

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

January 2020

Table of Contents

Agenda..... 2

Prior Meeting’s Draft Minutes..... 3

Commissioner’s Charges 5

Community and Technical College Formula Advisory Committee for 2022-2023 Biennium..... 7

 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)). 8

 Charge 3 – Study and make recommendations on the efficacy of critical need fields as they relate to contact hour and success point funding.....11

 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))18

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, January 9, 2020

1:00 p.m.

Agenda

- I. Call to Order
- II. Consideration and approval of the minutes from December 4, 2019, meeting
- III. Discussion, review, and consideration of the Commissioner's 2022-2023 Biennium charges
- IV. Discussion, review, and consideration of the final report draft
- 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, December 4, 2019
1:00 p.m.**

Minutes

Attendees: Ms. Teri Crawford, Mr. Patrick Lee, Mr. Jim Yeonopolus, Dr. Robert Riza, Dr. Pamela Anglin, and Dr. Jeremy McMillen

Phone conference: Dr. Brent Wallace, Mr. Richard Cervantes, Ms. Mary Wickland, Mr. Michael Reeser, Dr. Phil Rhodes, and Ms. Mary Elizondo

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 1:00 p.m.

1. The chair asked if there were any corrections to the minutes of the November 6, 2019, meeting. As there were not, Mr. Jim Yeonopolus motioned for approval, Dr. Robert Riza 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. 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 to include additional success point funding that will be discussed in charges 3 and 4 recommendations.
 - II. Dr. Anglin briefed the committee on the removal of students who received free and reduced lunch (but were not Pell recipients) from the economically disadvantaged student calculation for success points, which would amount to a reduction in this recommendation of approximately \$320,000.
 - III. The chair asked for a motion to approve the funding recommendations for the community colleges. Dr. McMillen recommended an amendment that would authorize the chair to adjust the percentage increase for contact hour funding based on an analysis of increases in expenses. Dr. McMillen motioned, Dr. Brent Wallace seconded, and the committee approved by acclamation.

3. 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 briefed the committee on the Charge 3 Work Group’s recommendation for critical need fields as they relate to ~~contact hour and~~ success point funding.
 - II. Dr. McMillen said the recommendation would include changing the current naming convention of “critical fields” to “targeted fields” further aligning the terminology with the Texas Workforce Commission.
 - III. Dr. McMillen said the work group didn’t recommend any changes to the current critical fields for contact hour funding. Instead, it recommends the next CTC FAC study the issue.
 - IV. The chair asked for a motion to approve the Charge 3 recommendations for critical need fields as they relate to contact hour and success point funding. Dr. Robert Riza motioned, Mr. Jim Yeonopolus seconded, and the committee approved by acclamation.
4. 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 recommendations for the appropriate number of points to be awarded for each success point metric.
 - II. Dr. Wallace commented on the additional cost dual credit students present to the institutions. He said he would support an increase in the additional weight for the Success Point for 15 SCH earned by dual credit students from .25 point to 0.50 point.
 - III. The chair asked for a motion to approve the charge 4 recommendation for the community colleges. Dr. McMillen recommended the motion include authorizing the chair to adjust the additional points awarded for Dual Credit students successfully completing 15 SCH from .25 to .5 after she discusses the issue further with the committee member’s colleagues. Dr. McMillen motioned, Mr. Jim Yeonopolus seconded, and the committee approved by acclamation.
5. The chair recommended the meeting scheduled for January 9, 2020, be a face-to-face meeting, as usual.

The chair asked for a motion to adjourn; Dr. Robert Riza motioned, Mr. Jim Yeonopolus seconded, and the committee approved by acclamation. The committee adjourned at 1:43 p.m. and will next convene on January 9, 2020, 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 2022-2023 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)).

Draft Committee Recommendation *alternative one* for Community Colleges

Recommendation increases CH rate from \$5.44 to \$5.83 (*includes 0.50 increase for all identified Success Point metrics for academically and economically disadvantaged*)

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	\$282.8	\$54.5	23.9%
Contact Hour	\$1,533.7	\$1,652.2	\$118.5	7.7%
Bachelor of Applied Technology	\$3.2	\$3.8	\$.6	18.7%
Total	\$1,833.2	\$2,038.8	\$205.6	11.2%

- The committee recommends increasing the funding to Community Colleges for the 2022-2023 biennium to \$2,038.8 million, which is an increase of \$205.6 million, or 11.2 percent, 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, modify success points to account for anticipated growth of 7.5 percent, update targeted fields using a new process, and add metrics to account for momentum of dual credit students earning 15 hours, and academically and economically disadvantaged students earning a credential or transferring to a university. This is an increase from \$228.3 million to \$282.8 million or a \$54.5 million increase for 2022-2023. Moving forward, for success points to work as designed, we need to maintain at least a constant rate of \$215 per point. Future formula advisory committees may want to consider building in increases to the rate to keep up with inflation.

- Increase Contact Hour funding from \$5.44 per contact hour to \$5.83 based on a projected growth rate of 0.56 percent in contact hours- Contact hour funding increases from \$1,533.7 million in 2020-2021 to \$1,652.2 million in 2022-2023.

Increase Bachelor of Applied Technology (BAT) based on a 14.7 percent 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 an 18.7 percent increase.

Draft Committee Recommendation *alternative two* for Community Colleges

Recommendation increases CH rate from \$5.44 to \$5.83 (*includes .5 increase for dual credit progress metric and .25 increase for academically and economically disadvantaged*).

