

**FY 05-06 Key Performance Indicators  
Strategic Cluster 1: Student Learning & Support Services**

KPI	Additional clarification of measures	Bench-mark	Below Threshold (0)	Threshold (1)	Target (2)	Maximum (3)	Weight	Score
1.1 Diversity of Student Population <b>4637, Fall 05</b>	Number of minority students, fall term	4,783 in fall, 2004	4,400 or lower	4401 - 4600	<b>4601-4800</b>	Over 4800	5	<b>10</b>
1.2 Annual FTE Enrollment – relationship to projected <b>6% below projected FTE for the year</b>	FTE comprised of all registrations as of the 14 <sup>th</sup> day of each term	Projected FTE is 39,042 (Student Cr. Hrs./15)	More than 3% below projected FTE	2.1%-3% below projected annual FTE	Within 2% of projected FTE	Over 2% of projected annual FTE	5	<b>0</b>
1.3 Fall Headcount Enrollment – relationship to projected <b>Fall 05 HC = 22,555 or -5.14% below projection</b>	Headcount as a result of all registrations collected by the 14 <sup>th</sup> day	Projected Fall 05 headcount was 23,777	More than 3% below projected Fall HC	2.1%-3% below projected Fall HC	Within 2% of projected Fall HC	Over 2% of projected Fall HC	5	<b>0</b>
1.4 Market Penetration – Percentage of the 15-39 age group <b>6.81 Fall 05</b>	Fall headcount as a percentage of the 15-39 age cohorts within the following 4 county area (Montgomery, Green, Miami, Warren)	6.84 Fall 04	Less than 6.7	6.7 – 6.79	<b>6.8 – 6.9</b>	Over 6.9	5	<b>10</b>
1.5 Market Penetration - Percentage of all college-going (public, Ohio institutions) Montgomery County Residents attending Sinclair, Fall term <b>60.5% Fall 05</b>	Source: HEI	60.3% Fall 04	Less than 57.5%	57.5 - 59.4%	<b>59.5-61.5%</b>	Over 61.5%	5	<b>10</b>
1.6 Market Penetration - Percentage of recent high school graduates from top feeder schools at SCC FY 05-06 <b>24.8%</b>		24%	Less than 21%	21% - 22.9%	<b>23%-25%</b>	Over 25%	5	<b>10</b>

KPI	Additional clarification of measures	Bench-mark	Below Threshold (0)	Threshold (1)	Target (2)	Maximum (3)	Weight	Score
1.7 Associate degree completion rate <b>24.3%</b>	Rate of first-time, full-time degree seeking students who begin in select fall term, and completed or transferred within 3 years (150% of time to degree)	N=1509 in Fall 01 123 grads (8.2%) 243 transfers (16.1%) 24.3% total	Less than 21.0%	21.0% - 23.9%	24.0% - 26.0%	Over 26%	5	10
1.8 Certificate completion rate <b>12.1%</b>	Rate of first-time, full-time degree-seeking students who begin in select fall terms and completed or transferred within 150% of time to one-year or short-term certificate	N = 174 10 grads (5.7%) 11 transfer (6.3%) 12.1% total	Less than 12%	12.0 – 12.9%	13.0 – 14.0%	Over 14.0%	5	5
1.9 Successful course completion rate <b>Fall 05 – 71.4%</b>	% of A,B,C,P grades fall terms	71.3% A,B,C,P grades Fall 04	Less than 68%	68% - 69.9%	70% - 72%	Greater than 72%	5	10
1.10 Student rating of quality of instruction <b>89.9%</b>	% of respondents indicating it is excellent or very good (ratings of 1 or 2 on a 5 point scale). Source: Point of Graduation Survey	90.6% 3-year weighted average	Less than 87%	87-88.9%	89%-91%	Over 91%	5	10
1.11 Success of former DEV English students in subsequent college English classes <b>63.7%</b>	Successful completion (A,B,C grade of DEV English students in fall 05 English 111 classes	68.3% Fall 04	Less than 64%	64% - 66.9%	67% - 70%	Over 70%	5	0

KPI	Additional clarification of measures	Bench-mark	Below Threshold (0)	Threshold (1)	Target (2)	Maximum (3)	Weight	Score
1.12 Success of former DEV math students in subsequent college math classes  <b>39.7%</b>	Successful completion (A,B,C grade of DEV math students in fall 05 MAT 101 classes	33.7% Fall 04	Less than 31%	31% - 32.9%	33% - 35%	Over 35%	5	15

