2017-2021 District Strategic Plan Alignment

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
Goal 1: We will increase college going for the Los Angeles region through enhanced outreach to community and educational partners and expanded access to educational programs that meet community and student needs.	**Objective 1:** We will expand educational opportunities to local high school students by increasing the number of courses offered through dual enrollment.	**Measure 1.1.1:** Number of sections offered through dual enrollment	Need internal data. **TARGET: 25% increase.** The proposed methodology is to determine a 25% increase from the number of sections available in 2016 for dual enrolled students.	SIS/PeopleSoft
		Measure 1.1.2: Number of students who are dual enrolled	2017: ≈ 11,000 students or 8.6% of high schoolers **TARGET: 13,750 students.** The goal was determined by calculating a 25% increase (2,750) from number of students in 2016 who are dual enrolled (11,000 + 2,750 = 13,750).	SIS/PeopleSoft
	Objective 2: We will fully implement the LA College Promise and will seek to expand the promise to additional school districts and municipalities in the service area.	**Measure 1.2.1:** Number of new LA College Promise students	2017: ≈ 4,000 students **TARGET: 6,000 students** The goal was determined by calculating a 50% increase (2,000) from 2017 student counts (4,000 + 2,000 = 6,000).	SIS/PeopleSoft
		Measure 1.2.2: Percentage of LAUSD schools served by LA College Promise program	Need internal data. **TARGET: 90% of LAUSD Schools (Secondary & Charter Schools)**	?

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
	Objective 3: We, in partnership with Los Angeles Regional Adult Education Consortium, will increase educational opportunities to nontraditional students through the expansion of noncredit adult education courses focused on skills improvement and vocational training.	**Measure 1.3.1:** Number of noncredit adult education sections	2012: 539, 2013: 519, 2014: 518, 2015: 552, 2016: 602 **TARGET: 753 sections.** The goal was determined by calculating a 25% increase (150.5) from 2016 section counts and rounding to the nearest whole number (602 + 150.5 = 752.5 = 753).	DataMart
		Measure 1.3.2: Number of students enrolled in noncredit adult education courses	2012: 9,668; 2013: 9,698; 2014: 9,441; 2015: 11,405; 2016: 11,556 **TARGET: 14,445 students.** The goal was determined by calculating a 25% increase (2,889) from 2016 student counts (11,556 + 2,889 = 14,445).	DataMart
	Objective 4: We will improve outreach strategies for new and returning students through effective marketing and branding that increases the recognition of LACCD colleges and programs as premier in the community.	**Measure 1.4.1:** Number of first-time students	Need internal data. The proposed methodology is to add the value of 2 standard deviations ($2\,\sigma$ = ?) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (μ = ?) and round up to the nearest whole number (? + ? = ? = ?).	
		Measure 1.4.2: Number of returning students	Need internal data. The proposed methodology is to add the value of 2 standard deviations ($2\,\sigma$ = ?) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (μ = ?) and round up to	

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
			the nearest whole number (? + ? = ? = ?).	
		Measure 1.4.3: Percentage of students whose decision to enroll was impacted by newspaper, radio, or television advertisements	2017: 16.1% endorsed very much or quite a bit **TARGET: 25% of students endorsing very much or quite a bit.** The goal was determined by consensus.	Student Survey
		Measure 1.4.3: Percentage of students whose decision to enroll was impacted by social media	2017: 19.3% endorsed very much and quite a bit **TARGET: 25% of students endorsing very much or quite a bit.** The goal was determined by consensus.	Student Survey

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
Goal 2: We will develop a premier learning environment that places students as the first priority in the institution and effectively supports students in attaining educational goals.	**Objective 1:** We will have an excellent campus climate by improving student services, providing a safe learning environment, and by establishing a higher standard for customer service.	**Measure 2.1.1:** Percentage of student services with high satisfaction ratings (80% of students stating that they are somewhat or very satisfied). *(Student services include: Admissions and Records, Assessment and Placement Services, Associated Student Organization/Union, Athletics, Bookstore, Business and Fiscal Office, CalWORKs, Career and Employment Center, Child Care Center, College Sheriff, Disabled Student Programs and Services, EOPS or CARE, Financial Aid Office, Food Services, Foster Youth, General College Counseling Services, Health Center, Instructional or Computer Labs, International Student Program and Services, Library, On-campus Orientation, Online Orientation, PUENTE, Transfer Center, Tutoring Services, Umoja, and Veterans Office)*	Survey Options: Very Satisfied, Somewhat Satisfied, Not Satisfied, Not Applicable 2014: average of 59% were somewhat to very satisfied with services 2017: average of 60% were somewhat to very satisfied with services **TARGET: 90% of student services having high satisfaction ratings.** The goal was determined by consensus.	Student Survey
		Measure 2.1.2: To what extent do you agree with the statement, I feel safe and secure at this college?	Survey Options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, N/A 2014: 10.1% disagree or strongly disagree 2017: 7.2% disagree or strongly disagree **TARGET: 3.6% of students stating they disagree or strongly disagree.** The goal was determined by reducing 2017 ratings by half, 50%.	Student Survey