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	\$273.9	\$45.6	20.0%
Contact Hour	\$1,533.7	\$1,652.2	\$118.5	7.7%
Bachelor of Applied Technology	\$3.2	\$3.8	\$.6	18.7%
Total	\$1,833.2	\$2,029.9	\$196.7	10.7%

- The committee recommends increasing the funding to Community Colleges for the 2022-2023 biennium to \$2,029.9 million, which is an increase of \$196.7 million, or 10.7 percent, 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, modify success points to account for anticipated growth of 7.5 percent, update targeted fields using a new process, and add metrics to account for momentum of dual credit students earning 15 hours, and academically and economically disadvantaged students earning a credential or transferring to a university. This is an increase from \$228.3 million to \$273.9 million or a \$45.6 million increase for 2022-2023. Moving forward, for success points to work as designed, we need to maintain at least a constant rate of \$215 per point. Future formula advisory committees may want to consider building in increases to the rate to keep up with inflation.
 - Increase Contact Hour funding from \$5.44 per contact hour to \$5.83 based on a projected growth rate of 0.56 percent in contact hours. Contact hour funding increases from \$1,533.7 million in 2020-2021 to \$1,652.2 million in 2022-2023.
 - Increase Bachelor of Applied Technology (BAT) based on a 14.7 percent 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 an 18.7 percent increase.

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

Draft Committee Recommendation for critical need fields and success point funding.

After close examination, the CTCFAC has three recommendations for Success Point funding and two recommendations for contact hour funding related to critical fields. These recommendations emerge from intensive effort by the workgroup assigned to this task and rely heavily on the recommendations emerging from the Texas Association of Community Colleges Metrics Task Force. Finally, the THECB staff have provided extensive technical support for this work and are to be commended for helping this Committee reach a point to advance recommendations.

CRITICAL FIELDS AND SUCCESS POINT FUNDING

Critical fields for Success Points were developed at the inception of Success Points (2009) and have been altered once since then (by the 86th Texas Legislature). Data provided by the THECB suggest that the current critical fields do not align well with current and projected workforce trends. Highlighting the need to update the fields, a recent Dallas County Community College District analysis of the seven largest metropolitan statistical areas in the state revealed that about 40 percent of economically vital occupations are not linked to a current critical field. Therefore, the Committee advances the following:

RECOMMENDATION 3.1

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

RECOMMENDATION 3.2.

The CTCFAC recommends an update to the Targeted Fields (formerly “Critical Fields”) for Success Points.

The committee recommends better aligning the efforts of Texas community colleges with the pressing needs of our state’s economy by adopting “Targeted Fields” using a standardized process and refreshing fields biennially. The proposed methodology would immediately identify seven new fields to be added to the existing 25. As this change is realized, it is recommended all current critical fields be grandfathered for the FY 2022-23 budget (resulting in 34 total fields) and nonidentified fields be removed beginning with the FY 2024-25 budget (resulting in 16 of the current fields being removed at that time). Below is a description of the process as envisioned by the committee.

Targeted Field Update Methodology

The CTCFAC recommends a Targeted Fields Identification Task Force (TFITF) be convened for biennial updates of the targeted fields in conjunction with the CTCFAC. It should include at least one representative from the THECB and a standing Task Force of the Texas Association of

Community Colleges (currently the TACC Metrics Task Force) to (a) execute the methodology for identifying Targeted Fields, (b) consider fields that ought to be included or excluded in contradiction to the quantitative results, and (c) make recommendations for improving on that methodology as additional analytical tools become available. The base methodology recommended by the CTCFAC is a two-step process based on the analysis of occupations to which fields are most closely associated:

Step 1: Meet at Least Two of the Following:

- Top 20+ Largest Growth Occupations generally needing Certificates or Associate Degrees.
- Top 20+ Fastest Growth Occupations generally needing Certificates or Associate Degrees.
- Top Targeted Occupations identified by the Texas Workforce Commission, or as identified by 11 or more Workforce Boards.

Step 2:

Occupations identified above will have their fields recommended for addition to *or* continuation on the targeted field list in cases where:

- Demand exceeds supply *and* wages are above the state median; *or*
- Demand exceeds supply, wages are below the state median, *and* the TFITF articulates a clear and convincing case to the Commissioner of Higher Education that adding the field is important for the state. (*note: fields that are captured in the top 20 fastest/largest growth)

To satisfy these steps, the THECB will provide a list of top 20 fastest and largest growth occupations that meet or exceed the state median wage, which will also include occupations that do not meet the median wage but do meet the fastest/largest components of the measure. Since occupations that do not meet wage requirements would require clear and convincing case for inclusion, they are not counted in the 20. The list will also include supplemental information (to be determined by the TFITF) to aid in the assessment of whether fields associated with a below-median wage occupation merit designation as targeted fields and, as appropriate, provide evidence for why a field was excluded in contradiction to the quantitative results.

The process outlined above leads to a state-wide list. It should be noted that the committee worked to find solutions that would help identify regional needs but was unable to come to a region-based recommendation. At this time, the committee recommends staying with a state-wide list with additional analysis based on the above-mentioned regional Workforce Board identification to ensure it captures fields important to several regions.

Targeted Field Identification Timeline

- In the fall of each odd-numbered year (in this is example, August 2019), the Targeted Fields Identification Task Force (TFITF) evaluates available data on targeted fields and make recommendations to the CTCFAC for addition, continuation, and removal.

- The CTCFAC incorporates TFITF recommendations for targeted field updates as a part of their CTCFAC recommendations to the THECB each year no later than January of each even-numbered year (in this example, January 2020).

Targeted Field Adoption Timeline: Addition/Continuation

- THECB adopts approved targeted fields during its April meeting every even-numbered year (in this example, April 2020).
- THECB calculates the prior three-year average of numbers of graduates for the measurement period affecting the next biennial funding. (In this example, graduates from 2018, 2019, and 2020 would be calculated in August 2020)
- In the case of new fields, the THECB will use the greater of the prior three-year average *or* the immediate prior year as the basis for funding in the next biennium. (In this example, the greater of the three-year average from 2018, 2019, and 2020 *or* graduates from 2020, as calculated by the THECB in August 2020)
- Once a field is added, it will remain for at least four years (two biennia) before being eligible for removal. This is done to create consistency across the fields, prevent addition/removal of fields as they move in and out of the targeted occupations list, and provide institutions assurance that programs developed in support of the state's targeted fields will lead to predictable funding. This method is designed to help in cases where colleges develop new programs, further allowing colleges time to produce graduates.

