



RENTON  
TECHNICAL  
COLLEGE®

# **2019-20 STRATEGIC PLAN MONITORING REPORT**

**Year Three of the 2017-2022 Strategic Plan**



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....3

Strategic Indicators Scorecard.....6

Strategic Goal 1: Learning.....9

Strategic Goal 2: Equity.....16

Strategic Goal 3: Community.....22

Strategic Goal 4: Institutional Strength & Resilience.....24

Recommendations .....30



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Renton Technical College's (RTC) mission is to engage a diverse student population through educational opportunities for career readiness and advancement, serving the needs of individuals, the community, businesses, and industry.

For achieving the mission, RTC developed its 2017-2022 Strategic Plan based on the foundation of past success and through a comprehensive and inclusive planning process. The Strategic Plan Monitoring Report is an annual report that is distributed campus-wide and shared with Executive Cabinet and the Board of Trustees to provide them with an overview of RTC's progress toward mission fulfillment.

The four strategic goals outlined in the plan are what RTC intends to achieve throughout the life of the plan. Under the four strategic goals there are 16 strategic objectives. Priority activities are aligned to each objective as collaborative tasks by departments and committees. The four goals outlined in the strategic plan are as follows:

**GOAL 1 Learning:** RTC will be a learning community in which students, faculty, and staff all strive for excellence and growth

**GOAL 2 Equity & Inclusion:** RTC will foster an academic and work environment of equity, inclusion, and collaboration

**GOAL 3 Community:** RTC will engage the greater community through intentional partnerships and responsive programming

**GOAL 4 Institutional Strength & Resilience:** RTC will enhance institutional strength and resilience

38 strategic indicators have been established to monitor success toward strategic plan implementation. The strategic indicators are outlined in the scorecard in page 6. To assist with implementation of the plan, the College has broken down its five-year plan into annual strategic plans (i.e. Year 1, Year 2, Year 3, Year 4, and Year 5).

Each [annual strategic plan](#) articulates the College's key areas of focus for that particular year and specifies priority activities to begin or complete in a given year. Unit/departments align their annual unit plans to the institutional priority activities to operationalize the institutional strategic plan. Units also specify measures of success for tracking progress toward completion of their stated goals and activities.

Key findings from the Year Three Strategic Plan assessment are as follows:

- 23 strategic indicators out of 34 (68%) "met the goal" or were "in progress of meeting the goal". Goals/targets for each indicator set higher than the previous one for continuous improvement.
- 75% students responded positively in the Covid-19 Online Student Impact Survey. Students agreed or strongly agreed that they felt engaged in their online classes. In the same question, students of color responded 4% more positively than the white students group did.



- RTC improved the practices of student learning outcomes assessment and developed the culture of assessment significantly during 2019-20 year. The Faculty Assessment Committee finalized a revised learning outcomes assessment plan and annual learning outcomes assessment report during the summer quarter. The revised assessment plan and report are focused on multiple measures and using the results for improving teaching and learning. The plan also includes the level of mastery of each program-level learning outcomes by specific courses as a curriculum map. The revised plan and report were used during faculty in-service meeting in September to submit the annual assessment report.
- RTC has been successful at engaging people across departments in working on RTC Access for All canvas course. By December 2020, 142 out of 326 (44%) RTC community members had completed RTC CANVAS Accessibility course.
- During 2019-20 year RTC has disaggregated student achievement data and those data are benchmarked against intentionally selected regional and national peers. Those peer institutions are selected through meaningful conversation among College Council members and Institutional Research staff based on institutional characteristics, effectiveness, and specific best practices. The peer data are benchmarked in the three key student achievement areas. They are retention, completion/graduation, and career outcomes. In the benchmarking, peer institutions are compared additionally in terms of equity. Furthermore, best practices of the leading peer institution in the category were identified to benchmark them and to improve RTC's practices and results.
- RTC retained 43% of students (2018 cohort) from 1st fall to 2nd fall quarter. In the peer comparison based on first-time ever in college students only, RTC noted 7% gap to catch up. However, in the full-time only comparison in the same category, RTC showed 12% lead for the peer average comparison. In the additional comparison among Washington State peers for 1st fall to spring retention (2019 cohort), RTC also noted 4% gap to catch up. In terms of racial/ethnic equity gap comparison, RTC had 8% gap to close in the SBCTC peer comparison.
- In peer comparison on employed percentage RTC tied with Bellingham and on annualized earnings RTC performed better than other peers. Furthermore, the student of color group at RTC did 3% better than the white student group in terms of employed percentage. In peer comparison for the equity practice, RTC did 1.5% better than the peer average.
- The overall one-year persistence rate was 59% (2018 cohort). The rate has been decreased by 11%. The persistence rate of 2017 cohort was 69%. One-year persistence rate gap between students of color (SOC) and white students group was -9%. Previously RTC had maintained the gap within +/-5% for last six years.
- Three-year overall completion was 59% (2017 cohort). The rate has been decreased by 6% from 65% (2016 cohort). Three-year completion rate gap between students of color (SOC) and white students group was -3.7%. RTC has maintained the gap successfully within +/-5% for last six years. In the peer comparison in this category, RTC outperformed peers by 12% (full-time and part-time, first-time ever). RTC outperformed its SBCTC peers by 20% in the category of first-time ever professional/technical cohort comparison. In the racial equity lens, RTC also outperformed SBCTC peer institutions by 12%.



- The RTC Foundation received \$1,072,600 in donations during 2019-20. The donation amount jumped by \$469,237 from the previous year and it is the highest annual donation.
- The percentage of RTC's faculty and staff who are people of color is 39%. RTC outperformed all SBCTC peers by 18%. The system average for the category was 21%. Also, employee retention rate for 2019-20 was 95%, which is the highest in the recent five years.
- The Enrollment percentage of students of color in prof-tech programs was 58% in the finalized 2018-19 system data. The enrollment percentage of student of color in prof-tech programs has increased by 11% from year 2014 to 2018.



# STRATEGIC INDICATORS SCORECARD

## OVERVIEW

The strategic indicators scorecard represents RTC’s progress towards implementation of the 2017-2022 strategic plan. Each strategic goal has associated strategic objectives and strategic indicators that are measured throughout the life of the plan. The data is collected and reviewed by the Institutional Research Office, discussed at College Council and Executive Cabinet, and shared with the Board of Trustees and campus constituents. Each strategic indicator receives a score based on objective, quantifiable measures. College Council is responsible for scoring the indicators.

