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Outline

• Who is ZogoTech?
• What KPIs to measure?
• How to store them?
• How to display them?

http://www.zogotech.com/recent-webinars/
Outline

• Best examples from outside higher ed
• Previous Work
  • Visualization: Tufte, Few, Wong, John Rome
  • KPIs: Seybert, AACC
  • Data Model: ZT
Less time gathering data, more time analyzing
Boring Charts

“If the statistics are boring, then you’ve got the wrong numbers”

Edward Tufte
Why does Japan (red) look so much smaller than S. Korea (blue) in the 3D chart on the left?

HOW MUCH DOES IT COST TO MAKE A DENIM SHIRT IN BANGLADESH, VERSUS THE U.S.?

U.S.

- $INDUSTRIAL LAUNDRY
- $MATERIALS
- $LABOR COSTS

TOTAL $/

BANGLADESH

- $INDUSTRIAL LAUNDRY
- $MATERIALS
- $LABOR COSTS

TOTAL $

SOURCE: Institute for Global Labour and Human Rights

http://0-www.cnn.com.library.ccbcmd.edu/2013/05/02/world/asia/bangladesh-us-tshirt
HOW MUCH DOES IT COST TO MAKE A DENIM SHIRT IN BANGLADESH, VERSUS THE U.S.?

**U.S.**
- **INDUSTRIAL LAUNDRY** $0.75
- **MATERIALS** $5
- **LABOR COSTS** $7.47
- **TOTAL** $13.22

**BANGLADESH**
- **INDUSTRIAL LAUNDRY** $0.20
- **MATERIALS** $3.30
- **LABOR COSTS** $0.22
- **TOTAL** $3.72

**SOURCE:** Institute for Global Labour and Human Rights

http://0-www.cnn.com.library.ccbcmd.edu/2013/05/02/world/asia/bangladesh-us-tshirt
How much does it cost to make a denim shirt?

United States: $13.22
- Materials: $5.00
- Labor Costs: $7.47
- Laundry: $0.75

Bangladesh: $3.72
- Materials: $3.30
- Labor Costs: $0.22
- Laundry: $0.20
Test 1: Which one is bigger?


Notes: sorting the bar chart would make it easier to find largest
Test 2: Which one is bigger?

Test 2: Which one is bigger?

Test 2: Which one is bigger?

ZogoTech has committed visualization sins as well.
Visualization Resources

INFORMATION DASHBOARD DESIGN

The Effective Visual Communication of Data

Stephen Few
Data Visualization Resources

Wall Street Journal Guide to Information Graphics
Dona M. Wong

acmqueue Interactive Dynamics for Visual Analysis
A taxonomy of tools that support the fluent and flexible use of visualizations
“Save the Pies For Dessert”

- Hard to compare slices
- Unnecessarily colorful
- Not good for multiple parts of whole
Did any candidate get 50%?

Who knows?? Hard to add the rectangles in your head
Did any candidate get 50%?

One (only?) instance where pie charts are more powerful than bar charts [http://www.perceptualedge.com/articles/08-21-07.pdf]
Did any candidate get 50%?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rouhani</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghalibaf</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalili</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezaee</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velayati</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gharazi</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table + data bars is probably better than pie or bar chart alone
REAL Dashboards

civics, fords, etc.
Test 3a: How fast am I going?
Test 3b: How fast am I going?

The Civic
Which one conveys information most efficiently?
Yet we still see them everywhere
Looks pretty, but not much information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Success</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Math linking program has been a great success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Education</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Lower reading scores hiding gains in math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Preparation</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Starting employer satisfaction survey in Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Success</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>New transfer center paying off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>CCSSE scores were up from last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Need to revisit pre-requisite sequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Still haven't found replacement for retired Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Different type of data: numbers, charts, story
“But people can’t handle that much information”
Thursday's results

Interleague
Detroit 2, St. Louis 1 (10)
Pittsburgh 9, Minnesota 1
Boston 6, Miami 5
Colorado 4, Philadelphia 1

National League

Today's probable pitchers, lines

American League

career

Pitchers
2012 season
2011-12 vs.
2011-12 vs.
Last 3 starts
opponent
opponent

National League

Pitchers
name vs.
name vs.
name vs.