Targeted Field Removal Timeline

Targeted fields identified for continuation removal will follow the following timeline:

- In the fall of each odd-numbered year (in this is example, August 2023), the Targeted Fields Identification Task Force (TFITF) evaluates available data on targeted fields and make recommendations to the CTCFAC for removal. A field will not be recommended for removal if it has not been on the targeted field list for at least four years.
- The CTCFAC incorporates recommendations for targeted field updates as a part of their CTCFAC recommendations to the THECB no later than January of each even-numbered year (in this example, January 2024).
- Institutions are notified of fields identified for proposed removal via the CTCFAC recommendations adopted no later than January of each even-numbered year (in this example, January 2024).
- The THECB adopts a targeted field list during its April meeting every even-numbered year (in this example, April 2024). Institutions are notified of the fields identified for inclusion no later than June 1 (in this example, June 1, 2024).

- THECB counts graduates in fields for funding through the measurement period affecting the next biennial funding (In this example, December 2024 or August 2024). Funding for the immediate biennium will include prior three-year average (2021, 2022, and 2023 in this example) for the field.
- Funding for the following biennium includes only those years in which the targeted field was “active,” resulting in a lower three-year average (it would not include 2025, but it would include 2023 and may include 2024, depending upon timing of data reported for this category).

Targeted fields in existence as of August 2019 would remain on the list for 2021-22 biennium funding and would only be removed if identified for removal at the refresh of the list in August 2021. This removal would follow the process outlined above. Based upon the data available today, the fields that are anticipated to be the fields for the 2023-24 session are outlined below. Keep in mind that these need to be looked at two years from now, as there may be changes to the economy of the state. They are simply provided here for context of how the process could work and to give institutions time to plan for the change.

The table below represents the extent of the targeted fields funding for targeted fields that would be applied to each current and newly identified targeted field in upcoming budget cycles if current data hold. The “Part” funding results from the three-year average for Success Points, as retroactive removal of the bonus from credentials conferred when it was still in effect would introduce damaging unpredictability to college revenues.

Table 3.1 - Proposed Fields Over Time

CIP	CIP Code Field Name	Biennium			
		2020-21	2022-23	2024-25	2026-27
"0302"	Natural Resources Management and Policy		Full	Full	Full
"11"	Computer and Information Sciences And Support Services	Full	Full	Full	Full
"14"	Engineering	Full	Full	Full	Full
"15"	Engineering Technology and Engineering-Related Fields	Full	Full	Full	Full
"2200"	Non-Professional General Legal Studies (Undergraduate)		Full	Full	Full
"2203"	Legal Support Services		Full	Full	Full
"27"	Mathematics and Statistics	Full	Full	Part	
"3001"	Biological and Physical Sciences	Full	Full	Part	

"40"	Physical Sciences	Full	Full	Part	
"4102"	Nuclear and Industrial Radiologic Technologies/Technicians ¹	Full	Full	Part	
"4103"	Physical Science Technologies/Technicians ¹	Full	Full	Part	
"4302"	Fire Protection		Full	Full	Full
"4702"	Heating, Air Conditioning, Ventilation and Refrigeration Maintenance Technology/Technician (HAC, HACR, HVAC, HVACR)		Full	Full	Full
"4703"	Heavy/Industrial Equipment Maintenance Technologies	Full	Full	Part	
"4902"	Ground Transportation		Full	Full	Full
"5100"	Health Services/Allied Health/Health Sciences, General		Full	Full	Full
"5102"	Communication Disorders Sciences and Services	Full	Full	Part	
"5106"	Dental Support Services and Allied Professions	Full	Full	Full	Full
"5107"	Health and Medical Administrative Services	Full	Full	Full	Full
"5108"	Allied Health and Medical Assisting Services	Full	Full	Full	Full
"5109"	Allied Health Diagnostic, Intervention, and Treatment Professions	Full	Full	Part	
"5110"	Clinical/Medical Laboratory Science/Research and Allied Professions	Full	Full	Full	Full
"5111"	Health/Medical Preparatory Programs		Full	Full	Full
"5118"	Ophthalmic and Optometric Support Services and Allied Professions	Full	Full	Part	
"5123"	Rehabilitation and Therapeutic Professions	Full	Full	Part	
"5126"	Health Aides/Attendants/Orderlies	Full	Full	Part	
"5127"	Medical Illustration and Informatics	Full	Full	Part	
"5131"	Dietetics and Clinical Nutrition Services	Full	Full	Part	
"5132"	Bioethics/Medical Ethics	Full	Full	Part	
"5133"	Alternative and Complementary Medicine and Medical Systems	Full	Full	Part	

"5134"	Alternative and Complementary Medical Support Services	Full	Full	Part	
"5135"	Somatic Bodywork and Related Therapeutic Services		Full	Full	Full
"5138"	Registered Nursing, Nursing Administration, Nursing Research and Clinical Nursing	Full	Full	Full	Full
"5139"	Practical Nursing, Vocational Nursing and Nursing Assistants	Full	Full	Full	Full

Below is the anticipated 2025-26 list. Keep in mind that this list is using current data and is meant as a forward looking.

