normalized using pre-determined rules.			
Data Quality: High – received from Banner		Data Collector: : Dean of Enrollment Services	
		Owner: Vice President of Instruction	
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is equal to 1 to 5 percentage points below the benchmark. Well below benchmark is equal to 6 or greater percentage points below the benchmark.		Benchmark: The benchmark was initially based on a five-year average; was continued at the same level for 2007/08 at 64%.	
Benchmark Rationale: Average provides for normalizing data over a period of five years. Adjustments may be made annually depending on new initiatives, resources and strategic direction set by the college.		College-wide Initiatives Links	
		1. Enrollment management	
		2. Education Master Plan	
		3. Facilities Master Plan	
		4. Resource Planning	

ES3 Outcome Measure: All Course Success Rates

College Strategy: 1.2 Student Success and Access		College Goal: 1		Indicator: Success	
Description: The percentage of students who were enrolled at census date and received a grade of A,B,C or CR.					
Lead/Lag: Lag		Frequency: Annual		Unit Type: Percent	
Polarity: High values are good					
Formula The number of students who complete a course with a grade of A,B,C or CR divided by total enrollments at first census. Report is based on Fall and Spring enrollments.					
Data Source: Data for this measure are housed in the enterprise-wide resource and planning system, Banner, and accessed through Banner or the SMCCCD data warehouse.					
Data Quality: High – received from Banner			Data Collector: Dean of Enrollment Services		
			Owner: Dean of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness		
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is 1 to 7 percentage points below the benchmark. Well below benchmark is 8 or greater percentage points below the benchmark.			Benchmark: The benchmark was initially based on a five-year average; was continued at the same level for 2007/08 at 70%.		
Benchmark Rationale: Average provides for normalizing data over a period of five years. Adjustments may be made annually depending on new initiatives, resources and strategic direction.			College-wide Initiatives Links		
			1. Enrollment management		
			2. First Year Experience		
			3. SLOAC		

ES4 Outcome Measure: Basic Skills Course Success Rates

College Strategy: 1.2 Student Success and Access	College Goal: 1	Indicator: Success
Description: The percentage of students who were enrolled in pre-collegiate basic skills developmental skills (DSKL), English, math or reading class at census date and received a grade of A, B, C or CR.		
Lead/Lag: Lag	Frequency: Annual	Unit Type: Percent
Polarity: High values are good		
Formula: The cohort for this measure consists of students enrolled as of census in credit basic skills DSKL, ESOL, English, math or reading courses (courses with a designation of "P," "B" or "PEL" in banner) in an academic year (excluding special admit students). The number of students who complete a course with a grade of A, B, C or CR divided by total enrollments at first census. Report is based on Fall and Spring enrollments.		
Data Source: Data are extracted based on the updated basic skills course list provided by the Office of Instruction.		
Data Quality: High – received from the state	Data Collector: : Administrative Analyst, Office of Instruction	
	Owner: Dean of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness	
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is 1 to 3 percentage points below the benchmark. Well below benchmark is 4 or greater percentage points below the benchmark.	Benchmark: The benchmark was initially based on a five-year average; was continued at the same level for 2007/08 at 63%.	
Benchmark Rationale: Average provides for normalizing data over a period of five years. Adjustments may be made annually depending on new initiatives, resources and strategic direction.	College-wide Initiatives Links	
	1. First Year Experience	
	2. Enrollment management	
	3. SLOAC	