Tigers 2, Cardinals 1
Quintin Berry hit a tiebreaking RBI single in the 10th inning for Detroit.

Athletics 4, Dodgers 1
Oakland's Yoenis Cespedes hit a three-run homer in the ninth inning for his first career game-ending shot.

Rockies 4, Phillies 1
Chris Nelson hit a go-ahead, two-run homer in the seventh inning and Wilin Rosario added a two-run shot in the ninth to lead Colorado.

Pirates 9, Twins 1
James McDonald pitched his first career complete game and Garrett Jones hit one of Pittsburgh's three home runs.

NATIONALS 5, Rays 2
Suspended Tampa Bay reliever Joel Peralta served up a tiebreaking, two-run double to Danny Espinosa in the sixth.

RED SOX 6, Marlins 5
Daniel Nava singled in the go-ahead run to cap a three-run eighth inning and Boston completed a sweep of Miami.

Red Sox 6, Marlins 5

Minneapolis 300 002 000 — 5
Boston 000 100 000 — 6

Pirates 9, Twins 1

Minneapolis 000 100 000 — 9
Pittsburgh 130 003 20x — 9

Tigers 2, Cardinals 1

St. Louis 000 010 000 — 0
Detroit 010 000 100 — 2

Athletics 4, Dodgers 1

Los Angeles 000 100 000 — 3
Oakland 003 000 000 — 3

Athletics 4, Dodgers 1

Los Angeles 000 100 000 — 3
Oakland 003 000 000 — 3

Los Angeles 000 100 000 — 3
Oakland 003 000 000 — 3
Are sports fans smarter than managers?

Why management reports need more information density and dashboards are based on a misunderstanding.

If you are a sports fan, the first thing you probably do each morning after grabbing a cup of coffee is reach for the sports section of the morning paper. Psychologists even say that one of the easiest ways to fight your daily doldrums is to route for your local team. But as non-native of Nuremberg, I try to be careful. I follow basketball (gasp!) instead of soccer.
This Monday’s paper shows the results of the German Basketball League (Bundesliga), including the scores from the 6 games of the weekend as well as overall ranking of the 18 teams in the league. That’s a total of 108 numbers on an 8th of a regular-sized page.

http://blog.bissantz.com/sportsfans
Don’t dumb down your data
Spring Dual Credit Enrollment

- 2008 Spring: 1,031
- 2009 Spring: 1,189
- 2010 Spring: 1,479
- 2011 Spring: 1,400
- 2012 Spring: 1,374
- 2013 Spring: 1,632

“Not Professional”
Annual report 2011

Financial Position
- Cash and cash equivalents: $2,328, $1,952, 19%
- Total assets: 27,385, 24,902, 10%
- Long-term debt, including current portion: 1,685, 1,930, (13)
- Common stockholders' investment: 15,220, 13,811, 10%

Comparison of Five-Year Cumulative Total Return*

*Graph showing cumulative total return over five years.
1. We changed our business mix toward higher-value, more profitable technologies and market opportunities.

| Segment Pre-Tax Income* (in billions) |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Hardware                    | 0 |
| Financing                   | 0 |
| Services                    | 2.8 |
| Software                    | 2.5 |

2007: 2.7, 2.5, 2.8, 2.5

2010: 1.8, 2.2, 3.9, 4.0

*Sum of external segment pre-tax income not equal to IBM pre-tax income.
**Excludes Enterprise Investments and not restated for stock-based compensation.

2. We became a globally integrated enterprise, improving productivity and capturing new growth.

Since 2005, global integration has enabled IBM to gain $6 billion in productivity savings while improving service quality. We have shifted resources toward building client relationships and employee skills, while positioning IBM for new market opportunities, such as business analytics, Smarter Cities and infrastructure build-outs underway in emerging markets.

Growth Markets Share of Geographic Revenue (excluding divested businesses of PCs and printers)

31%

3. By aligning our business model with our clients’ needs we generated superior financial results.

We achieved record earnings per share.

Diluted earnings per share in 2010 were $11.52, having nearly tripled since the end of 2000, and marking eight consecutive years of double-digit growth. Our focus on productivity and a continuing shift in our business mix to more profitable segments has helped drive our performance.

