



RENTON
TECHNICAL
COLLEGE®

2018-19 STRATEGIC PLAN MONITORING REPORT

Year Two of the 2017-2022 Strategic Plan



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	3
Strategic Indicators Scorecard.....	5
Strategic Goal 1: Learning.....	8
Strategic Goal 2: Equity.....	15
Strategic Goal 3: Community.....	19
Strategic Goal 4: Institutional Strength & Resilience.....	21
Recommendations and Conclusion.....	26



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. To facilitate the implementation of strategic objectives, priority activities are aligned to each objective as collaborative tasks carried out by departments and committees. The four goals outlined in the strategic plan are as follows:

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

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

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

GOAL 4: RTC will enhance institutional strength and resilience

38 strategic indicators have been identified and used to monitor success toward strategic plan implementation. 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 annual strategic plan and priority activities to operationalize the institutional annual strategic plan. Units also specify measures of success for tracking progress toward completion of their stated goals and activities. The strategic indicators developed for monitoring the overarching five-year plan are outlined in the scorecard in page 5. Key findings from the Year Two Plan are as follows:

- The College's total implementation success score is 51%. 18 indicators out of 35 "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. Some strategic indicators are based on the questions of the RTC Employee Satisfaction Survey and the survey was not conducted this year. It will be administered by Institutional Research in 2020 as planned. Fewer indicators available this year and indicator benchmarks set high for continuous improvement affect the overall score.
- The overall one-year persistence rates have decreased slightly by 1.9% in 2017-18 from the five-year average, 70.9%. However, the overall and student of color three-year completion rates met the target. The overall three-year completion rates are 1.3% higher than the previous rates. Also, student of color completion rates is 3% higher than the previous rates in the category.



- Three-year overall completion rates increased by 1.3% (2015 Cohort). Also, three-year completion rates of students of color increased by 3% and the gap between the student of color and white in the category is 1%.
- The percentage of hybrid/online courses increased by 1.4% during 2018-19. However, the number of evening courses has decreased from 623 (15%) to 505(13.3%) during 2018-19. Considering student progress and completion the decrease in evening courses is significant.
- Overall 85% of students responded that they were satisfied with the College in the RTC Student Learning Engagement Survey. However, in the survey students expressed their expectation for improvement in program orientation or college success course. 71% students responded as “satisfied” in the category.
- Through collaboration with the instruction group, Institutional Research, and Assessment Committee, RTC now has a built-in Canvas program shell which includes alignments among program, course, and college-level learning outcomes as well as outcome measures and a section for continuous improvement. The shell also provides student achievement outcomes including retention rates, persistence rate, transition rate, completion rate, and career placement/outcomes by program and subgroup (i.e. students of color, veteran, and Pell-recipient). Also, in the program shell, there is a communication tool for students and deans. Once the faculty submit their learning outcomes reflection/assessment through the program shell, they can complete the annual learning outcomes cycle and report.
- 1st to 3rd quarter overall retention rate of 2017 cohort is 52.3%. The rate increased by 2% from the rate of 2015 cohort. However, there is 7% gap between the rate of 2017 and 2013 cohort (59.4%) for improvement.
- The College has maintained high placement rates (career outcomes) continuously for the certificate (81%) and degree (87%) in the most updated state data.
- The overall licensure and certification pass rates have been maintained high (94%) and increased by 3% during 2018-19.
- 2018-19 FTE allocation is 88%. This is the first time that the total FTE did not fall between the tolerance thresholds of 98-105% of the allocation since 2014.
- During 2018-19 the number of grants funded decreased from 36 to 26 and dollar amount of grants funded also decreased from \$3,139,335 to \$2,579,810.
- Since the donation amount doubled in 2017, the level of amount and donor number have been maintained continuously this year. The RTC Foundation received \$603,362 in donations during 2018-19.
- The Aspen Institute College Excellence Program named Renton Technical College one of top 150 community colleges again in 2019 three times in a row for its student success outcomes. In 2019 Renton Technical College was also recognized as the best two-year college in the country for adult learners by



Washington Monthly. The ranking was based on two federal government sources and the College Board’s annual survey.