CIP Code Field Name	CIP
Natural Resources Management and Policy	"0302"
Computer and Information Sciences And Support Services	"11"
Engineering	"14"
Engineering Technology and Engineering-Related Fields	"15"
Non-Professional General Legal Studies (Undergraduate)	"2200"
Legal Support Services	"2203"
Fire Protection	"4302"
Heating, Air Conditioning, Ventilation and Refrigeration Maintenance Technology/Technician (HAC, HACR, HVAC, HVACR)	"4702"
Ground Transportation	"4902"
Health Services/Allied Health/Health Sciences, General	"5100"
Dental Support Services and Allied Professions	"5106"
Health and Medical Administrative Services	"5107"
Allied Health and Medical Assisting Services	"5108"
Clinical/Medical Laboratory Science/Research and Allied Professions	"5110"
Health/Medical Preparatory Programs	"5111"
Somatic Bodywork and Related Therapeutic Services2	"5135"
Registered Nursing, Nursing Administration, Nursing Research and Clinical Nursing	"5138"
Practical Nursing, Vocational Nursing and Nursing Assistants	"5139"

RECOMMENDATION 3.2 - The CTCFAC recommends leaving the current bonus 0.25 point for a credential in a Targeted Fields and adding bonus points when students earning credentials are identified as academically and/or economically disadvantaged. See Recommendations 4.10, 4.11, and 4.12 under Charge 4 for more details.

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 3.3

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

RECOMMENDATION 3.4

The CTCFAC recommends further study to develop a system to update Critical Fields for Contact Hour Reimbursement (related to courses) that will lead to alignment of fields with the needs of the state each biennium.

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))

Draft Committee Recommendation *alternative one* to move metrics to 0.50 points for dual credit progression and to increase all other identified metrics by 0.50 points for academically disadvantaged and 0.50 points for economically disadvantaged students.

The current draft proposal by the CTCFAC includes a recommended increase of \$54.5 million in Success Point funding, \$32.4 million of which is the result of funding each Success Point at \$215, updating targeted fields (formerly referred to as critical fields), and funding ~7.5% growth in success points. Finally, the CTCFAC recommends updating success points metrics to align equity goals for academically and economically disadvantaged students and to support success in dual credit. The proposed reworking of success points accounts for the remaining \$22.4 million in increased funding, which includes investing more in progress toward credentials by dual credit students, credentials awarded, and transfer. The table below shows the overall distribution of funding by success point type and the increase for new metrics and other recommendations (\$215 per point, 7.5% growth, and updating targeted fields).

Table 4.1 - Distribution of Funding by Success Point Type and Source of Increase

	2020-21	2022-23 Request		
	<i>Appropriated</i>	<u>\$215/pt. & Targeted Field & 7.5% Growth</u>	<u>Metrics Update</u>	<u>Total</u>
College Readiness	\$14,525,809	\$2,044,589	-	\$16,570,398
First College Level Course	\$64,550,170	\$9,085,609	-	\$73,635,779
Progress Toward Credential	\$69,948,116	\$9,845,448	\$4,239,001	\$84,032,566
Credentials Awarded	\$50,716,197	\$7,387,245	\$11,457,374	\$69,560,817
Transfer	\$28,555,818	\$4,051,431	\$6,351,897	\$38,959,146
Total Student Success Points Funding	\$228,296,111	\$32,414,322	\$22,048,273	\$282,758,706

Overall, the culmination of these recommendations leads to an increased proportion of Success Point funding going toward credentials and transfer, as seen in the following table (estimate is based on 2018-2019 data).

Table 4.2 - Proportional Distribution of Funding by Success Point Type

Success Point Type	2020-21	2022-23	Change
College Readiness	6.4%	5.9%	-0.5%
First College Level Course	28.3%	26.0%	-2.2%
Progress Toward Credential	30.6%	29.7%	-0.9%
Credentials Awarded	22.2%	24.6%	2.4%
Transfer	12.5%	13.8%	1.3%

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),
- Update points earned for targeted fields (formerly critical fields) by adding to the 2.25 points earned in cases where students are academically disadvantaged (0.50 points) or economically disadvantaged (0.50 points). As proposed, a total of 3.25 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.
- Update points earned for credentials awarded by adding to the 2.00 points earned in cases where students are academically disadvantaged (0.50 points) or economically disadvantaged (0.50 points). As proposed, a total of 3.00 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.
- Update 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 (0.50 points) or economically disadvantaged (0.50 points). As proposed, a total of 3.00 points could be earned. This is a proposed alternative to the Rider which would have increased transfer funding to 2.75.
- Update points earned for progress toward a credential after students complete 15 semester hours to include an additional 0.50 points in cases where ALL of the earned hours are dual credit. A total of 1.50 points would be possible in cases where all hours are dual credit.

Economically Disadvantaged is defined as a student who received Pell at any time in the 10 years prior to obtaining the base Success Point for completion or transfer. The CTCFAC recommends the THECB undertake efforts to capture additional economically disadvantaged information based upon (a) free and reduced lunch, (b) attendance at a high school that was predominantly free and reduced lunch, and (c) financial aid information obtained from the U.S. Department of Education, if feasible.

Academically Disadvantaged is defined as a student who has been identified as not college ready (by TSIA) at any point in the 10 years prior to obtaining the base Success Point for completion or transfer.

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 4.3 - Success Point Weights for Current Funding, the Rider, and CTCFAC Proposed Points

	Success Point Weights		
	<u>2020-21</u>	<u>Rider</u>	<u>Proposed</u>
COLLEGE READINESS			
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. <i>if ALL 15 Hours are Dual Credit</i>	1.00 point	1.00 point	1.00 point <i>0.50 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
<i>Academic Disadvantaged Bonus</i>			<i>0.50 point</i>
<i>Economically Disadvantaged Bonus</i>			<i>0.50 point</i>
Targeted Field Degree/Certificate	2.25 point	3.00 points	2.25 points
<i>Academic Disadvantaged Bonus</i>			<i>0.50 point</i>
<i>Economically Disadvantaged Bonus</i>			<i>0.50 point</i>
TRANSFER			
Successful Transfer (after 15 sch)	2.00 points	2.75 points	2.00 points
<i>Academic Disadvantaged Bonus</i>			<i>0.50 point</i>
<i>Economically Disadvantaged Bonus</i>			<i>0.50 point</i>
Co-Enrolled Successful Trans. (after 15 sch)	2.00 points	2.75 points	2.00 points
<i>Academic Disadvantaged Bonus</i>			<i>0.50 point</i>
<i>Economically Disadvantaged Bonus</i>			<i>0.50 point</i>

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. The table below provides a summary of each of these amounts.

