

**Agenda Materials
Community and Technical Colleges
Formula Advisory Committee (CTCFAC)
for the 2022-2023 Biennial
Appropriations**

December 2019

Table of Contents

Agenda..... 2

Prior Meeting’s Draft Minutes..... 3

Commissioner’s Charges 6

Community and Technical College Formula Advisory Committee for 2020-2021 Biennium..... 8

 Charge 1 – Study and make recommendations for the appropriate funding levels for the contact hour, core, and the student success funding. (TEC, Section 61.059 (b)). 9

 Charge 3 – Study and make recommendations on the efficacy of critical need fields as they relate to contact hour and success point funding.....10

 Charge 4 – Evaluate the continued relevancy of each success point and its components given various state-level policy changes, the increased focus on fields of study, and the implementation of the co-requisite model in developmental education; and study and make recommendations for the appropriate number of points to be awarded for each metric. (General Appropriations Act, HB 1, 86th Texas Legislature, Rider 19 (pages III-214 to III-215) and General Appropriations Act, HB 1, 86th Texas Legislature, Rider 25 (page III-215))13

Agenda

Meeting of the Community and Technical Colleges Formula Advisory Committee

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

Board Room, First Floor, 1.170

1200 East Anderson Lane, Austin

Wednesday, December 4, 2019

1:00 p.m.

Agenda

- I. Call to Order
- II. Consideration and approval of the minutes from November 6, 2019, meeting
- III. Discussion, review, and consideration of the Commissioner's 2022-2023 Biennium charges
- IV. Planning for subsequent meetings
- V. Adjournment

Texas Penal Code Section 46.035(c) states: "A license holder commits an offense if the license holder intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly carries a handgun under the authority of Subchapter H, Chapter 411, Government Code, regardless of whether the handgun is concealed or carried in a shoulder or belt holster, in the room or rooms where a meeting of a governmental entity is held and if the meeting is an open meeting subject to Chapter 551, Government Code, and the entity provided notice as required by that chapter." Thus, no person can carry a handgun and enter the room or rooms where a meeting of the THECB is held if the meeting is an open meeting subject to Chapter 551, Government Code.

Please Note that this governmental meeting is, in the opinion of counsel representing THECB, an open meeting subject to Chapter 551, Government Code and THECB is providing notice of this meeting as required by Chapter 551. In addition, please note that the written communication required by Texas Penal Code Sections 30.06 and 30.07, prohibiting both concealed and open carry of handguns by Government Code Chapter 411 licensees, will be posted at the entrances to this governmental meeting.

Prior Meeting's Draft Minutes

**Meeting of the Community and Technical Colleges Formula Advisory Committee
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
Board Room, First Floor, 1.170
1200 East Anderson Lane, Austin
Wednesday, November 6, 2019
10:00 a.m.**

Minutes

Attendees: Mr. Patrick Lee, Mr. Richard Cervantes, Ms. Mary Wickland, Mr. Jim Yeonopolus, Dr. Robert Riza, Dr. Pamela Anglin, Dr. Phil Rhodes, Dr. Jeremy McMillen, and Ms. Mary Elizondo

Phone conference: Ms. Teri Crawford, Dr. Brent Wallace, and Mr. Michael Reeser

Absent: Dr. Cesar Maldonado

THECB Staff: Dr. Julie Eklund, Mr. David Young, Mr. Gordon Taylor, and Mr. Roland Gilmore

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.

1. The chair asked if there were any corrections to the minutes of the October 14, 2019, meeting. Dr. Brent Wallace motioned, Ms. Teri Crawford seconded, and the committee approved by acclamation.
2. Discussion of Charge 1 – Study and make recommendations for the appropriate funding levels for the contact hour, core, and the student success funding. (TEC, Section 61.059 (b)).
 - I. Ms. Wickland briefed the committee on the proposed funding recommendations for the state colleges.
 - II. The chair asked for a motion to approve the funding recommendations for the state colleges. Mr. Jim Yeonopolus motioned, Mr. Richard Cervantes seconded, and the committee approved by acclamation.
 - III. Dr. Anglin briefed the committee on the workgroup funding recommendations for the community colleges, noting that the only change from the previous update would be an increase in core funding from the original \$1.5 million to \$2 million per district.
 - IV. Dr. Anglin said she would send a list of items that would support the core increase to the institutions for their input.
3. Discussion of Charge 2 – Study and make recommendations for the appropriate funding level for, and the refinement of, Texas State Technical College System's returned value funding formula (General Appropriations Act, HB 1, 86th Texas Legislature, Rider 11 (page III-228)).