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
Met	2
In Progress	1
Not Met	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	1	1.1	KPI 3	1
One-year persistence rate disaggregated by race/ethnicity	1	1.1	KPI 3	0
3-year completion rates	1	1.1	KPI 7	2
3-year completion rates disaggregated by race/ethnicity	1	1.1	KPI 7	2
Transition rates (College & Career Pathways students)	1	1.1	KPI 15	2
Transition rates disaggregated by race/ethnicity	1	1.1	KPI 15	0



Strategic Indicator	Strategic Goal	Strategic Objective	KPI Alignment	Annual Score
DTA student transition and/or completion rate	1	1.1	KPI 8	0
Number of hybrid/online courses	1	1.1	KPI 12	1
Number of evening courses	1	1.1	KPI 12	0
Student satisfaction with programs and services	1	1.2	KPI 5	2
Resources allocated to professional development activities	1	1.3	NA	1
Course and program outcomes	1	1.4	KPI 6	2
Systematic assessment plan and timeline	1	1.4	KPI 6	2
Program review implementation	1	1.1	KPI 6	1
Course success rates	2	2.1	KPI 4	0
Course success rates (pass 2.0 or higher) disaggregated by race/ethnicity	2	2.1	KPI 4	0
One-year persistence rate overall	2	2.1	KPI 3	1
One-year persistence rate disaggregated by race/ethnicity	2	2.1	KPI 3	0
1 st to 3 rd quarter retention rate overall	2	2.1	KPI 2	0
1 st to 3 rd quarter retention rate, disaggregated by race/ethnicity	2	2.1	KPI 2	0
1 st to 2 nd quarter retention rate overall	2	2.1	KPI 2	0
1 st to 2 nd quarter retention rate disaggregated by race/ethnicity	2	2.1	KPI 2	2
Enrollment percentage of students of color in prof-tech programs	2	2.1	NA	2
Employee demographics Race/ethnicity breakdown for faculty/staff	2	2.2	KPI 16	2
Employee retention rates	2	2.2	KPI 16	1
Status of compliance with WA state OCIO Policy 188 pertaining to accessibility	2	2.4	KPI 16	2



Strategic Indicator	Strategic Goal	Strategic Objective	KPI Alignment	Annual Score
Placement rates (Career outcomes)	3	3.1	KPI 11	0
Licensure and certification pass rates	3	3.1	KPI 9	2
Wages of graduates	3	3.1	NA	2
Percentage of programs that qualify as high-demand	3	3.1	NA	0
NWCCU recommendations cleared	4	4.3	NA	0
Fill rates	4	4.2	NA	0
Budget-to-actual variance	4	4.2	KPI 18	0
FTE enrollment	4	4.2	KPI 19	0
FTE enrollment by student intent	4	4.2	KPI 20	0
Number and dollar value of donor gifts	4	4.2	KPI 21	1
Number and dollar amount of grants funded	4	4.2	KPI 22	0
Total Implementation Success Score by Strategic Indicators 18 indicators out of 35 “met the target” or were “in progress of meeting the target”. Some strategic indicators were not available for scoring this year because of Employee Satisfaction Survey cycle.				51 (%)

* NA = These new strategic indicators are excluded from the total scores, as the College does not currently have enough data to establish a score. Future strategic plan monitoring reports will include data on these indicators based on the established data collection schedule.

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

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
One-year persistence	71.3%	69.4%	69.1%	70.9%	74.1%	69.3%
Benchmark met	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
KPI Score and Rationale	Score = 1					

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

Group	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
Students of color	69.5%	69.3%	67.6%	71%	74.6%	68.3%
White	73.4%	68.6%	69.2%	71.9%	74.8%	70.5%
Benchmark met	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
SI score and rationale	Score = 0					

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

It is important for the College to determine a) what best represents its student population, b) what will be the most informative from an equity standpoint, and c) clear definitions and terminology for race/ethnicity reporting and it agreed to use detailed race/ethnicity breakdown as follows: Central American, Mexican, South American, Other Hispanic/Latino, Asian, East Asian, Filipino, South Asian, Southeast Asian, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Black, African, African-American, Alaska Native/American Indian, White, and Other.



- Students of Color means all race/ethnicity after excluding white only and other in the new race/ethnicity category.

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

	2011 12 Cohort	2012 13 Cohort	2013 14 Cohort	2014 15 Cohort	2015 16 Cohort
Certificate	49.9%	50.1%	47.4%	45.5%	52.9%
Degree	16.5%	14.8%	16%	19.2%	13.1%
Total	66.4%	64.9%	63.4%	64.7%	66.0%
Benchmark met	No	No	No	No	Yes
SI Score = 2					

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 2016-17 data reflects completion rates for the 2013-14 cohorts.