Table 4.4 - Funding for Each Success Point Metric

	<u>2020-21</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>New</u> <u>Funding</u>	<u>2022-23</u> <u>Proposed</u>
COLLEGE READINESS			
Complete Math DE	\$8,145,004	\$1,146,489	\$9,291,493
Complete Reading DE	\$3,429,054	\$482,640	\$3,911,695
Complete Writing DE	\$2,951,751	\$415,460	\$3,367,211
FIRST COLLEGE LEVEL COURSE			
Pass 1 st College Math Course	\$25,949,622	\$3,652,494	\$29,602,115
Pass 1 st College Reading Course	\$21,065,030	\$2,964,947	\$24,029,977
Pass 1 st College Writing Course	\$17,535,519	\$2,468,168	\$20,003,687
PROGRESS TOWARD CREDENTIAL			
Complete 15 Semester Credit Hrs. <i>if ALL 15 Hours are Dual Credit</i>	\$43,288,886	\$6,093,000	\$49,381,886
		\$4,239,001	\$4,239,001
Complete 30 Semester Credit Hrs.	\$26,659,230	\$3,752,448	\$30,411,679
CREDENTIALS AWARDED			
Degree/Certificate Awarded	\$39,736,725	\$3,601,547	\$43,338,273
<i>Academic Disadvantaged Bonus</i>		\$3,022,500	\$3,022,500
<i>Economically Disadvantaged Bonus</i>		\$5,820,237	\$5,820,237
<i>Targeted Field Degree/Certificate</i>	\$10,979,472	\$3,785,698	\$14,765,170
<i>Academic Disadvantaged Bonus</i>		\$ 894,817	\$ 894,817
<i>Economically Disadvantaged Bonus</i>		\$1,719,821	1,719,821
TRANSFER			
Successful Transfer (after 15 sch)	\$28,055,561	\$ 3,948,674	\$32,004,235
<i>Academic Disadvantaged Bonus</i>		\$1,942,235	\$1,942,235
<i>Economically Disadvantaged Bonus</i>		\$4,378,818	\$4,378,818
Co-Enrolled Success Trans. (after 15 sch)	\$500,257	\$102,757	\$603,014
<i>Academic Disadvantaged Bonus</i>		\$3,081	\$3,081
<i>Economically Disadvantaged Bonus</i>		\$27,763	\$27,763
Total Success Points Funding	\$228,296,111	\$54,462,595	\$282,758,706

**Appendix:
COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF SUCCESS POINTS, INCLUDING
DEFINITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Below is a short summary of the recommendations from a comprehensive review of Student Success Points. This review was undertaken by the CTCFAC. The work has been influenced by the recommendations of the Texas Association of Community Colleges Metrics Task Force recommendations from January 2020. Recommendations are made for every Success Point Metric in the current system, as well as for new metrics. In cases where there is a new metric or where there is a recommended change in a metric’s value, the entire recommendation is emphasized in bold.

Complete Developmental Education: Math

<p>RECOMMENDATION 4.1: Leave the base weight for Successfully Completed First College-Level Readiness Math (0.5 point)</p>	<p>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.</p>
---	---

Complete Developmental Education: Reading

<p>RECOMMENDATION 4.2: Leave the base weight for Successfully Completed First College-Level Readiness Reading (0.5 point)</p>	<p>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.</p>
--	--

Complete Developmental Education: Writing

<p>RECOMMENDATION 4.3: Leave the base weight for Successfully Completed First College-Level Readiness Writing (0.5 point)</p>	<p>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.</p>
--	--

Complete First College-Level Math Course

RECOMMENDATION 4.4: Leave the base weight for Successfully Completed First College-Level Math Course (1.0 point)	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.
--	---

Completed First College-Level Reading/Writing Course

RECOMMENDATION 4.5: Leave the base weight for Successfully Completed First College-Level Reading/Writing Course (1.0 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.
--	---

Complete 15 SCHs

RECOMMENDATION 4.6: Leave the base weight for 15 Successfully Completed SCHs (1.00 points).	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.
---	--

Complete First 15 SCHs as Dual Credit

RECOMMENDATION 4.7: Add 0.50 Success Points for students who Successfully Completed their first 15 SCHs as Dual Credit (0.50 point).	Methodology: Accumulate student's successfully completed their first 15 SCHs as a dual credit student from 3 previous years, plus the year being measured. If the student reaches at least 15 completed SCH at same district as the cohort of 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.
---	--

Complete 30 SCHs

RECOMMENDATION 4.8: Leave the base weight for 30 successfully completed SCHs (1.00 points).	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.
---	--

Degrees/Certificates Awarded

<u>RECOMMENDATION 4.9:</u> Leave the base weight for credentials completed (2.00 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).
---	--

Degrees/Certificates Awarded: Targeted Fields Bonus

<u>RECOMMENDATION 4.10:</u> Leave the 0.25 bonus for credentials completed in targeted (formerly critical) fields. (0.25 points).	Methodology: Additional point is awarded to a student who completes a degree or certificate in a targeted field identified as important for meeting the future needs of the state. Unduplicated degrees and certificates awarded in the fiscal year being measured are counted. <i>See Charge 3 Narrative for details on the proposed targeted field update process. Recommendation 3.1 proposes to change the name to Targeted Fields, away from Critical Fields. Recommendation 3.2 proposes adopting a consistent and timely process for updating targeted fields every two years to maintain alignment with the needs of the state.</i>
---	---

