

# **Texas Community and Technical Colleges Funding Formulas for the FY 2022-2023 Biennium**

**Recommendations of the Community and  
Technical Colleges Formula Advisory  
Committee  
(CTCFAC)**

January 2020

## **Table of Contents**

Committee Background .....	2
Commissioner Charges and Committee Recommendations.....	2
Committee Membership.....	25
Committee Meeting Minutes.....	26

# Community and Technical Colleges Formula Advisory Committee (CTCFAC) Recommendation Report for the FY 2022-2023 Biennium

In accordance with the biennial Formula Advisory Committee process, the Community and Technical Colleges (CTCs) submit their report for consideration by the Commissioner of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB).

## Committee Background

The Commissioner of the THECB delivered his charge to the CTCFAC at its first meeting on August 14, 2019. The committee elected Dr. Pamela Anglin, President of Paris Junior College, as the chair and Dr. Jeremy McMillen, President of Grayson College, as the vice chair.

The CTCFAC held four additional meetings between October 2019 and January 2020. A list of CTCFAC members is provided in Attachment A. The minutes of the meetings are provided in Attachment B.

## Commissioner Charges and Committee Recommendations

The Community and Technical Colleges 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*. The CTCFAC's specific charges are to:

### Charge 1

Study and make recommendations for the appropriate funding levels for the contact hour, core, and the student success funding.

### Committee Recommendation for Community Colleges

<b>Community Colleges</b>	<b>2020-2021 Appropriations (millions)</b>	<b>2022-23 Appropriations (millions)</b>	<b>Change Amount (millions)</b>	<b>Percent Change</b>
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	\$118.4	7.7%
Bachelor of Applied Technology	\$3.2	\$3.7	\$0.5	14.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,833.2</b>	<b>\$2,038.6</b>	<b>\$205.3</b>	<b>11.2%</b>

- The committee recommends increasing the funding to Community Colleges for the 2022-2023 biennium to \$2,038.8 million, which is an increase of \$205.3 million, or 11.2 percent, compared to the 2020-2021 biennium.
- Fund Core Operations at \$2.0 million per community college district for the 2022-2023

biennium. This is an increase of \$32.0 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 weights to existing 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. Factor in 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 in weighted semester credit hours 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 \$3.7 million in 2022-23 or a 14.7 percent increase.

## Committee Recommendation for State Colleges

Sector	2020-2021 Appropriations (millions)	2022-23 Appropriations (millions)	Change Amount (millions)	Percent Change
Texas Public State Colleges	\$65.4	\$71.4	\$6.0	9.2%

- The committee recommends increasing the funding to the State College formulas for the 2022-2023 biennium to \$71.4 million, which is an increase of \$6.0 million, or 9.2 percent, as compared to the 2020-2021 biennium.
- Fund \$56.5 million to the State College Instruction and Administration formula for the 2022-23 biennium, which would be an increase of \$5.8 million, or 11.4 percent, compared to the \$50.7 million appropriated for the 2020-21 biennium.
  - ❖ This funding level assumes a rate of \$10.47 per contact hour, which is an increase of \$0.24, or 2.3 percent, compared to the \$10.23 funded for the 2020-21 biennium.
  - ❖ This funding level assumes a contact hour growth rate of 8.9 percent for the following reasons:
    - Continued expansion of co-enrollment into areas outside of the colleges' immediate boundaries.
    - Increased technical program offerings to traditional and co-enrolled students.
    - Expansion of prison credit offerings through a pilot PELL program.
    - Expansion of workforce programs to include realistic industrial training along with logistics and craft training.
    - Expansion through collaborative community involvement.
    - Implementation of an intervention plan focused on underserved populations.
    - Continued development and growth of online programs through aggressive marketing campaigns.
  - ❖ The recommendation includes an estimated \$9.8 million in statutory tuition and \$46.7 million in general revenue.

The increase will provide support for the *60X30TX* plan by:

- Allowing the continued collaborative efforts between the colleges and high school campuses for dual enrollment and promotion of college attainment.
- Continuing the development and implementation of programs based on the desirable skill needs of the local employer workforce.

