# STUDENT OUTCOMES COMMITTEE OF THE
# BOARD OF TRUSTEES

## MINUTES

### Thursday, October 13, 2016
### 1:30 p.m.
### Conference Room M2-34

**Presiding:** Dr. Rényi

**Present:** Ms. de Fries, Dr. Generals, Ms. Hernández Vélez, Dr. Hirsch, Ms. Horstmann (via phone), Mr. Lassiter, Dr. Roberts, Rep. Roebuck, Jr.

**Guests:** Ms. Dunston

## (1) Executive Session

There were no agenda items for the Executive Session.

## (2) Public Session

### (a) Approval of the Minutes of September 1, 2016

The minutes were accepted unanimously.

### (b) Dashboard

The discussion began with a question from Ms. Horstmann about the peer group and whether the College should use the top quartile of the peer group or Aspen winners (for example) as peers instead. Dr. Generals agreed that the College should look at possible "aspirational" or goal peers (and name the group accordingly). While the Aspen finalists may provide possible aspirational peers, the institutions might not all be comparable (for instance, suburban institutions) and the top quartile of the peer group might not compare to Aspen winners.

The group discussed how indicator 1.8 (New Full-time Students Who Left the College Prior to Earning a Degree and Transferred within 3 years (IPEDS)) provides additional data and insight into student success and that transferring without first earning an Associate degree is a form of student success (though the College would prefer that students first earn their degree before transferring). While the College might be below the peer group for graduation, it is above the peer group on indicator 1.8. Dr. Rényi asked about employment data; how can the College know what it is achieving in this area when data are difficult to get? Dr. Generals described how the College does have data for two employment-related indicators (1.24 on job placement rates and 1.25 on wage and wage growth); that College conducts surveys to gather

additional data on employment; and that the College is going to have an administrative position for placement.

Dr. Rényi suggested the following: for cells with "TBD," that the date for when the data will be available should be included (either in a footnote or in the cell); for dramatic changes, it would be helpful to include additional information in a footnote (for example, for 1.26, the exam pass rate for Nursing students increased from 2014-15 to 2015-16, but after the exam had been changed in 2013-14, which saw a noticeable decrease the following year); when areas are "under development", that the color blue be used to distinguish this.

Regarding indicator 2.2, Dr. Generals explained that the previous deal did collapse and that the College is exploring various options. Ms. de Fries remarked that Goldman Sachs 10,000 Small Businesses data could be added, as could data on career connections the College does have. Mr. Lassister noted that the number of volunteer hours (which can be tied to money for the local economy) would be good data. Ms. de Fries commented that the economic impact has good metrics; Dr. Generals added that the College just hired a coordinator for Community Engagement and Civic Leadership Initiatives, who works on topics such as expungement workshops and community outreach. Mr. Lassister also suggested that information on faculty who are on boards be included; this would show the College has "thought leaders."

Regarding the finance section, Dr. Generals said that although this is in the early stages of the dashboard, at the planning meeting in November the five-year budget will be unveiled and this section will then have more information. Dr. Rényi commented that it could be discussed with the Board whether information on private giving should be included in the dashboard (grants are important, but more restrictive).

Dr. Generals noted that the dashboard has not yet been shared with the Board of Trustees, but it will be at the planning meeting in November. Dr. Rényi mentioned that it is therefore important to determine the target comparison/peer group at the next Committee meeting. Additionally, the sections on facilities, finances, and community relationships should have more specific goals/indicators.

**(c) Academic Program Review Audit**

Ms. Dunston presented an updated format for academic program reviews. She noted several aspects of the updated format that should be helpful: emphasis on making the information more digestible/reader-friendly; attempt to make it more scaled in the recommendations; use of more robust citations (which allows the Office of Assessment and Evaluation to look at data points more consistently across programs and more easily see the focus of a given program). The goal is for the total length of the document to be 2-5 pages.

The executive summary will be bulleted key findings, each 1-2 sentences long (key findings are currently included but are embedded throughout the narrative; the new format will highlight them). The action items will mirror the language used by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. "Suggestions" will introduce best practice ideas the program could implement; "recommendations" will relate to topics programs should note or be aware of and could be addressed in their annual reporting and Quality/Viability Indicators report; "requirements" (formerly called "recommendations") will be topics that need to be addressed with follow-up reports (sometimes within the academic year). The narrative summary will be more robustly cited and focused on topics addressed in action items. Regarding the sources of evidence, they will try to be more consistent to include all sources of evidence, although these sources may vary across programs.

