# KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS ACADEMIC AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE AGENDA

# **December 12, 2018**

# 10:45 am – noon

The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee will meet in the Board Room located in the Curtis State Office Building at 1000 SW Jackson, Suite 520, Topeka, Kansas, 66612.

# I. Call To Order

Α.	Approve Minutes from the November 26, 2018, committee	Regent Brandau-Murguia	p. 2
	meeting		

# II. New Business

Α.	BAASC 19-02 Approval of Performance Reports for	Jean Redeker, KBOR	р. З
	Academic Year 2017	Institutional representative	
В.	Act on Naming of Academic Unit	Charles Taber, KSU	p. 36

# III. Next BAASC Meeting

January 7, 2019, teleconference at 11:30 am

# IV. Adjourn

Meeting Dates	Location	Time	Agenda Materials Due
January 7, 2019	Conference Call	11:30 am	December 17, 2018
January 16, 2019	Topeka	10:30 am	December 28, 2018
February 4, 2019	Conference Call	11:30 am	January 21, 2019
March 4, 2019	Conference Call	11:30 am	February 18, 2019
March 20, 2019	Topeka	10:30 am	March 1, 2019
April 1, 2019	Conference Call	11:30 am	March 18, 2019
April 29, 2019	Conference Call	11:30 am	April 15, 2019
May 15, 2019 (tentative)	Topeka	10:30 am	April 26, 2019
June 3, 2019	Conference Call	11:30 am	May 20, 2019
June 19, 2019 (tentative)	Topeka	10:30 am	May 31, 2019

# **Meeting Schedule**

# Kansas Board of Regents Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee

# MINUTES Monday, November 26, 2018

The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee of the Kansas Board of Regents met by conference call at 11:35 a.m. on Monday, November 26, 2018.

# In Attendance:

Members:	Regent Murguia	Regent Thomas	Regent Van Etten	Regent Schmidt
Staff:	Jean Redeker Max Fridell	Karla Wiscombe Natalie Yoza	Sam Christy-Dangermond	Julene Miller
Institutions Re	presented:			
	Barton CC	Cloud County CC	Coffeyville CC	Cowley CC
	Highland CC	Hutchinson CC	KSU	KU
	KUMC	Pratt CC	PSU	WSU

The meeting was called to order at 11:35 a.m.

# **Approval of Minutes**

Regent Thomas moved to approve the September 19<sup>th</sup> and October 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting minutes. Following the second of Regent Van Etten, the motion passed.

# Agenda Planning for December 12th Board Meeting

• Jean Redeker presented the request for approval for a Master of Human Resource Management at Wichita State University. Rick Muma, WSU, was available to answer questions.

Regent Van Etten moved the Master of Human Resource Management at WSU be placed on the Board agenda. Regent Thomas seconded, and the motion carried.

• Jean Redeker presented the request for the Continuance of Dr. Juergen Richt, KSU, as a Regents Distinguished Professor.

Regent Thomas moved to place the request for the Continuance of Dr. Juergen Richt, KSU, as a Regents Distinguished Professor on the Board agenda. Regent Van Etten seconded, and the motion carried.

# **Other Board Matters**

A. BAASC 19-02 Approval of Performance Reports for Academic Year 2017 was presented by Jean Redeker for the following institutions:

University/College	Funding Recommendation
Kansas State University	100% funding
University of Kansas Medical Center	100% funding
Wichita State University	100% funding
Cloud County Community College	100% funding
Manhattan Area Technical College	100% funding
Salina Area Technical College	100% funding

Discussion was held, and Rick Muma answered questions about WSU's retention rates. Regents had questions for MATC about indicators related to developmental education and students retained/completing. Jean Redeker will contact the college and forward its response to BAASC.

Regent Murguia moved that the above listed institutions receive the recommended funding. Following the second of Regent Van Etten, the motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 12:12 p.m.

# Act on Performance Reports for Institutions at Less Than 100% Funding

Summary: In accordance with K.S.A. 74-3202d and the Board-approved Performance Agreement Guidelines and Procedures, eight Academic Year 2017 Performance Reports are presented for action. These eight institutions qualify for less than 100% of any new funding, but as outlined in policy, are requesting to move to the next higher funding tier. December 12, 2018

# Background

Any new funding awarded is dependent upon the institution's compliance with its Board-approved performance agreement. Institutions submitted reports to Board staff on performance for Academic Year 2017; these reports will be the basis of awarding any new funds in July 2019. It is important to note that funds designated by the Legislature for a specific institution or purpose are exempted from these performance funding provisions.

Staff provided a preliminary review and shared any concerns with the institution who subsequently revised the report and resubmitted.

As per a policy<sup>1</sup> change approved in September 2017, in cases where an institution qualifies for the 0%, 75%, or 90% funding tier, the institution may make a case to move to the next higher funding tier. In such cases, an institution chooses one indicator for which it did not maintain or improve from the established baseline and submits evidence to BAASC that the indicator meets one or more of the following alternative evaluation criteria:

- Sustained excellence;
- Improvement from the prior year;
- Ranking on the indicator based on a relevant peer group;
- Improved performance using a three-year rolling average of the most recent three years; and/or
- Any extenuating circumstances beyond the control of the institution.

BAASC will review the evidence and determine if an institution warrants recommended funding at the next higher funding tier. If such a determination is made, the institution shall only be recommended for funding at the next higher funding tier and shall not qualify for funding tiers beyond that.

#### Request

Eight institutions qualify for less than 100% of any new funding based on their AY 2017 Performance Report, but as outlined in policy, are requesting to move to the next higher funding tier. Their requests and respective AY 2017 Performance Report follow.

University/College	Qualifies for:	Requesting:	Page
University of Kansas	90% funding	100% funding	4
Barton Community College	90% funding	100% funding	8
Coffeyville Community College	90% funding	100% funding	12
Dodge City Community College	90% funding	100% funding	16
Butler Community College	75% funding	90% funding	20
Independence Community College	75% funding	90% funding	24
Seward Community College	75% funding	90% funding	28
Pratt Community College	0% funding	75% funding	32

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Kansas Board of Regents. Performance agreements: Funding guidelines. Retrieved from: <u>https://www.kansasregents.org/resources/PDF/2441-Revised funding guidelines Sept 21 2017.pdf</u>

University of Kansas	Currently at 90% funding;
	Requesting 100% funding

Indicator number and title: Indicator 6: Increase Level of Philanthropic Support

**Identify alternative evaluation criteria being used:** Improved performance using a three-year rolling average of the most recent three years

# Justification:

Below is a display of KU's philanthropic support as submitted in the performance agreement. In FY 2015, KU received an extraordinary one-time gift of \$58 million, which impacted the baseline. Private giving has remained high but the inclusion of FY 2015 in the baseline created a challenging amount to surpass.

FY 2013	\$169 M
FY 2014	\$162 M
FY 2015	\$220 M
Baseline:	\$183.7 M

Philanthropic support for the following two years was as follows:

FY 2016	\$187.2 M
FY 2017	\$171.7 M

For the 2017 performance agreement, the FY 2017 amount of \$171.7 M did not exceed the baseline amount of \$183.7 M.

However, using a three-year rolling average over the time period of the performance agreement (displayed below), the three-year average for FY 2015-FY2017 of \$193 M, exceeds the baseline and the prior year. Using this analytical convention, we respectfully request the 100% funding tier.

FY 2013-FY 2015	\$183.7 M – performance agreement baseline
FY 2014-FY 2016	\$189.7 M
FY 2015-FY 2017	\$193.0 M – includes the year under review

Three-year rolling averages calculations:

FY 2013-FY 2015	169 + 162 + 220 = 551/3 = 183.7  M
FY 2014-FY 2016	\$162 + \$220 + \$187 = \$569/3 = \$189.7 M
FY 2015-FY 2017	\$220 + \$187 + \$172 = \$579/3 = \$193.0 M

	e Report AY 2017						22,506
	Phone and email: 785-864-4904/ <u>clejuez@ku</u>	.edu				Date: 7/18/2018	
Foresight Goals	3yr History	AY 2017 (Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017)		(Summ	er 2017,	(Summe	r 2018,
		Institutional Performance	Outcome	Institutional Performance	Outcome	Institutional Performance	Outcome
	AY 2014 5,771 AY 2015 5,587	5,909	Î				
	Fall 13 Cohort: 80.5% (3,191/3,964) Fall 14 Cohort: 80.1% (3,237/4,043)	83.0% (3,491/4,204)	Î				
2	AY2013 29.9% (1,789/5,974) AY2014 29.0% (1,675/5,771) AY2015 29.6% (1,654/5,587) Baseline: 29.5% (5,118/17,332)	29.9% (1,765/5,909)	Ť				
	FY 2013 38 <sup>th</sup> FY 2014 38 <sup>th</sup>	46th	Ļ				
	FY 2014 1,199 FY 2015 1,257	1,029	ţ				
	FY 2014 \$162 M	\$171.7 M	ţ				
	Foresight Goals          1         1         2         3         2         3         2         3	Foresight Goals         Jyr History           1         AY 2013 5,974 AY 2014 5,771 AY 2015 5,587 Baseline: 5,777           1         Fall 12 Cohort: 80.0% (2,989/3,736) Fall 13 Cohort: 80.5% (3,191/3,964) Fall 13 Cohort: 80.5% (3,191/3,964) Fall 14 Cohort: 80.1% (3,237/4,043) Baseline: 80.2% (9,417/11,743)           2         AY2013 29.9% (1,789/5,974) AY2014 29.0% (1,675/5,771) AY2015 29.6% (1,654/5,587) Baseline: 29.5% (5,118/17,332)           3         FY 2012 38 <sup>th</sup> FY 2013 38 <sup>th</sup> FY 2013 38 <sup>th</sup> FY 2014 38 <sup>th</sup> Baseline: 38 <sup>th</sup> 2         FY 2013 930 FY 2014 1,199 FY 2015 1,257 Baseline: 1,129           3         FY 2013 \$169 M FY 2014 \$162 M FY 2014 \$162 M FY 2015 \$220 M	Foresight Goals         3yr History         (Summer Fall 2016, Sp Institutional Performance           1         AY 2013 5,974 AY 2014 5,771 AY 2015 5,587 Baseline: 5,777         Institutional Performance           1         Fall 2016, Sp AY 2015 5,587 Baseline: 5,777         \$3.0%           1         Fall 12 Cohort: 80.0% (2,989/3,736) Fall 13 Cohort: 80.5% (3,191/3,964) Fall 14 Cohort: 80.1% (3,237/4,043) Baseline: 80.2% (9,417/11,743)         \$3.0%           2         AY2013 29.9% (1,789/5,974) AY2014 29.0% (1,675/5,771) AY2015 29.6% (1,654/5,587) Baseline: 29.5% (5,118/17,332)         29.9%           3         FY 2012 38 <sup>th</sup> FY 2013 38 <sup>th</sup> FY 2014 38 <sup>th</sup> Baseline: 38 <sup>th</sup> 46th           2         FY 2013 930 FY 2014 1,199 FY 2015 1,257 Baseline: 1,129         1,029           3         FY 2013 \$169 M FY 2014 \$162 M FY 2015 \$220 M         \$171.7 M	AY 2017 (Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017)         Institutional Performance         1       AY 2013 5,974 AY 2014 5,771 AY 2015 5,587 Baseline: $5,777$ Institutional Performance       Outcome         1       Fall 12 Cohort: $80.0\%$ (2,989/3,736) Fall 13 Cohort: $80.5\%$ (3,191/3,964) Fall 14 Cohort: $80.1\%$ (3,237/4,043) Baseline: $80.2\%$ (9,417/11,743) $83.0\%$ (3,491/4,204) $\uparrow$ 2       AY2013 29.9% (1,789/5,974) AY2015 29.6% (1,654/5,587) Baseline: 29.5% (5,118/17,332) $29.9\%$ (1,765/5,909) $\uparrow$ 3       FY 2012 38 <sup>th</sup> FY 2013 38 <sup>th</sup> FY 2014 38 <sup>th</sup> Baseline: 38 <sup>th</sup> $46th$ $\downarrow$ 2       FY 2013 930 FY 2014 1,199 FY 2015 1,257 Baseline: 1,129 $1,029$ $\downarrow$ 3       FY 2013 \$169 M FY 2014 \$162 M FY 2015 \$220 M $$171.7 M$ $\downarrow$	AY 2017       AY 2017       AY 2017         Gradia       AY 2017       AY 2017       AY 2017       Symmetry 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017)         Institutional Performance       Outcome       Institutional Performance         1       AY 2013 5,974 $5,909$ $\uparrow$ Institutional Performance         1       AY 2014 5,771 $5,909$ $\uparrow$ Institutional Performance         1       Fall 12 Cohort: 80.0% (2,989/3,736) $83.0\%$ $\uparrow$ Institutional Performance         1       Fall 12 Cohort: 80.0% (2,989/3,736) $83.0\%$ $\uparrow$ $\uparrow$ 1       Fall 12 Cohort: 80.0% (2,989/3,736) $83.0\%$ $\uparrow$ $\uparrow$ 1       Fall 12 Cohort: 80.0% (2,989/3,736) $83.0\%$ $\uparrow$ $\uparrow$ 1       Fall 12 Cohort: 80.0% (3,191/3,964) $(3,491/4,204)$ $\uparrow$ $\uparrow$ 2       AY2013 29.9% (1,789/5,974) $3,491/4,204$ $\uparrow$ $\uparrow$ 3       FY 2013 29.9% (1,675/5,771) $A2015 29.5\%$ (5,118/17,332) $29.9\%$ $\uparrow$ $\downarrow$ 3       FY 2013 38 <sup>th</sup> FY 2014 38 <sup>th</sup> $I_1,029$ $\downarrow$	AY 2017       AY 2017       AY 2018         (Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017)       AY 2018         Goals       Institutional Performance       Outcome         1       AY 2013 5,974 AY 2013 5,577 Baseline: 5,777       5,909 $\uparrow$ Institutional Performance       Institutional Performance       Institutional Performance       Outcome       Institutional Performance       Institutional Performance <td>Foresight Geals     AY 2017 (Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017)     AY 2018 (Summer 2017, Fall 2017, Spring 2018)     AY 2 (Summer 2017, Fall 2017, Spring 2018)       1     AY 2013 5,974 AY 2013 5,974 AY 2014 5,771 AY 2015 5,587 Baseline: 5,777     5,909     ↑     Institutional Performance     Institutional Performance       1     AY 2013 5,974 AY 2014 5,587 Baseline: 5,777     5,909     ↑      Institutional Performance       1     Fall 12 Cohort: 80.0% (2,989/3,736) Fall 13 Cohort: 80.5% (3,191/3,964) Fall 13 Cohort: 80.5% (3,191/3,964) Fall 13 Cohort: 80.5% (3,274,043) Baseline: 80.2% (9,417/11,743)     83.0% (3,491/4,204)     ↑       2     AY2013 29.9% (1,789/5,974) AY2015 29.6% (1,654/5,587) Baseline: 29.5% (5,118/17,332)     29.9% (1,765/5,909)     ↑       3     FY 2013 38<sup>h</sup> FY 2013 38<sup>h</sup> FY 2013 31<sup>h</sup> FY 2014 3169 FY 2014 1,199 FY 2014 1,199 FY 2015 1,257 Baseline: 1,129     1,029     ↓       3     FY 2013 \$169 M FY 2013 \$169 M FY 2015 \$162 M FY 2015 \$220 M     \$171.7 M FY 2015 \$220 M     \$171.7 M FY 2015 \$220 M</td>	Foresight Geals     AY 2017 (Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017)     AY 2018 (Summer 2017, Fall 2017, Spring 2018)     AY 2 (Summer 2017, Fall 2017, Spring 2018)       1     AY 2013 5,974 AY 2013 5,974 AY 2014 5,771 AY 2015 5,587 Baseline: 5,777     5,909     ↑     Institutional Performance     Institutional Performance       1     AY 2013 5,974 AY 2014 5,587 Baseline: 5,777     5,909     ↑      Institutional Performance       1     Fall 12 Cohort: 80.0% (2,989/3,736) Fall 13 Cohort: 80.5% (3,191/3,964) Fall 13 Cohort: 80.5% (3,191/3,964) Fall 13 Cohort: 80.5% (3,274,043) Baseline: 80.2% (9,417/11,743)     83.0% (3,491/4,204)     ↑       2     AY2013 29.9% (1,789/5,974) AY2015 29.6% (1,654/5,587) Baseline: 29.5% (5,118/17,332)     29.9% (1,765/5,909)     ↑       3     FY 2013 38 <sup>h</sup> FY 2013 38 <sup>h</sup> FY 2013 31 <sup>h</sup> FY 2014 3169 FY 2014 1,199 FY 2014 1,199 FY 2015 1,257 Baseline: 1,129     1,029     ↓       3     FY 2013 \$169 M FY 2013 \$169 M FY 2015 \$162 M FY 2015 \$220 M     \$171.7 M FY 2015 \$220 M     \$171.7 M FY 2015 \$220 M

