"Students First"

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS & BENCHMARKS (2005)

A Status Report November 2016

Table of Contents

## I.	Introduction

This *Key Performance Indicators & Benchmarks (2005): A Status Report (November 2016)*, hereinafter referred to as *KPI Update 2016*, is a review and assessment of the *Institutional Assessment Plan* that was adopted in October 2005. The *KPI Update 2016* report serves as a framework for addressing a range of issues adopted from the American Association of Community College's publication, *Core Indicators of Effectiveness for Community Colleges* (2nd edition). The same framework was used as part of the *Institutional Assessment Plan* of 2005. The *KPI Update 2016* also serves as a template for annual review of KPIs as part of the College's ongoing assessment of institutional effectiveness.

NMC has had difficulty in updating the KPI's on a consistent basis since 2009. Several factors have contributed to the difficulty in updating the report annually as part of the established reporting cycle, including turnover at the institution in leadership and key offices.

NMC recognizes the importance of adopting and regularly reporting on these KPI's as being integral to the institution's assessment of effectiveness. Results are incorporated into the planning and program review process.

Over the last several months, the institution has made steady progress in increasing coordination between the Office of Admissions and Records, Office of Information Technology, and Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

The PowerCampus (PC) Data Group (PDG)—comprised of these three offices—meets regularly to address data issues related to the college's student information system, PowerCampus. The group is working on improving processes to ensure complete, accurate, and timely enrollment and student data are available for use by the institution.

In November 2016, the *KPI Update 2009* was reviewed at a joint meeting with the president, PDG, and Academic Programs and Services division.

It was agreed that this group of KPI's will evolve and be updated over the next year to follow the American Association of Community College's publication, *Core Indicators of Effectiveness for Community Colleges* (3rd edition).

The *KPI Update 2016* will serve as a stimulus to the entire College community in formulating questions and framing a dialogue about its findings (to include presenting findings, establishing relevant connections, and drawing conclusions), observed trends, successes, challenges, and recommendations for action. This is an essential element of the College's systematic process that uses data to inform and drive decision-making for continuous quality improvement.

II.   Key Performance Indicators

1. Student Progress

KPI 1: Student Goal Attainment

Performance Standard 1. Seventy-five percent (75%) of students, upon leaving NMC, will report that their original goal in attending (or subsequent goal decided while enrolled) has been met. (Results need to be reported by sub-groups based on goal in attending NMC.)

Assessment Regularity:
Annually

Institutional Action:

The college annually administers the Graduating Student Survey which contains one item that addresses this KPI. Of those surveyed 2014 - 2016, on average 94% responded their level of satisfaction with attaining their educational goals was "very much" or "much".

Table 1
Percentage of Graduating Students Responding "Very Much" or "Much" to the Prompt: Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following.

KPI 1	2014 Graduating Students	2015 Graduating Students	2016 Graduating Students	3 Year Average
	N=56	N=48	N=32	
Attainment of my educational goals	95%	98%	90%	94%

Assessment:
The performance standard has been exceeded.

Next Steps:

Beginning 2016-2017, students who do not return the following semester, and have not yet earned a certificate or degree or have not transferred to another institution, will be contacted regarding goal attainment.

KPI 2: Retention (Fall to Fall)

Performance Standard 1. Of the cohort of degree-seeking students who register for their first credits at NMC in one fall term, the percentage that is still enrolled the following fall term and that has not completed a degree or certificate will be at or above the national retention rate for public community colleges. (Results need

---

to be reported by sub-groups based on goal in attending NMC. This will give the College a clearer picture of how well we are retaining students throughout the various programs of the College.)

Assessment Regularity:
Annually

Institutional Action:
The fall to fall retention rates are reported in Table 2 -- Retention Fall to Fall: Institution Level. Data shows that institutional retention rates have been fairly consistent, and trending upward, over the last 5 years, ranging between 56-62%.

Table 2
Retention Fall to Fall

Retention Fall to Fall: Institutional Level											
Fall Cohort	Fall 1	Fall 2	%	Fall 3	%	Fall 4	%	Fall 5	%	Fall 6	%
2011FALL	266	156	58.7	93	34..9	55	20.7	36	13.5	15	5.6
2012FALL	282	158	56.0	100	35.5	64	22.7	33	11.7		
2013FALL	263	152	57.8	117	44.5	70	26.6				
2014FALL	327	201	61.5	130	39.8						
2015FALL	263	162	61.6								
Note: The rates above do not account for students that have graduated or transferred to other institutions.											

Assessment:
These rates show that NMC student retention is above the U.S. national average for two-year public institutions (which has been reported by ACT to have ranged between 51.3 –54.9% from 1983 to 2015). The current 3-year rolling average is 54.8%. This performance standard has been met.

Next Steps:
The College is a member of Complete College America and has been implementing aspects of the "Game Changers" aimed at improving retention and completion rates. The college continues to improve programs and services in support of student learning and success through the program review process.

Retention Fall to Fall: Associate's Degree										
Fall Cohort	# in Cohort	Fall 2	%	Fall 3	%	Fall 4	%	Fall 5	%	Fall 6	%
2011FALL	218	127	58.3%	75	34.4%	43	19.7%	26	11.9%	9	4.1%
2012FALL	235	131	55.7%	81	34.5%	47	20.0%	26	11.1%		
2013FALL	238	139	58.4%	103	43.3%	58	24.4%				
2014FALL	269	168	62.5%	105	39.0%						
2015FALL	219	132	60.3%								

Note: The rates above do not account for students that have graduated or transferred to other institutions.

Retention Fall to Fall: Bachelor's Degree										
Fall Cohort	# in Cohort	Fall 2	%	Fall 3	%	Fall 4	%	Fall 5	%	Fall 6	%
2011FALL	48	29	60.4%	18	37.5%	12	25.0%	10	20.8%	6	12.5%
2012FALL	47	27	57.4%	19	40.4%	17	36.2%	7	14.9%		
2013FALL	25	13	52.0%	14	56.0%	12	48.0%				
2014FALL	58	33	56.9%	25	43.1%						
2015FALL	44	30	68.2%								

Note: The rates above do not account for students that have graduated or transferred to other institutions.