- Implementation of guided pathways to improve retention and decrease student debt.
- Fund \$14.8 million to the Space Support formula and Small Institution supplement for the 2022-2023 biennium, which would be an increase of \$0.2 million compared to the 2020-21 biennium.
  - ❖ This funding level assumes a rate of \$5.45 per adjusted predicted square foot, representing an increase of \$0.12, or 2.3 percent, compared to the \$5.33 funded for the 2020-21 biennium. The funding level assumes a 0.9 percent increase for growth in adjusted predicted square feet between fall 2018 and fall 2020 and a 2.3 percent increase for inflation.
- Split the recommended Space Support rate between “utilities” and “operations and maintenance” components using FY 2020 utility rates, update the utility rate adjustment factors using the FY 2020 utilities expenditures, and allocate the Space Support formula using the fall 2020 predicted square feet.

Fund the Small Institution Supplement using the same methodology and rate as the 2020-21 biennium.

## 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.

### Committee Recommendation for Technical Colleges.

Sector	2020-2021 Appropriations (millions)	2022-2023 Appropriations (millions)	Change Amount (millions)	Percent Change
Texas Public Technical Colleges	\$163.8	\$164.1	\$0.4	0.2%

Administration and Instruction (A&I) and Space Support	2020-2021 Appropriations (millions)	2022-2023 Appropriations (millions)	Change Amount (millions)	Percent Change
General Revenue	\$145.0	\$145.3	\$0.4	0.2%
General Revenue-Dedicated	8.7	8.7	0.0	0%
All Funds	\$153.7	\$154.0	\$0.4	0.2%

Dual Credit contact hour	2020-2021 Appropriations (millions)	2022-2023 Appropriations (millions)	Change Amount (millions)	Percent Change
General Revenue	\$2.2	\$2.2	-\$0.0	-0.3%

<b>Small Institution Supplement</b>	<b>2020-2021 Appropriations (millions)</b>	<b>2022-2023 Appropriations (millions)</b>	<b>Change Amount (millions)</b>	<b>Percent Change</b>
General Revenue	\$7.9	\$7.9	\$0.0	0%

Fund \$155.4 million in general revenue and \$8.7 million in general revenue-dedicated for a total of \$164.1 million for the 2022-2023 biennium, an increase of \$0.4 million, or 0.2 percent.

- Fund \$132.3 million in general revenue and \$141.0 million in all funds to the Texas State Technical College System (TSTCS) return value formula for the 2022-2023 biennium, an increase of \$0.1 million, or 0.05 percent, compared to the all funds appropriation of \$140.9 million for the 2020-2021 biennium.
  - ❖ The \$164.1 million All Funds recommendation includes an estimated \$8.7 million in general revenue-dedicated (statutory tuition and fees), which is equal to the amount appropriated in the Administration and Instruction and Space Support formulas for the 2020-2021 biennium.
  - ❖ The \$132.3 million general revenue recommendation funds 36.1 percent of the \$367 million estimated 2012-2013 cohort Return Value, which is the same percentage of return value that was funded for the 2020-2021 biennium general revenue appropriation.
  - ❖ Fund \$7.9 million to the Small Institution Supplement using the same methodology and rate as the 2020-2021 biennium.
  - ❖ Fund \$2.2 million in general revenue for Dual Credit contact hours for the 2022-2023 biennium, a decrease of \$0.01 million, or -0.3 percent, from the current biennium.

### **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.**

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 86<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature in 2019). 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 nine 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 conjunction with 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 makes 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 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 makes 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 2022-23 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 2024-25 biennium 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. "Full" means funding for the three years in the measurement period. "Part" funding results from only the portion of the three-year average where the Targeted Field was active. This is recommended, 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 <sup>1</sup>	Full	Full	Part	
"4103"	Physical Science Technologies/Technicians <sup>1</sup>	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 2026-27 list. Keep in mind that this list is using current data and is meant as a forward looking view.

<b>CIP Code Field Name</b>	<b>CIP</b>
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 Services <sup>2</sup>	"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 Field 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.

### **Committee Recommendation 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 CTCFAC recommends an 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 \$22.0 million in increased funding, which includes investing more in progress toward credentials by dual credit students, credentials awarded, and transfer students. 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>	<b><u>\$215/pt. &amp; Targeted Field &amp; 7.5% Growth</u></b>	<b><u>Metrics Update</u></b>	<b><u>Total</u></b>
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**

<b>Success Point Type</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>Change</b>
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 percent,
- 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 maximum 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 maximum of 3.00 points could be earned for credentials awarded. This is a proposed alternative to the Rider which would have decreased non-Critical Field credential 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 maximum 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 earned in cases where all 15 hours are dual credit.