# **University of Kansas Performance Report AY 2017**

# Indicator 1: Number of Degrees Awarded

# <u>Description:</u>

This indicator records the number of degrees that are conferred.

The degrees we award represent KU's greatest contribution to the State of Kansas, our graduates.

By improving the student experience, we hope to improve our retention rate and ultimately the number of degrees awarded.

# Outcome/Results:

KU has had a steady increase in degrees awarded in recent years. Our entering new frosh class has increased/held steady the past several years and our retention rates are improving so we anticipate that the number of certificates and degrees will continue to increase or hold study in the near future.

# **Indicator 2: First to Second Year Retention Rates**

# Description:

This indicator records the percent of first-time, full-time freshmen who are retained after one year.

Successful completion of the first year is critical to continuing enrollment and eventual graduation. This period is when more students discontinue their studies than any other.

# Outcome/Results:

KU had a notable increase in first to second year retention rates with the increase in admission standards and enhanced support services, including advising, to help students be successful. We hope that the retention efforts we have implemented will enable this increase to be maintained.

# **Indicator 3: Percent of Degrees Awarded in STEM Fields**

# <u>Description:</u>

This indicator records the percent of students who earned degrees in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics fields.

STEM education is crucial for Kansas workforce development to meet the needs of the state economy.

KU is working to increase the number of STEM degrees and certificates awarded by increasing the number of students entering the School of Engineering. KU will receive funding from the state from 2012 through 2021 through the Keeping Kansas Competitive Engineering Initiative.

Redesign of basic science and mathematics courses will increase student success and graduation in science fields.

# Outcome/Results:

KU's progress in increasing the percent of degrees awarded in STEM fields is in part due to the increase in engineering students and the additional support staff focused on student recruitment, retention, and support activities for these students. KU is also redesigning basic science and mathematics courses in order to increase student success and graduation in these fields.

# Indicator 4: Federally Financed Research and Development Expenditures Rankings among Public Institutions

# Description:

This is our ranking of the amount of federally financed research and development expenditures we receive compared with other national public universities based on the NSF survey.

# Outcome/Results:

KU's drop in the federally financed research and development expenditures ranking is largely being driven by losses of a few key researchers, as opposed to a larger systemic change in research funding and productivity. These losses were most notable in Medicinal Chemistry, which saw the loss of five researchers in the past several years. Three of them departed KU in FY 2015 for positions that are more competitive and had \$43.6 million in active grants at the time they left KU. Another two

researchers left KU the following two years and had \$10.4 million in active grants at departure. Additionally, with the steady decline in federal funding for research in recent years, we have engaged in a strategic effort to diversify our research funding streams. Specifically, our faculty have been seeking research funding from state governments, business, industry, and foundations. Federal research historically comprised 60% of our total research funding (FY 2012) but now stands at 50% of our total research funding due to efforts of our faculty to look beyond federal agencies for support. Thus, we requested an amendment to our performance agreement for the remaining two years to use total research funding. BAASC on behalf of KBOR approved our request on June 20, 2018.

# Indicator 5: Commercialization and Entrepreneurship (e.g., license agreements & confidential disclosures)

# Description:

The leading indicators of the university's knowledge-based entrepreneurial culture include the protection and licensing of KU faculty intellectual property. This indicator includes currently active confidential disclosure agreements, currently active inter-institutional agreements, currently active license agreements, new invention disclosures, and new material transfer agreements. An example of a material transfer agreement would entail the transfer of proprietary animal cells to a company for a fee each time cells are transferred for specific use. KU retains the ownership of the material being transferred. Through such licenses and agreements, the University's research discovery and innovation is brought to the public.

# Outcome/Results:

The overall indicators for Commercialization and Entrepreneurship are down because of a large drop in active confidential disclosure agreements. Active confidential disclosure agreements cover a variety of activities: research, service, commercialization, employment, consulting, committees, etc. and for a specified time period. In FY 2017, 200 more CDAs ended than started. While confidential disclosure agreements are not the most significant of the five indicators in showing progress toward increased commercialization and entrepreneurship, it is the one with largest magnitude. The other four indicators have shown increases or stayed consistent over the years we have been tracking them. KU is reorganizing efforts in the commercialization and entrepreneurship domain. The research leadership at both campuses are examining this very important area of research engagement and further analysis will be needed to determine the appropriate infrastructure required to support such activities. Thus, we requested an amendment to our performance agreement selecting an alternate metric of graduate programs ranked in the top 25 by US News and World Report for the Lawrence campus performance agreement for the remaining two years. BAASC on behalf of KBOR approved our request on June 20, 2018.

# Indicator 6: Philanthropic Support

# Description:

This indicator is the amount the KU Endowment Association (KUEA) annually reports in support from private sources (excluding pledges, testamentary commitments, and government grants) to the Council for Aid to Education through the Voluntary Support of Education survey.

Private support adds critical resources to the University in pursuit of the goal "to build a greater university than the state alone can build." This indicator speaks to the Foresight 2020 goal of ensuring state university excellence.

KU Endowment's *Far Above: The Campaign for Kansas* from April 2012 through June 2016, was a \$1.2 billion comprehensive fundraising campaign which sought support to educate future leaders, advance medicine, accelerate discovery, and drive economic growth to seize the opportunities of the future.

# **Outcome/Results:**

KU Endowment completed its *Far Above: The Campaign for Kansas* fundraising campaign on June 30, 2016, which exceeded \$1.66 billion during its eight years. The overwhelming success of this effort, particularly during three of the final fours years of the campaign, has positively impacted the three-year average annual fundraising baseline, raising it to \$183.7 million. This three-year period (*fiscal years 2013 – 2015*) saw three extraordinary one-time gifts, all occurring in fiscal year 2015, each in excess of \$10 million and totaling \$75 million. The tremendous success of the campaign makes surpassing the baseline a herculean challenge now that the campaign has ended. While KU did raise more in FY 2017 than in FY 2013 and FY 2014, we did not meet or exceed the baseline. Nonetheless, we believe this is an important metric that reflects the incredible private support for KU. KU Endowment will continue to work to increase the level of philanthropy.

Barton Community College	Currently at 90% funding;
	Requesting 100% funding

**Indicator number and title:** Indicator 4: Increase fall-to-fall retention of low-performing students requiring entry level developmental courses.

**Identify alternative evaluation criteria being used:** Ranking on the indicator based on a relevant peer group and improved performance using a three-year rolling average of the most recent three years with data.

# Justification. Ranking on the indicator based on a relevant peer group:

National Community College Benchmark Project (NCCBP).<sup>2</sup> To provide context, the NCCBP utilizes a peer comparison tool with which Barton can compare itself to peer colleges selected at random by NCCBP. Barton percentiles below indicate the percent of national survey responders who scored below Barton.

Credit Developmental Retention, Success

Barton, when compared to a random peer group, ranked in the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile for developmental math retention rate and 96<sup>th</sup> percentile for developmental writing retention rate.

Credit Developmental Retention, Success, to Complete First College Level

Barton, when compared to a random peer group, ranked in the 100<sup>th</sup> percentile for developmental math and the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile for developmental writing completer success rates.

# Improved performance using a three-year rolling average of the most recent three years: Indicator 4:

2014 = 111/240 (46.3%)	Below baseline by 3.9%
2015 = 146/280 (52.1%)	Exceeded baseline by 1.9%
2016 = 143/277 (51.6%)	Exceeded baseline by 1.4%
Baseline 400/797 (50.2%)	Using a three-year rolling average of the most
	recent years
2017 = 142/276 (51.4%)	Exceeds baseline by 1.2%

In 2016, 277 students were enrolled in developmental courses, which demonstrates a 15.4% increase over the total enrolled in 2014. Despite this substantial increase of students, 143 students were retained; accounting for 51.6% of the total enrollees in comparison to only 46.3% in 2014.

Barton continues to improve the identification process for students needing developmental courses as well as incorporating high impact instructional and student support to retain those students at or above the fundamental level established by the baseline. Applying the new rolling average, Barton exceeds the baseline by 1.9% in AY 2015, by 1.4% in AY 2016, and by 1.2% in AY 2017; a significant improvement from AY 2014 when the College fell short of the baseline by 3.9%.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The National Higher Education Benchmarking Project (NCCBP) was created to take a "balanced scorecard" approach to community college benchmarking. Since 2004, over 400 two-year institutions have participated in the data-collection and reporting process. The Institute is largest provider of community college benchmarking and peer comparison services in the nation.

Barton Community College Performa	nce Rep	orts AY 2017					AY 2017 FTE: 3,8	49
Contact Person: Elaine Simmons	-	Phone and email: 620-792-9303; simme	onse@bartonccc.edu				Date: 8/27/2018	
Barton Community College	Foresight Goals	3yr History	AY 2017         AY 2018           (Summer 2016,         (Summer 2017,           Fall 2016, Spring 2017)         Fall 2017, Spring 2018)		AY 2019 (Summer 2018, Fall 2018, Spring 2019)			
			Institutional		Institutional		Institutional	
1 Increase the number of Barton degrees and certificates awarded.	1	2013 = 1,032 2014 = 977 2015 = 830 Baseline: 946	Performance 869	Outcome	Performance	Outcome	Performance	Outcome
2 Increase the percentage of successful responses on competency-based reasoning questions pooled from multiple sections of five courses. (AY)	2	2013 = 1,528/1,804 (85%) 2014 = 1,298/1,566 (83%) 2015 = 1,184/1,398 (85%) Baseline: 4,010/4,768 (84%)	88.5% (895/1011)	Ť				
<b>3</b> Increase the yearly passing percentage rate of students receiving third-party health care technical program certification and licensure credentials by AY.	2	2013 = 232/306 (76%) 2014 = 277/349 (79%) 2015 = 334/404 (83%) Baseline: 843/1,059 (80%)	88.6% (233/263)	Ť				
4 Increase fall-to-fall retention of low- performing students requiring entry level developmental education courses.	2	2013 = 147/259 (57%) 2014 = 111/240 (46%) 2015 = 146/280 (52%) Baseline: 404/779 (51.9%)	51.4% (142/276)	Ţ				
*5 Increase three-year graduation rate.	2	Fall 10 Cohort = 23.8% (92/387) Fall 11 Cohort = 28.6% (108/377) Fall 12 Cohort = 34.7% (179/516) Baseline: 29.6% (379/1,280)	27.6% (125/453)	ţ				
6 Increase the percentage of student performing at the "Proficiency" level on mandatory competencies within written communication assessments of general education (AY).	2	2013 = 645/1,430 (45%) 2014 = 680/1,528 (45%) 2015 = 550/1,502 (37%) Baseline: 1,875/4,460 (42%)	51.7% (881/1704)	Ť				
*Updated 7/19/18								

# **Barton Community College Performance Report AY 2017**

# **<u>Indicator 1</u>**: Increase the number of degrees and certificates awarded.

**Description:** Foresight 2020, Goal #1 Increase Higher Education Attainment; as measured by "Number of degrees produced". Barton wishes to continue the upward growth of students completing certificates and degrees. This goal aligns directly with the KBOR 2020 Strategic Plan. For Barton, there were 556 completers in 2010 and by 2015 there were 830. If Barton can continue to grow, we believe we can impact and support KBORs desire to increase higher education attainment of Kansans to 60% by 2020.