Cluster Score \_\_\_90

**Strategic Cluster II: Workforce Development**

KPI	Additional clarification of measures	Bench-mark	Below Threshold (0)	Threshold (1)	Target (2)	Maximum (3)	Weight	Score
2.1 Annual non-credit revenue < <b>\$800,000</b>	Non-credit revenue reported by Corporate and Community Services	FY 2006 Budget = \$1,000,000	Less than \$800K	\$800K - \$894K	\$895K – \$1.094M	\$1.095M or greater	3	0
2.2 Employer rating of Sinclair graduates' job-related technical knowledge  <b>89.4%</b>	Percentage of employers rating graduate job-related technical knowledge as good/very good	85.8% 3-yr weighted mean average	Less than 81%	81%-83.9%	84%-87%	Over 87%	3	9
2.3 Employer rating of Sinclair graduates' thinking/problem-solving skills  <b>82.2%</b>	Percentage of employers rating graduate thinking/problem solving skills as good/very good	80.6% 3-yr Weighted mean average	Less than 76%	76-79.9%	80% - 83%	Over 83%	3	6

KPI	Additional clarification of measures	Bench-mark	Below Threshold (0)	Threshold (1)	Target (2)	Maximum (3)	Weight	Score
2.4 Employer rating of Sinclair graduates' communication and inter-personal skills  <b>81.3%</b>	Composite percentage of employers who rate the graduate's ability good/very good re: communication and interpersonal skills	76% 3-year weighted average	Less than 73%	73% - 74.9%	75% - 77%	Over 77%	3	<b>9</b>
2.5 Sinclair's share of Dayton region workforce training and development market  <b>Measure not available, but we are aware that we are not anywhere near where we want to be.</b>	43% of area businesses had used community colleges for training needs. May need to conduct a further survey of top 100 businesses to determine total training market, which community colleges, etc.						3	<b>0</b>
2.6 External rating of SCC's workforce development services  <b>TBD</b>	Rating of satisfaction from annual CCS phone survey of top 500 business in Dayton Region	90% composite from 3 years of survey results	87.9% or lower	88%-91.9%	92% - 96%	Greater than 96%	3	<b>NA</b>

Cluster Score 24

**Strategic Cluster III: Community Service**

<b>KPI</b>	<b>Additional clarification of measures</b>	<b>Bench-mark</b>	<b>Below Threshold (0)</b>	<b>Threshold (1)</b>	<b>Target (2)</b>	<b>Maximum (3)</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Score</b>
3.1 Sinclair Leadership Council members and department chairs serving on boards of community service organizations - Number of Leadership Council members serving on boards  <b>37 total</b>		22 of 47 Sinclair Leadership members serve on 73 boards  15 of 48 chairs serve on 48 boards	Less than 30	30-34	35-40	41 or more	1	<b>2</b>
3.2 Sinclair Leadership Council members and department chairs serving on boards of community service organizations – Percent of Leadership Council membership serving  <b>39% total</b>		31% of chairs serve on boards  47% of SLC serve on boards  39% total	Below 30%	30%-37.9%	38%-48.0%	Over 48.0%	1	<b>2</b>

KPI	Additional clarification of measures	Bench-mark	Below Threshold (0)	Threshold (1)	Target (2)	Maximum (3)	Weight	Score
3.3 Sinclair Leadership Council members and department chairs serving on boards of community service organizations - Number of boards being served <b>121 Boards</b>		121 Boards served by SLC and chairs	Less than 110	110-119	120-130	131 or more	1	2
3.4 Sinclair sponsorship of community events – Number of sponsorships	FY 2004-05 events paid for out of President's and Marketing/Public Relations	64 events	0-50 events	51-75 events	76-99	100+	1	1
3.5 Sinclair sponsorship of community events – Amount of funding committed to sponsorship <b>TBD</b>							1	NA
3.6 Community philanthropy – United Way Contribution <b>\$127,822 or 98% of goal</b>	Dollars raised in relationship to goal	98% of goal		95% - 99.9%	100%-104.99%	105% or greater	1	1
3.7 Community philanthropy – Number of students enrolled in service learning <b>496</b>	Integration of service learning into the curriculum as measured by the number of student enrollees in service learning	310 by Spring 05	Less than 325	325 - 349	350 - 375	Over 375	1	3
3.8 Community partnerships – Number of cooperation agreements <b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b> Not defined for this year's data						1	NA