## SCORING KEY

Progress Toward Goal	Score
<b>Met</b> (100% for Each Indicator Benchmark)	2
<b>In Progress</b> (85% or higher for Each Indicator Benchmark)	1
<b>Not Met</b>	0

## DEFINITIONS

STRATEGIC INDICATORS (SI) – measures used to determine success toward meeting strategic objectives.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (KPI) – measures used to monitor core theme achievement and progress toward mission fulfillment. KPIs are required by our institutional accrediting body, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities.

### Total Implementation Success Score by Strategic Indicators

Strategic Indicator	Strategic Goal	Strategic Objective	KPI Alignment	Annual Score
One-year persistence rate overall	Learning	1.1	KPI 3	0
One-year persistence rate disaggregated by race/ethnicity	Learning	1.1	KPI 3	0
3-year completion rates	Learning	1.1	KPI 7	0
3-year completion rates disaggregated by race/ethnicity	Learning	1.1	KPI 7	2
Transition rates (College & Career Pathways students)	Learning	1.1	KPI 15	2



Strategic Indicator	Strategic Goal	Strategic Objective	KPI Alignment	Annual Score
Transition rates disaggregated by race/ethnicity	Learning	1.1	KPI 15	0
Student satisfaction with programs and services	Learning	1.2	KPI 5	2
Resources allocated to professional development activities	Learning	1.3	NA	2
Course and program outcomes	Learning	1.4	KPI 6	2
Systematic assessment plan and timeline	Learning	1.4	KPI 6	2
Program review implementation	Learning	1.1	KPI 6	1
Course success rates	Equity	2.1	KPI 4	2
Course success rates (pass 2.0 or higher) disaggregated by race/ethnicity	Equity	2.1	KPI 4	2
One-year persistence rate overall	Equity	2.1	KPI 3	0
One-year persistence rate disaggregated by race/ethnicity	Equity	2.1	KPI 3	0
1 <sup>st</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter retention rate overall	Equity	2.1	KPI 2	0
1 <sup>st</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter retention rate, disaggregated by race/ethnicity	Equity	2.1	KPI 2	0
1 <sup>st</sup> to 2 <sup>nd</sup> quarter retention rate overall	Equity	2.1	KPI 2	1
1 <sup>st</sup> to 2 <sup>nd</sup> quarter retention rate disaggregated by race/ethnicity	Equity	2.1	KPI 2	0
Enrollment percentage of students of color in prof-tech programs	Equity	2.1	NA	2
Employee demographics Race/ethnicity breakdown for faculty/staff	Equity	2.2	KPI 16	2
Employee retention rates	Equity	2.2	KPI 16	2
Status of compliance with WA state OCIO Policy 188 pertaining to accessibility	Equity	2.4	KPI 16	2
Placement rates (Career outcomes)	Community	3.1	KPI 11	1
Licensure and certification pass rates	Community	3.1	KPI 9	1



Strategic Indicator	Strategic Goal	Strategic Objective	KPI Alignment	Annual Score
Wages of graduates	Community	3.1	NA	2
Percentage of programs that qualify as high-demand	Community	3.1	NA	2
NWCCU recommendations cleared	Inst. Strength	4.3	NA	2
Fill rates	Inst. Strength	4.2	NA	2
Budget-to-actual variance	Inst. Strength	4.2	KPI 18	2
FTE enrollment	Inst. Strength	4.2	KPI 19	0
FTE enrollment by student intent	Inst. Strength	4.2	KPI 20	0
Number and dollar value of donor gifts	Inst. Strength	4.2	KPI 21	2
Number and dollar amount of grants funded	Inst. Strength	4.2	KPI 22	2
<b>Total Implementation Success Score by Strategic Indicators</b> 23 indicators out of 34 “met the target” or were “in progress of meeting the target”.				<b>41/68 (60%)</b>



## STRATEGIC GOAL 1: LEARNING

Renton Technical College will be a learning community in which students, faculty, and staff all strive for excellence and growth. There are four strategic objectives that fall within this goal, as well as seven strategic indicators for measuring success. Objectives and indicators are as follows:

**Strategic Indicator:** One-year persistence overall & disaggregated by race/ethnicity (aligned to KPI 3)

Related Strategic Plan Objective 1.1: Increase student progress and completion

Benchmarks:

- 1) Persistence rates are at least 2% higher than the previous year. RTC has exceptionally high persistence rates, making substantial increases over time difficult to attain.
- 2) The persistence rates for students of color will be equal to or within +/-5% of the retention rates for students identifying as white. A 5% difference is the minimum achievement gap that is considered acceptable and accounts for natural fluctuations over time.

### Measure: One-year persistence rate overall

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
<b>One-year persistence</b>	69.4%	69.1%	70.9%	74.1%	69.3%	58.5%
<b>Benchmark met</b>	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No -10.8%
<b>KPI Score and Rationale</b>	Score = 0 (Did Not Meet)					

### Measure: One-year persistence rate disaggregated by race/ethnicity

Group	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
<b>Students of color</b>	69.3%	67.6%	71%	74.6%	68.3%	54.9%
<b>White</b>	68.6%	69.2%	71.9%	74.8%	70.5%	63.9%
<b>Gap</b>	0.7%	-1.6%	-0.9%	-0.2%	-2.2%	-9.0%
<b>Benchmark met</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
<b>SI score and rationale</b>	Score = 0 (Did Not Meet)					

Data Source: SBCTC Data Warehouse Student Achievement Database, PEP Cohorts.

Definition of Persistence Rate: A persistence rate is calculated as the number of students in a cohort who have graduated or are still enrolled (retained) typically after their first year at a 2-year college (e.g., Fall to Fall persistence).

Once students start to graduate, only the persistence rate makes sense because the retention rate starts to decline. Although IPEDS reports Fall to Fall retention rates for colleges, for 2-year colleges like RTC, it is



calculated as the number of students who graduated or were retained, so is actually a measure of persistence.

**Strategic Indicator:** 3-Year Completion rates overall & disaggregated by race/ethnicity (aligned by KPI 7)

Related Strategic Plan Objective 1.1: Increase student progress and completion

Benchmarks:

- 1) Completion rates are at least 2% higher than the previous year. RTC has exceptionally high completion rates, making substantial increases over time difficult to attain.
- 2) The completion rates for students of color will be equal to or within +/-5% of the completion rates for students identifying as white. A 5% difference is the minimum achievement gap that is considered acceptable and accounts for natural fluctuations over time.