KPI 3: Degree Completion Rates

Performance Standard 1. The percentage of an entering cohort officially enrolled in a certificate or degree program that actually completes a certificate or degree, will be at or above the national rate for public community colleges.

Assessment Regularity:
Annually.

Institutional Action:
The graduation rates in Table 3 show a 150 percent (3 years) completion rate below the national average for community colleges as reported by the National Center for Education Statistics using IPEDS data from the Fall 2011 cohort (20%).

Table 3
NMC Graduation Rates for Certificate and Degree-Seeking Cohorts Beginning Fall 2008

Associate's Degree												
Fall Cohort	# in Cohort	Year 2	%	Year 3	%	Year 4	%	Year 5	%	Year 6	%
2008FALL	125	9	7.2%	5	11.2%	4	14.4%	3	16.8%	1	17.6%
2009FALL	216	23	10.6%	18	19.0%	7	22.2%	1	22.7%	2	23.6%
2010FALL	278	22	7.9%	14	12.9%	7	15.5%	4	16.9%		
2011FALL	218	17	7.8%	12	13.3%	8	17.0%				
2012FALL	235	30	12.8%	10	17.0%						
2013FALL	238	29	12.2%								
2014FALL	269										

Bachelor's Degree											
Fall Cohort	# in Cohort	Year 4	%	Year 6	%	Year 8	%	Year 10	%	Year 12	%
2008FALL	22	2	9.1%	2	18.2%						
2009FALL	59	7	11.9%	4	18.6%						
2010FALL	65	2	3.1%	2	6.2%						
2011FALL	48	1	2.1%								
2012FALL	47										

Assessment:

This performance standard has not been met, but continuous data for subsequent cohorts need to be tracked and updated annually.

Next Steps:

The college will work to improve graduation rates in all academic programs. The College will develop and implement a multi-year retention plan in 2017. PROAC recommends that the foundation of that effort be a first-year experience / learning community program.

The College is a member of Complete College America and has been implementing aspects of the "Game Changers" aimed at improving retention and completion rates.

2. Workforce

KPI 4: Placement Rate in the Workforce

Performance Standard 1. Eighty percent of students achieving a certificate or degree, and who do not transfer to another institution, will obtain employment in a field directly related to that certificate or degree within one year of last attendance. (Results need to be reported by field of training or job classification.)

Assessment Regularity:

Annually.

Institutional Actions for all Degree Programs: Below are tables that illustrate student achievement data on job placement rates for all degree programs.

Table 4
Job Placement Data

B.S. in Education					
Year Graduated	No. of Graduates	No. Tracked	% Tracked	No. Employed	% Employed*
2011-2012	14	14	100.00	14	100
2012-2013	30	30	100.00	27	90
2013-2014	36	36	100.00	34	94
2014-2015	28	28	100.00	28	100
2015-2016	42	40	95.23	37	93
Grand Total	150	148	99	140	95

Source: School of Education records , Public School System Human Resources Office
*Percent of graduates tracked that have found employment

B.S. in Business Management					
Year Graduated	No. of Graduates	No. Tracked	% Tracked	No. Employed	% Employed*
2011-2012	-	-	-	-	-
2012-2013	-	-	-	-	-
2013-2014	-	-	-	-	-
2014-2015	-	-	-	-	-
2015-2016	12	12	100	9	75
Grand Total	12	12	100	9	75

Source: Business department records
*Percent of graduates tracked that have found employment

A.A. in Business					
Year Graduated	No. of Graduates	No. Tracked	% Tracked	No. Employed	% Employed*
2011-2012	6	5	83.33	2	40
2012-2013	6	4	66.67	4	100
2013-2014	3	1	33.33	0	0
2014-2015	11	10	90.91	7	70
2015-2016	9	9	100	7	77.78
Grand Total	35	29	83	20	72

Source: Business Department records

*Percent of graduates tracked that have found employment

A.S. in Nursing					
Year Graduated	No. of Graduates	No. Tracked	% Tracked	No. Employed	% Employed*
2011-2012	16	11	69	8	73
2012-2013	32	18	56	8	44
2013-2014	22	22	100	11	50
2014-2015**	0	0	0	0	0
2015-2016	15	15	100	7	47
Grand Total	85	66	78	34	52

Source: Nursing Department records
*Percent of graduates tracked that have found employment
** No cohort admitted due to accreditation status.

A.A.S. in Business Administration: Accounting Emphasis					
Year Graduated	No. of Graduates	No. Tracked	% Tracked	No. Employed	% Employed*
2011-2012	6	5	83.3	2	40
2012-2013	6	4	66.67	3	75
2013-2014	6	6	100	6	100
2014-2015	5	5	100	5	100
2015-2016	11	11	100	7	63.64
Grand Total	34	31	91	28	71.44

Source: Business Department records

*Percent of graduates tracked that have found employment

A.A.S. in Business Administration: Business Management Emphasis					
Year Graduated	No. of Graduates	No. Tracked	% Tracked	No. Employed	% Employed*
2011-2012	8	7	87.5	4	57.14
2012-2013	6	6	100	4	66.67
2013-2014	8	8	100	7	87.50
2014-2015	5	5	100	3	60
2015-2016	8	8	100	5	62.5
Grand Total	35	34	97	23	68

Source: Business Department records

A.A.S. in Business Administration: Computer Applications Emphasis					
Year Graduated	No. of Graduates	No. Tracked	% Tracked	No. Employed	% Employed*
2011-2012	4	2	50	2	100
2012-2013	9	3	33.33	2	66.67
2013-2014	6	2	33.33	1	50
2014-2015	0	0	0	0	0
2015-2016	3	3	100	2	66.67
Grand Total	22	10	45	7	70

Source: Business Department records

*Percent of graduates tracked that have found employment

A.A.S. in Hospitality Management					
Year Graduated	No. of Graduates	No. Tracked	% Tracked	No. Employed	% Employed*
2011-2012	2	2	100	1	50
2012-2013	9	4	44.44	2	50
2013-2014	6	5	83.33	2	40
2014-2015	13	12	92.31	6	50
2015-2016	11	11	100	4	36.36
Grand Total	41	34	83	15	44