Degrees/Certificates Awarded: Academically Disadvantaged Bonus

<u>RECOMMENDATION 4.11:</u> <u>Add 0.50 Success Points for completion of a credential by an academically disadvantaged student.</u>	Methodology: Additional point is awarded for academically disadvantaged degree/certificate completers (including those in targeted fields) as described in Recommendation 4.9 (above). Academically disadvantaged is defined as a student who has been identified as not college ready (under TSI) as a First-Time in College (FTIC) student, provided the student was FTIC at any point in the 10 years prior to obtaining the base Success Point for completion or transfer.
--	---

Degrees/Certificates Awarded: Economically Disadvantaged Bonus

<u>RECOMMENDATION 4.12:</u> <u>Add 0.50 Success Points for completion of a credential by an economically disadvantaged student.</u>	Methodology: Additional point is awarded for economically disadvantaged degree/certificate completers (including those in targeted fields) as described in 4.9 (above). Economically disadvantaged is defined as a student who received Pell at any time in the 10 years prior to obtaining the base Success Point for completion or transfer. See note in Charge 4 above regarding the inclusion of other potential measures of economic status.
--	--

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. As such, the above recommendations are *respectfully submitted as an alternative to the Rider proposed weight of 1.20.*

Transfer

<p><u>RECOMMENDATION 4.13:</u> Leave the base weight for transfer to a general academic institution after completing 15 hours (2.00 points).</p>	<p>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.</p>
--	---

Transfer – Academically Disadvantaged

<p><u>RECOMMENDATION 4.14:</u> <u>Add 0.50 Success Points for transfer by an academically disadvantaged co-enrollment student</u></p>	<p>Methodology: Additional point is awarded for academically disadvantaged transfers as described in either 4.13 (above) who is academically disadvantaged.</p> <p>Academically disadvantaged is defined as a student who has been identified as not college ready (under TSI) when enrolling as a First-Time in College (FTIC) student.</p>
--	--

Transfer – Economically Disadvantaged

<p><u>RECOMMENDATION 4.15:</u> <u>Add 0.50 Success Points for transfer by an economically disadvantaged student.</u></p>	<p>Methodology: Point is awarded for economically disadvantaged transfers described in 4.13 (above) who is economically disadvantaged.</p> <p>Economically disadvantaged is defined as a student who received Pell at any time in the 10 years prior to obtaining the base Success Point for completion or transfer.</p> <p>See note in Charge 4 above regarding the inclusion of other potential measures of economic status.</p>
---	--

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

Co-Enrollment Transfer

RECOMMENDATION 4.16: Leave the base weight for transfer to a general academic institution after completing 15 hours (2.00 points).	Methodology: Point is awarded to a student who is enrolled in a THECB approved co-enrollment program who is subsequently found enrolled at public/private university in year measured who has a record of successfully completing at least 15 SCH at the same two-year institution/ 3 years after entering the institution.
--	---

Co-Enrollment Transfer: Academically Disadvantaged

RECOMMENDATION 4.17: <u>Add 0.50 Success Points for transfer by an academically disadvantaged co-enrollment student</u>	Methodology: Additional point is awarded for co-enrollment transfers as described in 4.16 (above) who is academically disadvantaged. Academically disadvantaged is defined as a student who has been identified as not college ready (under TSI) when enrolling as a First-Time in College (FTIC) student.
--	--

Co-Enrollment Transfer: Economically Disadvantaged

RECOMMENDATION 4.18: <u>Add 0.50 Success Points for transfer by an economically disadvantaged student.</u>	Methodology: Additional point is awarded for co-enrollment transfers as described in 4.16 (above) who is economically disadvantaged. For this cohort, economically disadvantaged is defined as a student who received Pell as a First-Time in College (FTIC) student during the co-enrollment tracking window as described in 4.16 above. <i>See note in Charge 4 above regarding the inclusion of other potential measures of economic status.</i>
---	--

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

Draft Committee Recommendation *alternative two* to move new dual credit progression metric to 0.50 points and to increase all other identified metrics by 0.25 points for academically disadvantaged and 0.25 points for economically disadvantaged students.

The current draft proposal by the CTCFAC includes a recommended increase of \$45.6 million in Success Point funding, \$32.4 million of which is the result of funding each Success Point at \$215, updating targeted fields (formerly referred to as critical fields), and funding ~7.5% growth in Success Points. Finally, the CTCFAC recommends updating Success Points metrics to align equity goals for academically and economically disadvantaged students and to support success in dual credit. The proposed reworking of Success Points accounts for the remaining \$13.1 million in increased funding, which includes investing more in progress toward credentials by dual credit students, credentials awarded, and transfer. The table below shows the overall distribution of funding by success point type and the increase for new metrics and other recommendations (\$215 per point, 7.5% growth, and updating targeted fields).

Table 4.1 - Distribution of Funding by Success Point Type and Source of Increase

	2020-21	2022-23 Request		
	<i>Appropriated</i>	<u>\$215/pt. & Targeted Field & 7.5% Growth</u>	<u>Metrics Update</u>	<u>Total</u>
College Readiness	\$14,525,809	\$2,044,589	-	\$16,570,398
First College Level Course	\$64,550,170	\$9,085,609	-	\$73,635,779
Progress Toward Credential	\$69,948,116	\$9,845,448	\$4,239,001	\$84,032,566
Credentials Awarded	\$50,716,197	\$7,387,245	\$5,728,687	\$63,832,129
Transfer	\$28,555,818	\$4,051,431	\$3,175,949	\$35,783,198
Total Success Pts Funding	\$228,296,111	\$32,414,322	\$13,143,637	\$273,854,070

Overall, the culmination of these recommendations leads to an increased proportion of Success Point funding going toward credentials and transfer, as seen in the following table.