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
	Objective 2: We will create an environment that is respectful to the needs of diverse populations and that embraces the diversity of opinions found in a global society.	**Measure 2.2.1:** At this college, how often do you engage with students who differ from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or ethnic background?	Survey Options: Often, Sometimes, Seldom, Never 2014: 41.5% said often or sometimes 2017: 78.6% said often or sometimes **TARGET: 3.5 survey rating.** The goal was determined by consensus.	Student Survey
		Measure 2.2.2: My experience at this college, in and out of class, has improved my ability to understand people of other racial, cultural, or religious backgrounds?	Survey Options: Very much, Quite a Bit, Some, Very Little 2014: 75% said very much or quite a bit 2017: 77.3% said very much or quite a bit **TARGET: 3.5 survey rating.** The goal was determined by consensus.	Student Survey
	Objective 3: We will increase fulltime enrollment for students through the development of flexible programs focused on working students and students with barriers to attending traditionally scheduled programs.	**Measure 2.3.1:** Percentage of students enrolled full time	2012: 35,082 & 23.2%, 2013: 36,161 & 23.5%, 2014: 36,719 & 24.2%, 2015: 36,385 & 23.5%, 2016: 34,311 & 22.4% **TARGET: 26% of students enrolled full time.** The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations ($4\sigma = 2.6\%$) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years ($\mu = 23.4\%$) and rounding up to the nearest whole number	DataMart

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
			(23.4% + 2.6% = 26%).	
		Measure 2.7.2: Number of course enrollments	2011: 887,407, 2012: 749,753, 2013: 749,919, 2014: 801,331, 2015: 817,681 **TARGET: Exceed statewide performance in number of course enrollments.** The goal was determined by consensus.	CalPass/Strong Workforce Program Metrics
	Objective 4: We will review and refine curriculum and programs to ensure that they are responsive to student needs and meeting the economic, industry, and societal needs of the region.	**Measure 2.4.1:** Number of programs with zero completions	**TARGET: 0 programs.** The goal was determined by consensus, and will not include completions for the first four years a program is offered.	SIS/PeopleSoft
	Objective 5: We will provide facilities and technologies to effectively serve and connect with the modern student and enhance regular and effective communication.	**Measure 2.5.1:** To what extend do you agree with the statement, this college's Wi-Fi is reliable?	Survey Options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree 2014: 71.1% agree or strongly agree 2017: 63.1% agree or strongly agree **TARGET: 3.5 survey rating.** The goal was determined by consensus.	Student Survey

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
		Measure 2.5.2: In general, to what extend do you agree with the statement, my instructors adequately use available technology in and out of the classroom?	Survey Options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree 2014: 88.6% agree or strongly agree 2017: 88.1% agree or strongly agree **TARGET: 3.5 survey rating.** The goal was determined by consensus.	
		Measure 2.5.3: How often do you use email, social media, or text messaging to communicate with an instructor?	Survey Options: Often, Sometimes, Seldom, Never, Not Applicable 2014: 64.6% said often or sometimes 2017: 75% said often or sometimes **TARGET: 3.5 survey rating.** The goal was determined by consensus.	Student Survey
		Measure 2.5.4: How often do you use email, social media, text messaging, or this college's website to keep informed about college events?	Survey Options: Often, Sometimes, Seldom, Never, Not Applicable 2017: 67.5% said often or sometimes **TARGET: 3.5 survey rating.** The goal was determined by consensus.	Student Survey