Source: Business Department records

*Percent of graduates tracked that have found employment

A.A.S. in Criminal Justice					
Year Graduated	No. of Graduates	No. Tracked	% Tracked	No. Employed	% Employed*
2012-2013	6	6	100	6	100
2013-2014	8	7	87	7	100
2014-2015	12	12	100	12	100
2015-2016	16	9	56	9	100
Grand Total	42	34	81	34	100

Source: Criminal Justice program records

*Percent of graduates tracked that have found employment

A.S. in Natural Resource Management					
Year Graduated	No. of Graduates	No. Tracked	% Tracked	No. Employed	% Employed*
2010-2011	1	1	100	1	100
2011-2012	4	4	100	2	50
2012-2013	2	2	100	2	100
2013-2014	6	6	100	3	50
2014-2015	5	5	100	3	60

2015-2016	11	11	100	6	55
Grand Total	29	29	100	17	59

Source: Natural Resource Management program records

*Percent of graduates tracked that have found employment

Assessment:

Based on the students tracked, a majority of the degree programs have not met the 80% placement rate, with 5-year averages ranging from 44% to 100%. Data pertaining to "field directly related to…certificate or degree" was not collected, only whether the graduate was employed.

This performance standard has been partially met.

Next Steps:

Beginning with AY 2016-2017, the college will strive to track 100% of its graduates and will collect field-related employment data.

KPI 5: Alumni/Employer Assessment

Performance Standard 1. Eighty percent of a sample of regional employers in a given field will indicate that their employees who received training at NMC exhibit skills and job performance that are equivalent or superior to those exhibited by all their other employees. (Results need to be reported by field of training or job classification.)

Assessment Regularity:

Annually

Business Department Action: At the end of the spring 2016 semester, an Evaluation Survey was distributed to practicum internship supervisors to assess the performance of students in the Business cooperative education and hospitality practicum internship programs. Students with 50 or more program credits are placed in companies to complete the program required hours.

Assessment:

With a survey return rate of 100% (15/15), the results indicated that 93% (14/15) of students received an excellent rating, and 1 student received good/fair rating on professional performance.

Criminal Justice Action: No employer satisfaction surveys have been conducted in the last few years; however, the CJ program has been assessing the CJ capstone / internship course, CJ 299. Each semester, students who are in their last year or

last semester do an internship with the Department of Public Safety or the Office of Adult Probation. At the end of the internship, an assessment is done on the students work performance. This assessment evaluates student performance and provides feedback in areas in which students excel or need improvement.

Next Steps:
These data will be addressed in program review.

Nursing Department Action: Department will review the Employer Survey Questionnaire used back in May 2008 and come up with a new template by December 31, 2016. In addition, the Employer Survey Questionnaire will be administered to the employers of the 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016 graduated by mid-January 2017.

Next Steps:
The data will be addressed in program review.

KPI 5 Institutional Response: All programs will assess the skills and job performance of their graduates through the use of an employer survey. In addition to specific program-related items, all surveys will include several standard items, including one that asks employers to rate the skills and job performance of our graduates compared with their other employees. All major employers will be surveyed beginning 2016-2017.

KPI 6: Licensure/Certification Pass Rates

Performance Standard 1. Eighty percent of Associate in Science in Nursing and Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education graduates will actively seek and obtain licensure or certification within a 24-month period. (Results need to be reported by degree program.)

Assessment Regularity:
Annually.

Institutional Action for School of Education and the Nursing Department: Below are tables that illustrate student achievement data on licensure and certification pass rates for the Bachelor of Science in Education and the Associate of Science in Nursing graduates.

Table 5
Licensure Exam Data

NCLEX					
Year Graduated	No. of Graduates	No. Tracked	% Tracked	No. Passed NCLEX	% Passed NCLEX**
2012-2013	32	6	17	2	33
2013-2014	22	14	64	7	50
2014-2015*	0	0	0	0	0
2015-2016	15	3	100	3	100
Grand Total					53

Source: Nursing Department records, National Council of State Boards of Nursing
* There were no graduates during 2014-2015because admission was on hold for a new cohort
**Percent of graduates tracked that have passed the NCLEX

PRAXIS							
Year Graduated	No. of Graduates	No. Tracked	% Tracked	No. Passed PRAXIS I	% Passed PRAXIS I*	No. Passed PRAXIS II	% Passed PRAXIS II*
2012–2013	30	30	100.00	24	80.00	23	77.00
2013-2014	36	36	100.00	35	97.00	28	78.00
2014-2015	29	29	100.00	24	100.00	23	96.00
2015-2016	44	44	100.00	43	98.00	38	86.00
Grand Total					94		84

Source: School of Education records, CNMI Licensing Board and ETS Website.
 *Percent of graduates tracked that have passed PRAXIS II for CNMI Teacher Certification and revised TEACH Grant eligibility in 2016.

Assessment:

Based on the number of graduates' tracked, the 3-year average of 61% of Nursing graduates having passed the NCLEX is below the standard set of 80%. The 4-year average for Education graduates having passed the PRAXIS II was 84%, slightly above the standard set by the College.

The performance standard has been partially met.

Next Steps:

Both programs will continue to improve the collection of these data. Both programs are refining their procedures for regularly obtaining and tracking these data, including networking with employers and licensure and certification agencies. Nursing will also be tracking graduates' performance on the first attempt at taking the NCLEX. The goal is to have at least 80% of graduates passing the NCLEX on the first attempt.

KPI 7: Client Assessment of Programs and Services

Performance Standard 1. Eighty percent of Community Programs and Services (COMPASS) clients will rate course/workshop *content and instructional quality* of programs as satisfactory or better. Clients include such individuals and groups as students/participants, employers, contractors, organizations, etc.

<u>Assessment Regularity:</u>
Annually.

<u>Community Development Institute (CDI) Action</u>: At total of 43 training activities were conducted by CDI from October 1, 2015 thru September 30, 2016. Course and workshop evaluations were given to participants to evaluate the quality of the course or workshop and the level of client satisfaction. 1,545 individuals participated in these trainings from which 465 usable evaluations were received.

<u>Assessment:</u>
Ninety-nine (99%) of the CDI training participants rated training as satisfactory or better. Of these, eighty percent (80%) of the respondents stated that the course exceeded the standard.

<u>Next Steps:</u>
These data are being addressed in the current cycle of program review.