ES5 Outcome Measure: ARCC Achievement Rate

College Strategy: 1.2 Student Success and Access	College Goal: 1	Indicator: Success
Description: 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 achieved 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); or achieved "Transfer Prepared" (student successfully completed 60 UC/CSU transferable units with a GPA ≥ 2.0).		
Lead/Lag: Lag	Frequency: Annual	Unit Type: Percent
Polarity: High values are good		
Formula: The cohorts consisted of first-time students. Transfer was determined by matching with a database generated by the State Chancellor's Office that contains NSC, UC and CSU transfers.		
Data Source: Data for this measure are from the State Chancellor's Office.		
Data Quality: High – received from ARCC report	Data Collector: District ITS	
	Owner: Dean of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness	
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is 1 to 7 percentage points below the benchmark. Well below benchmark is 8 or greater percentage points below the benchmark.	Benchmark: Based on the ARCC peer group average. The 2006/07 ARCC peer group average was 53.4%, and was used as the benchmark for 2007/08 as the new peer groups were not yet available at time of printing.	
Benchmark Rationale: Average provides for normalizing data over a period of five years. Adjustments may be made annually depending on new initiatives, resources and strategic direction.	College-wide Initiatives Links	
	1. First Year Experience	
	2. Enrollment management	
	3. SLOAC	

ES6 Outcome Measure: Student Right to Know (SRTK) Transfer Rate

College Strategy: 1.2 Student Success and Access		College Goal: 1		Indicator: Success	
Description: SRTK refers to a Federally-mandated public disclosure of a college's Completion Rate and Transfer Rate. The intent of SRTK is to provide to the consumer a statistic of comparable effectiveness that they can use in the determination of college choice. All colleges nationwide are effectively required to participate in the annual disclosure of rates as of January, 2000. SRTK is a "cohort" study; that is, a group of students who are first-time freshmen, who are enrolled full-time in a fall term, and are degree-seeking.					
Lead/Lag: Lag		Frequency: Annual		Unit Type: Percent	
Polarity: High values are good					
Formula: A cohort of all certificate-, degree-, transfer-seeking first-time, full-time students who transferred to another post-secondary institution, prior to attaining a degree, certificate, or becoming 'transfer-prepared' during a five semester period are transfer students.					
Data Source: SRTK Rates are derived and reported yearly on the IPEDS-GRS (Integrated Postsecondary Educational Data System- Graduation Rate Survey).					
Data Quality: High – received from California Community College Chancellor's Office			Data Collector: Director of Admissions and Records		
			Owner: Dean of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness		
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is 1 to 5 percentage points below the benchmark. Well below benchmark is 6 or greater percentage points below the benchmark.			Benchmark: Benchmark is based on the college average from the previous reported years. The 2007/08 college benchmark was at 28.4%.		
Benchmark Rationale: Average provides for normalizing data over a period of four to five years. Adjustments may be made annually depending on new initiatives, resources and strategic direction set by the college.			1. Enrollment Management: Outreach and Marketing efforts		
			2. First Year Experience (FYE)		
			3. SLOAC		

ES7 Outcome Measure: Student to Counselor Ratio

College Strategy: 1.2 Student Success and Access	College Goal: 1	Indicator: Access
Description: The number of credit students enrolled per counselor		
Lead/Lag: Lead	Frequency: First Census	Unit Type: Ratio
Polarity: Low values are good		
Formula: The number of counselors per credit student enrolled in fall and spring. All full and part-time general counseling are included - no special program faculty such as DSPS and EOPS are included.		
Data Source: Data are derived from staff resource records in the Counseling Division and the enrollment reports (Census unduplicated headcounts) produced by the Office of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness.		
Data Quality: High - collected by Counseling Division	Data Collector: Counseling Division Assistant	
	Owner: Dean of Counseling and Matriculation	
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is equal to 10% above the number of students per counselor benchmark. Well below benchmark is equal to 11% or greater above the number of students per counselor benchmark.	Benchmark: The baseline benchmark was established in 2005/06 at 1,283:1 (1,283 students per counselor).	
Benchmark Rationale: Benchmark is based on the average student to counselor ratio over five years with considerations given to low budget and staffing years and adjustments to the baseline made to reflect optimum serve.	College-wide Initiatives Links	
	1. First Year Experience	
	2. Enrollment management	
	3. Education Master Plan	
	4. SLOAC	