# Outcome/Results:

Barton was not able to sustain previous year's growth rates. Most of our venues were down in unduplicated headcount with our online system dropping from 161 to 124. This drop of 30% coupled with our Barton County Campus dropping from 432 to 393 or 10% is responsible for the reduction in certificate and degree completion from 946 to 869 or 9%.

# Indicator 2: Increase the percentage of successful responses on competency based reasoning questions pooled from multiple sections of five courses.

**Description:** Foresight 2020, Goal #2: Improve Economic Alignment; as measured by Performance of students on institutional assessments in three areas; and as an indicator of performance of students on institutional quality measure. One of the ways that Barton assesses reasoning is by identifying questions within a course final that assess not only the specific competencies of the course, but also tie to the general education outcome expectations as a whole. This indicator is measured using five courses for which two competencies per course are selected (specific courses and skill competencies are outlined below). The performance numbers for this indicator represent the number of correct answers on the associated competency questions, divided by the total number possible answers pooled in the multiple sections of each of the five courses indicated below, resulting in the percentage of successful responses. Note that it is possible that students may be enrolled in more than one of these courses simultaneously, so some data may be duplicated.

BSTC 1036 - Computer Concepts and Applications; BSTC 1685 - Spreadsheet Applications; ECON 1615 - Personal Finance; MATH 1819 - Business Math; MATH 1806 - Technical Math

# Outcome/Results:

Barton shows an increase above baseline from 84% to 88.5%. 4,010 is the number of correct responses out of a total of 4,768 responses. We credit our faculty for their continued effort and support in improving student learning in this area.

# <u>Indicator 3</u>: Increase the yearly passing percentage rate of students receiving third-party health care technical program certification and licensure credentials by AY

**Description:** Foresight 2020, Goal #2: Improve Economic Alignment; as measured by "Performance of students on selected third-party technical program certificate/credential assessments". Barton recognizes the significance of industry credentials and the impact on employment requirements and/or opportunities they may have. The institution is interested in enhancing student achievement of technical certifications and/or licensure credentials and intends to apply additional priority to this student outcome. The College's Workforce Team plans to increase student awareness of the benefits of seeking these credentials, address (as necessary) course scheduling to assist in completion of required course, monitor participation through the development of less laborious tracking system to record student credential completion, and continue to seek a process to improve student self-reporting. The Healthcare area will be targeted with credentials associated with the following programs targeted: Nursing (RN & PN), Medical Lab Technician (ASCP), Emergency MedicaServices (EMT Basic, AEMT, & Paramedic), Dietary Manager (ANFP), and Adult Healthcare (CMA & CNA). The passing percentage rate is calculated each year. The numerator reflects the number of students who passed the exam. Note that the data for this indicator is self-reported for all program areas targeted, other than Nursing. *Outcome/Results:* 

Barton shows an increase above baseline from 80% to 88.6%. Significant increases in nursing pass rates (PN and RN) support the overall increase in addition to notable increases with the Dietary Manager, EMT Medical Lab Technician and Certified Nurse Aid programs. Program leadership continues to identify ways to assist students taking the certification and licensure exams including prep courses.

# <u>Indicator 4:</u> Increase fall-to-fall retention of low-performing students requiring entry level developmental education courses (Basic English, Basic Reading, College Prep Math).

**Description:** Foresight 2020, Goal #2; Institution Specific Indicator: Improve Economic Alignment; as measured by Performance of students on institutional assessments in three areas; and as an 'Institution Specific' indicator as a component of Barton Board expectations. Barton's goal is to increase the retention of low- performing non-college ready students. Our efforts will target the students who did not perform well, rather than all students in the class. To achieve our goal, students in Basic English, Basic Reading, and/or College Prep Math 1 will be provided with individualized instruction in areas of greatest weakness and receive positive reinforcement for successful "milestones" within the course. Student services and support staff will assist instructors in providing guidance and support for these low-performing entry level students. Intervention strategies will be used to provide support and guidance for low performing students in order to increase their self-efficacy and determination to return the following semester and improve their academic standing. Assessment will occur by mid- term during the first semester, and for the subsequent semester. The chart indicates the "low performing students" retained as the numerator, and all "low performing students" in the denominator.

# Outcome/Results:

Barton missed the baseline goal of 52% by 1%. The designated processes were followed including individualized instruction, early alerts, and intervention for lowperforming students. Multiple attempts were made to contact students who quit attending without withdrawing from courses. There was limited success in making contact. Also, low-performing student athletes who lost eligibility did not return. For many students the processes were successful.

# **Indicator 5: Increase three-year graduation rate.**

**Description:** Using the KBOR/KHEDS graduation rate of first-time, full-time, undergraduate degree-seeking students Barton Community College will increase the percent of students graduating in 150% (3 years) of initial enrollment. This indicator aligns with Barton's standing core value of Drive Student Success. The college will be improving advising processes across all venues and enhancing data tracking of how students are moving through the advising process and progression to completion. Faculty are receiving detailed training on how to use Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) data to achieve focused improvements.

# Outcome/Results:

Barton was not able to increase above baseline due to decreased enrollments.

# <u>Indicator 6</u>: Increase the percentage of student performing at the "Proficiency" level on a mandatory competency within written communication assessments of gen ed.

**Description:** Foresight 2020, Goal #2; Institution Specific Indicator: Improve Economic Alignment; as measured by Performance of students on institutional assessments in three areas; and as an 'Institution Specific' indicator as a component of Barton Board expectations; and as an 'Institution Specific' indicator as a component of the assessment of general education at Barton. Included within the general education outcomes is the inclusion of written communication. A competency in ENGL 1204 Composition I and ENGL 1205 Comp II, is to avoid plagiarism by crediting any outside sources incorporated into a document using attributive tags and/or in-text references as well as works cited/ bibliographical listings. This competency is assessed using a rubric where faculty grade a paper scoring students as Proficient (P), Competent (C), or Emerging (E) with regard to the competency expectations. The number of students who scored at the highest level, 'Proficient', is counted from both courses across multiple sections, this is then divided by the total number of students in the respective courses. The performance numbers for this indicator represent the number of students who received ratings of "proficient' to indicate successful completion of this indicator. The reported data is reflective as follows: the numerator identifies the number of students performing at the "Proficiency" level, and the denominator reflects the total number of students in the courses being assessed. *Outcome/Results:* 

# For this indicator, we measured how many students earned specifically the Proficient rating on their documentation skills out of the total number of papers processed. Barton results are above our baseline from 42% to 51.7%. 1875 represents the number of students performing at the proficiency level. 4460 represents the total number of student in the courses being assessed. We credit our faculty for their continued effort and support in improving student learning in this area.

Coffeyville Community College	Currently at 90% funding;
	Requesting 100% funding

Indicator number and title: Indicator 2: Increase the number of certificates and degrees awarded

Identify alternative evaluation criteria being used: Improvement from the prior year and sustained excellence

# Justification:

Coffeyville Community College increased the number of certificates and degrees awarded in AY 2017 to 499 from AY 2016 of 494. In 2016, CCC was recognized by the Kansas Board of Regents as having the highest graduation rate among community colleges in Kansas and has been in the top five since 2012. The institution's enrollment as well as the enrollment at High Schools in Southeast Kansas has been down during this timeframe.

Although the number of degrees and certificates awarded (499) fell below our three-year average baseline of 527, it is important to understand that the institution provided other educational opportunities. In the AY 2017, the institution awarded 892 third party credentials which was a significant increase above the new baseline of 527.

Coffeyville Community College sought to assist our community in providing workforce development opportunities for our service area. Local businesses enquired about specific skill sets that were needed at within their companies and CCC responded by adding additional night classes in the areas of HVAC, electrical and CPR certification. Additional community engagement opportunities were created to provide our local community with lifelong learning opportunities in technology, gardening, and the arts.

Coffeyville Community College's Mission is "identifying and addressing community and area needs, providing accessible, affordable quality education and training, and promoting opportunities for lifelong learning."

<b>Coffeyville Community College P</b>	erforma	nce Report AY 2017					AY 2017 FTE: 1,288	
Contact Person: Aron Potter		Phone and email: 620 251-7005, <u>potter.aron@coffeyville.edu</u>					Date: 7/12/2018	
Coffeyville Community College	Foresight Goals	3 yr History	AY 2017 (Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017)		AY 2 (Summer Fall 2017, Sp	r 2017,	AY 20 (Summer Fall 2018, Spi	: 2018,
			Institutional Performance	Outcome	Institutional Performance	Outcome	Institutional Performance	Outcome
<b>1</b> Increase the percentage of first to second year retention rates for college ready students.	1	2012 – 165/248 66.5% 2013 – 169/276 61.2% 2014 – 130/221 58.8% Baseline: 464/745 62.2%	55.6% (124/223)	Ļ				
<b>2</b> Increase the number of certificates and degrees awarded.		2013 – 499 2014 – 560 2015 – 524 Baseline: 527	499	Ţ				
<b>3</b> Increase the number of students successfully completing industry recognized third party credentials.	2	2012 – 288 2013 – 605 2014 – 686 Baseline: 526	892	Ť				
4 Increase the credit hours awarded through Credit for Prior Learning		2014 – 56 2015 – 17 2016 - 16 Baseline: 29	34	Ť				
<b>5</b> Increase the three year completion rate of minority students graduating with an Associate degree or certificate.		2010 53/185 28.6% 2011 78/245 31.8% 2012 81/204 39.7% Baseline: 212/634 33.4%	31.4% (82/261)	Ļ				
6 Increase Success Rates of Students in Developmental Courses		2013 – 212/316 67.1% 2014 – 200/273 73.3% 2015 – 222/309 71.8% Baseline: 634/898 70.6%	76.8% (262/341)	Ť				

# **Coffeyville Community College Performance Report AY 2017**

# Indicator 1: Increase the percentage of first to second year retention rates for college ready students.

**Description:** Percentage of first to second year retention of college ready students will be calculated based on first time, full time, and degree seeking students who are enrolled on the  $20^{th}$  day for two consecutive fall terms and are not enrolled in any developmental courses in the first term. Developmental courses are defined as credit bearing courses that do not count toward credit hours necessary for graduation. Students are required to enroll in developmental courses if they do not meet specified admission and placement requirements for college level courses. CCC chose first to second year retention, as it is the key to improvement in student success for most first year students. CCC has a long history of successfully working with students that are not college ready.

# Outcome/Results:

Coffeyville Community College is and will continue to focus on the retention of first year to second year students. The institution's retention rate has seen a steady growth of 6% beyond the previous performance reports base line. This improvement created a new baseline of 62.2%. With the creation of the new baseline, the institution fell below the baseline by 6%. The institution evaluates the student services area so that the institution can address students' needs that will enhance their experiences at CCC. The First Year Experience course has transitioned from a three week course to a semester long offering for first time freshman transitioning to college. The institution has made changes to the current Promoting Academic Student Success (PASS) reporting process for all students, including both technical campuses. This change was stimulated by the data analysis of the current PASS system. In the upcoming academic year, at risk students will be identified within the first two weeks of each academic semester by the faculty. Students will be contacted by the Student Success Center staff to create an academic success plan.

# Indicator 2: Increase the number of certificates and degrees awarded.

**Description:** The number of certificates and degrees awarded as indicated in the Kansas Higher Education Data System will be used to determine indicator two. Increasing the number of students who have a certificate or degree is critical in supporting the Foresight 2020 goal of increasing higher education attainment among Kansas citizens. This indicator also aligns with CCC's strategic goal of ensuring students receiving degrees and certificates attain employment in a wide variety of industries.

# Outcome/Results:

The total number of certificates and degrees awarded fell below the baseline of 527 to 499 for AY 2017. The institutions enrollment was down during this timeframe, as well as, the high school enrollment in Southeast Kansas. Coffeyville Community College continues to pursue and identify the needs of local and regional industries in the Southeast Kansas Area. The administration and curriculum teams continue to evaluate the current programs that are offered, as well as meeting the expectations and requirements that may change from academic year to academic year. The restructuring of our course offerings from a traditional setting of 16-week courses to 8-week courses has been created to assist students in easier access for completion time. In an effort to address this reduction, course scheduling is being evaluated to meet the needs of our constituents.