Performance Standard 2. Eighty percent of CDI clients will rate program services as satisfactory or better. Clients include such individuals and groups as students/participants, employers, contractors, organizations, etc.

<u>Assessment Regularity:</u>
Annually.

<u>CDI Program Action</u>: Ninety-nine percent (99%) of clients surveyed rated program services as satisfactory or better, well above the performance standard.

See Performance Standard 1.
Ninety-nine (99%) of clients surveyed rated workshops as satisfactory or better.

<u>Assessment:</u>
All three areas meet or exceed the standard.

<u>Next Steps:</u>
These data are being addressed in the current cycle of program review.

ABE Program Action: One hundred percent (100%) of ABE students surveyed for 2013-2014 workshops rates ABE program services as satisfactory or better. The performance standard has been exceeded.

CDI Program Action: See Performance Standard 1.

Assessment:
All three areas meet or exceed the standard.

Next Steps:
These data are being addressed in the current cycle of program review.

---

3. General Education

KPI 8: Demonstration of Critical Literacy Skills

Performance Standard 1. The demonstration of critical literacy skills (defined in the *Core Indicators of Effectiveness* as communication, critical thinking, problem solving, interpersonal skills, etc.) is included in the assessment of student learning outcomes as part of the NMC Program Review Process. They are implemented at the Degree and General Education program levels. The performance standard for the outcome set by the General Education (Gen Ed) Committee is that 75% of the students' work assessed will be at the acceptable level or higher.

Assessment Regularity:
The regularity of assessment will be governed by the cycle of data collection for this student learning outcome at the program level as part of the NMC Program Review Process.

Institutional Action:
Academic program learning outcomes have been mapped to the Gen Ed outcomes, and all NMC degree programs are expected to support these Gen Ed learning outcomes.

The following data comes from the Graduating Student Survey, which all graduates are asked to complete. Below is the percentage of students responding "very much" or "much" when asked how much progress they have made in critical literacy skills as a result of their experience at NMC.

Table 6
Percentage of Students Responding "Very Much" or "Much" to the Prompt: How much progress have you made in the following areas as a result of your experience at NMC?

KPI 8: Demonstration of Critical Literacy Skills. Performance Standard I	2014 Graduating Students	2015 Graduating Students	2016 Graduating Students	3 Year Average
	N=56	N=48	N=32	
Developing problem-solving skills	66%	70%	66%	67%
Learning to think and reason	73%	72%	69%	71%
Improving my writing skills	68%	77%	63%	69%
Improving my math skills	68%	70%	63%	67%
Reading with greater speed and better comprehension	64%	72%	66%	67%
Speaking more effectively	67%	85%	75%	76%
Understanding what others say	69%	85%	75%	76%
Research Skills	66%	81%	77%	75%
3 Year Average	68%	77%	69%	71%

❖ *Status Update as of Spring 2009*
General Education Committee Action: In 2015, the Gen Ed Committee was reconvened to assess the opportunities students had to complete general education outcomes at NMC. To that end, assignments in the six general education courses were collected in spring 2016 and fall 2016. These assignments will be evaluated using the VALUE LEAP rubrics which have been aligned by the committee with the institutional learning outcomes. These results will be used to assess the institution using the WASC General Education rubric.

Assessment:
The responses in Table 6 suggest that some of the components of the Critical Literacy Skills area are being met at the levels established by the Gen Ed Committee. Three year trends indicate rates below the targeted ranges with the exception of oral communication and research skills.

The performance standard has been partially met.

The General Education Committee will establish an archive of student work that can be drawn upon for future evaluations of general education outcomes.

KPI 9: Demonstration of Citizenship Skills

Performance Standard 1. The demonstration of citizenship skills (defined in the *Core Indicators of Effectiveness* as community involvement, multicultural understanding, leadership, etc.) is included in the assessment of student learning outcomes as part of the NMC Program Review Process being implemented at the Degree and General Education program levels. Outcomes data from these program activities will be used to inform this KPI. The performance standard for the outcome set by the Gen Ed Committee is that 75% of the students' work assessed will be at the acceptable level or higher.

Assessment Regularity:

The regularity of assessment will be determined by the cycle of data collection for this student learning outcome at the program level as part of the NMC Program Review Process.

Institutional Action:

The data in Table 7 comes from the Graduating Student Survey, which all graduates are asked to complete. Below is the percentage of students responding "very much" or "much" when asked how much personal growth they have made in areas related to citizenship skills as a result of their experience at NMC.

There has been a general trend of increasing personal growth made. Between 2015 and 2016, all items but two show a slight increase. For 2016, only 2 items indicate 80% or more of students having made "very much" or "much" personal growth in these areas.

Table 7
Percentage of Students Responding "Very Much" or "Much" to the Prompt: Please indicate the amount of personal growth you have achieved in the following areas as a result of your educational experience at NMC.

KPI 9: Demonstration of Citizenship Skills Performance Standard I	2014 Graduating Students	2015 Graduating Students	2016 Graduating Students	3 Year Average
	N=56	N=48	N=32	
Becoming a more effective member of a multicultural society	63%	74%	72%	70%

Becoming more aware of local and national political and social issues	55%	66%	71%	64%
Recognizing my rights, responsibilities, and privileges as a citizen or member of this community	59%	68%	72%	66%
Taking responsibility for my own behavior	79%	85%	88%	84%
Working cooperatively with others	86%	87%	84%	86%
3 Year Average	68%	76%	77%	74%

❖ *Status as of Spring 2009*
General Education Committee Action: See KPI 8.

Assessment:
The responses in Table 7 suggest that student responses for most components of the Citizenship Skills area are being met at the levels established by the Gen Ed Committee for the most recent graduating class. Additional progress needs to be made in the multicultural and social/political issues categories.

With the exceptions noted, this standard has been substantially met.

Next Steps: See KPI 8.

4. Transfer Preparation

KPI 10: Number and Rate of Transfer Students

Performance Standard 1. Seventy-five percent of an identified entering cohort actively enrolled in a degree program, with the intent to transfer, and completing at least 12 semester hours of college-level credit, will within two years enroll for at least 12 college-level credits in a degree program at a four-year institution. (The results need to be reported by degree program.)

Assessment Regularity:
Annually.