**Measure: 3-year completion rates**

Reporting Year	2012 13	2013 14	2014 15	2015 16	2016 17	2017 18
<b>Certificate</b>	50.1%	47.4%	45.5%	52.9%	46.2%	44.0%
<b>Degree</b>	14.8%	16%	19.2%	13.1%	18.8%	14.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>64.9%</b>	<b>63.4%</b>	<b>64.7%</b>	<b>66.0%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>58.7%</b>
<b>Benchmark met</b>	No	No	No	Yes	No	<b>No</b> -6.3%
SI Score = 0 (Did Not Meet)						

Reference: [RTC Retention & Completion Dashboard](#)

Data Source: SBCTC Data Warehouse Student Achievement Database, PEP Cohorts, and Completion Tables. Completion rates are checked within three years of entry for each cohort. Therefore, the 2017-18 data reflects completion rates for the 2014-15 cohorts.

**Measure: 3-year completion rates disaggregated by race/ethnicity**

Category	Race/Ethnicity	2012 13	2013 14	2014 15	2015 16	2016 17	2017 18
Certificate	Student of Color	51.5%	46.3%	45.7%	54.3%	47.6%	43.8%
	White	49.0%	48.3%	44.6%	51.1%	46.2%	45.3%
Degree	Student of Color	12.5%	16.4%	17.4%	11.6%	17.5%	13.2%
	White	17.4%	14.8%	19.3%	15.9%	19.7%	15.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>Student of Color</b>	<b>63.9%</b>	<b>62.7%</b>	<b>63.1%</b>	<b>66.0%</b>	<b>65.0%</b>	<b>57.0%</b>
	<b>White</b>	<b>66.4%</b>	<b>63.1%</b>	<b>63.9%</b>	<b>67.0%</b>	<b>65.9%</b>	<b>60.7%</b>
<b>Gap</b>		<b>-2.5%</b>	<b>-0.4%</b>	<b>-0.8%</b>	<b>-1.0%</b>	<b>-0.9%</b>	<b>-3.7%</b>
<b>Benchmark met</b>		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<b>Yes</b>
SI Score = 2 (Met)							

Data Source: SBCTC Data Warehouse Student Achievement Database, PEP Cohorts, and Completion Tables. Completion rates are checked within three years of entry for each cohort. Therefore, the 2017-18 data reflects completion rates for the 2014-15 cohorts.

RTC has disaggregated student achievement data and those data are benchmarked against intentionally selected regional and national peers. The College selected its peers by College Council, a main shared-governance body. The peers' data are annually reviewed to ensure appropriate and meaningful benchmarking practices and documented in its Annual Strategic Plan Monitoring Report.



Because of the unique mission, programs, and growth in the community as a technical college, RTC has some challenges to identify its peer groups. The comparison group in IPEDS, Aspen Award institutions, and Achieving the Dream network has some limitation because of definition and selected group of the students. For the reasons, College Council as a shared-governance body understands the need of a peer group for meaningful and systematic comparison and has worked with its members to identify institutions as a peer group (see the minutes of the [College Council](#)). The Council agreed that the institutions in the group are comparable, competitive, and aspirational. To meet the criteria, the Council selected six institutions which are similar in terms of institutional characteristics and mission. The Council selected two institutions from the system (SBCTC), the other two from the west coast, and the remaining two institutions for their best practices in the national pool.

Name	System	Regional	National	Institutional Characteristics	Mission & Values	Benchmarking Area for Best Practices
Lake Washington Inst. of Technology	X			X	X	Closing Equity Gap in Retention
Bellingham Technical College	X			X	X	Career Outcomes
American River College		X		X	X	Retention Practice
Atlanta Technical College			X	X	X	Diversity/Inclusion
Odessa College			X	X	X	Institutional Effectiveness

Updated by IR-jk-2020

The peers’ data are benchmarked in the three key student achievement criteria. They are retention, completion/graduation, and career outcomes. The completion rate is benchmarked under the RTC Strategic Goal 1, Learning. In the benchmarking, peer institutions are compared again in the same category for equity and inclusion gap. Furthermore, best practices of the leading peer institution in the category were identified to benchmark them and to improve RTC’s practices and results.

Three-year overall completion was 59% (2017 cohort). The rate has been decreased by 6% from 65% (2016 cohort). Three-year completion rate gap between students of color (SOC) and white students group was - 3.7%. RTC has maintained the gap successfully within +/-5% for last six years. In the peer comparison in this category, RTC outperformed peers by 12% (full-time and part-time first-time ever) to 20% (first-time ever professional/technical only among SBCTC peers) by cohort category. In the racial equity lens, RTC also outperformed SBCTC peer institutions by 12%.

Student Category	Bellingham	Lake Washington	American River	Odessa	Atlanta Technical	Peer Average	RTC	RTC Gap
1-year retention, first time in college (2018 Cohort)	53% (2)	54% (2)	62% (1)	39% (1)	42% (1)	50%	43% (2)	- 7%
1-year retention full-time only (2018)	N/A	N/A	70% (2)	56% (2)	56% (2)	61%	73% (1)	+ 12%
3-year completion	46% (1)	39% (1)	27% (1)	30% (1)	38% (1)	36%	57% (1)	+ 21%
Annualized Earnings	\$40,000 (1)	\$42,000 (1)	\$36,000 (3)	\$45,227 (2)	\$29,000 (3)	\$38,445	\$44,000 (1)	+ \$5,555

Data source 1 is U.S. News & World Report. Data source 2 is [College Scorecard](#). Data source 3 is an [SBCTC Student Outcomes Dashboard](#).

**Strategic Indicator:** Transition rates overall & disaggregated by race/ethnicity (aligned to KPI 15)

Related Objective 1.1: Increase student progress and completion

**Benchmarks:**

- 1) Transition rates are equal to or higher than the previous year.
- 2) Transition rates for students of color will be equal to or within +/-5% of the rate for students identifying as white. A 5% difference is the minimum achievement gap that is considered acceptable and accounts for natural fluctuations over time.