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
	Objective 6: We will increase access to higher education by assisting students in gaining access to financial aid and ensuring that all students, whether in-person or online, receive orientation, multiple measures assessment, and educational planning.	**Measure 2.6.1:** Percentage of eligible students receiving Pell Grant	2011: 71%, 2012: 71%, 2013: 71%, 2014: 70%, 2015: 66% **TARGET: 74%.** The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (2 σ = 4.3%) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (μ = 69.8%) and rounding to the nearest whole number (69.8% + 4.3% = 74.1% = 74%).	DataMart
		Measure 2.6.2: Percentage of new students completing an English assessment before or in the first term or being placed using a multiple measure	2011: 72%, 2012: 75%, 2013: 73%, 2014: 78%, 2015: 78% **TARGET: 81%.** The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (2 σ = 5.5%) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (μ = 75.2%) and rounding to the nearest whole number (75.2% + 5.5% = 80.7% = 81%).	
		Measure 2.6.3: Percentage of new students completing a math assessment before or in the first term or being placed using a multiple measure	2011: 72%, 2012: 75%, 2013: 73%, 2014: 78%, 2015: 78% **TARGET: 84%.** The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (2 σ = 7.1%) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (μ = 76.8%) and	

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
			rounding to the nearest whole number (76.8% + 7.1% = 83.9% = 84%).	
		Measure 2.6.4: Percentage of new students completing orientation	2014: 58%, 2015: 72% **TARGET: 95%.** The goal was determined by consensus.	
		Measure 2.6.4: Percentage of new students creating an academic plan	2014: 66%, 2015: 77% **TARGET: 95%.** The goal was determined by consensus.	
	Objective 7: We will increase student persistence and successful course completion through effective practices in the classroom and through student services.	**Measure 2.7.1:** Persistence rate, Fall to Spring	2011: 86%, 2012-13: 87%, 2014: 88%, 2015: 89% **TARGET: 90%.** The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (2 σ = 2.3%) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (μ = 87.4%) and rounding up to the nearest whole number (87.4% + 2.3% = 89.7% = 90%).	SIS/PeopleSoft
		Measure 2.7.2: Persistence rate, Fall to Fall	2011: 74% 2012-2015: 75% **TARGET: 76%.** The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (2 σ = .9%) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (μ = 74.8%) and rounding up to the nearest whole number (74.8% + .9% = 75.7% = 76%).	SIS/PeopleSoft

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
		Measure 2.7.3: Persistence rate, three consecutive terms Scorecard Metric – Persistence: Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer-seeking students starting first time in 2010-11 tracked for six years through 2015-16 who enrolled in the first three consecutive terms.	Scorecard, Overall (State): 2006: 62% (70%), 2007: 64% (71%), 2008: 66% (72%), 2009: 72% (73%), 2010: 76% (76%). **TARGET: Exceed statewide performance in persistence.**	Scorecard
		Measure 2.7.4: Percentage of new, first-time students successfully completing at least one English and math class in their first year	2011: 17%, 2012: 17%, 2013: 19%, 2014: 24%, 2015: 26% **TARGET: 29%.** The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (2 σ = 8.3%) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (μ = 20.6%) and rounding up to the nearest whole number (20.6% + 8.3% = 28.9% = 29%).	
		Measure 2.7.5: Successful course completion rates	2011: 63.8%, 2012: 67.5%, 2013: 65.9%, 2014: 65.7%, 2015: 65.8% **TARGET: Exceed statewide performance in in successful course completion rates.**	IEPI

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
Goal 3: We will increase student completion to exceed the statewide performance measures and increase attainment of milestones indicative of academic success.	**Objective 1:** We will decrease time to completion by enhancing academic and student support programs.	**Measure 3.1.1:** Average number of units accumulated by students earning an associate's degree	**TARGET: 79 units.** The goal was set by CCCO, Objective 3 which calls for a decrease in the average number of units accumulated by CCC students earning associate's degrees, from approximately 87 to 79 total units.	
		Measure 3.1.2: Median time to complete a degree	2011: 4.5, 2012-2015: 4.4 **TARGET: 4 years.** The goal was determined by calculating an approximate 10% decrease from previous years.	SIS/PeopleSoft
		Measure 3.1.3: Median time to complete a certificate	2013-2015: 3.7 **TARGET: 3 years.** The goal was determined by calculating an approximate 20% decrease from previous years.	SIS/PeopleSoft
		Measure 3.1.4: Graduation rates of full-time, first-time degree/certificate seeking undergraduates with 150% of normal time to completion	2011: 17%, 2012: 15%, 2013: 18%, 2014: 21%, 2015: 23% **TARGET: 26%.** The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (2 σ = 6.4%) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (μ = 18.8%) and rounding up to the nearest whole number (18.8% + 6.4% = 25.2% = 26%).	IPEDS