ES8 Outcome Measure: Financial Aid Recipient Rate

College Strategy: 1.2 Student Access and Success		College Goal: 2		Indicator: Access	
Description: The percentage of students who received financial aid including: BOG fee waivers, Pell Grants, Scholarships, TRIO, EOPS, CARE and CalWorks.					
Lead/Lag: Lag		Frequency: First Census		Unit Type: Percent	
Polarity: High values are good					
Formula: The percentage of students who received financial aid including: BOG fee waivers, Pell Grants, Scholarships Benchmark provides a preliminary gauge to help determine how well the college is meeting the student needs in this area. Future benchmarking may tie enrollment trends (including demographic segments) to recipient rate to better identify expected outcome and stretch goal.					
Data Source: Data for this measure are housed in the enterprise-wide resource and planning system, Banner, and accessed through Banner or the data warehouse. The data are normalized according to the State System Office using pre-determined rules and data parameters.					
Data Quality: High – received from Banner			Data Collector: Dean of Enrollment Services		
			Owner: V.P. of Student Services		
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is equal to 1 to 5 percentage points below the benchmark. Well below benchmark is equal to 6 or greater percentage points above the benchmark.			Benchmark: This benchmark is based on an average from the previous five years. The 2007/08 college benchmark was at 26.2%.		
Benchmark Rationale: The benchmark provides a preliminary gauge to help determine how well the college is meeting the student needs in this area. Future benchmarking may tie enrollment trends (including demographic segments) to recipient rate to better identify expected outcome and stretch goal			College-wide Initiatives Links		
			1. Enrollment management		
			2. Education Master Plan		
			3. First Year Experience		

ES9 Outcome Measure: Student Satisfaction Overall Rating

College Strategy: 1.2 Student Access and Success		College Goal: 2		Indicator: Satisfaction/Perception	
Description: : 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.					
Lead/Lag: Lead		Frequency: Every 3 years		Unit Type: Percents	
Polarity: High values are good					
Formula: The percentage of students who selected "Very Satisfied", "Satisfied" or "Somewhat Satisfied" on the question(s) from the student climate survey which asks about overall satisfaction with the college.					
Data Source: Data are collected through a survey (i.e., Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory) which may be delivered via paper and pencil or on-line.					
Data Quality: Moderate – Dependent on sampling method and response rate.			Data Collector: Dean of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness		
			Owner: Dean of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness		
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is equal to 1-5 percentage points below the benchmark. Well below benchmark is equal to 6 or greater percentage points below the benchmark.			Benchmark: The baseline benchmark is set at an overall satisfaction rating of 79%.		
Benchmark Rationale: The overall satisfaction benchmark is based on a limited amount of data and information collected. Increased frequency of this measure (e.g., every three years) will improve the benchmarking process and help to make adjustments if needed to the benchmark.			College-wide Initiatives Links		
			1. Accreditation Self-Study		
			2. Education Master Plan		
			3. SLOAC		

ES 10 Outcome Measure: Community Events

College Strategy: 3.2 Marketing and Outreach		College Goal: 3		Indicator: Marketing and Public Relations	
Description: The number of community events and activities open to the public that promote the college.					
Lead/Lag: Lead		Frequency: Annual	Unit Type: Count		Polarity: High values are good
Formula: The total number of community events annually. These events are open to the public, and may reach communities from around the Bay Area (primarily from San Jose to San Francisco). They include but are not limited to art, music, discussions, dramas and lectures, and are promoted in a variety of ways (e.g., newspapers, web sites and posters). The events are funded through a variety of budgets including President's Innovation Fund, PR& Marketing budget, sponsors and Skyline department budgets and self-supporting.					
Data Source: Data for this measure are tracked and recorded in the Office of Development, Marketing and Public Information					
Data Quality: High – received from college Office of Development, Marketing and Public Information			Data Collector: Public Information Officer		
			Owner: Director of Development, Marketing and Public Relations		
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is 1 to 6 numerical points below benchmark. Well below benchmark is 7 or fewer points below benchmark.			Benchmark: Benchmark was set at 60 events in 2007/08 after careful review of previous five years performance.		
Benchmark Rationale: Benchmark reflects the minimum number of regularly offered events required to reach a critical mass of community members in a single year.			College-wide Initiatives Links		
			1. Enrollment Management: Outreach and marketing efforts		
			2. First Year Experience		
			3. President's Innovation Fund		