And record cash performance.

In 2010 our free cash flow, excluding the year-to-year change in Global Financing receivables, was $18.3 billion — an increase of $10.9 billion in free cash flow.

4. We invested in future sources of growth and provided record returns to shareholders...

Since the end of 2000, we invested $43 billion in capital expenditures and $27 billion net on acquisitions (116 companies) targeted toward high-value areas.

We returned $70 billion to our shareholders as share repurchases and increased our dividend each year over the last decade.

At the end of 2010 our quarterly dividend per share was five times higher than in 2000.

... while continuing to invest in R&D — nearly $60 billion since the end of 2000.
Cognos

Annual report 2006 (before being acquired by IBM)
Note the combination of narrative and data.

Showing the new cases and the number of deaths gives an idea of the fatality rate of the cancer.

For example, while there are a large number of breast and prostate cancer cases, the fatality rates are relatively low.
Visualization Best Practices

• Avoid 3D
• Use color judiciously
• Don’t be scared of data density
• Mix qualitative and quantitative
• “Save the Pies for Dessert”
Higher Ed Examples
Tufts

Pros
- Simple, focus on the data

Cons
- Hard to understand without legend
- Boxes
### 30 Units

Percentage of degree and/or transfer seeking students tracked for six years through 2011-12 who achieved at least 30 units. Credit accumulation, 30 units specifically, tend to be positively correlated with completion and wage gain.

#### College Prepared vs. Unprepared for College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>College Prepared</th>
<th>Unprepared for College</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>College Prepared</th>
<th>Unprepared for College</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or over</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ethnicity/Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity/Race</th>
<th>College Prepared</th>
<th>Unprepared for College</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Key Performance Indicators

(Data as of June, 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPIs</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Actual vs. Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persistence: Fall-Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Graduation &amp; Transfer (3yr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Graduation &amp; Transfer (6yr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Performance: JCCC @ KU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Satisfaction**

- Instructional Effectiveness: 5.51
- Registration Effectiveness: 5.51
- Concern for Individual: 5.33
- Academic Advising Counseling: 5.23
- Safety and Security: 5.12

**Core Expenses Per FTE Student**

$13,971

(■ Actual; □ Target; ▲ Poor, ▼ Satisfactory, ▼ Good)
St. Charles Community College

SCC PI Report: Executive Dashboard Summary

- **Student Success**
  1. Persistence Rate Fall To Fall\(^1,2\)
  2. Occupational-Technical Degree Satisfaction\(^3\)
  3. Transfer-Degree Satisfaction\(^4\)

- **Career Preparation**
  4. Licensure Pass Rate\(^5\)
  5. Placement Rate In Workforce\(^3\)

- **Student Satisfaction**
  6. Overall Student Satisfaction\(^6\)
  7. Student Services\(^6\)
  8. Academic Services\(^6\)
  9. Administrative Services\(^6\)
  10. Non-Academic Facilities\(^6\)
  11. Academic Facilities\(^6\)

- **Developmental Education**
  12. Math\(^2\)
  13. English\(^2\)

- **Student Self-Assessment Of General Education Gains**
  19. Personal/Social Gains\(^7\)
  20. General Education Gains\(^7\)
  21. Practical Competencies\(^7\)

- **Transfer Success**
  22. Transfer Rate\(^1,8\)
  23. Academic Success After Transfer\(^1,8,9\)
  24. Persistence After Transfer\(^1,8\)

- **Best Educational Practices**
  14. Active And Collaborative Learning\(^7\)
  15. Student Effort\(^7\)
  16. Academic Challenge\(^7\)
  17. Student-Faculty Interaction\(^7\)
  18. Support For Learners\(^7\)

---

**PI Standard**
- Exceptional performance
- Above Benchmark
- Below Benchmark
- Alarm Bells
### Richland College Monthly Key Performance Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Score</th>
<th>Prev. Month Score</th>
<th>End of Year 07/08 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richland College</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Priorities for Student Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Indices (Weighting Factors)</th>
<th>Monthly Score</th>
<th>Prev. Month Score</th>
<th>End of Year 07/08 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify and Meet Community Educational Needs (20%)</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable All Students to Succeed (35%)</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable All Employees to Succeed (20%)</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure Institutional Effectiveness (25%)</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All scores based on a scale of 10. **Green** = Within target range, **Yellow** = 89.99% - 85.00% of target range, **Red** = Less than 85% of target range.
Pros
- Well-thought out
- Lots of data
- Data model supports decision support