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
	Objective 2: We will increase completion of degrees and certificates.	**Measure 3.2.1:** Completion rates Scorecard Metric – Completion: Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer-seeking students starting first time in 2010-11 tracked for six years through 2015-16 who completed a degree, certificate or transfer-related outcomes.	Scorecard completion (overall): cohort 2006-2007: 42%, 2008: 41%, **2009: 40%,** 2010: 43%. **TARGET: 50%.** The goal was set by the District Board, which asked for a 10% increase in completion rates in the 2015-16 academic year.	Scorecard
		Measure 3.2.2: Number of students who got a degree or certificate	2011: 8,372, 2012: 9,449, 2013: 10,200, 2014: 11,055, 2015: 12,957 **TARGET: 15,549 students / 20% increase.** (12,957*.20) + 12,957 = 15,548.4 = 15,549. The goal was set by CCCO, Objective 1 which calls for an increase of 20% in the number of CCC students annually who acquire associates degrees, credentials, certificates, or specific skill sets.	CalPass/Strong Workforce Program Metrics
		Measure 3.2.3: Number of students who received a degree	Need internal data. **TARGET: # degrees.** The goal was set by CCCO, Objective 1 which calls for an increase of 20% in the number of CCC students annually who acquire associates degrees, credentials, certificates, or specific skill sets.	SIS/PeopleSoft

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
		Measure 3.2.4: Number students who received a certificate	Need internal data. **TARGET: # certificates.** The goal was set by CCCO, Objective 1 which calls for an increase of 20% in the number of CCC students annually who acquire associates degrees, credentials, certificates, or specific skill sets.	SIS/PeopleSoft
	Objective 3: We will increase the number of students transferring to four-year institutions.	**Measure 3.3.1:** Number of students who transfer to California Public, 4-year institutions (UC or CSU)	2011: 4,628; 2012: 3,847; 2013: 4,855; 2014: 5,699; 2015: 5,395 **TARGET: 7,283 students / 35% increase.** (5,395*.35) + 5,395 = 7,283.3 = 7,283. The goal was set by CCCO, Objective 2 which calls for an increase of 35% in the number of CCC students transferring annually to a UC or CSU.	EPIE, Institutional Performance & Accountability page
		Measure 3.3.2: Number of students who transfer to a 4-year institution Strong Workforce Program Metric - Number of students who transferred: Unique individuals who transferred to a four-year institution	2010: 8,309, 2011: 7,523, 2012: 7,693, 2013: 8,975, 2014: 7,445 **TARGET: 10,050 students / 35% increase.** (7,445*.35) + 7,445 = 10,050.75 = 10,050. The goal was set using the CCCO, Objective 2 as a guide.	CalPass/Strong Workforce Program Metrics

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
	Objective 4: We will increase career and job placement rates in the field of study by enhancing business and industry partnerships, internships, and employment opportunities.	**Measure 3.4.1:** Percentage of students completing more than eight units in CTE courses in 6 years Career Technical Education: Percentage of students completing more than eight units in courses classified as career technical education (or apprenticeship) in a single discipline for the first time in 2010-11 tracked for six years through 2015-16 who completed a degree, certificate, apprenticeship or transfer-related outcomes.	LACCD Scorecard (State): 2006: 48% (51%), 2007: 47% (51%), 2008: 47% (50%), 2009: 49% (52%), 2010: 52% (54%). **TARGET: Exceed statewide performance in percentage of students completing more than eight units in CTE courses.**	Scorecard
		Measure 3.4.2: Number of Skills Certificates awarded	2012: 1,575; 2013: 1,533; 2014: 1,884; 2015: 2,744; 2016: 3,520 **TARGET: 3,972 skills certificates.** The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations ($2\,\sigma = 1{,}720.6$) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years ($\mu = 2{,}251.2$) and rounding to the nearest whole number ($2{,}251.2 + 1{,}720.6 = 3{,}971.8 = 3{,}972$).	EPIE, Degrees and Certificates Awarded Document
		Measure 3.4.3: Median percentage change in wages for students who completed higher level CTE coursework (Skills Builder) Skills Builder: The median percentage change in wages for students who completed higher level CTE coursework in 2013-2014 and left the system without receiving any type of traditional outcome such as transfer to a four year college or	LACCD Scorecard (State): 2010/11: 6.7% (10%), 2011/12: 8.2% (11%), 2012/13: 8.0% (13.4), 2013/14: 18.5% (22.6%) **TARGET: Exceed statewide performance in the median percentage change in wages.**	Scorecard