**Measure: Transition rates (College & Career Pathways students)**

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
<b>Transition rate</b>	29.7%	29.0%	30.1%	32.3%	35.9% +3.6%
<b>Benchmark met</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>SI score and rationale</b>	Score = 2 (Met)				

**Measure: Transition rates disaggregated by race/ethnicity**

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
<b>Students of color</b>	26.4%	26%	26.6%	27.9%	32.7%
<b>White</b>	39.8%	41.2%	45.1%	47.2%	52.8%
<b>Gap</b>	-13.40%	-15.20%	-18.50%	-19.30%	-20.10%
<b>Benchmark met</b>	No	No	No	No	No
<b>KPI Score and Rationale</b>	Score = 0 (Did not meet)				

Data Source: SBCTC Student Achievement Database. Transition = The percentage of students who earn at least one non-basic studies student achievement momentum point (excluding the retention point).

**Strategic Indicator:** Student satisfaction with programs and services (CCSSE, SENSE, annual student survey) (aligned to KPI 5)

Related Objective 1.2: Provide comprehensive student support services

**Benchmarks:** Survey benchmark average rating scores are higher than 70%. Gap between student of color group and student of white group is within +/-5%.

**Measure: COVID-19 STUDENT IMPACT SURVEY: ONLINE STUDENTS, SUMMER 2020**

Year 2020	
<b>Overall</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 75% students felt that they engaged in their online classes.</li> <li>• About 7 out of 10 students (69%) said that they felt supported by the college. 18% of students responded as neutral and 13% of them disagreed.</li> <li>• About 7 out of 10 students (68%) said that they know who to contact if they experience technical issues with online classes.</li> </ul>
<b>Students of color (SOC)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 79% students felt that they engaged in their online classes.</li> <li>• About 7 out of 10 students (70%) said that they felt supported by the college. 19% students responded as neutral and 9% of them disagreed.</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>About 7 out of 10 students (70%) said that they know who to contact if they experience technical issues with online classes.</li> </ul>
<b>Gap (SOC vs. White Student Group)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+4% on Classroom Engagement (SOC)</li> <li>+1% on Overall College Support &amp; Satisfaction (SOC)</li> <li>+2% on Support for Technical Issues with Online Classes (SOC)</li> </ul>
<b>Benchmark met</b>	<b>Yes</b>
KPI Score and Rationale	Score = 2 (Met)
Key Findings for Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Among multiple choices, mental and emotional health was the top concern for students. Also, students were concerned about physical health, being physically isolated from classmates and/or instructors, balancing other home responsibilities, and keeping up with coursework.</li> <li>Is the most helpful activity and resource students selected “recorded lectures where students view lectures any time of the day” followed by “live lectures delivered via videoconferencing” and “online textbooks;”</li> <li>As multiple choices for anticipated support services, students selected “class registration (24%), “financial aid (21%), and “advising (15%)” as top 3 services;</li> </ul>

**Strategic Indicator:** Resources allocated to professional development activities.

Objective 1.3: Foster continuous growth and professional development of faculty and staff

*Benchmarks: Amount of resources allocated to professional development activities is higher than the previous year*

Benchmark	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
Dollar amount of resources allocated to professional development activities	<b>\$337,800</b>	<b>\$336,360</b>	<b>\$296,350</b>	<b>\$296,660</b>
Benchmark met	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>
SI score and rationale	Score = 2			

**Strategic Indicator:** Student learning outcomes assessment (aligned to KPI 6)

Objective 1.4: Develop and implement a college-wide learning assessment strategy

Benchmarks:

- 1) All course and program learning outcomes are published on the applicable program page on the website, as well as in the syllabi.
- 2) The College has developed a systematic assessment plan and timeline for using assessment data to drive changes in the classroom.
- 3) The program review process is implemented in all programs according to the published timeline/cycle.

**Measure: Course and program outcomes**

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
--	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------



<b>Outcomes created and on syllabi</b>	In progress, not 100% completed	In progress, not 100% completed	93% Completed	100% Updated Completed	100% Updated Completed
<b>Benchmark met</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>SI score and rationale</b>	Score = 2. (Met) Program learning outcomes have been published and updated annually in the RTC program website pages. All syllabi are now required to include course learning outcomes in Canvas. The Curriculum Committee reviews and tracks to ensure all programs meet this expectation through regular meeting.				

**Measure: Systematic assessment plan and timeline**

	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
<b>Assessment plan created</b>	N/A	Not completed	Not completed	completed	completed
<b>Benchmark met</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>SI score and rationale</b>	Score = 2 (Met)  Highlighted progress: The Director of IR worked with the Assessment Committee to finalize a revised learning outcomes assessment plan and annual learning outcomes assessment report during the summer quarter (2020). The revised assessment plan and report are focused on multiple measures and using the results for improving teaching and learning. The plan also includes the level of mastery of each program-level learning outcomes by specific courses as a curriculum map. The revised plan and report were used during faculty in-service meeting in September.				

**Measure: Program review implementation and timeline**

	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
<b>Program review on schedule</b>	Program review not implemented	<b>Year One:</b> Pilot Year 1 in 15 programs started summer 2016 and completed; cohort A (15 programs) started in winter 2017 and completed; and cohort B (14 programs) started in spring 2017 and completed for the final Program Review Report.	Program review not implemented	Finalized program viability data	Evaluate current program review process for revision during winter and spring 2021



Benchmark met	N/A	No	No	No	No
<b>SI score and rationale = 1</b> The template for program review has been reformatted and updated. A faculty-led review committee will be launched during 2021 winter quarter and the new review form will be used in the 2021 spring quarter.					

## STRATEGIC GOAL 2: EQUITY & INCUSION

Renton Technical College will foster an academic and work environment of equity, inclusion, and collaboration. There are four strategic objectives that fall within this goal, as well as nine strategic indicators for measuring success. Objectives and indicators are as follows:

**Strategic Indicator:** Course success rates (aligned to KPI 4)

Objective 2.1: Close equity gaps for underrepresented, low-income, and first generation college students

*Benchmarks:*

- 1) Course success rates are 80% or higher.
- 2) The course success rates for students of color will be equal to or within +/-5% of the course success rates for students identifying as white. A 5% difference is the minimum achievement gap that is considered acceptable and accounts for natural fluctuations over time.