***Economically Disadvantaged*** is defined as a student who received Pell Grant funds 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**

	<b>Success Point Weights</b>		
	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>Rider</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
<b>COLLEGE READINESS</b>			
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
<b>FIRST COLLEGE LEVEL COURSE</b>			
Pass 1 <sup>st</sup> College Math Course	1.00 point	1.00 point	1.00 point
Pass 1 <sup>st</sup> College Reading Course	1.00 point	1.00 point	1.00 point
Pass 1 <sup>st</sup> College Writing Course	1.00 point	1.00 point	1.00 point
<b>PROGRESS TOWARD CREDENTIAL</b>			
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
<b>CREDENTIALS AWARDED</b>			
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>
<b>TRANSFER</b>			
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**

	<b><u>2020-21</u></b> <b><u>Appropriation</u></b>	<b><u>New</u></b> <b><u>Funding</u></b>	<b><u>2022-23</u></b> <b><u>Proposed</u></b>
<b>COLLEGE READINESS</b>			
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
<b>FIRST COLLEGE LEVEL COURSE</b>			
Pass 1 <sup>st</sup> College Math Course	\$25,949,622	\$3,652,494	\$29,602,115
Pass 1 <sup>st</sup> College Reading Course	\$21,065,030	\$2,964,947	\$24,029,977
Pass 1 <sup>st</sup> College Writing Course	\$17,535,519	\$2,468,168	\$20,003,687
<b>PROGRESS TOWARD CREDENTIAL</b>			
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
<b>CREDENTIALS AWARDED</b>			
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
<b>TRANSFER</b>			
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
<b>Total Success Points Funding</b>	<b>\$228,296,111</b>	<b>\$54,462,595</b>	<b>\$282,758,706</b>

**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><b>RECOMMENDATION 4.1:</b> 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><b>RECOMMENDATION 4.2:</b> 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><b>RECOMMENDATION 4.3:</b> 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

<b>RECOMMENDATION 4.4:</b> 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

<b>RECOMMENDATION 4.5:</b> 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

<b>RECOMMENDATION 4.6:</b> 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

<b>RECOMMENDATION 4.7:</b> <b>Add 0.50 Success Points for students who Successfully Completed their first 15 SCHs as Dual Credit (0.50 point).</b>	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

<b>RECOMMENDATION 4.8:</b> 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

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

## Degrees/Certificates Awarded: Targeted Fields Bonus

<p><b><u>RECOMMENDATION 4.10:</u></b> Leave the 0.25 bonus for credentials completed in targeted (formerly critical) fields. (0.25 points).</p>	<p>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></p>
---	--

## Degrees/Certificates Awarded: Academically Disadvantaged Bonus

<p><b><u>RECOMMENDATION 4.11:</u></b> <b><u>Add 0.50 Success Points for completion of a credential by an academically disadvantaged student.</u></b></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>
--	--

## Degrees/Certificates Awarded: Economically Disadvantaged Bonus

<p><b><u>RECOMMENDATION 4.12:</u></b> <b><u>Add 0.50 Success Points for completion of a credential by an economically disadvantaged student.</u></b></p>	<p>Methodology: Additional point is awarded for economically disadvantaged degree/certificate completers (including those in Targeted Fields) as described in 4.9 (above).</p> <p>Economically disadvantaged is defined as a student who received Pell Grant funding 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.</p>
--	---

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><b><u>RECOMMENDATION 4.13:</u></b>          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><b><u>RECOMMENDATION 4.14:</u></b>  <b><u>Add 0.50 Success Points for transfer by an academically disadvantaged co-enrollment student</u></b></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><b><u>RECOMMENDATION 4.15:</u></b>  <b><u>Add 0.50 Success Points for transfer by an economically disadvantaged student.</u></b></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 Grant funding 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

<b>RECOMMENDATION 4.16:</b> 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

<b>RECOMMENDATION 4.17:</b> <b><u>Add 0.50 Success Points for transfer by an academically disadvantaged co-enrollment student</u></b>	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

<b>RECOMMENDATION 4.18:</b> <b><u>Add 0.50 Success Points for transfer by an economically disadvantaged student.</u></b>	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 Grant funding 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.

## Charge 5

Study and make recommendations for the appropriate methodology for including the second 8-week courses in the base period.

### **Committee Recommendation for including the second 8-week courses in the base period**

The following recommendation is made for formula funding of 8-week courses if the reporting of actuals is not an option. Pushing reporting due dates further out would assist in the reporting of actual contact hours, which is preferred.