# Indicator 3: Increase the number of students successfully completing industry recognized third party credentials.

**Description:** Data will be collected from the Kansas Higher Education Data System to determine the number of industry recognized third party credentials. The third party credentials CCC students receive include; American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Auto Service Excellence, National Center for Construction Education & Research Certification, Microsoft Office Word 2007, Microsoft Office PowerPoint 2007, Occupational Safety & Health Administration (OSHA) 10 hour certification, Occupational Safety & Health Administration (OSHA) 30 hour certification, American Welding Society, EPA Section 608 approved certification, Certified Dietary Manager, American Medical Technologist Examination, Registered Nurse (National Council Licensure Examination), Licensed Practical Nurse (Kansas State Board of Nursing Examination), Emergency Medical Technician – Intermediate National Registry Exam/Kansas Skills Examination, Certified Medical Aid, and Home Health Aid. Coffeyville Community College choose the indicator to increase the number of students attaining recognized third party credentials, as it will enable more students of all ages the opportunity to build careers with family-sustaining, middle class incomes. At the federal level, both the U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Labor have taken important steps to support portable/stackable credentials and career pathways.

The number of students successfully completing industry recognized third party credentials have increased to 892, a significant increase beyond the baseline of 526. Coffeyville Community College has pushed to incorporate more industry-recognized  $3^{rd}$  party-assessments into the curriculum and is advising students to take certification to improve employability. CCC continues to work with our local high school administration to form partnerships with our technical campuses that create more opportunities for those secondary students to earn credentials.

# Indicator 4: Increase the number of credit hours awarded through Credits for Prior Learning.

**Description:** Data will be collected from our institutional database system and/or from the Kansas Higher Education Data System to determine the number of Credits for Prior Learning awarded by the institution. Coffeyville Community College strives to provide non-traditional students and service area secondary students the opportunity to gain college credit for knowledge and skills learned outside of the post-secondary setting. Currently the institution accepts Credit for Prior Learning for Military, Fire Science and Advanced Placement.

# Outcome/Results:

The number of credits awarded by the institution over the last three years has created a baseline of 29. During the AY 2017, the institution awarded 34 credits for prior learning. Coffeyville Community College will be focusing on evaluating general education and technical programs that would increase opportunities for all students.

# Indicator 5: Increase the three year completion rate of minority students graduating with an associate degree or certificate.

**Description:** Data reported and published in the Federal Government IPEDS report will be used to determine the number of minority students graduating with an associate degree or certificate. To determine increases in minority student completion rates we will compare the number of minority students enrolled full time to the number of minority students who graduate or earn a certificate in 3 years.

# Outcome/Results:

There was a 31.42% completion rate of minority students graduating with an Associate's degree or certificate, which fell below the newly established baseline of 33.4%. Although the indicator goal fell below the baseline, Coffeyville Community College saw one of the largest minority populations to arrive on campus over the last four years. Coffeyville Community College has focused on programming and curriculum that addresses the needs of our minority population. The office of Student Services has taken a more active role in promoting student engagement and providing support for transitioning students. The International Student Director and faculty members have begun initiating cultural opportunities for students to gather and grow on the CCC campus. Institutional data has also indicated the need to intervene with at-risk students within the first two weeks of the academic semester, which will be implemented in the Fall of 2018.

# Indicator 6: Increase success rates of Students in Developmental Courses

**Description:** Data will be collected from the institutional database on students enrolled in developmental courses on the  $20^{\text{th}}$  day. Data will also be collected on students receiving a grade of C or better at course completion. The percentage of success will be determined by the number of students who successfully complete with a C or better compared to the number of students who complete a developmental course.

# Outcome/Results:

The success rate of students in developmental courses is currently up from the baseline of 70.6% to 76.8%. Historically, Coffeyville Community College has focused on providing a quality academic support system for students in developmental courses. The commitment by the faculty and the Student Success Center has impacted the success of the developmental student. Coffeyville Community College has focused on developmental students by assessing each course so needs of the current student may be addressed as they move forward in completing their course work. The redesigning of course offerings and pedagogical practices are being implemented to address current trends in developmental issues.

Dodge City Community College	Currently at 90% funding;
	Requesting 100% funding

**Indicator number and title**: Indicator 4: Increase Adult Basic Education (ABD) educational gains for ESL students.

Identify alternative evaluation criteria being used: Improvement from the prior year; Sustained excellence

# Justification:

For AY2017, DCCC shows a gain of 1.3% from AY2016's 48.4%. This improvement is attributable to sustained excellence in the Adult Learning Center which delivers ESL instruction and ABE.

Over the past five years, the ALC has served 2291 learners; of those, 1628 are identified as low-level learners who have attended either ESL or ABE classes achieving educational gains at 51%. For low-level learners (those who lack literacy skills in their native, or home, languages) to demonstrate such gains is significant and attributable to the quality of the ALC's instructional staff, pedagogy and its delivery.

All <u>instructional staff</u> have earned bachelor's degrees from accredited colleges/universities; further, 20% of the instructional staff hold Masters degrees; over all, the staff brings a combined total of 80+ years of instructional/ABE experience. Additionally, the ALC staff meet and are knowledgeable of the qualifications established by the Kansas Adult Education Practitioner Standards.

<u>Pedagogically</u>, the staff utilizes individualized instructional strategies and integrates face-to-face, self-paced, and technology-assisted <u>deliveries</u> of a curriculum focused on practicalities of language acquisition and literacy skills. Additions to instructional resources include smart boards, various learner-centered software which allows access to learning beyond the classroom and the ALC.

For these reasons – sustained excellence and showing improved educational gains from the prior year—DCCC requests movement to 100% of new funding for which we are eligible.

							AY 2017 FTE: 1,337						
	Phone and email: (620) 227-9359; jholwerda@					Date: 7/16/2018							
Foresight Goals					3 yr History	(Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017)		× /		AY 2018 (Summer 2017, Fall 2017, Spring 2018		(Summer	2018,
					0.4	Institutional	0.4						
1	2012: 50.3% (91/181) 2013: 54.5% (91/167) 2014: 59.1% (104/176) Baseline: 54.6% (286/524)	53.3% (131/246)	↓ Uutcome	Performance	Outcome	Performance	Outcome						
1	2013: 383 (182 Assoc,56 Cert,145 SAPP) 2014: 432 (226 Assoc,52 Cert,154 SAPP) 2015: 426 (211 Assoc,59 Cert,156 SAPP) Baseline: 414	397	ţ										
2	2012: 51.5% (205/398) 2013: 52.7% (188/357) 2014: 56.2% (228/406) Baseline: 53.4% (621/1,161)	58.0% (253/436)	Ť										
1	2013: 62.1% (198/319) 2014: 54.5% (182/334) 2015: 50.3% (185/368) Baseline: 55.3% (565/1,021)	49.7% (148/298)	Ţ										
1	2014: 81.9% (77/94) 2015: 70.9% (39/55) 2016: 71.8% (46/64) Baseline: 76.1% (162/213)	83.0% (44/53)	Ť										
2	2013: 7 EPT + 16 Weld = 23 2014: 10 EPT + 12 Weld = 22 2015: 18 EPT + 9 Weld = 27 Baseline: 24	10 EPT + 14 Weld = 24	↔										
	Foresight	Phone and email: (620) 227-9359; jholwerda@Foresight Goals3 yr History2012: $50.3\%$ (91/181) 2013: $54.5\%$ (91/167) 2014: $59.1\%$ (104/176) Baseline: $54.6\%$ (286/524)2013: $383$ (182 Assoc, 56 Cert, 145 SAPP) 2014: $432$ (226 Assoc, 52 Cert, 154 SAPP) 2015: $426$ (211 Assoc, 59 Cert, 156 SAPP) Baseline: $414$ 22012: $51.5\%$ (205/398) 2013: $52.7\%$ (188/357) 2014: $56.2\%$ (228/406) Baseline: $53.4\%$ (621/1,161)22013: $62.1\%$ (198/319) 2014: $54.5\%$ (182/334) 2015: $50.3\%$ (185/368) Baseline: $55.3\%$ (565/1,021)12014: $81.9\%$ (77/94) 2015: $70.9\%$ (39/55) 2016: $71.8\%$ (46/64) Baseline: $76.1\%$ (162/213)22013: $7$ EPT + 16 Weld = 23 2014: 10 EPT + 12 Weld = 22 2015: 18 EPT + 9 Weld = 27	Phone and email: (620) 227-9359; jholwerda@dc3.eduAY 20 (Summer Fall 2016, SpInstitutional Performance2012: $50.3\%$ (91/181)53.3% (131/246)2013: $54.5\%$ (91/167)53.3% (131/246)2014: $59.1\%$ (104/176) Baseline: $54.6\%$ (286/524)3972013: $383$ (182 Assoc, 56 Cert, 145 SAPP) 2014: $432$ (226 Assoc, 52 Cert, 154 SAPP) 2015: $426$ (211 Assoc, 59 Cert, 156 SAPP) Baseline: $414$ 39722012: $51.5\%$ (205/398) 2013: $52.7\%$ (188/357) 2014: $56.2\%$ (228/406) Baseline: $53.4\%$ (621/1,161)58.0% (253/436)22013: $62.1\%$ (198/319) 2014: $54.5\%$ (182/334) 2015: $50.3\%$ (185/368) Baseline: $55.3\%$ (565/1,021)49.7% (148/298)12014: $81.9\%$ (77/94) 2015: $70.9\%$ (39/55) 2016: $71.8\%$ (46/64) Baseline: $76.1\%$ (162/213)83.0% (44/53)22013: $7$ EPT + 16 Weld = 23 2014: 10 EPT + 12 Weld = 22 2015: $18$ EPT + 9 Weld = 2710 EPT + 14 Weld = 24	Phone and email: (620) 227-9359; jholwerda@dc3.edu         AY 2017 (Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017)         Institutional Performance         2012: $50.3\%$ (91/181) $53.3\%$ (131/246) $0$ utcome         2013: $54.5\%$ (91/167) $(131/246)$ $4$ 2013: $54.5\%$ (91/167) $(131/246)$ $4$ 2013: $383$ (182 Assoc, 56 Cert, 145 SAPP) $397$ $4$ 2013: $383$ (182 Assoc, 52 Cert, 154 SAPP) $397$ $4$ 2013: $52.7\%$ (188/357) $397$ $4$ 2013: $52.7\%$ (188/357) $(253/436)$ $1$ 2013: $62.1\%$ (198/319) $49.7\%$ (148/298) $49.7\%$ (148/298) $49.7\%$ (148/298)         1       2013: $62.1\%$ (152/34) $49.7\%$ (148/298) $4$ 1       2013: $62.1\%$ (152/34) $49.7\%$ (148/298) $4$ 1 $2013:$ $62.1\%$ (152/34) $49.7\%$ (148/298) $4$ 1 $2013:$ $62.1\%$ (152/13) $49.7\%$ (148/298) $4$ 1 $2013:$ $77/94$ $83.0\%$ (44/53) $1$ 2013: <t< td=""><td>Phone and email: (620) 227-9359; jholwerda@dc3.edu         AY 2017 (Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017)         Foresight 3 yr History       Institutional Performance Outcome         2012: <math>50.3\%</math> (91/181)       <math>53.3\%</math>       1         2013: <math>54.5\%</math> (91/167)       (131/246)       Institutional Performance         2013: <math>383</math> (182 Assoc.56 Cert,145 SAPP)       <math>397</math> <math>\downarrow</math>         2013: <math>383</math> (182 Assoc.56 Cert,145 SAPP)       <math>397</math> <math>\downarrow</math>         2014: <math>432</math> (226 Assoc,52 Cert,156 SAPP)       <math>397</math> <math>\downarrow</math>         2013: <math>52.7\%</math> (188/357)       <math>(253/436)</math> <math>\uparrow</math>         2013: <math>52.7\%</math> (188/357)       <math>(253/436)</math> <math>\uparrow</math>         2014: <math>56.2\%</math> (228/406)       <math>= 58.0\%</math> <math>\uparrow</math>         Baseline: <math>53.4\%</math> (621/1,161)       <math>(48/298)</math> <math>\downarrow</math>         1       <math>2013: 62.1\%</math> (198/319)       <math>49.7\%</math> <math>\downarrow</math>         2014: <math>56.2\%</math> (228/406)       <math>83.0\%</math> <math>\uparrow</math> <math>i</math>         Baseline: <math>53.4\%</math> (621/1,161)       <math>i</math> <math>i</math> <math>i</math>         1       <math>2014: 56.2\%</math> (39/55)       <math>i</math> <math>i</math> <math>i</math>         2014: <math>56.2\%</math> (39/55)       <math>i</math> <math>i</math> <math>i</math> <math>i</math>         2014: <math>51.9\%</math> (185/368)       <math>i</math> <math>i</math> <math>i</math></td><td>Phone and email: (620) 227-9359; jholwerda@dc3.edu           Gordsight Goals         AY 2017 (Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017)         AY 2018 (Summer 2017, Fall 2017, Spring 2018)           Source         Dutcome         Performance         Outcome         Performance         Outcome           2012: 50.3% (91/181) 2013: 54.5% (91/167) 2014: 59.1% (104/176) Baseline: 54.6% (286/524)         53.3% (131/246)         ↓         Performance         Outcome           2013: 383 (182 Assoc.56 Cert,145 SAPP) 2015: 426 (211 Assoc.59 Cert,156 SAPP) Baseline: 51.6% (226/398) 2013: 52.7% (188/357) 2014: 56.2% (228/406) Baseline: 53.4% (621/1,161)         \$\$8.0% (148/298)         ↑         ↓           2         2013: 62.1% (198/319) 2014: 54.5% (182/334) 2015: 50.3% (185/368) Baseline: 55.3% (565/1,021)         \$\$8.0% (148/298)         ↑         ↓           1         2013: 62.1% (198/319) 2014: 81.9% (77/94) 2014: 81.9% (77/94) 2015: 70.9% (39/55) 2016: 71.8% (46/64) Baseline: 76.1% (162/213)         \$\$8.0% (44/53)         ↑         ↓           1         2013: 7 EPT + 16 Weld = 23 2014: 10 EPT + 12 Weld = 22 2015: 18 EPT + 9 Weld = 27         10 EPT + 14 Weld = 24         ↓         ↓</td><td>Note and email: (620) 227-9359; jholwerda@dc3.edu       Date: 7/16/2018         AY 2017       AY 2018       (Summer 2016, Fall 2017, Spring 2018)       Fall 2018, Sp         Foresight Goals       AY 2017       AY 2018       (Summer 2017, Fall 2017, Spring 2018)       Fall 2018, Sp         Control of the second second</td></t<>	Phone and email: (620) 227-9359; jholwerda@dc3.edu         AY 2017 (Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017)         Foresight 3 yr History       Institutional Performance Outcome         2012: $50.3\%$ (91/181) $53.3\%$ 1         2013: $54.5\%$ (91/167)       (131/246)       Institutional Performance         2013: $383$ (182 Assoc.56 Cert,145 SAPP) $397$ $\downarrow$ 2013: $383$ (182 Assoc.56 Cert,145 SAPP) $397$ $\downarrow$ 2014: $432$ (226 Assoc,52 Cert,156 SAPP) $397$ $\downarrow$ 2013: $52.7\%$ (188/357) $(253/436)$ $\uparrow$ 2013: $52.7\%$ (188/357) $(253/436)$ $\uparrow$ 2014: $56.2\%$ (228/406) $= 58.0\%$ $\uparrow$ Baseline: $53.4\%$ (621/1,161) $(48/298)$ $\downarrow$ 1 $2013: 62.1\%$ (198/319) $49.7\%$ $\downarrow$ 2014: $56.2\%$ (228/406) $83.0\%$ $\uparrow$ $i$ Baseline: $53.4\%$ (621/1,161) $i$ $i$ $i$ 1 $2014: 56.2\%$ (39/55) $i$ $i$ $i$ 2014: $56.2\%$ (39/55) $i$ $i$ $i$ $i$ 2014: $51.9\%$ (185/368) $i$ $i$ $i$	Phone and email: (620) 227-9359; jholwerda@dc3.edu           Gordsight Goals         AY 2017 (Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017)         AY 2018 (Summer 2017, Fall 2017, Spring 2018)           Source         Dutcome         Performance         Outcome         Performance         Outcome           2012: 50.3% (91/181) 2013: 54.5% (91/167) 2014: 59.1% (104/176) Baseline: 54.6% (286/524)         53.3% (131/246)         ↓         Performance         Outcome           2013: 383 (182 Assoc.56 Cert,145 SAPP) 2015: 426 (211 Assoc.59 Cert,156 SAPP) Baseline: 51.6% (226/398) 2013: 52.7% (188/357) 2014: 56.2% (228/406) Baseline: 53.4% (621/1,161)         \$\$8.0% (148/298)         ↑         ↓           2         2013: 62.1% (198/319) 2014: 54.5% (182/334) 2015: 50.3% (185/368) Baseline: 55.3% (565/1,021)         \$\$8.0% (148/298)         ↑         ↓           1         2013: 62.1% (198/319) 2014: 81.9% (77/94) 2014: 81.9% (77/94) 2015: 70.9% (39/55) 2016: 71.8% (46/64) Baseline: 76.1% (162/213)         \$\$8.0% (44/53)         ↑         ↓           1         2013: 7 EPT + 16 Weld = 23 2014: 10 EPT + 12 Weld = 22 2015: 18 EPT + 9 Weld = 27         10 EPT + 14 Weld = 24         ↓         ↓	Note and email: (620) 227-9359; jholwerda@dc3.edu       Date: 7/16/2018         AY 2017       AY 2018       (Summer 2016, Fall 2017, Spring 2018)       Fall 2018, Sp         Foresight Goals       AY 2017       AY 2018       (Summer 2017, Fall 2017, Spring 2018)       Fall 2018, Sp         Control of the second						