Institutional Action:
The Liberal Arts degree program is designed to prepare students for transfer to a baccalaureate degree program. Table 8 provides three years of transfer data for the A.A. in Liberal Arts. These figures include transfer to the NMC BS in

Education and BS in Business Management programs, and other institutions, including online programs.

Table 8
Transfer Data

A.A. in Liberal Arts									
Year Graduated	Total No. of Graduates	No. Transferred to NMC BS in Educ.	% Transferred to NMC BS in Educ.	No. Transferred to NMC BS in Bus. Mgmt.	% Transferred to NMC BS in Bus. Mgmt.	No. Transferred to Another Institution*	% Transferred to Another Institution*	Total Graduates that Transferred *	% of Total Graduates that Transferred *
2012-2013	54	33	61%	0	0%	5	9%	38	70%
2013-2014	64	36	56%	5	8%	5	8%	46	72%
2014-2015	73	34	47%	9	12%	9	12%	52	71%
Grand Total	191	103	54%	14	7%	19	10%	136	71%

Source: Admissions & Records, National Student Clearinghouse

*Number of students known to have transferred to another institution

Note: "Another institution" includes 2-year and 4-year schools, and online programs

Assessment:

The three-year average of 71% of Liberal Arts graduates transferring to a baccalaureate degree program is below the target of 75%.

The performance standard has not been met.

Next Steps:

The College will expand its use of the National Student Clearinghouse to include students that leave before completing a degree.

The College will review the need for additional transfer counseling support services beginning with student success programming.

KPI 11: Performance after Transfer

Performance Standard 1. Seventy-five percent of regular college-level courses at the transfer institution will be completed with a grade of "C" or better by students who previously attended NMC.

Assessment Regularity:

Annually.

Institutional Action:

The college has not addressed this KPI. At the most recent gathering of PPEC IRs in November 2016, there were discussions to provide aggregate student achievement data from 4-year institutions to 2-year institutions.

Assessment:

This performance standard is especially difficult to measure because of the necessity to track individual performance at the course level. The standard should be revised to use GPA data only and further refined to target regional transfer "destination" colleges as a priority.

Next steps:

The College will continue to work with regional and PPEC institutions to provide comparable data and to track the performance of students after transfer. Access to comparable group data for transfer GPAs will be included in all new and renewed transfer agreements.

5. Developmental Skills

KPI 12: Success in Subsequent, Related Coursework

Performance Standard 1. Of those who successfully complete developmental work, seventy-five percent will within one year complete their first college-level courses requiring the use of this skill with a grade of "C" or better.

Assessment Regularity:

Annually.

Institutional Action:

Developmental Math Program: Table 9 indicates that 68% of students that passed the highest developmental math course, MA 91, in AY 2014-2015 went on to complete MA 132 within one year. MA 132 is the lowest college-credit math course at NMC.

Table 9
Passed MA 91 Completed MA 132 Within One Year

Semester Passed MA 91	Completed* MA 132 Within One Year		
	# Passed MA 91	# Completed* MA 132	% Completed* MA 132

Fall 2014	104	80	76.9
Spring 2015	138	85	61.6
Grand Total	242	165	68.2

* C or higher

Assessment:

The performance standard has been partially met.

Next Steps:

These data are being addressed in the current cycle of program review.

Institutional Action:

Developmental English Program: Table 10 indicates that 61% of students that passed the highest developmental English course, EN 94, in AY 2014-2015 went on to complete EN 101 within one year. EN 101 is the lowest college-credit English course at NMC.

Table 10
Passed EN 94 Completed EN 101 Within One Year

Semester Passed EN 94	Completed* EN 101 Within One Year		
	# Passed EN94	# Completed* EN 101	% Completed* EN 101
Fall 2014	77	49	63.6
Spring 2015	65	38	58.5
Grand Total	142	87	61.3

* C or higher

Assessment:

The performance standard has not been met.

Next Steps:

These data are being addressed in the current cycle of program review.

6. Outreach

KPI 13: Participation Rate in Service Area

Performance Standard 1. The number of CNMI high school graduates enrolling at NMC will increase annually by one percent.

Assessment Regularity:

Annually.

Institutional Action:

Table 11 (see next page) indicates that the number of CNMI high school graduates enrolling at NMC has been increasing over the past nine years peaking in AY 2014-2015 with 55% of recent public high school graduates enrolling at NMC.

Assessment:

The college has met the standard as the percentage of graduates enrolling at NMC has steadily increased over the past nine years. The performance standard has been met.

Next Steps:

There are many factors influencing graduates' decision to attend NMC, including aggressive military recruiting on high school campuses and the need to find immediate employment. The College continues to expand and refine its recruiting efforts and is working closely with junior high and high school administrators, counselors, and teachers to increase awareness of NMC programs and services.

Table 11
Public High School Graduate Enrollment at NMC

All Public High Schools

Year of H.S. Graduation	Total H.S. Graduates	H.S. Graduates Newly Enrolled in **Fall** Following Graduation	H.S. Graduates Newly Enrolled in **Spring** Following Graduation	Total H.S. Graduates Newly Enrolled in Academic Year Following Graduation	Percentage of Change from Prior Year	Percentage of Total H.S. Graduates Newly Enrolled in Academic Year Following Graduation	Percentage of Change from Prior Year
June 2006	671	92	28	120	***	18%	***
June 2007	757	110	71	181	51%	24%	34%
June 2008	543	49	43	92	-49%	17%	-29%
June 2009	512	158	51	209	127%	41%	141%
June 2010	617	223	45	268	28%	43%	6%
June 2011	668	168	59	227	-15%	34%	-22%
June 2012	626	196	53	249	10%	40%	17%
June 2013	638	202	49	251	1%	39%	-1%
June 2014	675	309	59	368	47%	55%	39%

Performance Standard 2. The number of individuals participating in at least one organized Community Development Institute (CDI), Adult Basic Education (ABE), and Cooperative Research, Extension and Education Services (CREES) activity (course, program, service, event, etc.) will increase annually by one percent.

Assessment Regularity:
Annually.

ABE Program Action: ABE recorded a 34% participation rate in ABE Student Orientation attendance PY 2013-2014, 66% in 2014-2015, and 53% in 2015-2016.