**Measure: Course success rates (pass 2.0 or higher)**

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
<b>Course success rate</b>	85%	86%	86%	85%	84%	83%
<b>Benchmark met</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>SI score and rationale</b>	Score = 2					

**Measure: Course success rates (pass 2.0 or higher) disaggregated by race/ethnicity**

Group	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
<b>Students of color</b>	85%	86%	86%	85%	83%	82%
<b>White</b>	88%	89%	88%	88%	88%	87%
<b>Gap</b>	-3%	-3%	-2%	-3%	-5%	-5%
<b>Benchmark met</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>SI score and rationale</b>	Score = 2					

Data Source: SBCTC Data Warehouse Transcript Database as of January 2017.

-- Students of Color = All race/ethnicity except white and other in the new race/ethnicity category in page 10.

**Strategic Indicator:** One-year persistence by race (aligned to KPI 3)

Related Objective: 2.1 Close equity gaps for underrepresented, low-income, and first generation college students

*Benchmarks:*

- 1) Persistence rates are at least 2% higher than the previous year. RTC has exceptionally high persistence rates, making substantial increases over time difficult to attain.





2) The persistence rates for students of color will be equal to or within +/-5% of the retention rates for students identifying as white. A 5% difference is the minimum achievement gap that is considered acceptable and accounts for natural fluctuations over time.

**Measure: One-year persistence rate disaggregated by race/ethnicity**

Group	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Overall	69.4%	69.1%	70.9%	74.1%	69.3%	58.5%
Students of color	69.3%	67.6%	71%	74.6%	68.3%	54.9%
White	68.6%	69.2%	71.9%	74.8%	70.5%	63.9%
Gap	0.7%	-1.6%	-0.9%	-0.2%	-2.2%	-9.0%
Benchmark met	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
SI score and rationale	Score = 0 (Did not meet)					

Data Source: SBCTC Data Warehouse Student Achievement Database, PEP Cohorts.

**Strategic Indicator:** 1<sup>st</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter retention overall (aligned to KPI 2)

Objective 2.1: Close equity gaps for underrepresented, low-income, and first generation college students

*Benchmarks:*

- 1) Retention rates are at least 2% higher than the previous year. RTC has exceptionally high retention rates, making substantial increases over time difficult to attain.
- 2) The retention rates for students of color will be equal to or within +/-5% of the retention rates for students identifying as white. A 5% difference is the minimum achievement gap that is considered acceptable and accounts for natural fluctuations over time.

**Measure: 1<sup>st</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter retention rate overall**

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
1 <sup>st</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter retention	53.8%	50.6%	56.3%	52.3%	48.6%
Benchmark met	No	No	Yes	No	No
SI score and rationale	Score = 0 (Did not meet)				

**Measure: 1<sup>st</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter retention rate, disaggregated by race/ethnicity**

Group	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Students of color	49%	48%	56%	50%	45%
White	57%	53%	56%	53%	54%
Gap	-8%	-5%	0%	-3%	-9%
Benchmark met	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
SI score and rationale	Score = 0 (Did not meet)				

Data Source: SBCTC Data Warehouse Student Achievement Database, PEP Cohorts.



The 1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter retention is not an official strategic indicator. However, it is a critical measure of student success and progress that RTC tracks. This measure is also serves as core theme key performance indicator one. Thus, below is the most recent data on 1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter retention overall and disaggregated by race/ethnicity.

**Benchmarks:**

- 1) Retention rates are at least 2% higher than the previous year. RTC has exceptionally high retention rates, making substantial increases over time difficult to attain.
- 2) The retention rates for student of color will be equal to or within +/-5% of the retention rates for students identifying as white. A 5% difference is the minimum achievement gap that is considered acceptable and accounts for natural fluctuations over time.

**Measure: 1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter retention rate overall**

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
<b>1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter retention</b>	63.3%	61.5%	67.1%	64.5%	61.6%	62.1% +0.5%
<b>Benchmark met</b>	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
<b>SI score and rationale</b>	Score = 1 (In progress)					

**Measure: 1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter retention rate disaggregated by race/ethnicity**

Group	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
<b>Students of color</b>	60.2%	57.5%	65.3%	63.6%	58.5%	56.1%
<b>White</b>	65.1%	65.7%	68.5%	65.0%	65.0%	70.4%
<b>Gap</b>	-4.9%	-8.2%	-3.2%	-1.4%	-6.5%	-14.3%
<b>Benchmark Met</b>	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
<b>KPI Score and Rationale</b>	Score = 0					

Data Source: SBCTC Data Warehouse Student Achievement Database, PEP Cohorts.

Equity gap comparisons have been more straightforward with Washington state peer institutions. Using data from an [SBCTC Student Outcomes Dashboard](#), the following table presents comparisons of three achievement indicators disaggregated by race, where RTC does well in completion and employment metrics but lags in early measures like retention from first to third quarter.

**Comparison of Equity Gaps in Student Achievement Indicators among System Peer Institutions**

Student Category	Bellingham	Lake Washington	Peer Average	RTC	RTC Gap
1st fall to spring quarter (2019 Cohort)	57%	63%	60%	56%	-4%
<b>Fall to spring equity gap</b>	+2%	+4%	+3%	-5%	-8%
3-year completion, professional-technical, first-time students (2018)	42%	34%	38%	60%	+22



Student Category	Bellingham	Lake Washington	Peer Average	RTC	RTC Gap
<b>3-year completion equity gap</b>	-12%	-3%	-8%	+4%	+12%
Employed % (2017-18)	80%	74%	77%	80%	+3%
<b>Employment equity gap</b>	+5%	-8%	-3%	+3%	+7%

Already, College Council is exploring what practices at Lake Washington Institute of Technology contribute to their equitable fall-to-spring retention numbers, perhaps [their rich public diversity statements](#). Bellingham Technical College’s approach to advising and career services also is being examined so RTC can match their excellent employment rates for students of color.

**Strategic Indicator:** Increase enrollment of underrepresented students in prof-tech programs  
 Objective 2.1: Close equity gaps for underrepresented, low-income, and first generation college students  
 Benchmarks: Enrollment percentage of students of color in prof-tech programs is equal to or higher than the previous year.

**Measure: Enrollment percentage of students of color in prof-tech programs**

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
<b>Enrollment percentage of students of color</b>	47.4%	49.7%	50.7%	54.7%	57.7% 3%
<b>Benchmark met</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>SI score and rationale</b>	Score = 2 The enrollment percentage of student of color in prof-tech programs has increased by 11% from year 2014 to 2018.				