More program analysis will be added, with the program providing SWOT analysis (which should reduce the need for revisions). Programs will also be provided more opportunity for input with each section having a subsection labeled "Input from the Program." The Office of Assessment and Evaluation will meet with the program at the beginning of the review process and solicit their input on certain pieces. Program audits will still be conducted internally, but the document provided to the Committee will reflect this new format with more focused information.

Dr. Rényi and Ms. Horstmann suggested that the dashboard should somehow be integrated into program reviews, so that programs would consider how their work contributes to the dashboard. Dr. Rényi asked about how the report could provide more context regarding the College as an institution (for instance, the needs of students, needs of the city, future impact on economy). This could allow the report to focus not only on the micro but also on the big picture and how the two relate. Dr. Generals commented that this is part of the purpose of the planning process and that there could be an attachment about how the program is doing aligned with the broader plans and needs of the College. Ms. Dunston mentioned that an earlier draft of the document did ask programs for statements on mission alignment at the beginning of the review process; something similar could relate to the strategic plan. Dr. Rényi observed that this process could help program faculty perspective, to which Ms. Dunston replied that the action items should help programs/faculty look forward and broaden their thinking, thus enabling this to be an analysis and projection report.

Dr. Hirsch discussed that perhaps the program analysis section should be expanded to make it more clear and less broad; expanding the description of this section may provide clarification. Rep. Roebuck commented that a follow-up could be part of each report (such as how some programs currently submit a report after one year). Ms. Dunston explained that her office will keep a list of educational effectiveness action items, which could include actions from audits; then there could be an annual or bi-annual review of compiled action items. Ms. Dunston addressed upcoming audits and said that four audits were in the pipeline; the first two are in the final revisions, but the next two should include elements of the new system.

**(d) New Business**

There were no new business topics to discuss.

**(3)** <u>**Next Meeting**</u>

The next meeting of the Student Outcomes Committee of the Board is scheduled for November 3, 2016 at 1:30 p.m. at the Northeast Regional Center in Room 124

<u>**Attachments:**</u>

Minutes of September 1, 2016
Dashboard – October 7, 2016
Proposed Academic Program Review Format
Current Program Audit Format

**STUDENT OUTCOMES COMMITTEE OF THE
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

**MINUTES Thursday,**

**September 1, 2016
1:30pm
Conference Room M2-34**

**Presiding:**     Dr. Rényi

**Present:**     Mr. Armbrister, Ms. de Fries, Mr. Edwards, Dr. Gay, Dr. Generals, Ms. Hernández Vélez, Dr. Hirsch, Ms. Horstmann, Mr. Lassiter, Ms. McPherson, Dr. Roberts, Rep. Roebuck, Jr.

**Guests:**     Dr. Carter, Ms. Dunston, Mr. Saxton, Mr. Spielberg, Ms. Sweet

**(1)     Executive Session**

Personnel issues were discussed.

**(2)     Public Session**

**(a) Approval of the Minutes of May 5, 2016**

The minutes were accepted unanimously.

**(b) Academic Program Audit: Business Administration A.A. Degree/Business A.A. Degree**

Ms. Dunston, Director of Academic Assessment and Evaluation, provided an overview of the recommendations associated with the audit for two programs: Business Administration A.A. Degree/Business A.A. Degree. Recommendations included the following: to evaluate the integration of the Marketing and Management department with the Business Administration department; to evaluate the distinction between the two programs; to complete 335 evaluations; to look more closely at assessments of student learning; to review articulation agreements; and to improve student success outcomes.

Mr. Armbrister requested an explanation for why there are two closely related programs. Dr. Gay clarified that each program has a different specialized accreditation: Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) for the Business Administration program and Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP) for the Business program. Dr. Carter, Dean of the Business and Technology division, discussed how having the one degree will be more clear to students and there will be two possible math sequences (the two math sequences address AACSB and ACBSP math requirements). Ms. McPherson asked about the

merging of Marketing and Management into the Business Administration department. Dr. Carter explained that the merging of the two departments will allow for better management of the program, especially with faculty from both fields under one department head. The Business and Technology division had an all-day retreat in April and another meeting the day previous to the Student Outcomes Committee meeting to discuss future directions for the division.