- I. The chair asked for a motion to approve the funding recommendation for the state technical colleges. Dr. Brent Wallace motioned, Mr. Jim Yeonopolus seconded, and the committee approved by acclamation.
4. Discussion of Charge 3 – Study and make recommendations on the efficacy of critical need fields as they relate to contact hour and success point funding.
 - I. Dr. McMillen explained the differences in targeted/critical fields in both Contact hour and success point funding. Targeted/Critical field contact hour funding is based on classes and not programs. Success Point funding for Targeted/Critical field is program-based and not class-based.
 - II. Dr. McMillen said the workgroup would not recommend changing target/critical fields for contact hour funding.
 - III. Dr. McMillen briefed the committee on the proposed methodology to change targeted/critical fields for success points. A targeted field would need to meet two of the following:
 1. Top 20 Largest Growth-Certificate/Associate degrees
 2. Top 20 Fastest Growing-Certificate/Associate degrees
 3. Top Targeted Occupations (identified by the Texas Workforce Commission or at least 11 regional workforce boards)
 And, meet at least one of the following:
 1. Wages are at or above the statewide median and demand exceeds supply
 2. Wages are below the statewide median and demand exceeds supply by at least 50 percent
 - IV. Dr. McMillen discussed logistical details regarding the methodology for updating the critical fields for formula funding, such as how long a field will be active once added to the list and how often the fields will be revisited over time.
 5. Discussion of Charge 4 – Evaluate the continued relevancy of each success point and its components given various state-level policy changes, the increased focus on fields of study, and the implementation of the co-requisite model in developmental education; and study and make recommendations for the appropriate number of points to be awarded for each metric. (General Appropriations Act, HB 1, 86th Texas Legislature, Rider 19 (pages III-214 to III-215) and General Appropriations Act, HB 1, 86th Texas Legislature, Rider 25 (page III-215))
 - I. Dr. McMillen briefed the committee on the current success points and the weights associated with them. He said the workgroup did not want to recommend adopting the suggested changes presented in the rider; instead, it wanted to recommend the changes below:

- a) For the 15 SCH transfer metric, add 0.25 point if those 15 transfer hours were all dual credit.
 - b) For the credentials awarded metric, add 0.25 point if the credential was awarded to an economically disadvantaged student and 0.25 point if it was awarded to an academically disadvantaged student.
 - c) For the 15 SCH transfer metric, add 0.25 point if the credential was awarded to an economically disadvantaged student and 0.25 point if it was awarded to an academically disadvantaged student.
- II. Dr. Eklund confirmed that an economically disadvantaged student would be included if that student received Pell within the last 10 years.
 - III. Ms. Crawford asked if these students would be classified as economically disadvantaged if they had filled out TASFA.
 - IV. Dr. Eklund responded that further discussion would be required with general counsel to make sure we are moving forward in a way that is appropriate.
6. Discussion of Charge 6 – Study and make recommendations for the appropriate definition of a student in a structured co-enrollment program successfully completing at least 15 semester credit hours at the community college.
- I. Dr. McMillen gave a brief workgroup update and read the definition of a structured co-enrollment program being offered to the committee for approval.
 - II. The chair asked for a motion to approve the funding recommendation for the definition of a structured co-enrollment program. Mr. Jim Yeonopolus motioned, Dr. Robert Riza seconded, and the committee approved by acclamation.
7. Discussion of Charge 5 – Study and make recommendations for the appropriate methodology for including the second 8-week courses in the base period.
- I. Dr. Wallace said that if actuals are not available, the recommendation would be to adopt the work group’s proposed methodology for adding the second 8-week courses to the base period.
 - II. The chair asked for a motion to approve the recommendation for including the second 8-week courses in the base period. Ms. Teri Crawford motioned, Dr. Robert Riza seconded, and the committee approval by acclamation.
8. The chair recommended the work groups finalize their recommendations for final discussion and approval by the full committee.

The chair asked for a motion to adjourn, Mr. Jim Yeonopolus motioned, Dr. Robert Riza seconded, and the committee approved by acclamation. The committee adjourned at 10:39 a.m. and will next convene on December 4th, 2019, at 1:00 p. m.

Prepared by Roland Gilmore

Commissioner's Charges

The Community and Technical College Formula Advisory Committee (CTCFAC), conducted in an open and public forum, is charged with proposing a set of formulas that provide the appropriate funding levels and financial incentives necessary to best achieve the goals of *60x30TX*. A preliminary written report of its activities and recommendations is due to the Commissioner by December 7, 2019, and a final written report by February 2, 2020. The CTCFAC's specific charges are to:

1. Study and make recommendations for the appropriate funding levels for the contact hour, core, and the student success funding. (TEC, Section 61.059 (b)).

TEC, Section 61.059 (b)

"The board shall devise, establish, and periodically review and revise formulas for the use of the governor and the Legislative Budget Board in making appropriations recommendations to the legislature for all institutions of higher education, including the funding of postsecondary vocational-technical programs. As a specific element of the periodic review, the board shall study and recommend changes in the funding formulas based on the role and mission statements of institutions of higher education. In carrying out its duties under this section, the board shall employ an ongoing process of committee review and expert testimony and analysis."

2. Study and make recommendations for the appropriate funding level for, and the refinement of, Texas State Technical College System's returned value funding formula (General Appropriations Act, HB 1, 86th Texas Legislature, Rider 11 (page III-228).

"The Texas State Technical College System shall continue to work with the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, the Legislative Budget Board and other relevant agencies to refine the new Returned Value Funding Formula for the TSTCs. It is the intent of the Legislature that recommended adjustments to the formula shall be ready for implementation in the 2022-23 biennium and shall further the goal of rewarding job placement and graduate earnings projections, not time in training or contact hours."