**Strategic Indicator:** Employee demographics (aligned to KPI 16)  
 Objective 2.2: Attract, hire, and retain diverse faculty and staff  
 Benchmarks: The percentage of RTC’s faculty and staff who are people of color is within 5% (+/-) of the Washington System.

**Measure: Race/ethnicity breakdown for faculty/staff and local area**

		2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2018-2019	2019-2020
<b>Percent people of color</b>	RTC	27%	31%	34%	36%	39%
	System	20%	20%	21%	22%	21%
	Gap	+7%	+11%	+13%	+14%	+18%
<b>Benchmark met</b>		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>SI score and rationale</b>	Score = 2					

Data Source: [SBCTC Personnel Demographics Dashboard](#)



**Strategic Indicator:** Employee retention rates

Objective 2.2: Attract, hire, and retain diverse faculty and staff

*Benchmarks: Full time Employee retention rates are higher than the previous year*

**Measure: Employee retention rates**

	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
<b>Retention rate</b>	82%	78%	78%	95% +17%
<b>Benchmark met</b>	Baseline Year	No	No	Yes
<b>SI score and rationale</b>	Score = 2			

**Strategic Indicator:** Status of compliance with WA state OCIO Policy 188 pertaining to accessibility

Objective 2.4: Improve policies, procedures, and infrastructure to ensure equity among all campus constituencies

*Benchmarks: Meet the compliance with WA state OCIO Policy 188 pertaining to accessibility*

	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
<b>WA Accessibility Compliance</b>	2/7	7/7	7/7	7/7
<b>Benchmark met</b>	No	No	No	Yes
<b>SI score and rationale</b>	<p>Score = 2</p> <p>The Accessibility Advisory Committee (AAC) at Renton Technical College has been active for just over three years and has made significant progress in getting information out to campus and working on remediating website documents. In 2020 COVID impacted RTC and caused a shift for all resources. The College has focused on converting a non-telecommuting college to 100% remote operations. However, RTC achieved following progress for the continuous implementation of accessibility and inclusion on campus because of AAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RTC has been successful at engaging people across departments in working on RTC Access for All canvas course. As of December 2020, there have been 142 RTC community members who have completed our CANVAS Accessibility course.</li> <li>• Director of Disability Services was assigned the task of working with Accessible Information Management (AIM). AIM is a software package that allows RTC to manage Disability Resource Services (DRS) requests and cases.</li> <li>• A proposal was made to the Vice President of Instruction to conduct an all college meeting focused on accessibility, but was tabled due to COVID. CTS plans on placing this request for an upcoming all college meeting or Town Hall.</li> </ul>			



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• CTS is in the process of updating our website Drupal platform to provide greater accessibility options, eliminating all modules that are not WCAG 2.1 compliant.</li></ul>
--	--

## STRATEGIC GOAL 3: COMMUNITY

Renton Technical College will engage the greater community through intentional partnerships and responsive programming. There are four strategic objectives that fall within this goal, as well as seven strategic indicators for measuring success. Objectives and indicators are as follows:

**Strategic Indicator:** Placement rates (aligned to KPI 11)

Objective 3.1: Prepare skilled workers and leaders for the businesses and industries that power our regional and global economy

*Benchmarks:* Placement/employment rates are equal to or higher than the previous year.

**Measure: Estimated placement rates (DLOA database)**

	2013-2014		2014-2015		2015-2016		2016-2017		2017-2018	
	Cert	Degree	Cert	Degree	Cert	Degree	Cert	Degree	Cert	Degree
<b>Placement rate</b>	82%	89%	83%	89%	83%	89%	81%	87%	79%	92%
<b>Benchmark met</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
<b>SI score and rationale</b>										
Score = 1										

Data Source: SBCTC Data Warehouse, Data Linking for Outcomes Assessment database. Estimated placement rates include an adjustment factor of 1.1 to account for students who are employed, but are not in the Unemployment Insurance (UI) database.

**Strategic Indicator:** Wages of graduates

Objective 3.1: Prepare skilled workers and leaders for the businesses and industries that power our regional and global economy

*Benchmarks:* Wages of graduates are equal to or higher than the previous year.

**Measure: Estimated wages of graduates**

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
<b>Median annual wages</b>	34,674	36,213	36,837	39,156	39,520
<b>Benchmark met</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>SI score and rationale</b>					
Score = 2					

Data Source: SBCTC Data Warehouse, Data Linking for Outcomes Assessment database. Estimated placement rates include an adjustment factor of 1.1 to account for students who are employed, but are not in the Unemployment Insurance (UI) database.

**Strategic Indicator:** Licensure and certification pass rates (aligned to KPI 9)

Objective 3.1: Prepare skilled workers and leaders for the businesses and industries that power our regional and global economy

*Benchmarks:*

- 1) Average pass rates are 85% or higher, with no programs falling below 67%.
- 2) Overall scores are equal to or higher than the previous year.

**Measure: Licensure and certification pass rates**

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2018-2019	2019-2020
Pass rate	88%	88%	91%	94%	85%
Benchmark met	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
SI score and rationale	Score = 1 (In progress)				

Note: Programs do not have a consistent timeframe for reporting pass rate data. The numbers above are a best estimate based on available data.

**Strategic Indicator:** Percentage of programs that qualify as high-demand

Objective 3.1: Prepare skilled workers and leaders for the businesses and industries that power our regional and global economy

*Benchmarks: The percentage of high-demand programs using CIP Code is equal to or higher than the previous year.*

**Measure: The percentage of high-demand programs**

	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
The percentage of high-demand programs	33%	39%	45%
Benchmark met	NA (Baseline Year)	No	Yes
SI score and rationale	Score = 2		

Data Source: SBCTC Allocation Monitoring Report/Weighted Work Skills Gap

## STRATEGIC GOAL 4: INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTH

Renton Technical College will enhance institutional strength and resilience. There are four strategic objectives that fall within this goal, as well as seven strategic indicators for measuring success. Objectives and indicators are as follows:

**Strategic Indicator:** Recommendations cleared during next Year Seven accreditation visit

Objective 4.3: Implement intentional systems improvement

*Benchmarks: Total of four recommendations are cleared before Year Seven accreditation visit in 2021.*

The last Year Seven accreditation visit by NWCCU evaluators was conducted in October 2013. Following the visit, RTC received four recommendations and RTC like other colleges in the SBCTC submits [the Washington State Quality Award \(WSQA\) report](#) annually to inform the status of accreditation progress based on the recommendations.