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
		completion of a degree or certificate.		
		Measure 3.4.4: Percentage of students who report being employed in their field of study Job closely related to field of study: The proportion of students who reported that their current job is close or very close to their field of study (based on responses in the CTE Outcomes Survey)	LACCD data are incomplete (State) - 2011: (67%); 2012: (71%); 2013: (68%); 2014: (69%); 2015: (69%) **TARGET: 69%.** The goal was set by CCCO, Objective 4 which calls for an increase in the percent of exiting CTE students who report being employed in their field of study, from 60% to 69%	CalPass/Strong Workforce Program Metrics Career & Technical Education Outcomes Survey Reports
		Measure 3.4.5: Proportion of exiting students who attained a living wage Attained a living wage: Proportion of exiting completing and skills-builder students who attained the living wage for a single individual in the college's Doing What Matters region (based on a match to the state unemployment insurance wage file and Insight Center for Community Economic Development data)	LACCD (State) - 2010: 41% (49%), 2011: 39% (48%), 2012: 40% (47%), 2013: 39% (46%), 2014: 41% (48%) **TARGET: Exceed statewide performance in proportion of exiting students who attain a living wage.**	CalPass/Strong Workforce Program Metrics
	Objective 5: We will increase the percentage students completing transfer-level English and mathematics among those who begin at courses below transfer-level. Transfer Level Achievement: The percent of first-time students in 2014-15 who complete 6 units and attempt any Math or English in their first year who complete a transfer-level course in Math or English in their first year.	**Measure 3.5.1:** Percentage of students completing transfer-level English, among those who begin at courses below transfer-level	First Year, Cohort (State) 2010: 18% (30%), 2011: 17% (31%), 2012: 17% (33%), 2013 22% (36%), 2014: 26% (38%) **TARGET: Exceed statewide performance in Transfer level achievement in English.**	Scorecard
		Measure 3.5.2: Percentage of students completing transfer-level mathematics, among those who begin at courses below transfer-level	First Year, Cohort (State) 2010: 8% (15%), 2011: 8% (14%), 2012: 8% (15%), 2013: 8% (16%), 2014: 8% (17%) **TARGET: Exceed statewide performance in Transfer level achievement in Math.**	Scorecard

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
	Objective 6: We will increase equity in the attainment of student milestones. Achievement gap will be calculated using the Percentage Point Gap Method outlined by CCCCO.	**Measure 3.6.1:** Persistence--Percentage of new students who are enrolled in their first 3 consecutive terms (measured overall and by Gender, Age, and Ethnicity) Persistence: Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer-seeking students starting first time in 2010-11 tracked for six years through 2015-16 who enrolled in the first three consecutive terms.	LACCD Scorecard, Overall (State): 2006: 42% (49%), 2007: 42% (49%), 2008: 41% (48%), 2009: 40% (47%), 2010: 43% (48%). **TARGET: 40% decrease in achievement gaps.** The goal was set by CCCO, Objective 5 which calls for a cutting of achievement gaps by 40% in 5 years.	Scorecard
		Measure 3.6.2: 30 units--Percentage of New Student Cohort Completing 30 Units in 3 Years (measured overall and by Gender, Age, and Ethnicity) 30 Units: Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer-seeking students starting first time in 2010-11 tracked for six years through 2015-16 who achieved at least 30 units.	LACCD Scorecard, Overall (State): 2006: 63% (66%), 2007: 64% (67%), 2008: 63% (67%), 2009: 66% (68%), 2010: 68% (69%). **TARGET: 40% decrease in achievement gaps.** The goal was set by CCCO, Objective 5 which calls for a cutting of achievement gaps by 40% in 5 years.	Scorecard
		Measure 3.6.3: Completion--Percentage of new students who earned a degree, certificate, or transfer within six years (measured overall &by Gender, Age, Ethnicity) Completion: Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer-seeking students starting first time in 2010-11 tracked for six years through 2015-16 who completed a degree, certificate or transfer-related outcomes.	LACCD Scorecard, Overall (State): 2006: 42% (49%), 2007: 42% (49%), 2008: 41% (48%), 2009: 40% (47%), 2010: 43% (48%). **TARGET: 40% decrease in achievement gaps.** The goal was set by CCCO, Objective 5 which calls for a cutting of achievement gaps by 40% in 5 years.	Scorecard

