

Institutional Effectiveness Measures

Board Meeting
Wednesday, May 16, 2012

Why Measure?

- To demonstrate our commitment to continuous quality *improvement*.
- To measure our *success* as an educational institution.
- To provide information that documents *progress* towards our goals and identifies need for *change*.
- To provide the Board and constituents with a *monitoring* device.

Process

- Created 23 IEM's in FY11
- Targeted Performance Improvement Framework developed
- Review of data by Accountability Team
- 26 input groups identified - 20 input sessions conducted
- IEM priorities survey created and distributed
- Initial recommendation developed
- Recommendation endorsed by governance and President

IEM Categories

- Student Progress
- Performance After Transfer
- Progress of Developmental Students
- Market Penetration
- Workforce Development
- Financials
- Facilities
- Employee Diversity

Stretch and Improvement Targets

IEM Category	IEM	Target
Student Progress	Graduation Rate	Improvement = 16-17%
	Persistence Fall to Spring	Stretch = 76-77%
	Persistence Fall to Fall	Improvement = 51-52%
	Student Advancement Rate	Stretch = 77-78%
Market Penetration	% share of Public High School Graduates	Improvement = 34-35%
Facilities	Energy Consumption	Improvement = 160,000-169,999 Btu

Accountability Team

- Darlene Schlenbecker, Co-chair
- Kelly Page, Co-chair
- Mike Babb
- Dave Braunschweig
- Doug Easterling
- Julie Ellefson-Kuehn
- Sheila Quirk-Bailey
- Dave Richmond
- Jennifer Smith
- Joe Wachter