**Measure: Four recommendations cleared during Year Seven accreditation visit in 2021.**

	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
Four recommendations cleared	1 cleared out of 4	2 cleared out of 4	4 cleared out of 4
<b>Benchmark met</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>SI score and rationale</b>	Score = 2		

Accreditation recommendations to the College and year of recommendation	Actions taken by the college to address recommendations	Improvement results
<p><b>Recommendation 1:</b> <i>The evaluation committee recommends that for each year of operation, the College undergo an external financial audit and that the results from such audits, including findings and management letter recommendations, be considered in a timely, appropriate and comprehensive manner by the Board of Trustees (Eligibility Requirement 19 and Standard 2.F.7).</i></p> <p>This recommendation was addressed in an Ad-Hoc Report dated December 15, 2015, as well as in a Special Report dated March 11, 2016. RTC received an acceptance letter on July 19, 2016, from NWCCU for the submission of the Special Report that addressed recommendation one.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1:</b> The 2014-15 audit was completed, and the Board of Trustees approved the final audit report on October 20, 2015.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 1:</b> RTC has been cleared by the Commission with regard to this recommendation.</p>





Accreditation recommendations to the College and year of recommendation	Actions taken by the college to address recommendations	Improvement results
<p><b>Recommendation 2:</b> <i>The evaluation committee found evidence of multiple planning processes that appear confusing, lack meaningful evidence, and are not broadly understood across the institution. The evaluation committee recommends that the College evaluate its planning cycle to ensure it is effective and systematic, allows for constituent input and broad communication, encourages self-reflection, and results in evidence-based assessment of its accomplishments (Standards 3.A.1., 3.A.2, 3.A.3., and 5.A.1.)</i></p>	<p><b>Recommendation 2:</b> RTC developed a systematic and consistent planning cycle/process including a specific budget and planning calendar. The systematic planning cycle is designed to allow constituent input and broad communication, self-reflection, and results in evidence-based assessment.</p> <p>RTC reviewed its budgeting process and aligned its planning efforts to the budgeting and resource allocation process in a process informed by relevant and timely indicators, as well as a rigorous program review process. As part of that, the college refined its Key Performance Indicators (KPI) to better measure institutional effectiveness. The College continues to enhance integrated planning, budgeting and assessment process.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 2:</b> The President and VP of Administration and Finance provided educational sessions on budgeting to the College community and implemented the systematic planning cycle and alignment of planning and budget allocation. This cycle includes unit leaders submitted their unit plans in spring. The Office of Institutional Research then provides a GAP Analysis in the fall to see the alignments of unit plans with the Strategic Plan of RTC. Next, unit leaders reflect and report their unit plan activities in the winter based on their unit plans. They finalize the unit plan assessment in their closeout surveys at the end of the year.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 3:</b> <i>The evaluation committee recommends that the College ensure that planning is informed by meaningful and verifiable indicators which are evaluated and analyzed at the program, department, and direct service level, as well as within the context of the core themes, in order to determine areas of improvement, to inform decision making, and to prioritize the allocation of resources (Standards 1.B.2, 3.A.3., 3.B.3., 4.A.1., and 4.B.1.).</i></p>	<p><b>Recommendation 3:</b> The core themes and objectives established by the College in 2013 has continuously served as a systematic and consistent foundation for planning, assessment and progress toward the College’s mission fulfillment. The Board of Trustees also reaffirmed the College’s core themes during a board study session in fall 2017. Based on the foundation and support the College has used refined strategic indicators to monitor the success of strategic plan implementation. The College Council met used a strategic</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 3:</b> RTC was commended for its development of measurable, verifiable indicators during its Mid-Cycle Self-Evaluation visit in October 2016 and NWCCU accepted the Fall 2017 Ad Hoc Report in February 2018.</p> <p>The College continues to share meaningful and verifiable indicators in the four strategic goals (i.e. learning, equity, community, and institutional strength) with the campus community to understand the status and direction of the College’s mission fulfillment and to adjust as needed to meet the</p>



Accreditation recommendations to the College and year of recommendation	Actions taken by the college to address recommendations	Improvement results
	indicator scorecard to review and measure each strategic indicator result and to assess the overall success of its mission fulfillment.	institutional goals. Additionally, the College improved its annual assessment report by requiring more direct measures.
<p><b>Recommendation 4:</b> <i>The evaluation committee recommends that the College engage in an evidence-based evaluation of assessment processes to ensure that student learning outcomes are clearly identified, consistently provided to students and that the assessment results are used to enhance teaching and learning and to inform the planning process for academic programs and services (Standards 2.C.10., 4.A.6., and 4.B.2.)</i></p>	<p><b>Recommendation 4:</b> All programs successfully developed program learning outcomes that are aligned to one or more of the college-wide outcomes in 2017 and updated some program learning outcomes in 2018. Course learning outcomes were also completed in 2017. The College has worked to develop a systematic assessment plan and process for meaningful learning outcomes assessment. A cross-departmental assessment committee has been organized and it serves to facilitate the assessment process and to develop the culture of assessment. A student self-reflection assessment project has been implemented and used for improving student success. In September 2019, a faculty self-reflection assessment project was also implemented.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 4:</b> All professional-technical programs at RTC have begun the three-year program review process. We have experienced positive results to date. The deans and faculty have met to discuss the results of the program review process and have engaged their advisory board members in the process as well. As a result, the deans and faculty have developed a plan to move forward based on individual program reviews to ensure that programs are addressing any areas that need attention.</p> <p>Centering student success in the process has been important when reviewing program level data so that curriculum and pedagogy can be adjusted to better serve students.</p> <p>Learning outcomes data including student self-reflection have been used to improve teaching and learning as well as a resource data for overall program improvement. Because of the overall learning outcomes assessment efforts, the College is developing a culture of assessment by analyzing and discussing learning outcomes and documenting the assessment process and outcomes for continuous improvement.</p>



**Strategic Indicator:** Fill rates

Objective 4.2: Increase financial security by maximizing professional-technical programming and through the diversification of funding

Benchmarks: (1) Fill rates is higher than 50%

(2) Fill rates is equal to or higher than the previous year.