**Action: The Student Outcomes Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees accept the audit and that a follow-up report be submitted in one year.**

**(c) Photographic Imaging Curriculum Follow Up Report**
The program was last at a Student Outcomes Committee meeting in 2014 with a number of recommendations. Mr. Spielberg, the department head, provided information on progress the program has made since then. The number of graduates has increased (to 8 in 2015-16) and more graduates are anticipated. The program is almost ready to offer Photography 105 (Introduction to New Technology) to students; this is expected to improve the number of students in the major. Dr. Rényi commented positively on several ideas being considered, such as Saturday classes, working with the Music program, and stacking credentials. Mr. Armbrister asked how long recent graduates had been in school; Mr. Spielberg replied that students are typically part-time, older, and often take 5-6 semesters. Mr. Lassiter inquired about the types of jobs for which students would be qualified; Mr. Spielberg gave as examples advertising, commercials, magazines, internet, business head shots, portraits, wedding photography, and publishing. Ms. McPherson asked if image research was included in the curriculum; Mr. Spielberg said that it is covered in two courses. Rep. Roebuck, Jr. asked if students who come to the program have clear plans for a career and what brings them to the program in general; Mr. Spielberg replied that most do not come with a clear career path, but rather come to the program because of artistic interests.

**Action: The Student Outcomes Committee recommends that the program submit a follow-up report in May/June 2017 to provide more data regarding student outcomes.**

**(d) Dissolution of Policy No. 105: Robert S. King Scholarship for High School Students**
Dr. Hirsch explained that this scholarship became Board policy in 1985 after Robert S. King retired. Since the new 50th Anniversary Scholars program began last year, the Robert S. King Scholarship is no longer offered (funds had come from the operating budget). Robert S. King passed two years ago and his daughter is understanding regarding the dissolution.

**Action: The Student Outcomes Committee recommends that the Robert S. King Scholarship for High School Students be dissolved.**

**(e) Workforce Contacts and Outreach Efforts Report**

Dr. Rényi explained that the Board of Trustees members have committed to making contacts to introduce the Workforce Development leadership. Ms. de Fries provided a follow-up report. Out of the list of possible contacts, Ms. de Fries made contact with 16 companies on the list and 4 to follow up for the next group of companies. Ms. de Fries and Dr. Generals toured the facilities of Rhoads Industries. This company may be interested in an apprenticeship program for welders; Ms. de Fries took Rhoads on a site tour of Benjamin Franklin High School and are also discussing available funds for the training via WEDNet, a state funding program. PECO worked with the Collegiate Consortium on the creation of a gas pipeline mechanic program; the first class started at Delaware County Community College. PECO is interested in doing this program in Philadelphia with the College; We are currently working on identifying appropriate space. We have reached out to Spectrum Health Services regarding funding for their training via WEDNet, and helped identify $16,000 in funds to reimburse them for training they have already conducted; by providing this assistance, we are now in discussions with them about providing training directly. Comcast has specific needs related to customer service for a variety of positions within the company, particularly in the call center and the technicians that install the equipment. The company is interested in employing veterans and we are working with Comcast on putting together a job fair in the Fall for them to hire the College's veteran students. Four companies have been identified by Carol on the wish list for outreach: Osagie Imasogie - Iroko Pharmaceuticals, Madeline Bell – CHOP, Eric Foss – Aramark, Marcos Lopez - Exude Benefits. Carol will be following up with board members with suggested talking points for the outreach. As of July 1, 10,000 Small Businesses and Career Services report to Workforce Development. Searches are underway for the Executive Director, 10KSB, and Director, Career Connections positions; Ms. de Fries will send the job descriptions to the Board of Trustees. Dr. Rényi made several suggestions: job descriptions for high level jobs be sent to the Board of Trustees; Board members invite Dr. Generals and Ms. de Fries to social events; and an annual request be made to the Board for names of companies for possible connections. Ms. de Fries stated that there has been more high level external outreach to the College coming from companies. Dr. Generals mentioned a possible connection with IBM to bring a program to the College.

