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Why Measure?

• To demonstrate our commitment to continuous quality improvement.

• To measure our success as an educational institution.

• To provide information that documents progress towards our goals and identifies need for change.

• To provide the Board and constituents with a monitoring device.
Process

• Created 23 IEM’s in FY11

• Targeted Performance Improvement Framework developed

• Review of data by Accountability Team

• 26 input groups identified - 20 input sessions conducted

• IEM priorities survey created and distributed

• Initial recommendation developed

• Recommendation endorsed by governance and President
IEM Categories

- Student Progress
- Performance After Transfer
- Progress of Developmental Students
- Market Penetration

- Workforce Development
- Financials
- Facilities
- Employee Diversity
# Stretch and Improvement Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IEM Category</th>
<th>IEM</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Progress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Improvement = 16-17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence Fall to Spring</td>
<td>Stretch = 76-77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence Fall to Fall</td>
<td>Improvement = 51-52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Advancement Rate</td>
<td>Stretch = 77-78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market Penetration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% share of Public High School Graduates</td>
<td>Improvement = 34-35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Consumption</td>
<td>Improvement = 160,000-169,999 Btu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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