Table 4.2 - Proportional Distribution of Funding by Success Point Type

Success Point Type	<u>2020-21</u>	<u>2022-23</u>	<u>Change</u>
College Readiness	6.4%	6.1%	-0.3%
First College Level Course	28.3%	26.9%	-1.4%
Progress Toward Credential	30.6%	30.7%	0.0%
Credentials Awarded	22.2%	23.3%	1.1%
Transfer	12.5%	13.1%	0.6%

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),
- Update 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). As proposed, 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.
- Update points earned for credentials awarded by adding to the 2.00 points earned in cases where students are academically disadvantaged (0.25 points) or economically disadvantaged (0.25 points). As proposed, 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.
- Update 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). As proposed, 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.

- Update 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. As proposed, a total of 1.25 points would be possible in cases where all hours are dual credit.

Economically Disadvantaged is defined as a student who received Pell at any time in the 10 years prior to obtaining the base Success Point for completion or transfer. The CTCFAC recommends the THECB undertake efforts to capture additional economically disadvantaged information based upon (a) free and reduced lunch, (b) attendance at a high school that was predominantly free and reduced lunch, and (c) financial aid information obtained from the U.S. Department of Education.

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 obtaining the base Success Point for completion or transfer.

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 4.3 - Success Point Weights for Current Funding, the Rider, and CTCFAC Proposed Points

	Success Point Weights		
	<u>2020-21</u>	<u>Rider</u>	<u>Proposed</u>
COLLEGE READINESS			
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. <i>if ALL 15 Hours are Dual Credit</i>	1.00 point	1.00 point	1.00 point <i>0.50 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
<i>Academic Disadvantaged Bonus</i>			<i>0.25 point</i>
<i>Economically Disadvantaged Bonus</i>			<i>0.25 point</i>
<i>Targeted Field Degree/Certificate</i>	2.25 point	3.00 points	2.25 point
<i>Academic Disadvantaged Bonus</i>			<i>0.25 point</i>
<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
<i>Academic Disadvantaged Bonus</i>			<i>0.25 point</i>
<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
<i>Academic Disadvantaged Bonus</i>			<i>0.25 point</i>
<i>Economically Disadvantaged Bonus</i>			<i>0.25 point</i>

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. The table below provides a summary of each of these amounts.

Table 4.4 - Funding for Each Success Point Metric

	<u>2020-21</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>New</u> <u>Funding</u>	<u>2022-23</u> <u>Proposed</u>
COLLEGE READINESS			
Complete Math DE	\$8,145,004	\$1,146,489	\$9,291,493
Complete Reading DE	\$3,429,054	\$482,640	\$3,911,695
Complete Writing DE	\$2,951,751	\$415,460	\$3,367,211
FIRST COLLEGE LEVEL COURSE			
Pass 1 st College Math Course	\$25,949,622	\$3,652,494	\$29,602,115
Pass 1 st College Reading Course	\$21,065,030	\$2,964,947	\$24,029,977
Pass 1 st College Writing Course	\$17,535,519	\$2,468,168	\$20,003,687
PROGRESS TOWARD CREDENTIAL			
Complete 15 Semester Credit Hrs. <i>if ALL 15 Hours are Dual Credit</i>	\$43,288,886	\$6,093,000	\$49,381,886
		\$4,239,001	\$4,239,001
Complete 30 Semester Credit Hrs.	\$26,659,230	\$3,752,448	\$30,411,679
CREDENTIALS AWARDED			
Degree/Certificate Awarded	\$39,736,725	\$3,601,547	\$43,338,273
<i>Academic Disadvantaged Bonus</i>		\$1,511,250	\$1,511,250
<i>Economically Disadvantaged Bonus</i>		\$2,910,118	\$2,910,118
<i>Targeted Field Degree/Certificate</i>	\$10,979,472	\$3,785,698	\$14,765,170
<i>Academic Disadvantaged Bonus</i>		\$447,408	\$447,408
<i>Economically Disadvantaged Bonus</i>		\$859,911	\$859,911
TRANSFER			
Successful Transfer (after 15 sch)	\$28,055,561	\$ 3,948,674	\$32,004,235
<i>Academic Disadvantaged Bonus</i>		\$971,118	\$971,118
<i>Economically Disadvantaged Bonus</i>		\$2,189,409	\$2,189,409
Co-Enrolled Succ. Trans. (after 15 sch)	\$500,257	\$102,757	\$603,014
<i>Academic Disadvantaged Bonus</i>		\$1,540	\$1,540
<i>Economically Disadvantaged Bonus</i>		\$13,882	\$13,882
Total Success Points Funding	\$228,296,111	\$45,557,959	\$273,854,070

**Appendix:
COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF SUCCESS POINTS, INCLUDING
DEFINITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Below is a short summary of the recommendations from a comprehensive review of Student Success Points. This review was undertaken by the CTCFAC. The work has been influenced by the recommendations of the Texas Association of Community Colleges Metrics Task Force recommendations from January 2020. Recommendations are made for every Success Point Metric in the current system, as well as for new metrics. In cases where there is a new metric or where there is a recommended change in a metric’s value, the entire recommendation is emphasized in bold.