Enrollment has decreased in the past two years for ABE. ESL and Level 1 student numbers continue to decrease and more students testing out without needing to take instruction in the core subjects of math, reading, and writing. While students turn in applications, after being assessed they are found "ready" to take the national tests. These affect the enrollment numbers because ABE cannot report students having less than 12 hours in the program.

The performance standard has not been met.

CREES Program Action: The Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program provides free nutrition education classes to parents or caregivers in limited resource families with young children.   In FY 2015, 133 adults completed EFNEP, while in FY 2016, 137 adults completed EFNEP: 1.33% increase.

This performance standard has been met.

CDI Program Action: Participant enrollment in courses or workshops conducted by CDI went from 780 in 2014-2017 to 1,546 in 2015-2016, for an increase of 98.2%. The substantial increase is attributed to the lower number of courses offered in the previous year because of Typhoon Soudelor and a lengthy recovery.

The performance standard has been met.

Unduplicated Headcounts						
CDI Programs and Partnerships	AY 10-11	AY 11-12	AY 12-13	AY 13-14	AY 14-15	AY 15-16
Community Services Courses	*	1288	1432	1882	780	1,545
Framingham State College M.Ed. in International Teaching Courses	23	21	25	23	0	0
University of Guam SROTC Courses	53	45	22	13	8	5

Framingham State College M.Ed. in International Teaching	AY 10-11	AY 11-12	AY 12-13	AY 13-14	AY 14-15	AY 15-16
Number of Degrees Awarded	23	21	25	23	0	0

Source: Community Development Institute
   Reviewed and updated 28 Nov 2016

Performance Standard 2 Assessment: The performance standard has been met.

Next Steps:

These data are being addressed in the current cycle of program review.

KPI 14: Responsiveness to Community Needs

Performance Standard 1. Periodic assessments of community needs and expectations will be carried out at the institutional and program levels.

ABE Program Action: ABE staff continues to build collaborative partnerships with related workforce development partners by joining advisory committees and participating in community outreach activities. Assessments of community needs and expectations are made continuously through this participation.

CREES Program Action: In Summer of 2016, CREES conducted a needs assessment titled, "NMC-CREES Listening Sessions". The NMC-CREES Listening Sessions held in June of 2016 were implemented to understand the perceived needs of the CNMI community concerning Research and Extension services in four distinct programmatic areas: Agriculture; Aquaculture/Natural Resources; Family, Community, and 4-H Youth Development, and Nutrition and Health. This assessment will be a catalyst for community driven "needs-based" programming conducted by NMC-CREES as part of the five-year plan of work (POW).

CDI Program Action: CDI's Service and Course Proposal/Request system addresses this standard. Service and/or Course Proposals/Requests reflect the exact needs and expectations of clients. Other means of documenting needs and expectations include direct inquiries from community organizations, Community Needs Assessments on all three islands. Needs assessments have been conducted on Rota and Tinian and have plans to conduct assessments on Saipan during the spring. Consumer Advisory Committees for University Centers for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDD) and Area Health Education Center (AHEC)

programs meet quarterly or on an as needed basis. The CDI staff and Director serve on various community and national councils.

Business Department Action: The new bachelor's degree program in business management was first offered in fall 2014. Based on NMC's needs assessment and the CNMI Department of Labor data, the local demand for business management personnel outnumbered other professional needs. Graduates of the Associates in business and liberal arts program will be able to seamlessly transfer into the new program. Further, the recent opening of the gaming and casino industry comes with the expectation that there will be a need for programs to support this industry.

Institutional Action:

Led by Mr. Dennis Jones, president of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), the College convened a major long-term Strategic Planning Summit in 2012 that engaged a broadly based and representative group of private sector and community leaders, elected officials, NMC Board of Regents, and NMC employees. The summit focused on long-term planning for the College and its role in the economic growth of the Commonwealth.

Through the results from various surveys, the work of PROAC, NCHEMS roundtable meetings and analysis, the College acquired data focusing on what the institution can do to improve so as to better support student success and achieve its mission. Information gathered from community stakeholders served as a key input into the development of NMC's new mission and vision statements (approved September 2013), and five-year Strategic Plan 2015-2020—Full Speed Ahead (approved February 2014).

The five-year Strategic Plan 2015-2020—Full Speed Ahead provides the overall direction for prioritizing future key initiatives, which will ultimately link to the allocation of resources. This Plan will assist the college in focusing its efforts to cost-effectively provide the best services and learning opportunities for students across the Northern Mariana Islands of Rota, Saipan, and Tinian.

Assessment:
This performance standard has been met.

Next Steps:
These data are being addressed in the current cycle of program review.

Performance Standard 2. As part of the program review process, programs will demonstrate responsiveness to community needs and expectations by continuously improving and adapting programs and services.

ABE Program Action: ABE utilizes feedback on community needs and expectations to improve programs and services. Input from community partners increases the number of participants from various segments of the community including the Division of Youth Services (DYS) and Nutrition Assistance Program (NAP) clients and Head Start parents.

CREES Program Action: CREES regularly responds to community needs and expectations to improve programs and services. This is reflected in the AREERA 5 Year Plan of Work approved by the United States Department of Agriculture National Institute of Food and Agriculture.

CDI Program Action: CDI's Service and Course Proposal system as well as course and service evaluations address this standard. Ninety-eight (98%) of training participants surveyed agreed that CDI courses and/or services responded to their needs and expectations. Of these, eighty-three percent (83%) of the respondents "strongly agreed" that the course responded to their needs and expectations.

CDI's Service and Course Proposal system as well as course and/or service evaluations are used to address this standard. Of the participants who took evaluations, over 99% agreed or highly agreed that CDI courses and/or services responded to their needs and/or expectations.

SOE Program Action: Information gathered from community needs assessment activities indicates a strong market demand for Bachelor level programs in the areas of early childhood education, secondary education, and special education. The SOE is currently working on a program development plan to address these needs.

Information gathered from community needs assessment activities have produced additional program concentrations: Early Childhood Education and Special Education. The SOE is anticipating offering a Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Mathematics (STEAM) concentration in the fall 2017 semester in response to the CNMI Public School System association with Project Lead the Way. The SOE also added the requirement of PRAXIS I and II in response to the CNMI's need for highly qualified teachers and counselors, as defined by the CNMI Board of Education, and to meet TEACH Grant eligibility.