3. Study and make recommendations on the efficacy of critical need fields as they relate to contact hour and success point funding.
4. Evaluate the continued relevancy of each success point and its components given various state-level policy changes, the increased focus on fields of study, and the implementation of the co-requisite model in developmental education; and study and make recommendations for the appropriate number of points to be awarded for each metric. (General Appropriations Act, HB 1, 86th Texas Legislature, Rider 19 (pages III-214 to III-215) and General Appropriations Act, HB 1, 86th Texas Legislature, Rider 25 (page III-215))

"It is the intent of the Legislature that the success points earned for the following metrics shall be revised as follows in the 2022-23 General Appropriations Act:

- a. 'Student transfers to a General Academic Institution after successfully completing at least 15 semester credit hours at the community college, or a student in a structured co-

enrollment program successfully completing at least 15 semester credit hours at the community college' shall be revised to 2.75 points.

b. 'Student receives from the institution an associate's degree, a Bachelor's degree, or a certificate recognized for this purpose by the Coordinating Board in a field other than a critical field, such as Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM), or Allied Health' shall be revised to 1.2 points.

c. 'Student receives from the institution an associate's degree, a Bachelor's degree, or a certificate recognized for this purpose by the Coordinating Board in a critical field, including the fields of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM), or Allied Health' shall be revised to 3.0 points."

5. Study and make recommendations for the appropriate methodology for including the second 8-week courses in the base period.
6. Study and make recommendations for the appropriate definition of a student in a structured co-enrollment program successfully completing at least 15 semester credit hours at the community college.

Community and Technical College Formula Advisory Committee for 2020-2021 Biennium

Dr. Pamela Anglin, Chair

| Name/Title | Institution/Address | Email/Phone |
|--|--|--|
| <u>Institution Representatives:</u> | | |
| Ms. Teri Crawford (2022) Vice Chancellor of Public Relations, Marketing, and Governmental Affairs | San Jacinto College District 4624 Fairmont Parkway Suite 200 Pasadena, TX 77504 | teri.crawford@sjcd.edu (281) 998-6151 |
| Dr. Cesar Maldonado, Ph.D., P.E. (2022) Chancellor | Houston Community College 3100 main Houston, Texas 77002 | cesar.maldonado@hccs.edu (713) 718-5059 |
| Dr. Brent Wallace (2024) Chancellor | North Central Texas College 1525 West California Street Gainesville, Texas 76240 | bwallace@nctc.edu (940) 668-4230 |
| Mr. Patrick Lee (2022) Department Chair and Professor of Mathematics | Alamo Colleges 1400 West Villaret Boulevard San Antonio, Texas 78224 | plee18@alamo.edu (210) 486-3282 |
| Mr. Richard Cervantes (2022) Vice Chancellor Business and Finance/CFO | Blinn College 902 College Avenue Brenham, Texas 77833 | Richard.Cervantes@blinn.edu (979) 830-4123 |
| Ms. Mary Wickland (2020) Vice President for Finance | Lamar State College - Port Arthur PO Box 310 Port Arthur, TX 77641 | mary.wickland@lamarpa.edu (409) 984-6125 |
| Mr. Jim Yeonopolus (2022) Chancellor | Central Texas College PO Box 1800 Killeen, TX 76540 | JYeonopolus@ctcd.edu (254) 526-1214 |
| Mr. Michael Reeser (2020) Chancellor | Texas State Technical College System 3801 Campus Drive Waco, Texas 76705 | mike.reeser@tstc.edu (254) 867-4891 |
| Dr. Robert K. Riza (2022) President | Clarendon College 1122 College Drive Clarendon, TX 79226 | robert.riza@clarendoncollege.edu (806) 874-4808 |
| Dr. Pamela Anglin (2020) President | Paris Junior College 2400 Clarksville Street Paris, TX 75460 | panglin@parisjc.edu (903) 782-0330 |
| Dr. Jeremy McMillen (2020) President | Grayson College 6101 Grayson Drive Denison, TX 75020 | mcmillenj@grayson.edu (903) 463-8600 |
| Dr. Phil Rhodes (2020) Vice President - Research, Effectiveness, and Information Technology | McLennan Community College 1400 College Drive, Admin. 410 Waco, TX 76708 | prhodes@mcclennan.edu (254) 299-8642 |
| Ms. Mary Elizondo (2024) Vice President for Finance and Administrative Services | South Texas College 3201 West Pecan X224 McAllen, TX 78501 | marve@southtexascollege.edu (956) 872-3559 |

Charge 1 – Study and make recommendations for the appropriate funding levels for the contact hour, core, and the student success funding. (TEC, Section 61.059 (b)).

Committee Recommendation for Community Colleges.

Committee Recommendation for Community Colleges

| Community Colleges | 2020-2021 Appropriations (millions) | 2022-23 Appropriations (millions) | Change Amount (millions) | Percent Change |
|--------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Core Operations | \$68.0 | \$100.0 | \$32.0 | 47.0% |
| Success Points | \$228.3 | \$271.8 | \$43.5 | 19.0% |
| Contact Hour | \$1,533.7 | \$1,578.5 | \$44.8 | 2.9% |
| Bachelor of Applied Technology | \$3.2 | \$3.8 | \$.6 | 18.7% |
| Total | \$1,833.2 | \$1,954.1 | \$120.9 | 6.6% |

- The committee recommends increasing the funding to Community Colleges for the 2022-2023 biennium to \$1,954.1, which is an increase of \$120.9, or 6.6%, compared to the 2020-2021 biennium.
- Fund Core Operations at \$2 million per community college district for the 2022-2023 biennium. This is an increase of \$32 million. The increase in core operations is needed due to all 50 community college districts having increased costs in the following areas.
 - Safety and security on the college campuses.
 - Implementation of guided pathways.
 - Implementation of student success initiatives including additional advising and student support services.
 - Preparing dual credit degree plans for all high school students enrolled in dual credit.
 - Increased high school initiatives to meet mandated requirements.
 - Implementation of co-requisites.
 - ADA student costs.
 - Title IX.
 - Cyber Security.
 - Additional mandated tuition waivers and exemptions.
- Increase Student Success Points to \$215 per point from \$202.53 per success point. This is an increase from \$228.3 million to \$271.8 million or a \$43.5 million increase for 2022-2023. Moving forward, for success points to work as designed, we need to maintain a constant rate of \$215 per point.