**Measure: Fill rates**

	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
Fill rate	28%	31%	30%	49% +19%
Benchmark met	NA	No	No	No
SI score and rationale	Score = 1 (In progress)			

**Key Performance Indicator #18:** Budget-to-actual variance

Objective 4.2: Increase financial security by maximizing professional-technical programming and through the diversification of funding

Benchmarks:

1) The budget to actual variance for revenue and expenditure is within 5% (+/-) of the budget. This margin is considered to be acceptable from an auditing perspective, with any variance greater than 10% (+/-) needing additional explanation.

**Measure: Budget to actual variance**

	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
Revenue	-2.7%	-2.1%	-2.8%	-3.82%	0.19%
Expenditures	5.1%	7.6%	-0.5%	-5.31%	-6.64%
Variance Result	-7.8%	-9.7%	-2.3%	1.49%	6.83%
Benchmark met	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
KPI score and rationale	Score = 2 0.19% (revenue variance) – -6.64%(expenditure variance) =6.83% During FY2020 we had 0.19% more revenue and we spent 6.64% less from our budget. As a result we had a surplus of 6.83% from our budget.				

**Strategic Indicator:** FTE enrollment (aligned to KPI 19)

Objective 4.2: Increase financial security by maximizing professional-technical programming and through the diversification of funding

Benchmarks:

1) The total FTE falls between the tolerance thresholds of 98-105% of the allocation.

2) The percentage of career training FTE is equal to or higher than the previous year.

**Measure: FTE allocation vs. FTE actuals**

	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
% of allocation	101%	98%	99%	88%	79% -9%
Benchmark met	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No



<b>SI score and rationale</b>	Score = 0
-------------------------------	-----------

Data Source: SBCTC Allocation Monitoring Reports.

**Strategic Indicator:** FTE enrollment by student intent (aligned to KPI 20)

Objective 4.2: Increase financial security by maximizing professional-technical programming and through the diversification of funding

*Benchmarks:*

- 1) *The total FTE falls between the tolerance thresholds of 98-105% of the allocation.*
- 2) *The percentage of career training FTE is equal to or higher than the previous year.*

**Measure: FTE by institutional intent area**

		2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
<b>Career training</b>	#	1,587	1,569	1,655	1,532	1,369 (-163)
	%	38.0	39.8	40.0	40.3	39.4 (-0.9)
<b>General education</b>	#	533	538	506	491	492 (+1)
	%	12.8	13.6	12.2	12.9	14.1 (+1.2)
<b>College &amp; Career Pathways</b>	#	1,433	1,230	1,328	1,212	1,123 (-89)
	%	34.3	31.2	32.1	31.8	32.3 (+0.4)
<b>Occupational Supplemental</b>	#	623	609	650	571	494 (-77)
	%	14.9	15.4	15.7	15.0	14.2 (-0.8)
<b>Benchmark met</b>		<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>SI score and rationale</b>	Score = 0					

Data Source: SBCTC Data Warehouse Class Tables.

**Strategic Indicator:** Donations (aligned to KPI 21)

Objective 4.2: Increase financial security by maximizing professional-technical programming and through the diversification of funding

*Benchmarks: The number of gifts and dollar values are equal to or higher than the previous year.*

**Measure: Number and dollar value of donor gifts**

	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
<b>Number of Participants</b>	384	404	381	288
<b>Dollar value</b>	\$313,832.48	\$621,193.46	\$603,362.38	\$1,072,599.89 (+ \$469,237.51)
<b>Benchmark met</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>



<b>SI score and rationale</b>	Score = 2
-------------------------------	-----------

**Strategic Indicator:** Grants and contracts funding (aligned to KPI 22)

Objective 4.2: Increase financial security by maximizing professional-technical programming and through the diversification of funding

*Benchmarks: The dollar amount of grants funded is at least \$4,000,000 and indirect costs received are equal to or higher than the previous year.*

**Measure: Number and dollar amount of grants funded**

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
<b>Number funded</b>	24	26	32	36	26	26
<b>Dollar value</b>	\$4,647,976	\$4,502,781	\$4,052,918	\$3,139,335	\$2,579,810	\$2,810,269 (+\$230,459)
<b>Indirect costs</b>	\$172,490	\$239,363	\$110,071	\$136,858	\$86,528	\$80,969
<b>Benchmark met</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>SI score and rationale</b>	Score = 1 While the dollar value went up from the year before, it was not over the \$4M criteria.					

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The RTC Strategic Plan Monitoring Report provides the campus community with comprehensive and systematic information on its progress toward mission fulfillment and prepares the institution for implementation of the coming year's strategic plan and priority activities. Currently, a total of 38 Strategic Indicators (SI) are used to measure success towards mission fulfillment. These indicators are directly aligned to Strategic Goals and some of them are specifically aligned to the College's Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). Outlined below are recommendations for which the College and Executive Cabinet might consider in the coming year.

- RTC has faced major challenges because of Covid-19 pandemic, enrollment decrease, and reduced budget. Now, the College community need to collaborate more intentionally and innovatively using all the priority activities among units, councils, and initiative groups.
- To fulfil the RTC mission and to maintain fiscal sustainability, the College need to develop and implement a robust strategic enrollment management plan and assessment by various campus members. RTC almost doubled the percentage of student of color enrollment in prof-tech programs comparing the system (SBCTC) average percentage. However, the College needs to assess and plan whether the College are fully prepared for the underprepared students including adequate resources and support services.
- For equitable student achievement and success at RTC, the College needs to have more Intentional, integrated, and systematic processes and practices for improving student educational journey and environment. For that purpose, faculty and staff may develop holistic understanding and engagement of student expectation and experiences at the College.

Furthermore, the faculty and staffs needs to find ways to help individual students to begin their journeys with clear goals and steps in mind. Students should be able to use career coaching, academic advising, and college success course based on their personal motivations, interests, and goals in their early journey at RTC. At the same time, the College uses inclusive pedagogy and systematic student support services to improve the existing equity gaps continuously in student success and achievement.



**Data sources used in this report include:**

- RTC Program Enhancement Plan (PEP) Cohorts
- SBCTC Allocation Monitoring Reports
- SBCTC Data Warehouse, Class Table
- SBCTC Data Warehouse, Completion Table
- SBCTC Data Warehouse, Data Linking for Outcomes Assessment Database
- SBCTC Data Warehouse, Employee Database
- SBCTC Data Warehouse, Student Achievement Database
- SBCTC Data Warehouse, Transcript Database
- SBCTC Data Warehouse, WABERS Database