1. Use the time periods previously used for all courses except for those that are second 8 weeks.
  - a. Initial Run – In Fall
    - i. Previous Spring-Certified
    - ii. Summer 1-Certified
    - iii. Summer 2-Certified
    - iv. Current Fall-Error Free
  - b. Final Run – In Spring
    - i. Previous Summer 1-Certified
    - ii. Previous Summer 2-Certified
    - iii. Fall-Certified
    - iv. Spring-Error Free
  
2. To fill the missing second 8 -week data for the initial run (the data will not be available in time for formula funding deadlines)), staff will utilize previously certified data from the prior fall 8 week sessions using those data to proxy the missing data using a ratio approach. For the final run, previous spring data will be used to proxy the missing data using a ratio approach. See details below:
  - a. Initial Run
    - i. Previous Fall 1 and Fall 2 – Certified (used for proxy; see step vi)
    - ii. Previous Spring-Certified (both 8 week sessions)
    - iii. Summer 1-Certified
    - iv. Summer 2-Certified
    - v. Current Fall 1-Error Free
    - vi. Use a ratio from Previous Fall 1 Certified/Previous Fall 2-Certified
    - vii. Apply ratio to current Fall 1 error free to proxy missing data for current Fall 2
  - b. Final Run
    - i. Previous Spring 1 and Spring 2 – Certified (used for Proxy; see step vi)



- ii. Previous Summer 1-Certified
- iii. Previous Summer 2-Certified
- iv. Fall-Certified
- v. Spring 1-Error Free
- vi. Ratio from Previous Spring 1-Certified/Previous Spring 2-Certified
- vii. Apply ratio to current Spring 1 error free to proxy missing data for current Spring 2

This proposal is for formula funding. There are other considerations in allowing institutions to report 8-week courses on the beginning of semester fall and spring CBM reports versus reporting them as Flex courses the following semester (which has always been allowed). The Coordinating Board will provide a truncated reporting schedule for institutions that wish to include these courses in their fall headcount (on the CBM001 and 004). Note that a schedule with 10-week courses followed by 6-week courses, would not allow sufficient time for reporting enrollments in the 6-week session on the beginning of semester reports. Fortunately, schools are more interested in offering either 8-week courses or offering 16-week and 12-week courses – with the 12-week courses starting 4 weeks into the semester (which allows plenty of time for reporting and inclusion in error-free formula runs).

### **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.

### **Committee Recommendation for defining a Structured Co-enrollment Program**

“A Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board recognized program structured through a binding written agreement between a general academic institution and a community college. Under such a program students will be admitted to both institutions and recognized as having matriculated to both institutions concurrently.”

Attachment A - Committee Membership

Committee Membership

**Dr. Pamela Anglin, Chair**

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

## **Committee Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting of the Community and Technical Colleges Formula Advisory Committee  
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board  
Lone Star Room, Second Floor  
1200 East Anderson Lane, Austin  
Wednesday, August 19, 2019  
1:35 p.m.**

### Minutes

Attendees: Ms. Teri Crawford, Dr. Cesar Maldonado, Dr. Brent Wallace, Ms. Mary Wickland, Mr. Jim Yeonopolus, Mr. Michael Reeser, Dr. Robert Riza, Dr. Pamela Anglin, Dr. Jeremy McMillen, Dr. Phil Rhodes and Ms. Mary Elizondo

Absent: Mr. Richard Cervantes and Mr. Patrick Lee

THECB Staff: Mr. Roland Gilmore

1. The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m.
2. Ms. Teri Crawford nominated Dr. Pamela Anglin for chair; Dr. Brent Wallace seconded, committee approval by acclamation; there were no member objections to Dr. Pamela Anglin as committee chair.
3. Mr. Jim Yeonopolus nominated Dr. Jeremy McMillen for Vice Chair; Dr. Robert Riza seconded, committee approval by acclamation; there were no member objections to Dr. Jeremy McMillen as vice chair.
4. Dr. Pamela Anglin announced the departure of Dr. Van Miller and introduced Ms. Mary Elizondo and Dr. Brent Wallace as new committee members
5. Mr. Gilmore provided a brief overview of the funding formulas.
6. The chair reviewed the Commissioner's 2022-2023 biennium charges and asked committee members to indicate their preference for working on the charges.
  - a. Charge 1 – Study and make recommendation for the appropriate funding levels for the contact hour, core, and the student success funding.
  - b. 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.
  - c. Charge 3 – Study and make recommendations on the efficacy of critical need fields as they relate to contact hour and Success Point funding.
  - d. 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.