- Increase Contact Hour funding from \$5.44 per contact hour to \$5.57 based on a 2.3% inflation rate. Projected growth rate is .56% in contact hours. Contact hour funding increases from \$1,533.7 in 2020-2021 to \$1,578.5 in 2022-2023.
- Increase Bachelor of Applied Technology (BAT) based on a 14.7% projected growth rate and an increase from \$40.70 to \$41.66 in the semester credit hour rate based on inflation. The BAT funding would increase from \$3.2 million to \$3.8 million in 2022-23 or a 18.7% increase.

Charge 3 – Study and make recommendations on the efficacy of critical need fields as they relate to contact hour and success point funding.

Committee Recommendation for critical need fields and success point funding.

The CTCFAC took a long look at critical fields for contact hour and success point funding and recommend updating critical fields for success points using a standardized process that would help ensure the fields reflect the needs of the state on an ongoing basis. It is recommended that additional fields be added for the next biennium, and a process by which fields are added/removed occur every two years in advance of or in conjunction with the work of the CTCFAC.

CRITICAL FIELDS AND SUCCESS POINT FUNDING

RECOMMENDATION XXX.

The CTFAC recommends renaming Critical Fields for Success Points to Targeted Fields, which is in line with the Texas Workforce Commission’s language of Targeted Occupations.

RECOMMENDATION XXX.

The CTCFAC recommends an update to the Targeted Fields (formerly Critical Fields) for Success Points, as the fields have not been updated in several years.

The CTCFAC recommends this update because Critical fields for success points were developed at the inception of success points (2009), and they have ONLY been updated once since then (by the 86th Texas Legislature). It is perceived that biennial updates of fields that are important to the state of Texas will keep institutions focused on the pressing needs of our state’s economy. A recent Dallas County Community College analysis of the seven largest metropolitan statistical areas in the state revealed that the current fields fail to identify fields that we would recommend as targeted fields approximately 40% of the time. The committee worked to find solutions that would help identify those regional issues; however, at this time recommends staying with a

state-wide list with additional analysis to ensure it captures fields important to several regions.

The THECB worked with the Texas Association of Community Colleges Metrics Task Force to develop a methodology for identifying Targeted Fields, which includes a two-step process (outlined below):

Step 1: Meet at Least Two of the Following

- Top 20 Largest Growth-Cert/Assoc
- Top 20 Fastest Growing-Cert/Assoc
- Top Targeted Occupation (identified by the Texas Workforce Commission or at least 11 Workforce Boards)

Step 2: Meet at Least One of the Following

- Wages are at or above the statewide median (currently \$17.84) and demand exceeds supply
- Wages are below the statewide median and demand exceeds supply by at least 50%

<Insert timeline for updating Targeted Fields in advance/in conjunction with CTCFAC for future years.>

This leads to a recommendation that the following CIP Codes be identified as Targeted Fields for future funding:

"11", "14", "15", "27", "40", "0302", "1204", "1301", "1312", "1505", "1508", "1907", "2200", "2203", "3001", "4302", "4702", "4706", "4902", "5100", "5102", "5106", "5107", "5108", "5109", "5110", "5111", "5118", "5123", "5126", "5127", "5131", "5132", "5133", "5134", "5135", "5138", "5139", "4102", "4103", and "4703"

RECOMMENDATION XXX.

The CTCFAC recommends updating success points weights for Targeted Fields (formerly Critical Fields), leaving the current bonus 0.25 point for a credential in a Targeted Field and adding points for academically disadvantaged (0.25) and economically disadvantaged (0.25).

See the recommendations under Charge 4 for details on success point weight updates.

CRITICAL FIELDS AND CONTACT HOUR REIMBURSEMENT

The CTCFAC also looked at critical fields for contact hour funding, which are courses that are identified as supporting Critical Fields. These courses earn an additional 10% reimbursement on the contact hour formula. Critical Fields for success points do not match critical fields for formula funding (contact hours) because they were developed at different times and because one is based on instructional programs (success points) and the other is based on courses. Critical fields for formula funding (contact hours) have not been updated since their inception (1999), predating critical fields for success points.

Any revision to the critical fields in contact hour reimbursement needs to be undertaken with great care as changes can potentially disrupt funding that is expected by individual institutions. The CTCFAC recognizes that it is important to develop a process for updating critical fields for contact hour funding; however, the recommendation is to not update the fields at this time. It is recommended the next CTCFAC take this up as a charge during their next convening. Further, it is recommended the THECB and the Texas Association of Community Colleges work together to develop a methodology for updating critical fields within the contact hour formula. This study should carefully evaluate the intersection between targeted fields for success point funding and critical fields for contact hour reimbursement, and it should occur in advance of the next CTCFAC convening, preferably within the next year.

RECOMMENDATION: XXXX

The CTCFAC recommends no changes to Critical Fields for Contact Hour Reimbursement.

RECOMMENDATION: XXXX

The CTCFAC recommends further study in to developing a system for keeping critical fields for contact hour reimbursement evergreen and aligned with the needs of the state.