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
Goal 4: We will improve organizational effectiveness at the ESC and among the colleges through streamlined processes, minimized duplication of efforts, and enhanced communication and training.	**Objective 1:** We will invest in professional development opportunities for faculty, staff, and administrators to enhance work performance, broaden skills for leadership and career advancement, leverage academic programs, and allow for effective and clear career pathways for all employees.	**Measure 4.1.1:** Number of events that provide professional development opportunities for faculty, staff, and administrators	**TARGET: 250 events, annually.** The goal was determined by consensus.	Need to create a method to capture the number of professional development events.
	Objective 2: We will improve recruiting, hiring, orientation and evaluation processes, and improve the customer service provided to all employees.	**Measure 4.2.1:** Percentage of evaluations completed per contract	Currently: approximately 72% are complete. **TARGET: 100% of evaluations.** The goal was determined by consensus.	
		Measure 4.2.2: Satisfaction with on-boarding process	**TARGET: 80% satisfaction rate with on-boarding process.** The goal was determined by consensus.	Need to create a survey to capture satisfaction rates.
	Objective 3: We will improve processes to increase responsiveness to and within colleges, limit barriers, and accelerate completion of required business processes and tasks. *(ESC Departments: Chancellor's Office, ADA Compliance Administration, Business Services, Diversity Programs and Services, Information Technology, Board of Trustees, Attendance Accounting, Curriculum Support, Dolores Huerta Institute, Institutional Effectiveness, Student Success,*	**Measure 4.3.1:** Percentage of departments with high satisfaction ratings of responding to requests in a timely manner (80% of people stating that agree or strongly agree).	Survey Options: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree 2015/16: average of 69.8% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement **TARGET: 90% of departments having high satisfaction ratings.** The goal was determined by consensus.	ESC Services Survey

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
	Workforce Development, Accounts Payable, Budget and Management Analysis, Central Financial Aid, General Accounting, Internal Audit, Payroll, Bond Programs, Facilities, Real Estate Program, Employee Relations, Employment Services, Operations, Risk Management, Total Wellness Program, General Counsel, Personnel Commission)	**Measure 4.3.2:** Percentage of departments with high overall satisfaction ratings (80% of people stating that agree or strongly agree).	Survey Options: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree 2015/16: average of 66.6% strongly agreed or agreed with the statement **TARGET: 90% of departments having high satisfaction ratings.** The goal was determined by consensus.	ESC Services Survey
	Objective 4: We will use state-of-the-art technology to improve communication, including the development of an effective website that assists students, employees, and the community in interacting with the District.	**Measure 4.4.1:** To what extent do you agree with the statement, I can easily find the information I need on the college website?	Survey Options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree 2017: 81.1% agree or strongly agree **TARGET: 3.5 survey rating.** The goal was determined by consensus.	Student Survey
		Measure 4.4.2: To what extent do you agree with the statement, information on the college website is current and accurate?	Survey Options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree 2017: 84% agree or strongly agree **TARGET: 3.5 survey rating.** The goal was determined by consensus.	Student Survey
	Objective 5: We will revise all District policies and procedures to implement the Community College League of California model policy.	**Measure 4.5.1:** Percent of policies reviewed and approved in the current cycle using the new model	**TARGET: 100%.** The goal was determined by consensus.	