# **Dodge City Community College Performance Report AY 2017**

# **Indicator 1**: Increase first to second year retention rates of college ready cohort

**Description:** This indicator addresses goal 1 of *Foresight 2020*, "increase higher education attainment." DCCC's 2017 cohort of college-ready students increased from our 3-year history; specifically, we show a 36% increase in the size of our college-ready cohort of 246 in AY2017 over the cohort of 176 in AY2014. This increase is a result of successful recruiting strategies, as well as the expansion and remodeling of student services facilities and improvement of our enrollment processes.

#### Outcome/Results:

For AY2017, DCCC dipped below baseline by 1.3%. DCCC will continue with its recruiting strategy and will direct resources to improving advising and assessment, and to providing professional development opportunities for faculty on best practices. Our data collection on student engagement will be instrumental in pinpointing the needs of our college-ready cohort, driving retention strategies for this important student population.

# **Indicator 2:** Increase the number of certificates and degrees awarded

**Description:** This indicator addresses Goal 1 of *Foresight 2020*, "increase higher education attainment." Based on total number of associates, certificates, and SAPP, DCCC's history shows an overall upward trend. From AY2013 to AY2014, DCCC showed a 12.7% increase in the number of degrees, certificates, and SAPP awarded, with the most significant increase (24.1%) in associates degrees, followed by certificates (7.1%) and SAPP (6.2%). DCCC experienced an incremental decline (1.3%) from AY2014 to AY2015 but remained above baseline. However, in AY2017, DCCC awarded 6.8% fewer degrees, certificates and SAPP than in 2015.

# Outcome/Results:

For AY2017, DCCC dropped below baseline. Upon further analysis, we notice a total decrease of 98 degrees, certificates, and SAPP awarded from AY2016 (495) to AY2017 (397). Of that 98 decrease, 73 (or 74%) are in technical and workforce: 15 were AAS, 17 were certificates, and 41 were SAPP. This decrease correlates with unrest and faculty/staff turnover in technical/workforce programs on our campus throughout AY2017. In response, DCCC made new administrative appointments, including to Dean of Workforce, Director of Allied Health, and division chair of Workforce; recently placed our EMS program on hold; and implemented a fair market salary strategy with our nursing appointments to be competitive in recruiting and to assure retention of well qualified Nursing faculty. DCCC will continue to be proactive in evaluating instructional performance and in implementing student-centered policies and practices focused on degree completion.

# Indicator 3: Increase percent of students who are employed or transfer

**Description:** Key to our mission as a community college to prepare students for immediate employment (through workforce and technical education) as well as for delayed employment (through transfer to bachelor degree programs), this indicator addresses the second goal of *Foresight 2020*. We continue to recruit, place, and advise students towards successful completion of certificates that are gateways to high wage programs and to degrees that develop skills and knowledge for success in their transfer to four-year institutions.

# Outcome/Results:

For AY2017, DCCC improved on our baseline by 4.6% and are proud that we have shown increase for each year measured. We will continue to work with 4 year institutions to maintain and improve articulation agreements, as well as to tailor workforce programs to fit the needs of industry partners, including internship opportunities, adding value to our students by way of employment and higher wages. Grant-funded partnerships with 4-year institutions (Kansas State, Fort Hays State, and Kansas University) are in place to facilitate transfers in high-demand/high-wage pathways, such as science, math, and intelligence.

# Indicator 4: Increase Adult Basic Education (ABE) educational gains for ESL students

**Description:** The number of ABE participants is specifically mentioned as a measurement for *Foresight 2020* goal 1. Dodge City Community College and the Adult Learning Center (ALC) use the state mandated TABE exam to assess reading and listening skills for the six levels of ESL instruction as prescribed by the State of Kansas. Students are administered both for pre-and post-assessment. Students are considered completers when their post-assessment scores indicate readiness to move to the next level of ESL instruction; because students can move through multiple levels of ESL throughout a year, they may be considered completers multiple (or duplicate) times. For our measure, the numerator is the total number who post-assessed with a score to move to a higher level of ESL instruction within the year. The denominator is the total (duplicated) number of students enrolled in any of six course levels at the ALC. Over the past five years, the number of low-level learners studying in the ALC has increased by 13%. Low-level learners include those who lack literacy skills in their native, or home, languages.

*Outcome/Results:* For AY2017, DCCC shows a minimal gain of 1.3% from AY2016's 48.4%. To improve on this outcome, DCCC's ALC will continue to incorporate research-based curriculum, individualized instruction, specialized software, smart-board and tablet technologies to meet the learning needs of its high number of low-level learners.

# Indicator 5: Increase Developmental Reading successful completers

**Description:** The indicator addresses the increasing number of students who enter college without competency in reading college level material. Being able to read well is critical to being successful in college. Successful completion is a grade of C or better in College Reading. While we've noticed gains in the number of successful completers since 2015 through 2016, we have had fewer students taking College Reading, overall, since 2014. Last year we modified the measure to a percentage of successful completers, with the denominator of students enrolling in College Reading and the numerator being those completing with a C or better. We continue to work closely with advisors and faculty, especially in English and other reading-intensive disciplines, to identify students whose skills in reading are below those levels and to provide resources to improve those skills.

*Outcome/Results*: For AY2017, DCCC improved on our baseline. We will continue to work closely with faculty to revamp curriculum and incorporate learning strategies to strengthen fundamental skills for students, especially in developmental-level courses.

**Indicator 6:** Increase the number of students successfully completing one-year certificates through the Electrical Power Technician and Welding programs *Description:* Increasing the number of students who successfully complete EPT and welding certificates directly addresses *Foresight 2020* goal 2 of "meeting the needs of the Kansas economy." Locally, we have a strong local demand for a skilled workforce in pipeline construction and maintenance and in the meat-packing industry. In addition to working with local industry, we work with service area high schools to increase interest and concurrent enrollment. EPT continues to be in high-demand across the state; however, our campus/face-to-face offerings have proved viable and so we have reduced our online and put our partnerships in eastern Kansas on hold. Welding and EPT provide DCCC opportunities to respond strategically to meet demands for workforce development and industry training, even as students continue to accept industry positions having attained skills but not completing certificates.

# Outcome/Results:

For AY2017, we maintained baseline. We will continue to build relationships with our industry and service area partners in welding and in EPT, focusing on local opportunities and face-to-face course offerings.

Butler Community College	Currently at 75% funding; Requesting 90% funding
--------------------------	---

Indicator number and title: Indicator 1: Number of Certificates and Degrees Awarded Annually

**Identify alternative evaluation criteria being used:** Improvement from Prior Year, improved performance using a three-year rolling average of the most recent three years, and any extenuating circumstances beyond the control of the institution

# Justification:

After reviewing indicators where we fell short, we are asking you to reconsider our performance on Indicator # 1 based on the following three of the suggested alternative evaluation criteria, some of which could apply to the other 'shortfall' indicators as well but are collectively most relevant to Indicator # 1.

Improvement from the prior year: In the recently concluded academic year (AY 2018), Butler Community College recorded 1496 completers, an increase of 60 or 4.2 % from the previous academic year (AY 2017). This sharp increase is a reflection of the continued investment of resources–human, technology, and process–that Butler continues to devote to its Strategic Priority of 'Students Finish What They Start'. Our commitment to helping students complete their academic programs, as envisaged in the aforementioned Strategic Priority, highlights our confidence in, and partnership with, the Kansas Board of Regents in striving together for the Foresight 2020 Goal 1 of increasing measurable higher education attainment among Kansans. Improved performance using a three-year rolling average of the most recent three years: The rolling average of completers for the most recent three years (AY 2015, AY 2016, and AY 2017) is {(1445+1435+1436)/3} =1438, a number that Butler surpassed by a substantial margin with an AY 2018 number of completions standing at 1496.

Any extenuating circumstances beyond the control of the institution: Raw number of completions are, to a large extent, a function of the overall enrollment trends; *ceteris paribus*, fewer students mean fewer completers. If this reality is taken into account and the completions for AY 2017 taken as a proportion of that year's overall enrollment and compared to the same metric for, respectively, AY 2013, AY 2014, and AY 2015, the picture appears somewhat different than the one presented in the Indicator # 1 grid on Performance Agreement report.

AY	Completers	Overall Enrollment	Completers As % of Enrollment
2013	1453	14551	9.99%
2014	1492	13495	11.06%
2015	1445	13315	10.85%
2013-2015 Aggregate	4390	41361	10.61%
2017	1436	12895	11.14% ↑

As can be seen from the table above, when enrollment trends are figured in, Butler's performance on Indicator # 1 shows an increase in AY 2017 compared to the calculated baseline of the aggregate AY 2013, AY 2014, and AY 2015 figures. Incidentally this softness of overall likely enrollment affected our performance on Indicator # 5 as well which deals with a smaller subset of completion credentials.