Attachment B - Committee Meeting Minutes

- e. Charge 5 –Study and make recommendations for the appropriate methodology for including the second 8-week courses in the base period.
- f. 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.

Work groups and members were determined as follows:

- A. Charge 1– Wickland (lead), Crawford, Cervantes, Anglin and Elizondo.
  - B. Charge 2 – Reeser (lead), Wallace, Wickland and Riza.
  - C. Charges 3, 4 and 6 – McMillen (lead), Maldonado, Yeonopolus, Cervantes, Reeser and Rhodes.
  - D. Charge 5 – Wallace (lead), Crawford, Wickland, Yeonopolus, and McMillen.
7. The chair asked the committee if the future meeting dates and times distributed with the agenda were acceptable to the committee.
- a. September 19<sup>th</sup> meeting was canceled in favor of workgroup meetings with the time, place and method to be determined with work group leads.
  - b. October 17<sup>th</sup> meeting was changed to October 14<sup>th</sup>, if available.
  - c. November 7<sup>th</sup> meeting was moved to November 6<sup>th</sup>, from 1 p.m. to 3 p.m.
  - d. December 5<sup>th</sup> meeting was moved to December 4<sup>th</sup>, from 1 p.m. to 3 p.m.
  - e. January 9<sup>th</sup> meeting remained the same, if needed.
8. The chair called for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Jim Yeonopolus motioned for adjournment, Dr. Robert Riza seconded, and the meeting was adjourned at 2:23 p.m. The committee will next convene on October 14, 2019, at a time to be determined.

Prepared by Roland Gilmore

**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  
Monday, October 14, 2019  
10:00 a.m.**

Minutes

Attendees: Ms. Teri Crawford, Mr. Patrick Lee, Mr. Richard Cervantes, Mr. Michael Reeser, Dr. Pamela Anglin, Dr. Jeremy McMillen, Dr. Phil Rhodes and Ms. Mary Elizondo

Phone conference: Dr. Brent Wallace, Ms. Mary Wickland, and Dr. Robert Riza

Absent: Dr. Cesar Maldonado and Mr. Jim Yeonopolus

THECB Staff: Mr. David Young, Ms. Jennifer Gonzales and Mr. Roland Gilmore

Phone conference: Dr. Julie Eklund

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 August 19, 2019, meeting. Dr. Jeremy McMillen motioned, Ms. Teri Crawford seconded, committee approval 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 stated the workgroup will recommend for Lamar State Colleges an increase for contact hour funding, minimal increase for space support, and no increase for the Small Institution Supplement.
  - II. Dr. Anglin stated the workgroup will recommend increases for the Community College funding in the area of core funding, contact hour funding, and Success Point funding; and it will recommend no increase in the rate for Bachelor of Applied Technology (BAT) programs.
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. Mr. Reeser stated the workgroup reviewed the THECB staff projections and will have a funding recommendation to present to the Committee for the November meeting.

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 stated that the committee workgroup and the TACC workgroup met and discussed refreshing the list of critical need fields.
  - II. Dr. McMillen mentioned the work of the THECB in the refreshing the critical need fields list, and the workgroup was cautioned by Dr. Eklund that any refreshing of the current list could lead to a shorter list.
  - III. Dr. McMillen also suggested that there was the need to discuss a time frame to be applied to a critical need fields and how long it should remain on the list.
  - IV. Dr. Eklund added that time was spent with Ms. Vega at the Texas Workforce Commission reviewing a proposed methodology for developing a critical need field's list for the committee's review. The methodology was consistent with one proposed to the CTCFAC committee that met prior to the last session. Because tools are being continually updated, staff wanted to get outside input on the proposed approach.
  