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
Goal 5: We will improve fiscal integrity through enhanced resource development, institutional advancement, and effective use of existing resources.	**Objective 1:** We will enhance communication, support, and collaboration associated with grant development processes for curricular and student support programs.	**Measure 5.1.1:** Number and amount of grants awarded	Need internal data. **TARGET: 10% increase.** The goal was determined by consensus.	?
	Objective 2: We will develop community and business partnerships to assist the District in achieving its mission and enhance student success by providing additional support to students and appropriate referrals to external resources for non-academic needs.	**Measure 5.2.1:** Number and types of community partnerships	Need internal data. **TARGET: 10% increase.** The goal was determined by consensus.	Need to create a method to collect this information.
	Objective 3: We will enhance the District and College foundations and improve alumni relations leading to the development of endowments from which additional resources for students and academic and support programs can be drawn.	**Measure 5.3.1:** Amount of funds raised by Foundations	Need internal data. **TARGET: 10% increase.** The goal was determined by consensus.	Foundation Need to create a method to collect this information.
		Possible Measure 5.3.2: Number and amount of scholarships dispersed by the Foundations	Need internal data. **TARGET: 10% increase.** The goal was determined by consensus.	Foundation Need to create a method to collect this information.
	Objective 4: We will effectively use District and College resources and implement position control to support the ongoing improvements of academic and student support programs.	**Measure 5.4.1:** Total FTES	2011: 103,529; 2012: 97,858; 2013: 101,383; 2014: 104,568; 2015: 107,601 **TARGET: 110,266.** The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (2 σ = 7,277.5) to the average or mean performance of the last five years (μ = 102,987.8) and rounding up to the nearest	Attendance & Accountability

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
			whole number (102,987.8 + 7,277.5 = 110,265.3 = 110,266).	
		Measure 5.4.2: Expenditures per FTES	2011: $4,036, 2012: $4,148, 2013: $4,305, 2014: $4,371, 2015: $4,624, 2016: $4,869 **TARGET: $4,869.** The goal was determined by consensus to maintain the same expenditures per FTES as observed in 2016.	Expenditure Analysis from the Budget Office
		Measure 5.4.3: WSCH/FTEF	2012: 609, 2013: 573, 2014: 556, 2015: 536, 2016: 518 **TARGET: 540.** The goal was determined by consensus.	Databook-Accountability
		Measure 5.4.4: Average class size	2011: 41.0; 2012: 39.9; 2013: 37.7; 2014: 36.5; 2015: 35.2 **TARGET: 36.** The goal was determined by consensus.	Databook-Accountability
		Measure 5.4.5: Fund balance	2011-12: 14.5%, 2012-13: 13.1%, 2013-14: 13.6%, 2014-15: 13.4%, 2015-16: 20.9% **TARGET: 15.1%.** The goal was determined by taking the average or mean performance of the last five years (μ = 15.1%).	Final Budget Document Need to check with Bob to ensure that this is a proper target.
	Objective 5: We will improve the resource allocation processes to be integrated with District strategic plan.	**Measure 5.5.1:** District-level decision making is effective in relation to budget development and resource allocation	Survey Options: Agree, Disagree 2014-16: 39.4% agree **TARGET: >50% agree.** The	LACCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Survey

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
			goal was determined by consensus.	
	Objective 6: We will effectively plan and use resources to build and maintain District and College facilities and infrastructure in support of the academic and student support programs.	**Measure 5.6.1:** To what extent do you agree with the statement, buildings are clean and well maintained?	Survey Options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, N/A 2014: 75.5% agree or strongly agree 2017: 73.9% agree or strongly agree **TARGET: 3.5 survey rating.** The goal was determined by consensus.	Student Survey
		Measure 5.6.2: To what extent do you agree with the statement, learning facilities (equipment, classrooms, and labs) are adequate and up-to-date?	Survey Options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, N/A 2014: 69.9% agree or strongly agree 2017: 76.1% agree or strongly agree **TARGET: 3.5 survey rating.** The goal was determined by consensus.	Student Survey
		Measure 5.6.3: Facilities Condition Index (FCI) (the ratio of repair cost/replacement cost used to indicate the condition of the building)	2010: 37.88%; 2013: 27.37%; 2016: 24.35% **TARGET: 20% FCI.** The goal was determined in consultation with the Facilities Department.	Fusion Data (Facilities)
		Measure 5.6.6: Capitalization Load Ratio (CAP Load) (the ratio of Net Operating Income to property asset value)	Need data.	Fusion Data (Facilities)

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
	Objective 7: We will develop and implement districtwide standards in information technology, facilities, and human resources that apply to all colleges.	**Possible Measure 5.7.1:** The development of districtwide standards	**TARGET: Yes.** The goal was determined by consensus.	IEPI Website