Butler Community College Perfe							Fall 2017 FTE: 6	,049	
Contact Person: Lori Winningham		Phone and email: 316.322.3110; (lwinning	Phone and email: 316.322.3110; (lwinning@butlercc.edu)					Date: 7/12/2018	
			AY 2017 (Summer 2016,		AY 2018		AY 2019		
Butler Community College	Foresight Goals	3 yr History	Fall 2016, Spring 2017)		(Summer 2017, Fall 2017, Spring 2018)		(Summer 2018, Fall 2018, Spring 2019)		
			Institutional		Institutional		Institutional		
			Performance	Outcome	Performance	Outcome	Performance	Outcome	
1 Number of certificates and degrees awarded annually	1	AY2013 = 1,453 AY2014 = 1,492 AY2015 = 1,445 Baseline = 1,463	1,436	÷					
*2 First to second year retention of college-ready cohort (fall-to-fall retention of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking students)		Fall 2012 = 63.5% (464/731) Fall 2013 = 61.5% (450/732) Fall 2014 = 62.2% (530/852) Baseline: 62.4% (1,444/2,315)	62.9% (624/992)	Ť					
<b>3</b> Award of third party technical credentials	2	AY2014 = 973 AY2015 = 973 AY2016 = 1,091 Baseline: 1,012	969	Ļ					
<b>4</b> Percentage of Accelerated Learning Program students who pass co-requisite developmental English and college composition courses in the same term	1	AY2014 = 65% (41/63-spring only) AY2015 = 67.5% (77/114) AY2016 = 60.4% (137/227) Baseline: 63.1% (255/404)	60.6% (237/391)	Ļ					
<b>5</b> Increase in number of STEM technical certificates and degrees	2	AY2014 = 323 AY2015 = 291 AY2016 = 292 Baseline: 302	298	Ļ					
<b>6</b> Directional Improvement in College Algebra Pass Rates	1	AY2014 = 67.24% (1,248/1,856) AY2015 = 63.60% (1,092/1,717) AY2016 = 64.68% (1,174/1,815) Baseline: 65.2% (3,514/5,388)	67.0 % (1310/1955)	1					
*Updated 7/12/18									

# **Butler Community College Performance Report AY 2017**

# Indicator 1: Number of certificates and degrees awarded annually

**Description:** Using the Kansas Higher Education Data System, Butler will report the total number of certificates and degrees awarded each academic year. Our Student Success strategic priority is the center of our ongoing strategic plan, as reflected in our goal to ensure "Students Finish What They Start." Over the last three years Butler started several student success initiatives aimed at improving teaching and student engagement. Over the next three years the college will maintain that work while putting greater emphasis on achieving retention goals at the course and program levels. This work will contribute to an overall increase in credentials.

<u>Outcome/Results</u>: The baseline of 1463 was impacted significantly by the unusually high completion numbers of AY 2014. In AY 2016 (which was not in the baseline calculations due to final numbers not being available at the time of establishing this PA), BCC had 1435 completers. In AY 2017, we had 1436, a slight improvement. This is in the context of continuing decline in overall enrollment numbers. As the institution transitions in the Guided Pathways model for students beginning in Fall 2018, processes and support systems are in place that will serve to increase completion rates and raw completion numbers in the near future.

# Indicator 2: First to second year retention of college-ready cohort (fall-to-fall retention of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking students)

**Description:** This indicator tracks the first to second year retention rates for first-time, full-time, degree-seeking students who return to enroll in the fall term of the subsequent year. In the last three years, Butler has developed a more effective, strategic approach to enrollment management. We have developed the capacity to set and meet short-range enrollment goals and have learned more about what causes student turnover. Over the next three years, faculty will implement retention goals at the course/program level to address specific student needs. This work will contribute to an increase in retention of college-ready students.

<u>Outcome/Results:</u> Butler is proud of the results of its intentional efforts to increase the retention of students from first to second semesters. Continuous investment in strategic positioning, hands on advising, reformatted math sequencing, and modern pedagogical techniques is guiding our efforts in this area.

# Indicator 3: Award of third party technical credentials

**Description:** A top-notch vocational education combined with the appropriate professional credential is a key competitive advantage for individuals entering the workforce or starting new careers. Working through its professional and industry network, and leveraging the capacity built through the federal Perkins IV program, Butler has identified appropriate industry credentials for its different technical programs. Faculty and staff provide the information to program students, who are instructed according to the specifics of these credentials. Program faculty also facilitate the necessary testing and implement a systematic process to track the attainment of credentials. For this indicator Butler tracks credentials awarded to students in Nursing (LPN Certificate of Completion and national licensure; RN NCLEX certification, IV Therapy Certification), Allied Health (EMT and Advanced EMT certificates, Certified Nurse Assistant and Certified Medical Aide; Home Health Aide), Fire Science (Firefighter 1 and 2 certifications, Hazmat certifications), Welding (American Society of Welding), Networking Technology (Microsoft and other industry credentials), Culinary Arts (Serve Safe certificate) and Automotive Technology (Automotive Service Excellence certificates).

<u>Outcome/Results:</u> While we barely missed the baseline, this was largely a function of softness of overall enrollment. Nonetheless we are proud of our continuous successful efforts at preparing students for workforce ready credentialing, facilitating the credentialing process, and documenting success. With a greater focus on aligning such credentialing with program outcomes through our Guided Pathways approach, we are confident of even better results for this indicator in the future.

# Indicator 4: Percentage of Accelerated Learning Program students who pass co-requisite developmental English and college composition courses in the same term

**Description:** ALP allows developmental English students to enroll in EG060 (developmental) and EG101 (college composition) as co-requisites in the same term. The program is rigorous, the courses are integrated by design, and trained instructors use cognitive and non-cognitive techniques. ALP decreases the attrition between the developmental and college level courses in the traditional sequence and increases the number of students who pass EG101 with a C or better. Success is computed by

dividing the total number of students who persist to the end of the term and receive a C or better in EG060/101 ALP courses by the total number of students who receive an A, B, C, D, F, or withdraw before the end of the term. Prior to spring 2016, Butler ALP courses were taught at two levels, EG 052/060 and EG 060/101 and separate results were calculated for each level. In spring 2016, the two levels were combined into one, EG 060/101 only. Fall 2016 brought two more major changes: all students who placed in developmental English and were not referred to Adult Education were required to enroll in ALP, and students who placed in RD 011 (developmental reading) were allowed to enroll in ALP for the first time.

<u>Outcome/Results</u>: A first glance, the Butler AY 2017 success rate of 60.6% slightly exceeds its AY2016 rate and falls somewhat short of its 2014-16 baseline, 63.1%. These percentages are explained and ameliorated by the fact that the greatly expanded footprint of ALP model includes many more students and sections to make the transition from developmental to college credit shorter and more economical while still improving success. The 2012 pre-ALP baseline in EG 060/101 in two semesters was 39%; AY2017 ALP students passed EG060/101 in one semester nearly 22% more often. In the future, expanded support networks for ALP students and broader faculty training/resources should positively affect metrics.

# Indicator 5: Increase in the number of STEM technical certificates and degrees

**Description:** Butler will help students develop applied STEM skills that will enable completers to attain jobs in occupations critical to the future of the south-central Kansas. This indicator focuses on two core job clusters – Information Technology and Healthcare. The college has built a sustainable infrastructure to provide pathways to occupations in these areas. The college established early college academies for high school students interested in IT and Healthcare. Programs included in this indicator are Database Administration, Windows, Software Development, Engineering Graphics Technology, Engineering Technician, Cybersecurity, Interactive 3D, Internetworking/CISCO, Digital Media, Web Development, Nursing and EMT. (The corresponding program codes are: CEDA, COIS, CPRG, ENGT, ENTC, IADF, IN3D, INTW, MULT, WEDV, EMT and NUR.)

<u>Outcome/Results:</u> While we barely missed the baseline, this was largely a function of softness of overall enrollment. Nonetheless we are proud of our continuing and successful efforts at preparing STEM ready graduates for the workforce. With an even greater focus on aligning outcomes of programs with industry needs through our Guided Pathways approach, we remain confident of even better results in this indicator in the years ahead.

# Indicator 6: Directional Improvement in College Algebra Pass Rates

**Description:** Successful completion of College Algebra is the most important leading, predictive indicator for completing a college credential. Nationally, failure to get a passing grade the first time around is an obstacle to completion for about 60% of college students who quit before earning a credential. Students who don't pass College Algebra often leave school in their first year. For AY2018, Butler implemented a complete math redesign from the lowest developmental course through College Algebra. The project divided seven existing courses (four three-credit hour courses and three one-credit hour courses) into twelve one-credit modules that would enable students to develop the skills they need to be successful in College Algebra. While we still offer College Algebra (MA135) in the traditional format, we have received approval at the state level for the following equivalency: College Algebra 1,2 and 3 (MA132, MA133 and MA134) = College Algebra (MA135). These modules include in-class learning support and tutoring and help with study skills and other noncognitive skills. The intent of the redesign is to lessen the time students take to move through the sequence and to increase the number of students that successfully complete College Algebra. The success rate for AY2017 is calculated by dividing the number of College Algebra students who persist to the end of the term and receive a grade of A, B or C by the number of students who receive an A, B, C, D, F grade or who withdraw from the class before the term ends.

*Outcome/Results:* Butler is proud of the results of its continuing and intentional efforts to make the transition from developmental to college-credit shorter and more economical. The Math Redesign to modularizes the developmental math courses through College Algebra has been a direct influence on these encouraging trends.

Independence Community College	Currently at 75% funding;
	Requesting 90% funding

**Indicator number and title:** Indicator 6: Improve percentage of students who successfully complete (A, B, or C) online courses.

Identify alternative evaluation criteria being used: Sustained Excellence

# Justification:

Independence Community College received HLC approval to offer fully online programs and courses on December 14, 2015.

Before this time, we could only offer 50% of a degree program online, thus limiting the amount of course offerings available to students. Once approval occurred, ICC was able to rapidly increase our course offerings, thus ensuring more students access to the modality they sought for course completion.

In reviewing ICC's performance on this indicator since AY2014, you will indeed see a level of sustained excellence even though the number of course offerings tripled in size to AY2017. The only difference is that due to our sustained excellence, our average of the three prior years increased our baseline by 4.2%.

# Please see the chart below:

Indicator:	AY 2014:	AY2015:	AY2016:	AY2017:
6.) Improve percentage of students who successfully	72% (312/433)	76% (109/144)	66% (96/146)	66% (865/1303)
complete (A, B, or C) online courses.				

Our base line for the prior three years (AY14, 15, 16) was 63.8%. On this agreement, the percentage has increased to 68% due to the baseline data using AY13, 14, and 15. AY2016 was not included in the baseline calculation of 68%, but as you can tell from the table above, we have remained steady in our success rates regarding students successfully passing an online course with ICC despite the rapid enrollment increase. It is for this reason that we request to be moved to the next tiered funding rate.

Independence Community Colleg	e Perfo	rmance Report AY 2017	AY 2017 FTE: 826						
Contact Person: Kara Wheeler		Phone and email: 620-332-5635; kwhe			Date: 7/24/2018				
			AY 201		AY 20		AY 2019		
	Foresight		(Summer 2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(Summer		(Summer 2018,		
Independence Community College	Goals	3 yr History	Fall 2016, Spring 2017)		Fall 2017, Spring 2018)			ring 2019)	
			Institutional		Institutional		Institutional		
			Performance	Outcome	Performance	Outcome	Performance	Outcome	
<b>1</b> Increase first to second year retention rates of college ready cohort	1	2012: 42.2% (38/90) 2013: 33.3% (50/150) 2014: 43.9% (43/98) Baseline: 38.7% (131/338)	44.4% (59/133)	Ť					
<b>2</b> Increase number of certificates and degrees awarded to ICC students	1	2013: 314 2014: 272 2015: 214 Baseline: 266	186	ţ					
<b>3</b> Increase the retention rate of students who participate in our Student Support Services program.	1	2009:45% (88/194) 2010:53% (100/189) 2011:54% (106/195) Baseline:51% (294/578)	84% (194/230)	Ť					
<b>4</b> Increase % of students employed in a related field and/or continuing their education within one year of successfully completing any Program	2	2012-13: 52% (146/280) 2013-14: 39% (90/229) 2014-15: 66% (111/169) Baseline: 51% (347/678)	47% (66/141)	Ţ					
<b>5</b> Increase completion % of students who complete English Comp I with at least a grade of "C" after completing a developmental English course.		2012: 76% (22/29) 2013: 79% (33/42) 2014: 75% (9/12) Baseline: 77% (64/83)	73% (8/11)	Ţ					
*6 Improve percentage of students who successfully complete (A, B, or C) online courses.		F12/S13: 65.3% (678/1,038) F13/S14: 72.1% (312/433) F14/S15: 76% (109/144) Baseline: 68% (1,099/1,615)	66% (865/1303)	Ţ					
*Updated 7-16-18									

# **Independence Community College Performance Report AY 2017**

#### Indicator 1: Increase first to second year retention rates of college ready cohort.

**Description:** According to KBOR data, an average of 38.7% of first-time, full-time college ready students who enroll in the fall semester return to ICC the following fall term. This means that over the past three years, 207 students have failed to return for their second year with us. To try and help increase this percentage, ICC will be looking to move advising from faculty to full-time staffed positions.

<u>Outcome/Results</u>: ICC moved in January of this past year to implement student "Navigators", or full-time staff to serve as the sole contact for students regarding their journey at ICC. Navigators walk with students from the admissions process all the way through to graduation. While the data we received from KBOR for this outcome (59/133—44.4%) was above our baseline, we would like to continue to push this number higher with the implementation of the Navigators. We will not really see the results of this effort until the third year of data collection. Power Campus was implemented during this period, although the functionality of academic plans is still on the to-do list for implementation. Hopefully with some updates coming this summer to Power Campus, we will be able to build these plans out and put them to work this next academic year.

# Indicator 2: Increase number of certificates and degrees awarded to ICC students.

**Description:** ICC knows that we can do a better job of helping students understand the value of completing their degree or certificate while they are enrolled with us. Many of the initiatives that will be implemented to improve retention of students will also allow us to increase the number of students who complete their programs with us before they take their next step.