Nursing Program Action: At the request of CDI/AHEC to meet community needs, the Nursing program reactivated the Certificate of Completion in Nursing Assistant Training (NU 095 – Nursing Assistant). The course has been inactive since 2005, and was approved for reactivation on April 12, 2016.

Criminal Justice Program Action: The CJ program collaborated with the Department of Fire and Emergency Medical Services (DFEMS) to offer the Fire Science Technology Certificate program. This program met the need to fill vacant

fire officer positions on Saipan, Tinian, and Rota. At the completion of the program, thirty-eight cadets graduated. All thirty-eight cadets are now fire officers with DFEMS.

Business Department Action: The new bachelor's degree program in business management was first offered in fall 2014. In addition, a new concentration in Accounting was added under the bachelor's degree. The program will include a concentration in Information Technology Security in the fall 2017. The recent opening of the gaming and casino industry prompted the program to offer a 33-credit Certificate of Achievement in Casino Management from the College of Southern Nevada.

Institutional Action:
Programs throughout the college have utilized the findings of the Strategic Planning Summit in program review to better meet community needs and expectations.

Assessment:
This performance standard has been partially met.

Next Steps:
These data are being addressed in the current cycle of program review.

Performance Standard 3. As part of the program review process, programs will demonstrate that individuals and groups served are satisfied with, and have benefited from, these programs and services. (See KPIs 7 and 15.)

ABE Program Action: ABE conducts a student survey during workshops. See percentage rate above KPI 7-Performance Standard 2, 100%. Further, ABE compiles a federally required National Reporting System report to the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education (OCTAE) that provides data on achievement of student personal goals to enter Employment of Higher Education and Training.

CREES Program Action: This is reflected in KPI 7 and 13.

CDI Program Action: Of the participants who took evaluations, 99% agreed or highly agreed that they were satisfied with CDI courses and/or services.

SOE Action: SOE, in collaboration with NMC Community Development Institute (CDI), offers training for daycare providers through the Childcare Development Fund. Of the participants who took the end of the semester class surveys, approximately 89% enrolled in three randomly selected education courses (ED

205, 321 and 471) were highly satisfied with their learning experience and the curriculum offered at SOE.

Business Department Action: This is reflected in KPI 5.

Assessment:
This performance standard has been partially met.

Next Steps:
These data are being addressed in the current cycle of program review.

Performance Standard 4. The College will report on the number and kind of partnerships with other agencies and organizations, together with other descriptive data such as numbers served.

Assessment Regularity:
Annually.

Institutional Action: The College reports on the number and kind of partnerships in individual department or unit reports, but not in a comprehensive College document.

CREES Program Action: In AY 2015 and 2016 CREES worked closely with 6 elementary schools, 6 Head Start Programs, the Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), Non-Communicable Disease Bureau, Non-Communicable Disease Alliance, two private businesses, Nutrition assistance Program, and 4 community-based non-profit groups to carry-out various research and extension programs. Because of its strong partnerships, which allowed for implementation of various health promoting changes in the villages of Tanapag, Achugao, San Roque and As Matuis, the NMC CREES Children's Healthy Living program (CHL) and the TASA Role Models were given the "2015-2016 Health in All Policies" award by the World Health Organization.

SOE Action: SOE has participated in the following: McREL's research with PSS and Department of Labor to meet anticipated workforce needs; CNMI Board of Education on bi-annual Title II Reports; CNMI PSS, Head Start Program, Mt. Carmel School, Northern Marianas International School, Green Meadow, Smart Start and other daycare providers for practicum placement and observations; DCCA's Childcare Development Fund for Impact Project (grant) to increase quality in childcare services in the CNMI. SOE is in initial discussions with Lego company for training sessions on EV3 robotics for STEAM concentration. SOE participates in BUILD EXITO, an ongoing partnership with Portland State University and other regional colleges and universities, to increase minority representation in biomedical careers.

Nursing Action: Nursing continues to work closely with the Commonwealth Healthcare Corporation Hospital and Public Health Programs, NMC Community Development Institute (CDI), and CNMI/NMC Area Health Education Center (AHEC), and AYUDA Network.

Tables 12 through 14 show the number and type of partnerships from various departments, together with the numbers served.

Table 12
ABE Program Partnerships

Program Partnership	Mechanism for Establishment	Purpose: Programs and Services Provided	# of Cients Served FY
1. WIA	MOU	Refer WIA clients to ABE to complete education before job placement.	2013-2014: No data 2014-2015: 27 2015-2016: 45
2. OVR	MOU	Refer clients to finish education.	2013-2014: 02 2014-2015: 01 2015-2016: 03

Table 13
CDI Program Partnerships

Program Partnership	*Mechanism for Establishment*	*Purpose: Programs and Services Provided*	*# of Clients Served 2004 - 09*
1. Workforce Investment Agency	Proposals	Computer Literacy, Admin Assistant Certificate Training	863
2. Interagency Coordinating Council	Governor Appointment	Council Membership & Technical Assistance	*17*
3. DPH – Maternal Child Health Bureau	Committee	Technical Assistance	2
4. CNMI Head Start	MOA	Early Childhood Certificate	18
5. Council on Developmental Disabilities	Federal Law/Governor Appointment	Council Membership & Technical Assistance	315
6. Northern Mariana Islands Protection and Advocacy Systems Inc.	Federal Law	Consumer Advisory Committee & Technical Assistance	25
7. CNMI Assistive Technology Program	Committee	Committee Member & Technical Assistance	15
8. DCCA Aging Program	Proposals	*Computer Literacy*	23
9. DCCA NAP Program	Proposals	Computer Literacy	7
10. CREES – CARIPAC	Proposals	Technical Assistance and Courses	9
11. CREES – Farmer Advisory Group	Proposals	2009 Ag Summit and Technical Assistance	97