Cluster Score 11

**Strategic Cluster IV: External Accountability**

<b>KPI</b>	<b>Additional clarification of measures</b>	<b>Bench-mark</b>	<b>Below Threshold (0)</b>	<b>Threshold (1)</b>	<b>Target (2)</b>	<b>Maximum (3)</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Score</b>
<p>4.1 Findings of annual financial audit:: assessment of findings and management letter related to 1) Control Weaknesses 2) improper expenditures; 3) other avoidable controllable items</p> <p><b>No findings or management comments for FY 2005</b></p>	<p>Assessment of findings and management letter comments related to control weaknesses, improper expenditures or other avoidable /controllable items.</p>	<p>Comments in line with expectations</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>No material items; the number and type of comments fall short of expectations</p>	<p>No material items; comments in line with expectations</p>	<p>No material items; assessment of comments exceed expectations</p>	<p>4</p>	<p><b>12</b></p>
<p>4.2 Results of "Senate Bill 6 Financial Ratio Analysis": composite score of three ratios: 1) Viability/debt ratio; 2) net income ratio; and 3) primary reserve ratio</p> <p><b>Composite score of 4.4 for FY 05</b></p>	<p>Composite score computed by the OBR that is based on three ratios: viability; net income and primary reserve. Score ranges from 0 (worst) to 5 (best)</p>	<p>FY 2004 score = 4.0</p>	<p>Score less than 3.0</p>	<p>Score of 3.0 – 3.9</p>	<p>Score of 4.0 – 4.9</p>	<p>Score of 5.0</p>	<p>4</p>	<p><b>8</b></p>
<p>4.3 Poll results: Rating of College's Net Value to the Community</p> <p><b>93%</b></p>	<p>% of Montgomery Co. voters who rating SCC as very or somewhat favorable to the following question: <i>Thinking about SCC, would you say that overall you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable or very unfavorable opinion of the College?</i></p>	<p><i>93% rated this very or somewhat favorable in April 2006</i></p>	<p>Below 80%</p>	<p>80% - 84.9%</p>	<p>85% - 90%</p>	<p>Over 90%</p>	<p>4</p>	<p><b>12</b></p>

KPI	Additional clarification of measures	Bench-mark	Below Threshold (0)	Threshold (1)	Target (2)	Maximum (3)	Weight	Score
4.4 Poll results: Rating of the College's efforts to inform the public  <b>87%</b>	% of Montgomery Co. voters who responded they felt very or somewhat informed to the question: How well informed would you say you are about SCC?'	87% indicated they felt very or somewhat informed (2005 Triad Survey)	Below 80%	80% - 84.9%	85% - 90%	Over 90%	4	8
4.5 Rating of Sinclair by community leaders regarding Sinclair's efforts to align its educational programs with community needs.  <b>4.3</b>	Rating of respondents to this question on Community Leader's survey (scale of 1-5)	4.3 on the August 05 Survey	Below 3.5	3.5 – 3.99	4.0 – 4.5	Over 4.5	4	8
4.6 Rating of Sinclair by community leaders regarding Sinclair's efforts to participate in the community.  <b>4.2</b>	Rating of respondents to the following question on the Community Leader's Survey: <i>The community services provided by SCC return ample added-value to the taxpayer</i> Scale of 1-5	4.2 on the August 05 Survey	Below 3.5	3.5 – 3.99	4.0 – 4.5	Over 4.5	4	8
4.7 Rating of Sinclair by community leaders regarding Sinclair's efforts to seek input from community leaders  <b>4.3</b>	Ratings on Community Leader's Survey to the following: <i>SCC listens to the needs of the community.</i> Scale of 1-5	4.3 on the August 05 Survey	Below 3.5	3.5 – 3.99	4.0 – 4.5	Over 4.5	4	8

Cluster Score   64

**Strategic Cluster V: Organizational Development & Effectiveness**

<b>KPI</b>	<b>Additional clarification of measures</b>	<b>Bench-mark</b>	<b>Below Threshold (0)</b>	<b>Threshold (1)</b>	<b>Target (2)</b>	<b>Maximum (3)</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Score</b>
5.1 Diversity of faculty and staff  <b>19.25% (full- and part-time faculty and staff)</b>	% minority faculty/staff population reflective of 4-county area, fall term	16.5%	15.0% - 15.99%	16.0% - 16.99%	17.0% - 17.99%	<b>18.0%</b>	3	<b>9</b>
5.2 Mean ratings by employees – Operations of Sinclair reflect its mission	<b>Not Collected FY 2006-07</b>						3	<b>NA</b>
5.3 Mean ratings by employees – Open and ethical communication is practiced at Sinclair	<b>Not Collected FY 2006</b>						3	<b>NA</b>
5.4 Mean ratings by employees – Information is shared within Sinclair	<b>Not Collected FY 2006</b>						3	<b>NA</b>
5.5 Mean ratings by employees – Sinclair is appropriately organized	<b>Not Collected FY 2006</b>						3	<b>NA</b>
5.6 Mean ratings by employees – Student needs are central to core operations	<b>Not Collected FY 2006</b>						3	<b>NA</b>
5.7 Mean ratings by employees – Students receive an excellent education at Sinclair	<b>Not Collected FY 2006</b>						3	<b>NA</b>
5.8 Mean ratings by employees – Sinclair's leadership communicates a clear vision of the college's future direction	<b>Not Collected FY 2006</b>						3	<b>NA</b>
5.9 Mean ratings by employees – Sinclair's resource allocation process is adequate to accomplish the mission of my department	<b>Not Collected FY 2006</b>						3	<b>NA</b>
5.10 External review of all critical departments (rotating schedule) – deficiencies and opportunities are identified and plans made to resolve <b>TBD</b>	TBD – establish benchmark						3	<b>NA</b>
5.11 External review of all critical departments (rotating schedule) – professional standards and norms of quality are met or exceeded <b>TBD</b>	Schedule of rotating academic and non-academic external reviews.		No movement on process	Process discussed	<b>Creation of rotating list/id of players begun</b>	Creation of rating list/id of players finished and approved	3	<b>6</b>