**Outcome/Results:** ICC was only able to award 186 completions. This is a significant drop from the previous year but shows the results of having less technical short-term certificates awarded. Part of this is due to smaller populations of high school students in our service area, and part of it is our fault for not developing more opportunities for students to be awarded shorter certificates. We worked hard this year to offer more short-term certificate options to those who may be wanting to update their skills or as a stackable credential. Again, we will not see whether our efforts were effective or not for another data reporting year.

#### Indicator 3: Increase the retention rate of students who participate in our Student Support Services program.

**Description:** Students served by our Student Support Services (SSS) program, a TRIO program funded by the US Department of Education, are identified to be at high risk of failure by virtue of having earned low scores on academic proficiency tests, having low high school grades, being of limited English proficiency or not having graduated from high school. The denominator is the total membership in SSS for that academic year. The numerator is the number of those SSS members who returned for the next fall semester. Their part-time or full-time status was not taken into account because the grant does not specify enrollment load. For clarification, for 2009—the denominator (194) is the total membership for SSS for the 2009-2010 school year. The numerator (88), is the number who returned the next fall (Fall 2010).

Outcome/Results: We had 194/230 students (84%) of student return, so we exceeded our goal is this category.

Indicator 4: Increase % of students employed in a related field and/or continuing their education within one year of successfully completing any program. <u>Description</u>: ICC's baseline for this indicator is 51%. ICC has worked hard this past year to update most of its technical programs to ensure employability in those fields once students graduate, and to educate technical faculty on good advising practices to ensure we are giving students the best advice to get work in that field. We think that we can continue to increase this percentage over the next three years by continually working with faculty on their important role with retention and completion. The denominator is the total number of students on the Follow-Up File provided by the college from KBOR. These students represent all graduates of ICC's career and tech ed. certificates and AAS programs. The numerator are the students who are working in their related field, and/or continuing their education. <u>Outcome/Results:</u> 47% (66/141) students were employed in a related field or continuing their education within one year of successfully completing any program. While this is below our baseline, it is within 4% and falls into the middle of the three years that were pulled to establish the baseline. ICC does not have a good mechanism for tracking students once they leave our institution, so this job falls mainly on instructors of technical programs to track their students beyond graduation. This data will continue to not be very reliable using word-of-mouth contacts.

# Indicator 5: Increase completion % of students who complete English Comp I with at least a grade of "C" after completing a developmental English course.

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G
Fall of	# Enrolled in Comp Prep	# Successful in Comp Prep	% Loss from Column A	# Enroll in Comp I by end of next AY	% Loss from Column A	# Successful in Comp I	Success Rate (Column F/Column A)
2010	77	53	31%	44	57%	37	48%
2011	75	46	39%	36	52%	30	40%
2012	69	34	51%	29	58%	22	32%
2013	75	57	24%	42	44%	33	44%
2014	40	17	57%	12	70%	9	23%

*Description:* This data is comprised by using the following table:

The numerator is column "F", which is the number of students who successfully completed English Comp I with an A, B, or C. The denominator is column "D" which is the total number of students who successfully passed Comp Prep and enrolled in Comp I by of the end of the next annual year. This data is pulled from the National Community College Benchmarking Project. ICC will increase student academic success in passing Composition I after students have successfully completed development writing. Data compiled for the baseline indicated a need to review student success in Composition I after successfully completing Composition Preparation, as we are seeing a downward trend in the year to year percentage. ICC proposes strengthening student success from developmental through college level writing so that at least 85% of those students are successful by 2017.

<u>Outcome/Results:</u> ICC reached 73% (8/11) students successfully completing English Comp I with an A, B, or C after they successfully passed Comp Prep. We consider this as met because of the low number of students used for the percentages. Overall, we need to continue to ensure students who start in Comp Prep can pass it, because their opportunities to pass English Comp I increase greatly when they start at this level.

# Indicator 6: Improve percentage of students who successfully complete (A, B, or C) online courses.

**Description:** As part of our overall efforts to attract and retain students, ICC has spent considerable time redesigning our online courses, while ensuring academic rigor. The denominator is the entire number of online enrollees for the entire academic year (summer, fall, spring). The numerator is the number of students successfully passing the online courses with a C or above. The data calculation is A, B, C, P/A, B, C, D, F. (This data is reported in the same format to the NCCBP annually.)

**Outcome/Results:** ICC had 66% (865/1303) students pass with an A, B, C, or P. The exponential growth of students within online classes shows the impact that accreditation had on the ability to offer online classes. We only came in 2% below our goal, which for us is really good and maintaining our baseline since we went from 144 students enrolled to 1,303. We have been able to keep rigor up and while still having students successfully pass their courses.

Seward Community College	Currently at 75% funding;
	Requesting 90% funding

**Indicator number and title:** Indicator 2: Performance of students on institutional quality measures – Increase success rate of students in college algebra.

# Identify alternative evaluation criteria being used:

- Sustained excellence;
- Improved performance using a three-year rolling average of the most recent three years;
- Ranking on the indicator based on a relevant peer group.

#### Justification:

The peer institutions used for comparison were selected through the National Community College Benchmark Project reporting system using the characteristics of rural, public, and at least 20% Hispanic enrollment. One institution from Kansas, one from Colorado, two from Texas, and one institution from New Mexico met the selection characteristics. Between 233 and 260 community colleges submitted data to the National Community College Benchmark Project, depending on the year.

Institution	Fall 2016	National	Institution		National	Institution		National	Institution		National	Institution		National
Institution	Fdli 2010	Rank	institution	Fall 2015	Rank	msulution	Fall 2014	all 2014 Rank	Fall 2013	Fall 2013	Rank	institution	Fall 2012	Rank
A	79%	86%	SCCC	80%	87%	SCCC	82%	92%	SCCC	76%	83%	SCCC	75%	84%
SCCC	77%	83%	Α	78%	81%	Α	71%	71%	A	68%	65%	Α	70%	76%
В	75%	77%	В	74%	74%	В	68%	63%	В	66%	59%	В	65%	60%
С	66%	48%	С	71%	66%	С	60%	33%	С	56%	26%	С	59%	37%
D	60%	28%	D	67%	53%	D	59%	31%	D	49%	10%	D	53%	18%
E	56%	19%	E	53%	17%	E	44%	2%	E	40%	2%	E	42%	4%

SCCC has demonstrated sustained excellence over the past five reporting periods with college algebra success rates between 75% and 82%. The national rankings were between 83% and 92%.

Over the past three years, the average student success rate has been 80%, which is an increase over the current performance agreement baseline. When compared to our regional peers with similar demographics, SCCC students have had the highest success rates in four of the last five years.

Seward County Community Colleg	e Perto	rmance Report AY 2017	AY 2017 FTE: 1,262					
Contact Person: Todd Carter		Phone and email: 620-417-1012; todd.ca		Date: 7/18/2018				
Seward County Community College	Foresight Goals	3 yr History	AY 2017 (Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017)		AY 2018 (Summer 2017, Fall 2017, Spring 2018)		AY 2019 (Summer 2018, Fall 2018, Spring 2019)	
			Institutional Performance	Outcome	Institutional Performance	Outcome	Institutional Performance	Outcome
<b>1</b> Increase the number of certificates and degrees awarded	1	AY2013 - 450 AY2014 - 488 AY2015 - 484 Baseline: 474	527	ſ				
*2 Performance of students on institutional quality measures -Increase success rate of students in College Algebra.	• • •	F13 – 166/220 (75.5%) F14 – 189/232 (81.5%) F15 – 170/215 (79.1%) Baseline: 525/667 (78.7%)	77.4% (181/234)	Ţ				
*3 Increase three-year graduation rates of college ready cohort	1	F10 Cohort – 75/149 (50.3%) F11 Cohort – 101/204 (49.5%) F12 Cohort – 97/196 (49.5%) Baseline: 273/549 (49.7%)	37.2% (73/196)	Ţ				
<b>4</b> Increase the success rate of developmental writing students in English Composition I	1	F12 Cohort – 23/35 (65.7%) F13 Cohort – 24/36 (66.7%) F14 Cohort – 39/59 (66.1%) Baseline: 86/130 (66.1%)	59.2% 32/54	ţ				
*5 Increase the first to second year retention rate for college ready cohort.	1	F12 Cohort: 122/191 (63.9%) F13 Cohort: 102/159 (64%) F14 Cohort: 115/196 (59%) Baseline: 339/546 (62.1%)	57.4% (112/195)	ţ				
<b>6</b> Increase the % of full-time students completing 24 credit hours in their first year	1	F2012 Cohort – 144/360 (40%) F2013 Cohort – 213/310 (69%) F2014 Cohort – 238/349 (68%) Baseline: 595/1,019 (58%)	73% 256/353	Ť				
*Updated 7-18-18								

# Seward County Community College Performance Report AY 2017

#### Indicator 1: Increase the number of certificates and degrees awarded.

Description: The data for this indicator is provided by the Kansas Higher Education Data System.

# Outcome/Results:

The number of certificates and degrees is above the baseline and increased by 29 over the previous year (498 in AY2016).

#### Indicator 2: Increase the success rate of students in College Algebra.

*Description:* This indicator uses data from the National Community College Benchmark Project. It allows us to compare our success rates with peer colleges and with all participating community colleges in the nation. The denominator represents all students taking college algebra in the fall semester, while the numerator represents students successfully completing the course with a grade of A, B, or C.

# Outcome/Results:

The Fall 2016 success rate is 1.4% below the baseline which equates to 3 students. In comparison, our success rate is higher than 75% of the community colleges reporting to the National Community College Benchmark Project.

Historical National Community College Benchmark Ranking:

Fall 2016 Enrollee Success 77.4%; 75th percentile (based on 2015 rating scale, 2016 not available until September 2018)

Fall 2015 Enrollee Success 80%; 87th percentile

Fall 2014 Enrollee Success 81.97%; 92nd percentile

Fall 2013 Enrollee Success 75.91%; 83rd percentile

# Indicator 3: Increase the three year graduation rate of the college ready cohort.

**Description:** The data for this indicator is provided by the Kansas Higher Education Data System.

- 1) All first-time, full-time degree or certificate seeking students entering the fall semester.
- 2) Full-time is defined as 12 or more credit hours for the fall semester.
- 3) College ready is defined as students not requiring any developmental education courses.

# Outcome/Results:

The graduation rate for the college ready cohort was 12.5% below the baseline which equates to a decrease of 24 students. Six students in the Cosmetology program did not finish until after the AY2017 report cutoff date. They completed the program over the summer and did not return in fall 2017. There is no way for these students to be identified in the KSPSD system because the completions file has not yet been reported, so the students are counted as non-completers. We have adjusted the Cosmetology program for 2018-19 to alleviate the reporting overlap in the future. We also discovered two students who completed the Diesel program that did not make application for graduation and were not awarded. We will award the certificates. These additional 8 students would increase our graduation rate from 37.2% to 41.3%. As of Fall 2014, students cannot enroll unless their bill is paid, or they are in good standing on a payment plan. Our retention data shows a 26% decrease in retention for students with past-due accounts which would certainly impact graduation rates (see indictor 5 explanation).

# Indicator 4: Increase the success rate of developmental writing students in English Composition I.

**Description:** This indicator uses data from the National Community College Benchmark Project. It allows us to compare our success rates with peer colleges and with all participating community colleges in the nation. This indicator focuses on student success in their first college level writing course after completing the previous

developmental writing course with a grade of A, B, or C. The denominator represents all students completing English Composition I within one year after successfully completing developmental writing in the fall semester. The numerator indicates the students completing English Composition I with a grade of A, B, or C.

# Outcome/Results:

The success rate for the Fall 2016 cohort of developmental writing students in English Composition I was 6.9% below the baseline, a decrease of 4 students. Our research shows that 16 students who were successful in development writing did not attempt English Composition I and we are investigating individual student circumstances among this group. If students exit the developmental writing course with a grade of "C", they are advised about the historically low success rate in English Composition I and are offered alternative methods to improve the areas that will make them successful. In the Fall 2016 cohort, 1 of 5 students with a grade of "C" successfully completed English Composition I. Over the past year we piloted a co-requisite English Composition I course where students who place in the top half of the developmental writing placement range can enroll in English Composition I along with a co-requisite course where they get assistance with specific areas that need improvement. Twenty-three students chose to participate in the pilot and 70% (16/23) successfully completed. Students who placed in English Composition I had a 71% success rate.

# Indicator 5: Increase the retention rate of degree / certificate seeking students.

*Description:* This indicator uses retention data from KHEDS and focuses on the first year to second year retention rate of the college ready cohort of students. The denominator represents all degree or certificate seeking students, not requiring developmental education for the program of enrollment (e.g. students enrolled in Welding Technology certificate program) or placing into college-level courses (e.g. transfer track student). The numerator indicates students retained from fall to fall.

# Outcome/Results:

The AY17 retention rate is 4.7% below the baseline which equates to a loss of 9 additional. The six completions in Cosmetology are not in the calculation (see indicator 3) and would increase the retention rate by 3.1% to 60.5%. Our research shows an increase in students with past-due accounts over the past three years (note the decrease of 5% for the F14 cohort). As of Fall 2014, students cannot enroll unless their bill is paid, or they are in good standing on a payment plan. The retention rate for students in the AY2017 cohort with past-due accounts is 39% while students with no past-due account are retained at 65%. There are certainly many factors involved in retention but paying for college has consistently been a concern for our students based on surveys and focus groups. In response to this issue, we have added additional financial aid and bilingual advising staff to specifically address counseling of first-generation students and families. We have also revised our student and parent orientation to improve communication of the financial responsibilities and financial aid opportunities for the Fall 2018 cohort.