Charge 4 – Evaluate the continued relevancy of each success point and its components given various state-level policy changes, the increased focus on fields of study, and the implementation of the co-requisite model in developmental education; and study and make recommendations for the appropriate number of points to be awarded for each metric. (General Appropriations Act, HB 1, 86th Texas Legislature, Rider 19 (pages III-214 to III-215) and General Appropriations Act, HB 1, 86th Texas Legislature, Rider 25 (page III-215))

Committee Recommendation for the appropriate number of points to be awarded for each metric.

The current draft proposal by the CTCFAC includes a recommended increase of \$43.5 million in success point funding, \$14.5 million of which is the result of funding each success point at \$215 and updating targeted fields (formerly referred to as critical fields). An anticipated ~7.5% growth in success points accounts for \$17.5 million. Finally, the CTCFAC recommends updating success points metrics to align equity goals for academically and economically disadvantaged students. The proposed reworking of success points accounts for the remaining \$11.3 million in funding, which includes investing more in progress toward credentials (dual credit), credentials awarded, and transfer. Table XXX.XXX shows the overall distribution by success point type and the increase for each of the above areas.

Table XXXX.xxx Overall Success Point Funding by Global Success Point Type

| OVERALL SUCCESS POINTS FUNDING | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| | <u>2020-21</u> <u>Funding</u> | <u>\$215/pt. &</u> <u>Targeted Field</u> | <u>Growth</u> <u>(~7.5%)</u> | <u>Metrics</u> <u>Update</u> | <u>New Dollars</u> | <u>Total</u> <u>Recommended</u> |
| College Readiness Total | \$ 14,525,809 | \$ 894,206 | \$ 555,834 | \$ - | \$ 1,450,040 | \$ 15,975,849 |
| First College Level Course Total | \$ 64,550,170 | \$ 3,973,519 | \$ 5,112,090 | \$ - | \$ 9,085,609 | \$ 73,635,779 |
| Progress Toward Credential Total | \$ 69,948,116 | \$ 4,305,860 | \$ 5,539,588 | \$ 2,119,500 | \$ 11,964,949 | \$ 81,913,065 |
| Credentials Awarded Total | \$ 50,716,197 | \$ 3,700,267 | \$ 4,059,645 | \$ 5,931,559 | \$ 13,691,471 | \$ 64,407,669 |
| Transfer Total | \$ 28,555,818 | \$ 1,787,706 | \$ 2,263,726 | \$ 3,293,452 | \$ 7,344,883 | \$ 35,900,700 |
| Student Success Points Funding | \$ 228,296,111 | \$ 14,661,557 | \$ 17,530,883 | \$11,344,511 | \$ 43,536,952 | \$ 271,833,063 |

Overall, the culmination of these recommendations leads to an increased proportion of success point funding going toward credentials and transfer.

Table XXX.XXX. Change in Percentage of Funding by Success Point Type

| SUCCESS POINT TYPE | <u>2020-21</u> | <u>2022-23</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| College Readiness Total | 6.4% | 5.9% | -0.5% |
| First College Level Course Total | 28.3% | 27.1% | -1.2% |
| Progress Toward Credential Total | 30.6% | 30.1% | -0.5% |
| Credentials Awarded Total | 22.2% | 23.7% | 1.5% |
| Transfer Total | 12.5% | 13.2% | 0.7% |

More specifically, success point funding changes are proposed as follows:

- Raise funding per success point from \$202.53 per point to \$215 per point,
- Fund anticipated growth of success points estimated by the THECB to be approximately 7.5%,
- Update the methodology for identifying which credentials should be “Targeted Fields” for the state of Texas (we recommend renaming these from what was formerly referred to as Critical Fields),
- Recommend updating points earned for targeted fields (formerly critical fields) by adding to the 2.25 points earned in cases where students are academically disadvantaged (0.25 points) or economically disadvantaged (0.25 points). With this recommendation, a total of 2.75 points could be earned for targeted fields. This is a proposed alternative to the rider which would have increased critical fields funding to 3.0.
- Recommend updating points earned for credentials awarded by adding to the 2.00 points earned in cases where student are academically disadvantaged (0.25 points) or economically disadvantaged (0.25 points). With this recommendation, a total of 2.50 points could be earned for credentials awarded. This is a proposed alternative to the Rider which would have decreased critical fields funding to 1.2.
- Recommend updating points earned for successful transfer after 15 hours (including students who transfer from co-enrollment programs) by adding to the 2.00 points earned in cases where students are academically disadvantaged (0.25 points) or economically disadvantaged (0.25 points). With this recommendation, a total of 2.50 points could be earned. This is a proposed alternative to the Rider which would have increased transfer funding to 2.75.
- Recommend updating points earned for progress toward a credential after students complete 15 semester hours to include an additional 0.25 points in cases where ALL of the earned hours are dual credit. A total of 1.25 points would be possible in cases where all hours are dual credit.

The following table summarizes success point weights as they currently exist, as they are proposed in the rider, and as they are recommended by the CTCFAC. These weights were developed in concert with the Texas Association of Community Colleges Metrics Task Force.