**Cluster Score** \_\_\_\_15\_\_\_\_

**Strategic Cluster VI: Financial Management & Resource Development**

KPI	Additional clarification of measures	Bench-mark	Below Threshold (0)	Threshold (1)	Target (2)	Maximum (3)	Weight	Score
6.1 Total grant program awards (annual) <b>\$5.2 Million projected</b>	Total grant funding/year exceeds benchmark	\$7.0 Million	Less than \$7.0 Million	\$7.0 Million to target	\$7.2-Million to maximum	\$7.4 Million or more	4	<b>0</b>
6.2 Foundation dollar acquisition index – campaign <b>No current campaign</b>	Measure new gifts resulting from a major campaign; e.g. Changing Lives	No current campaign; TBD when next campaign is planned					4	<b>NA</b>
6.3 Foundation dollar acquisition index – annual fund <b>As of mid-April 2006 annual fund campaign has raised \$180,346 per Donor Relations records</b>	Measure new gifts resulting from annual fund raising solicitations	Projected FY 2006 gifts of \$150,000	Less than \$75,000	\$75,000 – \$125,000	\$125,001 - \$175,000	<b>More than \$175,000</b>	4	<b>12</b>
6.4 Percent of foundation dollars committed to scholarships <b>The FY 2006 expenditure budget is 832,208, consisting of 424,759 (51%) for scholarships. Based on mid-April data, projecting scholarship spending of \$395,000 and non-scholarship spending of \$400,000. Therefore projected ratio is \$395,000/\$795,000 or 49.7%</b>	Scholarship expenditures as a percentage of total expenditures from unrestricted net assets	FY 2006 original budget allocates 51% to scholarships	Less than 40%	40% - 45.0%	<b>45.1% - 50%</b>	Greater than 50%	4	<b>8</b>
6.5 Operating budget revenue/FTE student <b>KPI under review due to interpretation constraints</b>	Measure revised budget versus original budget	FY 2006 Original budget = \$7,544 or 2.2% below prior year	Less than \$7,506	\$7,506 - \$7,543  (99.5% - 99.9% of budget)	\$7,544 - \$7,845  (100% - 103.9% of budget)	\$7,846 or more  (104% of budget or greater)	4	<b>NA</b>

KPI	Additional clarification of measures	Bench-mark	Below Threshold (0)	Threshold (1)	Target (2)	Maximum (3)	Weight	Score
6.6 Operating budget cost/student <b>\$7,961 FY 06 revised budget</b>	Measure revised budget versus original budget	FY 2006 Original budget = \$7,538 or 2.5% below prior year	More than \$7,575	\$7,575-\$7,539  (100.5% - 100.1% of budget)	\$7,538 - \$7,388  (100% - 98.1% of budget)	\$7,387 or less  (98% of budget or less)	4	<b>0</b>
6.7 (personnel cost as a percent of total cost) <b>-0.3%</b>	Operating budget net income before transfers as a % of revenues (adjusted for tuition stabilization fund add or draw so as to normalize the cyclical nature of levy funds)	Prospective long-term range projection average is about 3.5%	Less than 2%	2% - 2.9%	3% - 4.9%	5% or greater	4	<b>0</b>
6.8 Deferred/preventive maintenance level	Qualitative and quantitative assessments of college's deferred maintenance level	Currently there are no material deferred maintenance problems		Some level of previously unidentified items that need maintenance attention	Some level of identified maintenance issues and a low level of risk for major system failures	Absence of significant maintenance issues.	4	<b>8</b>

Cluster Score 28