PERSPECTIVE:

Internal Stakeholders

IS1 Outcome Measure: Percentage of Program Reviews Completed

College Strategy: 2.2 Integrated Planning and Institutional Performance Measurement		College Goal: 2	Indicator: Program and Service Quality
Description: The number of completed program reviews in a given year, as a percentage of the number scheduled. The program reviews are scheduled 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.			
Lead/Lag: Lag	Frequency: Annual	Unit Type: Percent	Polarity: High values are good
Formula: The total number of program reviews completed divided by the total number of program reviews scheduled (submitted in report and presentation formats) in a given year.			
Data Source: Skyline College Office of Instruction			
Data Quality: High - information from the Office of Instruction.		Data Collector: Administrative Analyst, Office of Instruction	
		Owner: Vice President of Instruction	
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is 25 percentage points below the benchmark. Well below benchmark is 26 or percentage numerical points below the benchmark.		Benchmark: The benchmark is set at 75% of scheduled programs reviews completed annually. The baseline benchmark was established in 2007/08.	
Benchmark Rationale: The benchmark is set as a minimum threshold for maintaining the quality of programs and services and informing the budget process.		College-wide Initiatives Links	
		1. Budget and Strategic Planning	
		2. SLOAC	
		3. Workforce Development	
		4. Program Review Subcommittee Recommendations	

IS2 Outcome Measure: Employee Overall Satisfaction Rating

College Strategy: 2.2 Effective Communication		College Goal: 2		Indicator: Employee Satisfaction and Perception	
Description: The percentage of employees who selected "Very Satisfied" or "Satisfied" on the question(s) that ask about overall satisfaction with the college from the employee survey.					
Lead/Lag: Lag		Frequency: Every 3 Years		Unit Type: Percent	
Polarity: High values are good					
Formula: The "Very Satisfied" and "Satisfied" ratings on the questions asking about overall satisfaction are compiled to give a rating on overall satisfaction. For the employee survey of Fall 2006, Employee Voice, this included questions 19,37,65,11,58,46, and 25.					
Data Source: Data are collected through a survey (i.e., Employee Voice Survey, Fall 2006) which may be delivered via paper and pencil or on-line.					
Data Quality: Moderate – Dependent on sampling method and response rate.			Data Collector: Dean of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness		
			Owner: Dean of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness		
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is equal 1 to 5 percentage points below the benchmark. Well below benchmark is equal to 6 or greater percentage points below the benchmark.			Benchmark: The baseline benchmark was established in 2007 at 70% overall satisfaction.		
Benchmark Rationale: The overall satisfaction benchmark is based on the average ratings from six overall satisfaction items in the survey (one from each of the survey dimensions) including items: 11, 19, 25, 37, 58 and 65.			College-wide Initiatives Links		
			1. Accreditation Self-Study		
			2. Education Master Plan		
			3. Strategic Planning		

IS3 Outcome Measure: Student Right to Know (SRTK) Crime Statistics

College Strategy: 2.3 Safe and Secure Campus	College Goal: 2	Indicator: Campus and Safety
Description: In compliance with Federal Public Law 101-542, the Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act of 1990, Skyline College publicly reports campus crime statistics to students and staff. Pursuant to reporting guidelines, crime statistics are updated and posted between August and October for the three previous years.		
Lead/Lag: Lag	Frequency: Annual	Unit Type: Count
Polarity: Low values are good		
Formula: Number of reported on-campus criminal offenses annually from the following categories: murder/non-negligent manslaughter, negligent manslaughter, forcible sex offenses, non-forcible sex-offenses, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, motor vehicle theft and arson.		
Data Source: Data for this measure are tracked and recorded in the college Security Office.		
Data Quality: High – received from college Security Office.	Data Collector: Security Office Assistant	
	Owner: Vice President of Student Services	
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is 1 to 2 numerical points above the benchmark. Well below benchmark is 3 or greater numerical points above the benchmark.	Benchmark: Benchmark has been set at 10.	
	College-wide Initiatives Links	
Benchmark Rationale: After initially using an average, an absolute benchmark of 10 was applied in 2007-08. Adjustments may be made annually depending on new initiatives, resources and strategic direction set by the college.	1. Enrollment Management: Outreach and Marketing efforts	
	2. Facilities Master Plan	