**(f) Dashboard**
Dr. Rényi stated that every time the Committee meets, the Committee should review data to see if the College is on track and what possible future steps could be taken. As part of the dashboard, there will be five goals, each with high-level indicators. Dr. Hirsch said that the dashboard will be continuously updated and that a few elements were still under development. Because of timing, data were not yet available, so projections were provided when possible. The dashboard contains five-year goals and the college knows the percentage of the goal that should be achieved each year. Dr. Rényi suggested that the entire dashboard be presented to the Board of Trustees retreat in January. Dr. Generals explained that the numbers can change about twice a year. The dashboard also contains comparisons to peer institutions; the use of peer institutions is part of the national benchmarking process. Ms. Horstmann asked if it was decided to aim for peer institution averages or for the top quartile. Dr. Generals

indicated that for the Aspen Prize, institutions might be reviewed in comparison to peers and their progress; he will confirm the groups regarding the Aspen Prize.

Dr. Rényi put forth that as homework for the next meeting, members should review the dashboard so it can be at the top of the next meeting's agenda. The general consensus of the Committee was that the dashboard was very effective.

**(3)** **Next Meeting**
The next meeting of the Student Outcomes Committee of the Board is scheduled for October 13, 2016 at 1:30pm in Conference Room M2-34.

**Attachments:**
Minutes of May 5, 2016
Academic Program Audit: Business Administration A.A. Degree/Business A.A. Degree
Program Audit Follow-Up Report Photographic Imaging Curriculum
College Policies and Procedures Memorandum No. 105: Robert S. King Scholarship for High School Students
Dashboard – September 1, 2016

# Community College of Philadelphia

## Dashboard

**1.0      Student Success**
- **Implement Guided Pathways Model**
- **Establish Comprehensive Advising System**
- **Institute Predictive Data Analytics**

| Indicator of Success | | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | Peer | CCP Trend | CCP Comparison to Peer | 5-Year Goal 2020 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Increase Enrollment** | | | | | | +3 to 5% pts |
| 1.1 | New Full-time Students (Fall Admission) | 1,574 | 1,874 | | ↗ | | |
| 1.2 | New Part-time Students (Fall Admission) | 3,700 | 3,599 | | → | | |
| 1.3 | Total Fall Credit Hours | 158,471 | 160,972 | | → | | |
| | **Increase Persistence** | | | | | | +5 to 7% pts |
| 1.4 | Fall to Fall New Full-time Students | 53.5% | 55.3% | 58.0% | ↗ | | |
| 1.5 | Fall to Fall New Part-time Students | 40.8% | 43.0% | 46.0% | ↗ | | |
| 1.6 | Fall to Spring (All first-time) Students | 70.6% | 72.0% | 71.7% | → | → | |

# Community College of Philadelphia

| | | 2011 Cohort 2014 | 2012 Cohort 2015 | 2013 Cohort Projection 2016 | Peer | CCP Trend | CCC Comparison to Peer | 5-Year Goal 2020 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Increase 3-Year CCP Completion** | | | | | | | +7 to 10% pts |
| 1.7 | 3-Yr Cohort, Full-time, First-time College Associate Degree/Certificate Awards (IPEDS) | 10.4% | 11.6% | 12.3%[1] | 21.5% | ↗ (green) | ↘ (red) | |
| 1.8 | New Full-time Students Who Left the College Prior to Earning a Degree and Transferred within 3 years (IPEDS) | 27.3% | 24.9% | TBD | 14.7% | → (yellow) | ↗ (green) | |
| 1.9 | Total percentage of satisfactory student outcomes | 37.7% | 36.5% | TBD | 36.2% | → (yellow) | → (yellow) | |