Table XXXDX.SSSS. Success Point Weights for Current Funding, the Rider, and CTCFAC Proposed Points

| SUCCESS POINT TYPE | SUCCESS POINT WEIGHT | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| COLLEGE READINESS | <i>Current</i> | <i>Rider</i> | <i>Proposed</i> |
| Complete Math DE | 1.00 point | 1.00 point | 1.00 point |
| Complete Reading DE | 0.50 Point | 0.50 Point | 0.50 Point |
| Complete Writing DE | 0.50 Point | 0.50 Point | 0.50 Point |
| FIRST COLLEGE LEVEL COURSE | | | |
| Pass 1 st College Math Course | 1.00 point | 1.00 point | 1.00 point |
| Pass 1 st College Reading Course | 1.00 point | 1.00 point | 1.00 point |
| Pass 1 st College Writing Course | 1.00 point | 1.00 point | 1.00 point |
| PROGRESS TOWARD CREDENTIAL | | | |
| Complete 15 Semester Credit Hrs. | 1.00 point | 1.00 point | 1.00 point |
| <i>if ALL 15 Completed Hours are Dual Credit</i> | | | <i>0.25 point</i> |
| Complete 30 Semester Credit Hrs. | 1.00 point | 1.00 point | 1.00 point |
| CREDENTIALS AWARDED | | | |
| Degree/Certificate Awarded | 2.00 points | 1.20 points | 2.00 points |
| ¹ <i>Academic Disadvantaged Bonus</i> | | | <i>0.25 point</i> |
| ² <i>Economically Disadvantaged Bonus</i> | | | <i>0.25 point</i> |
| ³ <i>Targeted Field Degree/Certificate Bonus</i> | 0.25 point | 1.80 points | 0.25 point |
| ¹ <i>Academic Disadvantaged Bonus</i> | | | <i>0.25 point</i> |
| ² <i>Economically Disadvantaged Bonus</i> | | | <i>0.25 point</i> |
| TRANSFER | | | |
| Successful Transfer (after 15 sch) | 2.00 points | 2.75 points | 2.00 points |
| ¹ <i>Academic Disadvantaged Bonus</i> | | | <i>0.25 point</i> |
| ² <i>Economically Disadvantaged Bonus</i> | | | <i>0.25 point</i> |
| Co-Enrolled Succ. Trans. (after 15 sch) | 2.00 points | 2.75 points | 2.00 points |
| ¹ <i>Academic Disadvantaged Bonus</i> | | | <i>0.25 point</i> |
| ² <i>Economically Disadvantaged Bonus</i> | | | <i>0.25 point</i> |

¹ *Academically disadvantaged is defined as a student has been identified as not college ready (by TSIA) at any point in the 10 years prior to them obtaining the point (i.e. at time of transfer or graduation).*

² *Economically disadvantaged is defined as a student who (a) received Pell, or (b) was flagged as a student who received free and reduced lunch while in high school, or (c) attended a high school that was predominantly free and reduced lunch at any point in the 10 years prior to obtaining the point (i.e. at time of transfer or graduation).*

³ *Formerly called "critical fields." Legislature added three fields in the 86th session. TACC Metrics Task Force is recommending that we refresh fields (see attached).*

Adoption of the CTCFAC recommendations would lead to specific changes in funding for each success point. Each of those changes can be attributed to adjusting the points to \$215, adjusting targeted (formerly critical) fields, growth, or the metrics update. Table XXXX.XXX provides a summary of each of these amounts.

Table XXXX.XXX Funding for Each Success Point Metric

| | <u>2020-21</u> <u>Funding</u> | <u>\$215/pt. &</u> <u>Targeted</u> <u>Field</u> | <u>Growth</u> <u>(~7.5%)</u> | <u>Metrics</u> <u>Update</u> | <u>New Dollars</u> | <u>Total</u> <u>Recommended</u> |
|--|----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|
| COLLEGE READINESS | | | | | | |
| Complete Math DE | \$ 8,145,004 | \$ 501,436 | \$ 50,504 | | \$ 551,940 | \$ 8,696,944 |
| Complete Reading DE | \$ 3,429,054 | \$ 211,075 | \$ 271,565 | | \$ 482,640 | \$ 3,911,695 |
| Complete Writing DE | \$ 2,951,751 | \$ 181,695 | \$ 233,765 | | \$ 415,460 | \$ 3,367,211 |
| FIRST COLLEGE LEVEL COURSE | | | | | | |
| Pass 1 st College Math Course | \$ 25,949,622 | \$ 1,597,397 | \$ 2,055,097 | | \$ 3,652,494 | \$ 29,602,115 |
| Pass 1 st College Reading Course | \$ 21,065,030 | \$ 1,296,690 | \$ 1,668,257 | | \$ 2,964,947 | \$ 24,029,977 |
| Pass 1 st College Writing Course | \$ 17,535,519 | \$ 1,079,432 | \$ 1,388,736 | | \$ 2,468,168 | \$ 20,003,687 |
| PROGRESS TOWARD CREDENTIAL | | | | | | |
| Complete 15 Semester Credit Hrs. | \$ 43,288,886 | \$ 2,664,712 | \$ 3,428,288 | | \$ 6,093,000 | \$ 49,381,886 |
| <i>if ALL 15 Completed Hours are Dual Credit</i> | | | | \$ 2,119,500 | \$ 2,119,500 | \$ 2,119,500 |
| Complete 30 Semester Credit Hrs. | \$ 26,659,230 | \$ 1,641,148 | \$ 2,111,300 | | \$ 3,752,448 | \$ 30,411,679 |
| CREDENTIALS AWARDED | | | | | | |
| Degree/Certificate Awarded | \$ 39,736,725 | \$ (2,181,529) | \$ 2,801,740 | | \$ 620,211 | \$ 40,356,936 |
| ¹ Academic Disadvantaged Bonus | | | | \$ 1,369,103 | \$ 1,369,103 | \$ 1,369,103 |
| ² Economically Disadvantaged Bonus | | | | \$ 2,828,677 | \$ 2,828,677 | \$ 2,828,677 |
| ³ Targeted Field Degree/Certificate Bonus | \$ 10,979,472 | \$ 5,881,796 | \$ 1,257,905 | | \$ 7,139,701 | \$ 18,119,173 |
| ¹ Academic Disadvantaged Bonus | | | | \$ 589,556 | \$ 589,556 | \$ 589,556 |
| ² Economically Disadvantaged Bonus | | | | \$ 1,144,224 | \$ 1,144,224 | \$ 1,144,224 |
| TRANSFER | | | | | | |
| Successful Transfer (after 15 sch) | \$ 28,055,561 | \$ 1,726,812 | \$ 2,221,862 | | \$ 3,948,674 | \$ 32,004,235 |
| ¹ Academic Disadvantaged Bonus | | | | \$ 971,118 | \$ 971,118 | \$ 971,118 |
| ² Economically Disadvantaged Bonus | | | | \$ 2,306,084 | \$ 2,306,084 | \$ 2,306,084 |
| Co-Enrolled Succ. Trans. (after 15 sch) | \$ 500,257 | \$ 60,893 | \$ 41,864 | | \$ 102,757 | \$ 603,014 |
| ¹ Academic Disadvantaged Bonus | | | | \$ 1,540 | \$ 1,540 | \$ 1,540 |
| ² Economically Disadvantaged Bonus | | | | \$ 14,710 | \$ 14,710 | \$ 14,710 |