PERSPECTIVE:

Financial & Business Operations

FBO1 Outcome Measure: FTES Trend - All Courses

College Strategy: 4.1 Integrated & Evidence-based Resource Planning System		College Goal: 4	Indicator: Productivity
Description: Percent change of full time equivalent students (FTES) compared to collegewide FTES goal. Used to determine State apportionment and reported in three periods through the 320 Report.			
Lead/Lag: Lag	Frequency: Annual	Unit Type: Percent	Polarity: High values are good
Formula: The growth / decline, as a percentage, from the previous year's total number of full time equivalent students enrolled at census. Note that the annual FTES include a single academic (fiscal) year comprised of three subsequent terms (summer, fall and spring).			
Data Source: Data for this measure are housed in the enterprise-wide resource and planning system, Banner and accessed through Banner or the data warehouse. The data are normalized using pre-determined rules which include method of accounting.			
Data Quality: High – received from Banner		Data Collector: Dean of Enrollment Services	
		Owner: Vice President of Instruction	
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is equal to 1 to 3 percentage points below the benchmark. Well below benchmark is equal to 4 or greater percentage points below the benchmark.		Benchmark: The 2007/08 college FTES goal was 6,938, which represented a 2% increase over the 2006/07 reported FTES of 6801. Thus, 2% was established as the benchmark for 2007/08.	
Benchmark Rationale: The FTES benchmark is designed to establish a realistic annual growth target for the college. It is based on quantitative and qualitative techniques including enrollment projections using linear equation modeling and adjusted projections based on the estimated impact of the College Growth Plan (including section and program additions, marketing interventions and completion of capital improvements for specific programs).		College-wide Initiatives Links	
		1. Enrollment management	
		2. Education Master Plan	
		3. Facilities Master Plan	
		4. Resource Planning	
		5. Fresh Look Project	

FBO2 Outcome Measure: Load

College Strategy: 4.1 Integrated & Evidence-based Resource Planning System		College Goal: 4	Indicator: Efficiency
Description: Load is one measure of efficiency and indicates the ratio of FTEF (Full-time Equivalent Faculty) to WSCH (Weekly Student Contact Hours).			
Lead/Lag: Lag	Frequency: First Census	Unit Type: Count	Polarity: High values are good
Formula: The ratio of WSCH to FTEF (Full-Time Equivalent Faculty).			
Data Source: Data for this measure are housed in the enterprise-wide resource and planning system, Banner and accessed through Banner or the data warehouse. The data are normalized using pre-determined rules which include method of accounting.			
Data Quality: High – received from Banner		Data Collector: Dean of Enrollment Services	
		Owner: Vice President of Instruction	
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is equal to 1 to 20 numerical points below the benchmark. Well below benchmark is equal to 21 or greater numerical points below the benchmark.		Benchmark: Benchmark is based on the standard widely used for measuring efficiency (525).	
Benchmark Rationale: The benchmark is designed to establish a cost-effective model for managing enrollment and faculty resources.		College-wide Initiatives Links	
		1. Enrollment management: Retention and Marketing	
		2. Education Master Plan	
		3. Facilities Master Plan	
		4. Resource Planning	