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

Category	Race/Ethnicity	2011 12 Cohort	2012 13 Cohort	2013 14 Cohort	2014 15 Cohort	2015 16 Cohort
Certificate	Student of Color	47.7%	51.5%	46.3%	45.7%	54.3%
	White	51.1%	49.0%	48.3%	44.6%	51.1%
Degree	Student of Color	14.2%	12.5%	16.4%	17.4%	11.6%
	White	18.9%	17.4%	14.8%	19.3%	15.9%
Total	Student of Color	61.9%	63.9%	62.7%	63.1%	66.0%
	White	70.0%	66.4%	63.1%	63.9%	67.0%
Benchmark met		No	No	No	No	Yes
SI Score = 2						

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 2016-17 data reflects completion rates for the 2013-14 cohorts.

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



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)

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
Transition rate	26%	29.7%	29.0%	30.1%	32.3%
Benchmark met	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SI score and rationale	Score = 2				

Measure: Transition rates disaggregated by race/ethnicity

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
Students of color	20.5%	26.4%	26%	26.6%	27.9%
White	40.9%	39.8%	41.2%	45.1%	47.2%
Benchmark met	No	No	No	No	No
KPI Score and Rationale	Score = 0				

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).

Key Performance Indicator #8: DTA student transition and/or completion rate

Related Objective 1.1: Increase student progress and completion

Benchmark: Transition and/or completion rates are at least 2% higher than the previous year.

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
Transition/completion rate	N/A	N/A	12.6%	19.5%	13.9%
Benchmark met	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	No
KPI score and rationale	Score = 0. The majority of DTA students are enrolled part-time, therefore, transfer and/or completion rates are checked within a three-year period, to allow sufficient time for this to occur. *In 2012-2013 Renton Technical College began coding students as Direct Transfer Agreement (DTA). For that year, all students in the program should count as a new cohort since that was the first year the program was offered. Moving forward however, new Direct Transfer Agreement (DTA) cohorts should follow the PEP cohort model (i.e. have earned no prior credit at the institution the previous year). This would not impact data from the 2012-2013 cohort, but would be consistently applied to other cohorts moving forward. The rate of 19.5% is calculated based on the PEP cohort model.				



Data Source: SBCTC Data Warehouse Student Achievement Database and Completion Tables.

Key Performance Indicator #12: Course and program learning formats

Related Objective 1.1: Increase student progress and completion

Benchmark: Maintain or increase the number of evening and/or online/hybrid course offerings

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
# Hybrid/online courses	525 (12.3%)	591 (13.3%)	779 (18.8%)	883 (21.7%)	876 (23.1%)
Benchmark met	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
KPI score and rationale	Score = 1 Percentage of hybrid/online courses has been increased steadily. Current measure excludes web-supported courses (i.e. Canvas) since the Canvas is mandatory and it is specifically fit into the category of hybrid/online.				

Measure: Number of evening courses (total for academic year)

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
# evening courses	691 (16.2%)	706 (15.9%)	697 (16.8%)	623 (15.3%)	505 (13.3%)
Benchmark met	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
KPI score and rationale	Score = 0				

Data Source: SBCTC Data Warehouse Class Tables.

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

Related Objective 1.2: Provide comprehensive student support services

Benchmarks: Annual Student Survey benchmark average rating scores are higher than 4 (80%) out of 5.

Services for Student Success	2018 2019 Satisfaction Score
Advising	91% (n=35)
Career Counselling	100% (n=12)
Job Placement Assistance	100% (n=2)
Disability Services	100% (n=5)
Financial Aid Support	97% (n=39)
Learning Resource & Career Center	98% (n=43)
Library Services	94% (n=51)
Tutoring Services	100% (n=14)
Services for Active Military & Veterans	100% (n=6)
CANVAS Support	100% (n=30)
Using Computer at LRCC	100% (n=45)
Technology Support	100% (n=7)
Student Organizations	78% (n=9)
Transfer Advising/Planning	90% (n=10)



Instruction Overall	79%
Instruction/ Academic Reading	82%% (n=11)
Instruction/ English 100/101/Bridge to Composition	86% (n=44)
Instruction/ Adult Basic Skills (HSE, Transition ECA)	100% (n=8)
Instruction/ Program Orientation/College Success Course	71% (n=42)
Instruction/ Practicum/Internship	56% (n=9)
Instruction/ Fieldwork	60% (n=5)
Instruction/ Co-op	100% (n=6)
Instruction/ Clinical Assignment	80% (n=10)
Benchmark met	Yes
KPI score and rationale	Score = 2. The College scored higher (90%) than 85%

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
Dollar amount of resources allocated to professional development activities	\$337,800	\$336,360	\$296,350
Benchmark met	No	No	No
SI score and rationale	Score = 1. Dollar amount of resources allocated to professional development activities for 2017-2018 is lower than the previous year.		