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 stated that the workgroup met and visited about the impact of changes adopted by the Legislature this year related to Success Point funding, including additions to Critical Fields and the addition of co-enrollment.
  - II. Dr. McMillen stated that feedback was received from community college presidents about the weights that were outlined in the rider in the last biennium. Generally the feedback was cautionary against devaluing the credentials, awards and certificates they are not in Critical Fields.
  - III. Dr. McMillen stated there was discussion around proposed alternatives by the TACC metrics task force.
  - IV. Dr. McMillen stated that the TACC metrics task force offered a number of additional items for consideration. The first would give a Success Point for 12 hours of credit vs. 15 hours. The second focused on adding half of a Success Point for economically and academically disadvantaged students to the Success Point category for degrees, core completers and certificates.
  - V. Ms. Crawford asked for clarification on academically and economically disadvantaged students. Dr. McMillen responded explaining academically disadvantaged students were those who had not met the TSI upon entry to college. Dr. McMillen also stated that economically disadvantage students would

be those that would be Pell eligible, as far back as 10 years, which was confirmed by Dr. Eklund.

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 stated the initial definition provided by the THECB staff was acceptable with minor changes to the wording regarding “agreement”.
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 stated the workgroup contacted several colleges that are preparing to offer 8-week courses.
  - II. Dr. Wallace also stated that the workgroup felt the original methodology was fairly accurate. The workgroup will stick with the original piloted methodology with limited changes and will be bringing a formal recommendation to the committee at the next meeting.
8. The vice 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, Dr. Robert Riza motioned, Mr. Richard Cervantes seconded, committee approved by acclamation. The committee adjourned at 10:20 a.m. and will next convene on November 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019, at 10:00 a. m.

Prepared by Roland Gilmore

**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 4<sup>th</sup>, 2019, at 1:00 p. m.

Prepared by Roland Gilmore

**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)).
  - V. 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.
  - VI. 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.
  - VII. 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.

- V. Dr. McMillen briefed the committee on the Charge 3 Work Group’s recommendation for critical need fields as they relate to Success Point funding.
- VI. 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.
- VII. 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 CTCFAC study the issue.
- VIII. 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))

- V. Dr. McMillen briefed the committee on the recommendations for the appropriate number of points to be awarded for each Success Point metric.
- VI. 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.
- VII. 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

**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.**

Minutes

Attendees: Ms. Teri Crawford, Dr. Cesar Maldonado, Dr. Brent Wallace, Mr. Patrick Lee, Mr. Richard Cervantes, Mr. Jim Yeonopolus, Dr. Pamela Anglin, and Dr. Jeremy McMillen

Phone conference: Mr. Michael Reeser, Dr. Phil Rhodes, and Ms. Mary Elizondo

Absent: Ms. Mary Wickland and Dr. Robert Riza

THECB Staff: Dr. Julie Eklund, 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 December 4, 2019, meeting. As there were not, Dr. Brent Wallace motioned for approval, Mr. Jim Yeonopolus seconded, and the committee approved by acclamation.
2. 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.
  - IX. Dr. McMillen briefed the committee on the Charge 3 Work Group’s recommendation for critical need fields as they relate to Success Point funding.
  - X. 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 CTCFAC study the issue.
  - XI. 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. Mr. Jim Yeonopolus motioned, Mr. Richard Cervantes seconded, and the committee approved by acclamation.
3. 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 two draft recommendations for the appropriate number of points to be awarded for each Success Point metric. Alternative recommendation one would move all new Success Point category metrics to 0.50. Alternative recommendation two would move all new Success Point category metrics to 0.25 and the dual credit Success Point to 0.50.

- II. The chair asked for a motion to approve the charge 4 alternative one recommendation for the community colleges. Dr. Brent Wallace motioned, Ms. Teri Crawford seconded, and the committee approved by acclamation.
4. 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 alternative one funding recommendation for the community colleges.
  - II. Dr. Anglin said that based on discretion the committee gave her at the last meeting to adjust contact hour funding, she was recommending an increase in the rate from \$5.44 to \$5.83.
  - III. The chair asked for a motion to approve the Charge one funding recommendation for the community colleges. Jim Yeonopolus motioned, Mr. Richard Cervantes seconded, and the committee approved by acclamation.
5. Discussion of final committee report.
  - VIII. The chair asked for a motion to approve the committee final report. Ms. Teri Crawford motioned, Dr. Phil Rhodes seconded, and the committee approved by acclamation.
6. The chair asked for a motion to approve the committee chair and vice chair to have final review and approval for any edits to the adopted recommendations, January meeting minutes, and the final Committee Report. Dr. Brent Wallace motioned, Mr. Jim Yeonopolus seconded, and the committee approved by acclamation.

The chair asked for a motion to adjourn; Mr. Jim Yeonopolus motioned, Dr. Brent Wallace seconded, and the committee approved by acclamation. The committee adjourned at 1:16 p.m.

Prepared by Roland Gilmore