¹ Academically disadvantaged is defined as a student has been identified as not college ready (by TSIA) at any point in the 10 years prior to them obtaining the point (i.e. at time of transfer or graduation).

² Economically disadvantaged is defined as a student who (a) received Pell, or (b) was flagged as a student who received free and reduced lunch while in high school, or (c) attended a high school that was predominately free and reduced lunch at any point in the 10 years prior to obtaining the point (i.e. at time of transfer or graduation).

³ Formerly called "critical fields." Legislature added three fields in the 86th session. TACC Metrics Task Force is recommending that we refresh fields (see attached).

Appendix A – Definitions of Success Points with Recommendations Attached

Measure 1: College Readiness Math (1 point)

Methodology: Determine student's college readiness in math as first time undergraduate (FTUG). Only students who are not ready in math as FTUG can potentially qualify for a point. If the student is not ready when FTUG at either the same district* or another district, but became ready in math for the first time at the same district as the cohort record in year measured, then a point is awarded. If an eligible student is reported ready for the first time by two districts in the same semester, each district receives credit.

RECOMMENDATION:

Leave the base weight for Successfully Completed First College-Level Readiness Math (0.5 point)

Measure 1: College Readiness Reading (0.5 point)

Methodology: Determine student's readiness in reading as first time undergraduate (FTUG). Only students who are not ready in reading as FTUG can potentially qualify for a point. If the student is not ready as FTUG at either the same district or another district, but became ready in reading for the first time at the same district as the cohort record in year measured, then .5 point is awarded. If an eligible student is reported ready for the first time by two districts in the same semester, each district receives credit.

RECOMMENDATION:

Leave the base weight for Successfully Completed First College-Level Readiness Reading (0.5 point)

Measure 1: College Readiness Writing (0.5 point)

Methodology: Determine student's readiness in writing as first time undergraduate (FTUG). Only students who are not ready in writing as FTUG can potentially qualify for a point. If the student is not ready as FTUG at either the same district or another district, but became ready in writing for the first time at the same district as the cohort record in year measured, then .5 point is awarded. If an eligible student is reported ready for the first time by two districts in the same semester, each district receives credit.

RECOMMENDATION:

Leave the base weight for Successfully Completed First College-Level Readiness Writing (0.5 point)

Measure 2: Successfully Completed First College-Level Reading/Writing Course (1 point if reading/writing combo, or 0.5 point if reading or writing only)

Methodology: Student passes first college-level math course at same district as the cohort record with a grade of "A", "B" or "C" in fiscal year measured, then a point is awarded. If an eligible student is reported as successfully completing a first college-level course for the first time by two districts in the same semester, each district receives credit.

RECOMMENDATION:

Leave the base weight for Successfully Completed First College-Level Reading/Writing Course (1 point if reading/writing combo, or 0.5 point if reading or writing only)

Measure 3: Successfully Completed First College-Level Reading/Writing Course (1 point if reading/writing combo, or 0.5 point if reading or writing only)

Methodology: Student passes first college-level reading/writing course at same district as the cohort record with a grade of "A", "B" or "C" in fiscal year measured, then a point is awarded (.5 for reading and .5 for writing when separate courses are reported). If an eligible student is reported as successfully completing a first college-level course for the first time by two districts in the same semester, each district receives credit.

RECOMMENDATION XXXX

Leave the base weight for Successfully Completed First College-Level Reading/Writing Course (1 point if reading/writing combo, or 0.5 point if reading or writing only)

Measure 4: 15 Successfully Completed SCH (1 point)

Methodology: Accumulate student's successfully** completed SCH from 3 previous years, plus the year being measured. If the student reaches at least 15 completed SCH at same district as the cohort record for the first time in year measured, then a point is awarded. If a point was awarded in previous 2 prior fiscal years, no point is awarded.

RECOMMENDATION XXXX

Leave the base weight for 15 successfully completed SCHs (2.00 points).

RECOMMENDATION XXXX.