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
Outcomes created and on syllabi	Not completed	In progress, not 100% completed	In progress, not 100% completed	93% Completed	100% Updated Completed
Benchmark met	No	No	No	No	Yes
SI score and rationale	Score = 2. Most learning outcomes (93%) have been published on the applicable 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

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Assessment plan created	N/A	N/A	Not completed	Not completed	completed
Benchmark met	N/A	N/A	No	No	Yes
SI score and rationale	<p>Score = 2</p> <p>Through collaboration with instruction group, Institutional Research, and Assessment Committee, RTC now has a built-in Canvas program shell which includes alignments among program, course, and college level learning outcomes. The shell also provides student achievement outcomes including retention rates, persistence rate, transition rate, completion rate, and career placement/outcomes by program and subgroup (i.e. students of color, veteran, and Pell-recipient). In the program shell, there are also communication platform for students and deans. Once the faculty submit their learning outcomes reflection/assessment through the program shell, they can complete the annual learning outcomes report.</p> <p>During 2018 and 2019 faculty in-service day, there were professional development opportunities to learn assessment and to improve teaching and student success.</p>				



Measure: Program review implementation and timeline

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Program review on schedule	Program review not implemented	Program review not implemented	Year One: 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
Benchmark met	N/A	N/A	No	No	No
SI score and rationale	Score = 1				

STRATEGIC GOAL 2: EQUITY

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
Course success rate	85%	86%	86%	85%	84%
Benchmark met	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
SI score and rationale	Score = 0				

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

Group	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Students of color	85%	86%	86%	85%	83%
White	88%	89%	88%	88%	88%
Benchmark met	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
SI score and rationale	Score = 0				

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 overall

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
One-year persistence	71.3%	69.4%	69.1%	70.9%	74.1%	69.3%
Benchmark met	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
KPI Score and Rationale	Score = 1					

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

Group	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
Students of color	69.5%	69.3%	67.6%	71.0%	74.6%	68.3%
White	73.5%	68.6%	69.2%	71.9%	74.8%	70.5%
Benchmark met	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
SI score and rationale	Score = 0					

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

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

Strategic Indicator: 1st to 3rd 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: 1st to 3rd quarter retention rate overall

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
1st to 3rd quarter retention	59.4%	53.8%	50.6%	56.3%	52.3%
Benchmark met	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
SI score and rationale	Score = 0				

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

Group	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
Students of color	56.2%	49.2%	48.4%	55.5%	50.1%
White	61.2%	57.1%	53%	56.1%	52.7%
Benchmark met	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
SI score and rationale	Score = 0				



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

- Students of Color = All race/ethnicity except white and other in the new race/ethnicity category in page 9.

Although 1st to 2nd quarter retention is not an official strategic indicator, 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 1st to 2nd 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: 1st to 2nd quarter retention rate overall

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
1st to 2nd quarter retention	76.5%	63.3%	61.5%	67.1%	64.5%
Benchmark met	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
SI score and rationale	Score = 0				

Measure: 1st to 2nd quarter retention rate disaggregated by race/ethnicity

Group	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
Students of color	71.9%	60.4%	56.3%	65.3%	63.6%
White	78.9%	65.3%	65.7%	68.5%	65.0%
Benchmark Met	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
KPI Score and Rationale	Score = 2				

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

- Students of Color = All race/ethnicity except white and other in the new race/ethnicity category in page 9.

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
Enrollment percentage of students of color	47.4%	49.7%	50.7%	54.7%	57.7%
Benchmark met	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes



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

		2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2018-2019
Percent people of color	RTC	26%	27%	31%	34%	36%
	System	18%	20%	20%	21%	22%
Benchmark met		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SI score and rationale	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
Retention rate	82%	78%	78%
Benchmark met	Baseline Year	No	No

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
Status of compliance with WA state OCIO Policy 188 pertaining to accessibility	2	7	7
Benchmark met	NA	Yes	Yes
SI score and rationale	Score = 2		

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)

	2012-2013		2013-2014		2014-2015		2015-2016		2016-2017	
	Cert	Degree	Cert	Degree	Cert	Degree	Cert	Degree	Cert	Degree
Placement rate	76%	83%	82%	89%	83%	89%	83%	89%	81%	87%
Benchmark met	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No
SI score and rationale	Score = 0									

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

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2018-2019
Pass rate	91%	88%	88%	91%	94%
Benchmark met	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SI score and rationale	Score = 2. For the three years represented here, the licensure/certification pass rates have exceeded the 85% benchmark.				