Cons
- Heavy grid lines
- Not interactive
Developing KPIs
Indicators

Use what already works

Menu of indicators from other sources (NCCBP, AtD schools, AACC, etc)

See Webinars
http://www.zogotech.com/
## Table 7
**Student Engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group (Number of indicators in group)</th>
<th>Number of Dashboards Using (N=66)</th>
<th>Percent of Dashboards Using</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Body Engagement (39)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors in major</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of undergraduates living on campus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table 8
**Academic Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group (Number of indicators in group)</th>
<th>Number of Dashboards Using (N=66)</th>
<th>Percent of Dashboards Using</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student/Faculty Contact (9)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/faculty ratio</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes &lt; 20 students</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes &gt; 50 students</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Information (68)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of fellowships</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course sections offered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL ranking of library</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scorecards involve value judgments – may help to have third party moderator.
Dr. Jeff Seybert

- Extensive consulting experience
- Co-Author of Core Indicators of Effectiveness
- Resume
- Personality
How KPIs are Identified

• Outgrowth of strategic planning
  – Important and meaningful to stakeholders
  – Viewed as important to the organization
  – Linked to strategic plan and organizational priorities
  – Help determine the extent to which the organization is progressing toward its stated goals

• Team can begin with a large number of potential KPIs and then whittle down to the vital few—no more than 15-20
Who’s Involved

- Scorecard Development Team
  - Senior leadership
  - IR
  - Key constituencies (Faculty, Student Affairs, others)
  - Team solicits input from affected work groups and administrators

- Senior leadership (president’s cabinet?)
  makes final determination
The KPI Day-long Kickoff Workshop

• Team solicits input
• Pre-workshop “homework”
  – Mission/vision/values statements
  – Strategic plan
  – AACC “Core Indicators of Effectiveness for community colleges”
Workshop Agenda
(morning)

• The “work”
  – Introductory presentation by facilitator (45-60 minutes)
  – Divide into small groups
  – Round 1
    – Goal is to identify the college’s “core business”/most important institutional functions/key mission components (60-75 minutes)
    – Reconvene: groups report progress (30-45 minutes)
    – Entire group comes to consensus on core functions (60 minutes)
  – Lunch
Workshop Agenda (afternoon)

• The “work” (cont’d.)
  – Round 2
    • Same groups or “shuffle”?
    • Each group assigned one core function
    • Begin to derive KPIs that measure each core function (60-75 minutes)
    • Reconvene: groups report progress (30-45 minutes)
    • Entire group comes to consensus on first-level KPIs (45-60 minutes)
Whittling down the indicators
## Day 1 Outcome
(NorthArk)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Student Success</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Affordability</td>
<td>• Partnerships</td>
<td>• Professional Development</td>
<td>• Student Progress</td>
<td>• Fiscal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enrollment / recruitment / admissions</td>
<td>• Engagement</td>
<td>• Employee Engagement</td>
<td>• Career Development</td>
<td>• Facilities / operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Personal &amp; Cultural Enrichment</td>
<td>• Employee satisfaction</td>
<td>• Transfer Prep</td>
<td>• Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• General Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Developmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Engagement?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Satisfaction?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After coming up with the initial indicators, colleges develop the second level (the example above is from a different college than Day 1)
### Scorecard: Iteration 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Score (weighted average)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Details (weighting factor)

1. **Student Access and Success** (30%)  
   - Score: 92  
   - Trend: Up

2. **Financial and Administrative Stability** (20%)  
   - Score: 63  
   - Trend: Up