15 Successfully Completed SCH as Dual Credit (0.25 point)

Award additional success points for students who earn their first 15 credit hours as dual credit.

Measure 5: 30 Successfully Completed SCH (1 point)

Methodology: Accumulate student's successfully** completed SCH from 3 previous years, plus the year being measured. If the student reaches at least 30 completed SCH at same district as the cohort record for the first time in year measured, then a point is awarded. If a point was awarded in previous two prior fiscal years, no point is awarded.

RECOMMENDATION XXXX

Leave the base weight for 30 successfully completed SCHs (2.00 points).

Measure 6: Degrees, Core Curriculum Completers and Certificates Awarded (2 points)

Methodology: Point is awarded to a student who completes a degree or certificate or is a core

curriculum completer (CCC). Unduplicated degrees and certificates awarded by the district in the fiscal year being measured are counted (one degree or award per student). Students who earn awards in critical fields are not included in Measure 6 (see Measure 7).

Credentials Awarded (Unduplicated Degrees or Certificates) Current Weight 2.00;

RECOMMENDATION XXXX

Leave the base weight for credentials completed (2.00 points).

RECOMMENDATION XXX

Add 0.25 success points for completion of a credential by an academically disadvantaged student.

RECOMMENDATION XXX

Add 0.25 success points for completion of a credential by an economically disadvantaged student.

The above recommendations are *respectfully submitted as an alternative to the Rider proposed weight of 1.20*. The goals of 60X30TX and the efforts of the state have been squarely and appropriately focused on degree completion over the last several years. Reducing the weight of credentials earned could have unintended consequences.

Measure 7: Graduates in Critical Fields (2.25 Points)

Methodology: Point is awarded to a student who completes a degree or certificate in a Science, Technology, Engineering, or Math (STEM) or allied health major. Unduplicated degrees and certificates awarded in the fiscal year being measured are counted.

RECOMMENDATION XXXX

Update Targeted Fields (formerly Critical Fields) using the methodology identified in Charge 3. Targeted Fields for 2022-23 would be: "11", "14", "15", "27", "40", "0302", "1204", "1301", "1312", "1505", "1508", "1907", "2200", "2203", "3001", "4302", "4702", "4706", "4902", "5100", "5102", "5106", "5107", "5108", "5109", "5110", "5111", "5118", "5123", "5126", "5127", "5131", "5132", "5133", "5134", "5135", "5138", "5139", "4102", "4103", and "4703" (*verify this includes all fields that are in the current system*)

RECOMMENDATION XXXX

Leave the base weight for critical fields (targeted fields) (2.25 points).

RECOMMENDATION XXXX

Add 0.25 success points for completion of a credential in a targeted field by an academically disadvantaged student.

RECOMMENDATION XXXX

Add 0.25 success points for completion of a credential in a targeted field by an economically disadvantaged student.

RECOMMENDATION XXXX

Modify the process of identifying critical fields and make sure it is evergreen.

Goal: Replace 2019-21 Critical Fields (defined by prior THECB analysis or statute) over time with an evergreen analysis.

Analysis of Critical Fields occurs at the conclusion of the biennium (by June 1st each year), with notice given to institutions that the following biennium's critical fields will include the new fields.

The above recommendations are respectfully submitted as an alternative to the Rider proposed weight of 3.00.

Measure 7: Transfer Point (2 points)

Methodology: Point is awarded to a student found enrolled for first time at public/private university in year measured who has a record of successfully completing at least 15 SCH at the same two-year institution/district prior to university enrollment. The 15 SCH at the community college must be earned during the 3 years prior to the year found at a university for the first time.

RECOMMENDATION XXXX

Leave the base weight for transfer to a general academic institution after completing 15 hours (2.00 points).

RECOMMENDATION XXXX

Add 0.25 success points for transfer by an academically disadvantaged student.

RECOMMENDATION XXXX

Add 0.25 success points for transfer by an economically disadvantaged student.

The above recommendations are respectfully submitted as an alternative to the Rider proposed weight of 2.75.

Measure 8: Co-Enrollment Transfer Point (2 points)

Methodology: Point is awarded to a student found enrolled for first time at public/private university in year measured who has a record of successfully completing at least 15 SCH at the same two-year institution/district in a structured co-enrollment program (with a university) prior to university enrollment. The 15 SCH at the community college must be earned during the 3 years prior to the year found at a university for the first time.

RECOMMENDATION XXXX

Leave the base weight for transfer of a co-enrolled student to a general academic institution after completing 15 hours (2.00 points).

RECOMMENDATION XXXX

Add 0.25 success points for transfer by an academically disadvantaged co-enrollment student.

RECOMMENDATION XXXX

Add 0.25 success points for transfer by an economically disadvantaged co-enrollment student.

* Points are awarded at the district level so the term district is used rather than institution. Note that student status at 4-year institutions is included in calculations as applicable. For example, if a student is reported as meeting the first college-level course requirement at a university before this milestone is reported for the first time by a community college district, the district will not earn a point.

** The CBM002 report is used to determine course completion prior to summer 2011. Student grade data was not available for use in determining "successful" completion until summer 2011 when the CBM00S was introduced. More specific detail on the codes used for completion and successful completion is found on the following two pages.

This document is available on the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
Website: <http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/formulafunding>

For more information contact:

Roland Gilmore

Program Director

Strategic Planning and Funding

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

P.O. Box 12788

Austin, TX 78711

(512) 427-6243

roland.gilmore@thecb.state.tx.us