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: 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

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
Median annual wages	34,216	34,674	36,213	36,837	39,156
Benchmark met	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SI score and rationale	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: 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	2017-2018
The percentage of high-demand programs	23%	17%
Benchmark met	NA (Baseline Year)	No
SI score and rationale	Score = 0	

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
Four recommendations cleared	1 cleared out of 4	2 cleared out of 4
Benchmark met	No	No
SI score and rationale	Score = 0	

Recommendation	Actions Taken and Results <i>(Updated October 30, 2019)</i>
<p>Recommendation 1: <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>RTC has been cleared by the Commission with regard to this recommendation.</p>
<p>Recommendation 2: <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</i></p>	<p>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 provides an 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</p>



<p><i>accomplishments (Standards 3.A.1., 3.A.2, 3.A.3., and 5.A.1.)</i></p>	<p>their unit plans. They finalize the unit plan assessment in their closeout surveys at the end of the year.</p>
<p>Recommendation 3: <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>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 through College Council and other collaborative opportunities like Guided Pathways initiative.</p>
<p>Recommendation 4: <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>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
Fill rate	28%	31%	30%
Benchmark met	NA	No	No
SI score and rationale	Score = 0. Fill rates is calculated based on the number of students enrolled and capacity number of each course. Fill rates is lower than the benchmark of 50%.		

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

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
Revenue	-8.0%	-3.0%	-2.7%	-2.1%	-2.8%
Expenditures	-4.5%	1.1%	5.1%	7.6%	-0.5%
Benchmark met	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
KPI score and rationale	Score =0				

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

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
% of allocation	99%	101%	98%	99%	88%
Benchmark met	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
SI score and rationale	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

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
General education and career training	2,147	2,120	2,107	2160	2024
College & Career Pathways	1,466	1,433	1,230	1328	1212
Supplemental	529	623	609	650	571
Benchmark met	No	No	No	Yes	No
SI score and rationale	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
Number of Participants	384	404	381
Dollar value	\$313,832.48	\$621,193.46	\$603,362.38
Benchmark met	No	Yes	No
SI score and rationale	Score = 1		



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

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Number funded	17	24	26	32	36	26
Dollar value	\$3,202,928	\$4,647,976	\$4,502,781	\$4,052,918	\$3,139,335	\$2,579,810
Indirect costs	\$40,270	\$172,490	\$239,363	\$110,071	\$136,858	\$86,528
Benchmark met	NA	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
SI score and rationale	Score = 0					

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

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.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- To fulfil the RTC mission and to maintain fiscal sustainability, the College need to develop and implement a robust strategic enrollment management Plan.
- Based on RTC Strategic Plan, the College needs to have more Intentional, integrated, and systematic planning, implementation, and assessment structure and process in the operational side (i.e. unit, department, and division) and collaborative side (committee, council, and initiative group) to fulfill its mission through institutional effectiveness.
- During 2018-19 the number of grants funded decreased from 36 to 26 and dollar amount of grants funded also decreased from \$3,139,335 to \$2,579,810. The College needs to enhance financial security through grants and other funding diversification.

CONCLUSION

For the continuous improvement of the institution, during the 2018-19 academic year, RTC has aimed higher targets for its strategic indicators and implemented meaningful outcomes for student achievements.

Three-year overall completion rates increased by 1.3% (2015 Cohort). Also, three-year completion rates of students of color increased by 3%. Overall 85% of students responded that they were satisfied with the College in the RTC Student Learning Engagement Survey. The College has maintained high placement rates (career outcomes) continuously for the certificate (81%) and degree (87%) in the most updated state data. The overall licensure and certification pass rates have been maintained high (94%) and increased by 3% during 2018-19. Those are some of the highlighted student achievements. Because of the commitment and efforts, in 2019 the College was recognized by external evaluations for its strength and improvement in student achievement outcomes. The Aspens Institute College Excellence Program ranked RTC a Top 150 Community Colleges again three times in a row and Washington Monthly recognized RTC as the best two-year college in the country for adult learners.

To ensure the continuous improvement and to enhance the College's capacity, all the planning, implementation, and assessment practices and initiatives at the College need to be more intentional, integrated, systematic, and innovative. Furthermore, all the plans related to those practices and initiatives should be specific and shared with the College community. Also, action steps in the plans and outcomes from the plans should be discussed and documented to support and to hold accountable each other for the mission fulfillment of RTC.



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