12. Commonwealth Ports Authority Aircraft Rescue and Firefighting	MOA	Fire Academies, Courses, Technical Assistance, and Continuing Education	New
13. Bank of Saipan	Proposals	Computer Literacy and Customer Service Courses	13
14. World Resort	Internship Agreement	International Internship Service and Language Courses	48
15. Hyatt Regency Saipan	Internship Agreement	International Internship Service and Language Courses	126
16. Pacific Islands Club	Internship Agreement	International Internship Service and Language Courses	12
17. Marianas Resort	Internship Agreement	International Internship Service and Language Courses	4
18. Lao Lao Bay Golf Resort	Internship Agreement	International Internship Service and Language Courses	9
19. Aqua Resort	Internship Agreement	International Internship Service and Language Courses	12
20. Fiesta Resort and Spa	Internship Agreement	International Internship Service and Language Courses	90
21. Saipan Grand Hotel	Internship Agreement	International Internship Service and Language Courses	3
22. University of Guam - SROTC	Tri-lateral Agreement	Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps Facilitation Services/Courses	81
23. U.S. Department of Army	Tri-lateral Agreement	Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps Facilitation Services/Courses	81
24. University of Hawaii	Sub-Grant	Area Health Education Center	183
25. University of Hawaii	Sub-Grant	Pacific Basin University Centers for Excellence - PBUCE	300
26. America Samoa Community College	Co-Recipient of Sub-Grant	PBUCE Partner	3
27. Pacific Basin Interagency Leadership Council	Committee	Committee Member and Technical Assistance	333
28. Association of University 29. Centers on Disabilities	Membership Fee/Dues	Member	1
30. Framingham State College	MOA	Masters Degree in Education	170

Table 14
Business Partnerships

Program Partnership	_Mechanism for Establishment_	_Purpose: Programs and Services Provided_
Cooperative Education and Practicum Internship sites		
Department of Labor		Receiving data re: gaps in business specialized positions. This data allows the department to develop programs based on the gaps identified.
Program Advisory Council		To ensure programs are current and relevant to industry, business, and the community. To ensure graduates acquire the knowledge and skills required for employment.

This performance standard has been partially met.

Next Steps:

Beginning 2016, the College will include such information in the Annual Report.

These data are being addressed in the current cycle of program review.

---

7. Student Satisfaction

KPI 15: Student Satisfaction with Programs and Services

Performance Standard 1. Eighty percent of students will indicate satisfaction with instructional programs and services.

Assessment Regularity:

Annually.

Institutional Action:

Table 15 reports the percentage of students responding "very much" or "much" on the Graduating Student Survey when asked about their level of satisfaction with various aspects of instructional programs and services.

Table 15
Percentage of Graduating Students Responding "Very Much" or "Much" to the Prompt: Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following.

KPI 15 Performance Standard I	2014 Graduating Students	2015 Graduating Students	2016 Graduating Students	3 Year Average
	N=56	N=48	N=32	
Attainment of my educational goals	95%	98%	90%	94%
Quality of instruction	90%	96%	90%	92%
Quality of my program of study	90%	94%	97%	94%
Placement Testing	80%	89%	77%	82%
Academic Advising	85%	89%	94%	89%
3 year Average	88%	93%	90%	90%

Assessment:

For the last three years, the level of satisfaction exceeds the performance standard of 80%.

The performance standard has been exceeded.

Next Steps:

These data are being addressed in the current cycle of program review. The College will be administering the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory in spring 2017 to address this performance standard.

Performance Standard 2. Eighty percent of students will indicate satisfaction with administrative and educational support unit programs and services.

Assessment Regularity:

Annually.

Institutional Action:

Table 16 shows the percentage of students responding "very much" or "much" when asked on the Graduating Student Survey about their level of satisfaction with various aspects of administrative and educational support unit programs and services.

Table 16
Percentage of Graduating Students Responding "Very Much" or "Much" to the Following Prompt: Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following.

KPI 15 Performance Standard II	2014 Graduating Students	2015 Graduating Students	2016 Graduating Students	3 Year Average
	N=56	N=48	N=32	
Attainment of my personal goals	93%	98%	93%	95%
My sense of belonging on campus	75%	94%	87%	85%
Admissions Services	76%	94%	87%	86%
Registration	62%	93%	84%	80%
Financial Aid Services	84%	94%	84%	87%
New Student Orientation	73%	79%	77%	76%
Finance Office Services	76%	100%	84%	87%
Job Placement Services	53%	55%	65%	58%
Counseling Services	64%	68%	58%	63%

Career Planning	58%	70%	55%	61%
Quality of Computer Resources	67%	70%	58%	65%
Availability of Computer Resources	60%	79%	61%	67%
Library Resources	78%	81%	74%	78%
Student Activities	69%	78%	57%	68%
Bookstore Services	73%	85%	77%	78%
Snack Bar Services	75%	79%	55%	70%
Parking Facilities	44%	62%	58%	55%
Classroom Facilities	58%	72%	71%	67%
Laboratory Facilities	47%	68%	61%	59%
This college in general	75%	89%	80%	81%
3 Year Average	**68%**	**80%**	**71%**	**73%**

Assessment:

This is an exhaustive list of data which produces much useful feedback. However, for many items, the level of satisfaction is below the performance standard of 80%.

The performance standard has been partially met.

Next Steps:

These data are addressed in program reviews to improve College performance.

The College will be administering the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory to address this performance standard.

III. Summary & Recommendations for Improvement

The College will use information from the *KPI Update 2016* to engage in dialog about institutional effectiveness related to the College's strategic goals, priority initiatives, institutional level general education outcomes, and the results of program review.

This review has suggested that several Key Performance Indicators need to be refined or reviewed further. In many instances the review of current performance standards has suggested raising performance standards for those KPI's not linked to a national benchmark to 100%.

Based on a review of the Key Performance Indicators, some of the major recommendations for improvement include:

- The College will review and incorporate the 3rd edition of the *Core Indicators of Effectiveness for Community Colleges* (2007).
- The College will expand its use of the National Student Clearinghouse to include students that leave before completing a degree.
- The College will review the need for additional transfer counseling support services beginning with student success programming.
- The College will continue to work with regional and PPEC institutions to provide comparable data and to track the performance of students after transfer. Access to comparable group data for transfer GPAs will be included in all new and renewed transfer agreements.
- The College will administer the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory every four years to address KPI 15 Student Satisfaction with Programs and Services.
- The General Education Committee will evaluate assignments using the VALUE LEAP rubrics. Results will be used to assess the institution using the WASC General Education rubric