FBO3 Outcome Measure: Fill Rates

College Strategy: 4.1 Integrated & Evidence-based Resource Planning System		College Goal: 4	Indicator: Efficiency
Description: The percent a class fills/enrolls based on capacity or enrollment maximum stated in the curriculum.			
Lead/Lag: Lag	Frequency: First Census	Unit Type: Percent	Polarity: High values are good
Formula: Census headcount divided by maximum enrollment. Calculation does not include positive attendance, open entry/open exit, or independent study classes. Maximum enrollment for cross-listed sections are combined to calculate a single fill rate.			
Data Source: Data for this measure are housed in the enterprise-wide resource and planning system, Banner, and accessed through Banner or the data warehouse. The data are normalized using pre-determined rules which include method of accounting.			
Data Quality: High – received from Banner		Data Collector: Dean of Enrollment Services	
		Owner: Vice President of Instruction	
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is equal to 1 to 3 percentage points below the benchmark. Well below benchmark is equal to 4 or greater percentage points below the benchmark.		Benchmark: Benchmark was established in 2006 at 83% to better parallel the 525 Load benchmark.	
Benchmark Rationale: The Fill Rate benchmark is designed to provide another measure of efficiency. It should be viewed along with the Load figure and considered one aspect of the capacity filling equation.		College-wide Initiatives Links	
		1. Enrollment management	
		2. Education Master Plan	
		3. Facilities Master Plan	
		4. Resource Planning	
		5. Fresh Look Project	

FBO4 Outcome Measure: Ending Balance

College Strategy: 4.1 Integrated & Evidence-based Resource Planning System		College Goal: 4	Indicator: Budget Efficiency
Description: Measures the difference between the college's end of year general unrestricted fund expenditures and the year's total unrestricted fund budget - called the ending balance.			
Lead/Lag: Lead	Frequency: Annual	Unit Type: Ratio	Polarity: High values are good
Formula: The total annual college general unrestricted fund expenditure subtracted from the total unrestricted fund balance, divided by the total unrestricted fund balance.			
Data Source: Data for this measure are provided in the Banner report: Financial Statement by Account.			
Data Quality: High – received from Banner		Data Collector: Director of Business Services	
		Owner: Director of Business Services	
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is equal to 0 to 2.5 percentage points below the benchmark. Well below benchmark is equal to 2.5 or greater percentage points below the benchmark.		Benchmark: The baseline benchmark was established in 2006-07 at 2% and revised in 2007-08 to 2.5%.	
Benchmark Rationale: Benchmark is based on a recommended ending balance for protecting against unforeseen expenditures in the subsequent year and changes in funding.		College-wide Initiatives Links	
		1. Seek new sources of revenue	
		2. Enrollment management	
		3. Resource development	



PERSPECTIVE:

Innovation & Growth

IG1 Outcome Measure: Number of New Courses Approved

College Strategy: 1.1 Innovative Programs, Services and Modes of Delivery	College Goal: 1	Indicator: : Program and Service Enhancements
Description: The number of new courses reviewed and approved annually by the Curriculum Committee and the Board.		
Lead/Lag: Lead	Frequency: Annual	Unit Type: Count
Polarity: High values are good		
Formula: The number of new courses and programs reviewed and approved annually by the Curriculum Committee and the Board.		
Data Source: Data for this measure are provided by the Office of Instruction.		
Data Quality: High – received from the college Office of Instruction	Data Collector: Administrative Analyst, Office of Instruction	
	Owner: Vice President of Instruction	
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is 1 to 4 numerical points below the benchmark. Well below benchmark is 5 or greater numerical points below the benchmark.	Benchmark: Based on an average rate from the most recent five years. Baseline benchmark was established in 2005/06 at 37 courses approved per year.	
	Benchmark Rationale: Average provides for normalizing data over a period of five years. Adjustments may be made annually depending on new initiatives, resources and strategic direction.	
College-wide Initiatives Links		
1. Program Review		
2. Enrollment management		
3. SLOAC		

IG2 Outcome Measure: Percentage of Technology-mediated Instruction

College Strategy: 1.1 Innovative Programs, Services and Modes of Delivery		College Goal: 1	Indicator: Program and Service Enhancements
Description: The total number of sections offered through technology-mediated instruction, as a percentage of the total number of sections offered.			
Lead/Lag: Lead	Frequency: Annual	Unit Type: Count	Polarity: High values are good
Formula: Technology-mediated instruction includes both hybrid and pure on-line course sections. This measure identifies the percentage of courses offered through technology-mediated instruction out of all sections offered in an academic year (summer, fall and spring).			
Data Source: Data for this measure are housed in the Banner system.			
Data Quality: High – received from the Office of Instruction		Data Collector: Administrative Analyst, Office of Instruction	
		Owner: Vice President of Instruction	
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is 1 to 2 percentage points below the benchmark. Well below benchmark is 3 or greater percentage points below the benchmark.		Benchmark: The baseline benchmark was established in 2005/06 at 4% of all courses.	
Benchmark Rationale: Benchmark is based on an incremental goal as determined by the Education Master Plan and college-wide planning groups.		College-wide Initiatives Links	
		1. Enrollment Management: Retention and Outreach	
		2. Education Master Plan	
		3. Technology Plan	