| | | 2008 Cohort Reported 2014 | 2009 Cohort Reported 2015 | 2010 Cohort Projection 2016[2] | Peer | CCP Trend | CCP Comparison to Peer | 5-Year Goal 2020 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Increase 6-Year CCP Completion** | | | | | | | +7 to 10% pts |
| 1.10 | 6-Yr Cohort, Full-time, First-time College Associate Degree/Certificate Awards | 20.0% | 18.5% | 21.8% | 27.9% | → (yellow) | ↘ (red) | |
| 1.11 | New Full-time Students Who Left the College Prior to Earning a Degree and Transferred within 6 years | 31.6% | 31.4% | TBD | 18.8% | → (yellow) | ↗ (green) | |
| 1.12 | Total percentage of satisfactory student outcomes | 51.6% | 50.0% | TBD | 46.7% | → (yellow) | ↗ (green) | |

| | **Increase Completion** | Grad Year 2014 | Grad Year 2015 | Grad Year 2016 (Projected) | CCP Trend |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.13 | Unduplicated Number of Completers by Graduation Year | 1,996 | 2,103 | 2,045[3] | → (yellow) |

---

[1] Projection; not finalized until October 2016

[2] Not yet available

[3] Number of completers for Grad Year 2016 is a projected value

# Community College *of* Philadelphia

| | | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | Peer | CCP Trend | CCP Comparison to Peer | 5-Year Goal 2020 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Improve Success Rates of Students in Developmental English** | | | | | | +7% pts |
| 1.14 | Placed Developmental English (Decrease annually) | 54.9% | 46.6% | | ↗ | | |
| 1.15 | First-Year Success in ENGL 098 (Increase annually) | 63.8% | 63.5% | | ⇒ | | |
| 1.16 | Completed ENGL 101 within two years (Improve annually) | 44.0% | TBD | | | | |
| | **Improve Success Rates of Students in Developmental Math** | | | | | | +7% pts |
| 1.17 | Placed Developmental Math (Decrease annually) | 46.4% | 44.0% | | ↗ | | |
| 1.18 | Success in Foundational MATH 017 (Increase annually) | 32.6% | 35.6% | | ↗ | | |
| 1.19 | Completed MATH 118 within two years (Improve annually) | 17.0% | TBD | | | | |
| | **Improve Achievement Gap in First Year Success in Developmental English** | | | | | | +5% pts |
| 1.20 | All First-time | 63.8% | 63.5% | | ⇒ | | |
| 1.21 | Black | 59.7% | 58.1% | | ⇒ | | |
| 1.22 | Hispanic | 65.4% | 64.4% | | ⇒ | | |
| 1.23 | White | 73.2% | 76.3% | | ↗ | | |

# Community College of Philadelphia

| | Improve Career Preparation and Employment | 2014-15 | 2015-16 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.24 | Career Program Job Placement Rates | 83.6% | TBD |
| 1.25 | Career Program Graduates' Wages and Wage Growth | $41,926 | TBD |
| 1.26 | Licensure Exam Pass Rates | | |
| | Clinical Laboratory Technology | 100% | 86% |
| | Dental Hygiene | 100% | 100% |
| | Diagnostic Medical Imaging | 100% | 100% |
| | Nursing | 67.1% | 83.2% |
| | Respiratory Care Technology | 100% | 100% |

| 2.0 | Facilities | Updates | Target Completion | Progress |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Projects** | | | |
| 2.0 | Facilities Master Plan | Draft Master Plan by Fall 2016 | Spring 2017 | 60% |
| 2.1 | The Hamilton | Negotiating Letter of Intent | August 2018 | 5% |
| 2.2 | Expansion of West Regional Center | Impasse | | 1% |

| 3.0 | Finance | Quarterly Report September 2016 (In Millions) | Quarterly Report December 2016 (In Million) | Quarterly Report March 2017 (In Millions) | Quarterly Report June 2017 (In Millions) | CCP Trend |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3.1 | Operating Budget Status 2015-2016 | Realign budget based on enrollment | | | | |
| 3.2 | Operating Cash Flow Position 2015-2016 | $15.0 | | | | |
| 3.3 | Long Term Cash Investments 2015-2016 | Projected $22.0 | | | | |

| 4.0 | Workforce Development – Under development | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4.1 | Annual Enrollments | | | | | |
| 4.2 | Revenue | | | | | |
| 4.3 | Number of Clients Serviced | | | | | |

| 5.0 | Community Relationships – Under development | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------|--|--|
| 5.1 | Number of College-community partnerships | | |
| 5.2 | Number of student volunteer hours | | |
| 5.3 | Monetary value of faculty/staff volunteer hours | | |
| 5.4 | Number of visitors for events open to the public | | |

***ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW***

***SUMMARY REPORT TO STUDENT OUTCOMES COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD***

*Proposed Format*

*Total Length: Two to five pages.*

*Summary will include citations to full analysis, and will reference relevant sources of evidence.*

Executive Summary:

I.      The Executive Summary portion of the report includes bullet-pointed *Key Findings* and *Action Items* portion, prior to the narrative report. These include a formal template of language; which would be utilized on every audit.  The *Action Items* portion intentionally mimics the structure of a Middle States (MSCHE) report.

*Length: One/Two sentences per finding.*

A.  Key Findings

The Office of Assessment and Evaluation makes the following observations, with regard to the quality and viability of the program:

   i.   One/Two sentence statement; w/ page or graph citation.
   ii.  " "
   iii. " "


B.  Action Items

The Office of Assessment and Evaluation makes the following suggestions/recommendations/requirements to senior leadership and the board, in response to information collected in this report:

*Length: One or two paragraphs per item.*

   i.   Suggestions – will be made with regard to quality improvement, further introduction of best practices, notations on the larger educational or career field, trends, and possible opportunities.
   ii.  Recommendations – include items of concern, which should be addressed and re-examined, based on the *current* plan.
   iii. Requirements – include items which threaten the quality or viability of the program.  If the program is to continue, such items demand action and resolution. Required actions should be implemented and evaluated on both a short term (i.e. one term or academic year) and long term (within three years.)


C.  Narrative Summary

*Length: Two to three pages.*

**SOURCES OF EVIDENCE FOR PROGRAM ANALYSIS**

- Program Description
  - Published Catalog
  - Curricular Revision Documents – Office of Curriculum Development
  - Input from Program
- Program Faculty
  - Faculty Schedules - Academic Course Scheduling
  - Input from Program
- Performance Indicators
  - Institutional Data – Office of Institutional Research
    - Headcount and Fulltime enrollment
    - Major/ New major
    - Demographics (gender, race/ ethnicity, age, fulltime/ part-time, all developmental/ some developmental/ college level)
    - Outcomes data: five year trend line (standing, retention, success at departure, outcomes)
    - Degrees awarded
    - Transfer at departure
    - Distribution of students in the program (developmental, freshman, sophomore)
    - Section enrollment/population served
    - Student Satisfaction (optional**)
- Learning Outcomes and Assessment
  - Office of Assessment and Evaluation
    - Curriculum Map
    - Assessment Cycle Plan
    - Assessment Overview/Annual Report data
  - Input from Program
  - External Research
- Environmental Scan
  - Economic Modeling Specialists International (EMSI) data
    - Expected Job Growth
    - Educational Attainment
  - National Student Clearinghouse
    - Transfer Programs
  - Input from Program
  - External Research
- Special Expenditures and Resources
  - Input from Program
  - Office of Business and Finance

- Program Analysis – this narrative section is intended to allow faculty and program leadership to give a fuller view of the program, its contributions, characteristics, strengths and weaknesses.
    - Input from Program

**Current Academic Program Audit Format**

I. Executive Summary
II. Program Description
      A.  Catalog Description
      B.  History and Revisions to the Curriculum
      C.  Curriculum Sequence
      D.  Curriculum Map
      E.  Advisory Committee
      F.  Future Directions of the Field/Program
III. Profile of the Faculty
IV. Program Characteristics
      A.  Student Profile
          1.  Headcounts and FTE Counts
          2.  Demographics
          3.  Outcomes Data: 5 Year Averages
          4.  Degrees Awarded
          5.  Transfer at Departure
          6.  Distribution of Students in the Program
          7.  Distribution of Students in Program (Dev., Freshman, Sophomore)
          8.  Median Statistics for Program Graduates
          9.  Section Enrollment
V. Learning Outcomes and Assessment
      A.  Assessment Overview
      B.  Multi-year Calendar
VI. Resources
VII. Demand
      A.  Expected Job Growth
      B.  Educational Attainment
VIII. Operating Costs
IX. Audit Recommendations

2015-16