Complete Developmental Education: Math

<p>RECOMMENDATION 4.1: Leave the base weight for Successfully Completed First College-Level Readiness Math (0.5 point)</p>	<p>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.</p>
---	---

Complete Developmental Education: Reading

<p>RECOMMENDATION 4.2: Leave the base weight for Successfully Completed First College-Level Readiness Reading (0.5 point)</p>	<p>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.</p>
--	--

Complete Developmental Education: Writing

<p>RECOMMENDATION 4.3: Leave the base weight for Successfully Completed First College-Level Readiness Writing (0.5 point)</p>	<p>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.</p>
--	--

Complete First College-Level Math Course

RECOMMENDATION 4.4: Leave the base weight for Successfully Completed First College-Level Math Course (1.0 point)	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.
--	---

Completed First College-Level Reading/Writing Course

RECOMMENDATION 4.5: Leave the base weight for Successfully Completed First College-Level Reading/Writing Course (1.0 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.
--	---

Complete 15 SCHs

RECOMMENDATION 4.6: Leave the base weight for 15 Successfully Completed SCHs (1.00 points).	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.
---	--

Complete First 15 SCHs as Dual Credit

RECOMMENDATION 4.7: <u>Award bonus points for students who Successfully Completed their first 15 SCHs as Dual Credit (0.50 point)</u>	Methodology: Accumulate student's successfully completed their first 15 SCHs as a dual credit student 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.
--	---

Complete 30 SCHs

RECOMMENDATION 4.8: Leave the base weight for 30 successfully completed SCHs (1.00 points).	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.
--	--

Degrees/Certificates Awarded

<u>RECOMMENDATION 4.9:</u> Leave the base weight for credentials completed (2.00 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).
---	--

Degrees/Certificates Awarded: Targeted Fields Bonus

<u>RECOMMENDATION 4.10:</u> Leave the 0.25 bonus for credentials completed in targeted (formerly critical) fields. (0.25 points).	Methodology: Additional point is awarded to a student who completes a degree or certificate in a targeted field identified as important for meeting the future needs of the state. Unduplicated degrees and certificates awarded in the fiscal year being measured are counted.
---	---

See Charge 3 Narrative for details on the proposed targeted field update process. Recommendation 3.1 proposes to change the name to Targeted Fields, away from Critical Fields. Recommendation 3.2 proposes adopting a consistent and timely process for updating targeted fields every two years to maintain alignment with the needs of the state.

Degrees/Certificates Awarded: Academically Disadvantaged Bonus

<u>RECOMMENDATION 4.11:</u> <u>Add 0.25 Success Points for completion of a credential by an academically disadvantaged student.</u>	Methodology: Additional point is awarded for academically disadvantaged degree/certificate completers (including those in targeted fields) as described in Recommendation 4.9 (above). Academically disadvantaged is defined as a student who has been identified as not college ready (by TSIA) at any point in the 10 years prior to obtaining the base Success Point for completion or transfer
--	---

Degrees/Certificates Awarded: Economically Disadvantaged Bonus

<u>RECOMMENDATION 4.12:</u> <u>Add 0.25 Success Points for completion of a credential by an economically disadvantaged student.</u>	Methodology: Additional point is awarded for economically disadvantaged degree/certificate completers (including those in targeted fields) as described in 4.9 (above). Economically disadvantaged is defined as a student who received Pell at any time in the 10 years prior to obtaining the base Success Point for completion or transfer. See note in Charge 4 above regarding the inclusion of other potential measures of economic status.
--	--

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. As such, the above recommendations are *respectfully submitted as an alternative to the Rider proposed weight of 1.20.*

Transfer

<p><u>RECOMMENDATION 4.13:</u> Leave the base weight for transfer to a general academic institution after completing 15 hours (2.00 points).</p>	<p>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.</p>
---	---

Transfer – Academically Disadvantaged

<p><u>RECOMMENDATION 4.14:</u> <u>Add 0.25 Success Points for transfer by an academically disadvantaged co-enrollment student</u></p>	<p>Methodology: Additional point is awarded for academically disadvantaged degree/certificate completers (including those in targeted fields) as described in Recommendation 4.9 (above).</p> <p>Academically disadvantaged is defined as a student who has been identified as not college ready (under TSI) as a First-Time in College (FTIC) student, provided the student was FTIC at any point in the 10 years prior to obtaining the base Success Point for completion or transfer.</p>
---	--

Transfer – Economically Disadvantaged

<p><u>RECOMMENDATION 4.15:</u> <u>Add 0.25 Success Points for transfer by an economically disadvantaged student.</u></p>	<p>Methodology: Point is awarded for economically disadvantaged transfers described in 4.13 (above) who is economically disadvantaged.</p> <p>Economically disadvantaged is defined as a student who received Pell at any time in the 10 years prior to obtaining the base Success Point for completion or transfer.</p> <p>See note in Charge 4 above regarding the inclusion of other potential measures of economic status.</p>
--	--

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

Co-Enrollment Transfer

RECOMMENDATION 4.16: Leave the base weight for transfer to a general academic institution after completing 15 hours (2.00 points).	Methodology: Point is awarded to a student who is enrolled in a THECB approved co-enrollment program who is subsequently found enrolled 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 3 years after entering the institution.
--	---

Co-Enrollment Transfer: Academically Disadvantaged

RECOMMENDATION 4.17: <u>Add 0.25 Success Points for transfer by an academically disadvantaged co-enrollment student</u>	Methodology: Additional point is awarded for co-enrollment transfers as described in 4.16 (above) who is academically disadvantaged. Academically disadvantaged is defined as a student who has been identified as not college ready (under TSI) when enrolling as a First-Time in College (FTIC) student.
--	--

Co-Enrollment Transfer: Economically Disadvantaged

RECOMMENDATION 4.18: <u>Add 0.25 Success Points for transfer by an economically disadvantaged student.</u>	Methodology: Additional point is awarded for co-enrollment transfers as described in 4.16 (above) who is economically disadvantaged. For this cohort, economically disadvantaged is defined as a student who received Pell as a First-Time in College (FTIC) student during the co-enrollment tracking window as described in 4.16 above. <i>See note in Charge 4 above regarding the inclusion of other potential measures of economic status.</i>
---	--

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

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