3. **Economic Responsiveness** (15%)  
   - Score: 91  
   - Trend: Down

4. **Community Engagement** (15%)  
   - Score: 96  
   - Trend: Down

5. **Diversity and Cultural Competency** (10%)  
   - Score: 83  
   - Trend: Up

6. **Operational Strength** (10%)  
   - Score: 94  
   - Trend: Up

---

Above: Dashboard based on work done by AACC, Richland College, and others
# Scorecard: Iteration 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Weighting Factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Centered College</td>
<td>(16.66%)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates awarded annually</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM degrees awarded annually</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA Teaching degrees awarded annually</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA degrees awarded annually</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers within one year</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Ed Core Completers</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Ed Core Course Successes</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental successes</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Education CEU's</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>11,207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivation of Excellence</td>
<td>(16.66%)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment, Retention, and Recognition</td>
<td>(16.66%)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access, Equity, and Diversity</td>
<td>(16.66%)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Equipment</td>
<td>(16.66%)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources and Funding</td>
<td>(16.66%)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# College of Lake County Scorecard

## Student Learning & Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion Success Rate</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Rate</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence (Fall-Fall)</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>1,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates Awarded</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Educational Opportunity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>17,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
<td>142,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Market Share</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Share</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Sustainability & Stewardship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance %</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Cost per Sq Ft</td>
<td>$2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Utilization</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Diversity & Global Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% FT Minority Employees</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Minority College Students</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Serving Institution</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># International Students</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Innovation & Excellence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Academic Services</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student College Services</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## College Reputation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction with Program / Course Quality</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Legend

- 100% or more of Target
- Between Baseline and 99% of Target
- Below Baseline

**Notes:** Most baselines are based off of 95% of previous year's results.
## Enrollment: 17,389 as of Fall 11

### Trend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 06</td>
<td>15,558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 07</td>
<td>16,010</td>
<td>14,780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 08</td>
<td>16,359</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 09</td>
<td>18,092</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 10</td>
<td>18,091</td>
<td>17,187</td>
<td>18,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 11</td>
<td>17,389</td>
<td>17,186</td>
<td>18,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 12</td>
<td>17,563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 13</td>
<td>17,739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 14</td>
<td>17,916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legend
- ![Green Circle](image): 100% or more of Target
- ![Blue Circle](image): Between Baseline and 99% of Target
- ![Red Circle](image): Below Baseline

### Source: 10th Day Headcount

### Notes
Headcount of all credit students enrolled (College-level, Adult Education and Vocational). Target is based on a 1% increase in enrollment from the previous year. The baseline is based on 95% of the previous year result.

### Peer Information
- [Enrollment Peer Average](#)
- [Enrollment by Peer](#)
## Scorecard: Another Configuration

### Student Momentum
- % Pass 1st College Math: 62%
- % Completing 30 SCH: 14%
- Persistence (Fall-Fall): 50.1%
- Degrees / Certs Awarded: 905
- Transfer Rate: 26.4%

### Access, Equity and Diversity
- Enrollment (credit): 17,400
- Enrollment (non-credit): 30,408
- Credit Hours: 148,475
- Diversity Index: 37
- % Pell Students: 74%

### Community Needs
- Market Share (credit): 4.60%
- Market Share (non-credit): 4.80%
- % Dual Credit Contact hrs: 19%
- Workforce Ed Contact hrs: 2,000

### Employee Success
- Student-Faculty Interaction: 4.60
- Turnover Rate: 12%
- Professional Development: 3.50
- Credential Attainment: 201

### Facilities and Equipment
- Facilities Condition Index: 30
- Classroom Utilization: 67%
- Utility Cost per Sq Ft: $2.40
- Work Orders: 67

### Resources and Funding
- % Budget for Instruction: 26%
- Net Revenue WE: $159,000
- Budget Balance: 60%
- % Contact Hours Taught by FT Faculty: 83%
Facilities could support an additional **2,000** students if course enrollment was near full capacity during the afternoon hours.*
Enrollment by Offset from Census

[Line chart showing enrollment trends from 2005-2013 across different academic years and categories such as age group, dual credit, division and department, high school, instructional mode, and subject and course.]
Gateway Completion to Graduation

![Graph showing Gateway Completion to Graduation with specific statistics for ENGL1301, HIST1301, and MATH1314.](image)

**CSV Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Series</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGL1301 to grad</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST1301 to grad</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH1314 to graduate</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scorecard Best Practices

• Why are we doing this?
• Process critical
• Research other institutions
• Value judgments
• Layer complexity / Interactive drill-down
• Data model complex (DW)
Thanks!
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