IG3 Outcome Measure: President's Innovation Funds Granted

College Strategy: 1.1 Innovative Programs, Services and Modes of Delivery		College Goal: 1		Indicator: Program and Service Enhancements	
Description: The amount of funds raised by the President's Council at the President's Breakfast annually. Funds are raised for the President's Innovation Fund which is used to support faculty and staff projects in their effort to promote student success and to meet college goals.					
Lead/Lag: Lead		Frequency: Annual		Unit Type: Count	
Polarity: High values are good					
Formula: The total amount of PIF funding granted.					
Data Source: Skyline College Office of Development, Marketing and Public Relations					
Data Quality: High - received directly from the Office of Development, Marketing and Public Relations			Data Collector: Director of Development, Marketing and Public Relations		
			Owner: Director of Development, Marketing and Public Relations		
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is 10% below the benchmark. Well below benchmark is 11% or greater below the benchmark.			Benchmark: Benchmark is based on the fundraising goal for the President's Breakfast set by the President's Council. The baseline established in 2007/08 was set at \$75,000 annually.		
Benchmark Rationale: The benchmark is based on an average of past fundraising at the annual President's Breakfast and projections or goals set at the end of each year.			College-wide Initiatives Links		
			1. Enrollment Management: Retention and Outreach		
			2. Education Master Plan		
			3. Resource Development		

IG4 Outcome Measure: Amount of Grant Allocations

College Strategy: 1.1 Innovative Programs, Services and Modes of Delivery		College Goal: 1		Indicator: Grant Procurement	
Description: The amount of local, state and federal grants procured annually.					
Lead/Lag: Lead		Frequency: Annual		Unit Type: Percent	
Polarity: High values are good					
Data Source: Data for this measure are provided by the Business Services Office.					
Data Quality: High – received from Budget Office			Data Collector: Director of Business Services		
			Owner: Director of Business Services		
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is equal to 10 to 15 percentage points below the benchmark. Well below benchmark is equal to 16 or greater percentage points below the benchmark.			Benchmark: Baseline benchmark was established in 2005/06 at \$4.2 million annually.		
Benchmark Rationale: Benchmark is based on an average from the previous five years			College-wide Initiatives Links		
			1. Budget and Strategic Planning		
			2. SLOAC		
			3. Workforce Development		
			4. Program Review Subcommittee Recommendations		

IG5 Outcome Measure: Amount of Professional Development Funds

College Strategy: 5.1 Comprehensive Staff Development Program		College Goal: 5		Indicator: Staff Development Opportunities	
Description: Amount that the college funds for academic employee professional development activities used for maintaining and enhancing educational programs.					
Lead/Lag: Lead		Frequency: Annual		Unit Type: Percent	
Polarity: High values are good					
Formula: 1% of faculty salaries budgeted for a given academic year.					
Data Source: Skyline College Office of Instruction					
Data Quality: High - information from Budget Office.			Data Collector: Director of Business Services		
			Data Owner: Director of Business Services		
Scorecard Control Limits: Slightly below benchmark is .1 to .5 percentage points below the benchmark. Well below benchmark is .6 or greater percentage points below the benchmark.			Benchmark: Benchmark is a predetermined 1% of faculty salaries budgeted each year.		
Benchmark Rationale: The benchmark is set as a minimum threshold for maintaining the quality of programs and instructional component of the college.			College-wide Initiatives Links		
			1. Budget and Strategic Planning		
			2. SLOAC		
			3. Workforce Development		
			4. Program Review Subcommittee Recommendations		