# Indicator 6: Increase the % of first-time, full-time students completing 24 credit hours in their first year of college.

*Description:* This indicator focuses on increasing the percentage of full-time entering freshman completing 24 or more credit hours in their first year of college. The data used to calculate this indicator are provided by KHEDS.

- 1) All first-time, full-time degree or certificate seeking students entering in the fall semester.
- 2) Full-time is defined as 12 or more credit hours for the fall semester.
- 3) Credit hour accumulation in first year is the number of full-time students who earned 24 credit hours in the fall, spring, and summer terms combined.
- 4) The indicator is calculated by taking the total from (3) and dividing by the total from (1).

# Outcome/Results:

The 15% increase over the baseline is misleading because of the low data point for the F2012 cohort. Compared to Fall 2013 and 2014, we had a 4% increase which equates to 14 additional students achieving at least 24 credit hours in their first year. Complete College America reports 35% of the Fall 2012 community college cohort achieved 24 or more credit hours in their first year compared to 73% at SCCC. Thirty-three states report data to Complete College America.

Pratt Community College	Currently at 0% funding;
	Requesting 75% funding

**Indicator number and title**: Indicator 1: Increase first-to-second year retention rates of the college ready cohort (full-time students not enrolled in developmental classes.)

**Identify alternative evaluation criteria being used:** Include the number of students who earn the One Year Electrical Power Line Technology-Certificate as college ready cohort completers.

# Justification:

During AY17, Pratt Community College (PCC) did not meet Indicator 1 (55% 83/151). Historically, PCC has had extreme difficulties meeting Indicator 1, primarily because of the number of students enrolled in the Electrical Power Line Technology (EPT) Program. Institutionally, the EPT Program has two tracks for student completion. The first is the One Year Electrical Power Line Technology-Certificate and the second is the Electrical Power Line Technology-Associate of Applied Science degree.

During AY17, 51 students enrolled in the EPT Program, of which 11 earned the Electrical Power Line Technology-Associate of Applied Science degree compared to 40 students who earned the One Year Electrical Power Line Technology-Certificate. If the students who successfully completed the One Year Electrical Power Line Technology-Certificate were included in Indicator 1, PCC would have met the benchmark (81%, 123/151). Granting PCC's request to include the One Year Electrical Power Line Technology-Certificate as college ready cohort completers, BAASC would recognize the fact industry hires students after one year and the students have met their academic goal of obtaining a full-time position in their chosen career path.

Below is a synopsis of three alternative evaluation criteria which justifies PCC's request for BAASC to include the One Year Electrical Power Line Technology-Certificate as college ready cohort completers for Indicator 1:

• Sustained Excellence. The EPT Program is celebrating its 35th anniversary and has a longstanding history of sustained excellence. For example, year-over-year job placement rates hover between 95%-to-96% and Department of Labor Evaluation consistently rates the program at <90% which is above the 75% benchmark. Further, in 2017, the Kansas Board of Regents reported PCC' s EPT Program has one of the best return-on-investments; lineman in the region have the potential to earn \$100,000 within five years of entering the industry. Finally, this career has grown by 5% the last two years; it is expected to grow by 10% over the next 10 years.

• Peer Group Ranking. When compared across multiple metrics, including, but not limited to, job placement rates, salaries, industry partnerships, faculty qualifications, innovation, etc. PCC's EPT Program is the premier in the state compared to other institutions with comparable programs.

• Extenuating Circumstances. Students enroll in a paid summer internship. Once they enter the industry, the vast majority of students typically are offered full-time positions and do not return to complete their AAS degree. Whereas the 11 students who completed the AAS degree during AY17 were required to earn their degree prior to being employed full-time by the company where they completed their summer internship. Additionally, industry partners, advisory board members, and other stakeholders have advocated to transition away from the AAS option and only offer the One Year Certificate Program. To date, PCC's Vice President of Instruction has staunchly opposed this recommendation, in favor of continuing to provide students an option to complete their degree.

Gratitude to BAASC for allowing PCC the opportunity to request 75% funding.

11/16/18 Av. Calvert

Foresight Goals	3 yr History	(Summer 2016,		(Summer	2017,	AY 2019 (Summer 2018, Fall 2018, Spring 201	
		Institutional	- 8 /	Institutional		Institutional	
		Performance	Outcome	Performance	Outcome	Performance	Outcome
1	Fall 2012 62/102 60.8% Fall 2013 109/173 63.0% Fall 2014 68/125 54.4% Baseline: 239/400 59.7%	55.0% (83/151)	ţ				
1	AY 2010 Cohort 286/451 63.4% AY 2011 Cohort 469/684 68.6% AY 2012 Cohort 446/657 67.9% Baseline: 1,201/1,792 67.0%	65.3% (395/605)					
2	AY 2013 637 AY 2014 474 AY 2015 483 Baseline: 531	305	ţ				
1	Fall 2012 106/141 75.2% Fall 2013 110/139 79.1% Fall 2014 142/181 78.5% Baseline: 357/461 77.4%	78.3% (141/180)	Ť				
1	Fall 2010 191/299 63.9% Fall 2011 147/243 60.5% Fall 2012 159/230 69.1% Baseline: 497/772 64.4%	60% (181/302)	ţ				
2	Fall 2012 44/56 78.6% Fall 2013 36/61 59.0% Fall 2014 50/62 80.6% Baseline: 130/179 72.6%	66.2% (47/71)	ţ				
	Foresight Goals         1	Foresight Goals         3 yr History           1         Fall 2012 62/102 60.8% Fall 2013 109/173 63.0% Fall 2014 68/125 54.4% Baseline: 239/400 59.7%           1         AY 2010 Cohort 286/451 63.4% AY 2011 Cohort 469/684 68.6% AY 2012 Cohort 446/657 67.9% Baseline: 1,201/1,792 67.0%           2         AY 2013 637 AY 2014 474 AY 2015 483 Baseline: 531           1         Fall 2012 106/141 75.2% Fall 2013 110/139 79.1% Fall 2014 142/181 78.5% Baseline: 357/461 77.4%           1         Fall 2010 191/299 63.9% Fall 2011 147/243 60.5% Fall 2012 159/230 69.1% Baseline: 497/772 64.4%           2         Fall 2012 44/56 78.6% Fall 2013 36/61 59.0% Fall 2014 50/62 80.6%	Foresight Goals         3 yr History         AY 20 (Summer Fall 2016, Sp Institutional Performance           1         Fall 2012 62/102 60.8% Fall 2013 109/173 63.0% Fall 2013 109/173 63.0% Fall 2014 68/125 54.4% Baseline: 239/400 59.7%         Institutional Performance           1         AY 2010 Cohort 286/451 63.4% AY 2011 Cohort 469/684 68.6% AY 2012 Cohort 446/657 67.9% Baseline: 1,201/1,792 67.0%         65.3% (395/605)           2         AY 2013 637 AY 2014 474 AY 2015 483 Baseline: 531         305           1         Fall 2012 106/141 75.2% Fall 2013 110/139 79.1% Fall 2013 110/139 79.1% Fall 2014 142/181 78.5% Baseline: 357/461 77.4%         78.3% (141/180)           1         Fall 2010 191/299 63.9% Fall 2011 147/243 60.5% Fall 2012 159/230 69.1% Baseline: 497/772 64.4%         60% (181/302)           2         Fall 2012 44/56 78.6% Fall 2013 36/61 59.0% Fall 2013 36/61 59.0% Fall 2014 50/62 80.6%         66.2% (47/71)	Foresight Goals         3 yr History         AY 2017 (Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017)           1         Fall 2012 62/102 60.8% Fall 2013 109/173 63.0% Fall 2013 109/173 63.0% Fall 2014 68/125 54.4% Baseline: 239/400 59.7%         55.0% (83/151)         ↓           1         AY 2010 Cohort 286/451 63.4% AY 2011 Cohort 469/684 68.6% AY 2012 Cohort 446/657 67.9% Baseline: 1,201/1,792 67.0%         65.3% (395/605)         ↓           2         AY 2013 637 AY 2014 474 AY 2015 483 Baseline: 531         305         ↓           1         Fall 2012 106/141 75.2% Fall 2013 110/139 79.1% Fall 2014 142/181 78.5% Baseline: 357/461 77.4%         78.3% (141/180)         ↑           1         Fall 2010 191/299 63.9% Fall 2011 147/243 60.5% Fall 2012 159/230 69.1% Baseline: 497/772 64.4%         60% (181/302)         ↓           2         Fall 2012 2159/230 69.1% Baseline: 497/772 64.4%         66.2% (47/71)         ↓	Foresight Goals         AY 2017 (Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017)         AY 20 (Summer Fall 2017, Spring 2017)           1         Fall 2012 62/102 60.8% Fall 2013 109/173 63.0% Fall 2013 109/173 63.0% Fall 2014 68/125 54.4% Baseline: 239/400 59.7%         Institutional Performance         Outcome           1         AY 2010 Cohort 286/451 63.4% AY 2011 Cohort 469/684 68.6% AY 2012 Cohort 446/657 67.9% Baseline: 1,201/1,792 67.0%         65.3% (395/605)         ↓           2         AY 2013 637 AY 2014 474 AY 2015 483 Baseline: 531         305         ↓           1         Fall 2012 106/141 75.2% Fall 2013 110/139 79.1% Fall 2014 142/181 78.5% Baseline: 357/461 77.4%         78.3% (141/180)         ↑           1         Fall 2010 191/299 63.9% Fall 2011 147/243 60.5% Fall 2012 159/230 69.1% Baseline: 497/772 64.4%         60% (181/302)         ↓           2         Fall 2012 44/56 78.6% Fall 2013 36/61 59.0% Fall 2013 36/61 59.0% Fall 2014 50/62 80.6%         66.2% (47/71)         ↓	Foresight Goals         AY 2017 (Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017)         AY 2018 (Summer 2017, Fall 2017, Spring 2018)           1         Fall 2012 62/102 60.8% Fall 2013 109/173 63.0% Fall 2014 68/125 54.4% Baseline: 239/400 59.7%         55.0% (83/151)         ↓           1         AY 2010 Cohort 286/451 63.4% AY 2011 Cohort 469/684 68.6% AY 2012 Cohort 446/657 67.9% Baseline: 1,201/1,792 67.0%         65.3% (395/605)         ↓           2         AY 2013 637 AY 2014 474 AY 2015 483 Baseline: 531         305         ↓           1         Fall 2012 106/141 75.2% Fall 2013 110/139 79.1% Fall 2014 142/181 78.5% Baseline: 357/461 77.4%         78.3% (141/180)         ↑           1         Fall 2010 191/299 63.9% Fall 2011 147/243 60.5% Fall 2012 159/230 69.1% Baseline: 497/772 64.4%         60% (181/302)         ↓           2         Fall 2012 144/56 78.6% Fall 2013 36/61 59.0% Fall 2014 59/62 80.6%         66.2% (47/71)         ↓	Foresight Goals         3 yr History         AY 2017 (Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017)         AY 2018 (Summer 2017, Fall 2017, Spring 2018)         AY 20 Fall 2017, Spring 2018)           1         Fall 2012 62/102 60.8% Fall 2013 109/173 63.0% Fall 2014 68/125 54.4% Baseline: 239/400 59.7%         55.0% (83/151)         1         Institutional Performance         Institutional Performance         Institutional Performance         Institutional Performance           1         AY 2010 Cohort 286/451 63.4% AY 2011 Cohort 469/684 68.6% AY 2012 Cohort 446/657 67.9% Baseline: 1.201/1,792 67.0%         65.3% (395/605)         1         Image: Commer 2017, Fall 2012 62/102 60.4%         Performance         Outcome         Performance         Performance           2         AY 2010 Cohort 286/451 63.4% AY 2012 Cohort 446/657 67.9% Baseline: 1.201/1,792 67.0%         305         1         Image: Commer 2017, Fall 2012 106/141 75.2% Fall 2013 110/139 79.1% Fall 2013 110/139 79.1% Fall 2014 142/181 78.5% Baseline: 357/461 77.4%         78.3% (141/180)         1           1         Fall 2010 191/299 63.9% Fall 2011 147/243 60.9% Fall 2012 159/230 69.1% Baseline: 497/772 64.4%         60% (181/302)         1           2         Fall 2012 14/56 78.6% Fall 2013 36/61 59.0% Fall 2013 36/61 59.0% Fall 2014 36/67 80.6%         66.2% (47/71)         1

# Pratt Community College Performance Report AY 2017

#### Indicator 1: Increase first to second year retention rates of the college ready cohort (full-time student not enrolled in developmental classes)

*Description:* The data for this outcome will be provided by KBOR. The cohort will be composed of students who are new to college fall semester and are full-time students seeking a degree. Students enrolled in a developmental course in the fall term are excluded from this population.

<u>Outcome/Results:</u> Overall our retention rate has fallen 4.7% when compared to the baseline average for the previous 3 year average. When compared to the fall of 2014 we do show a slight upward trend. Our assessment of this trend indicates that 25% of the 2016 cohort group included students enrolled in PCC's Electrical Power Technology program (EPT). Due to high demand from employers for EPT students, less than 40% of EPT students from this cohort were retained beyond the certificate program year contributing to the downward trend. We anticipate that this trend will continue as our EPT program attracts more students and as wages and demand for these credentials increase.

# Indicator 2: Increase third year Student Success Index

**Description:** The data for this outcome will be provided by KBOR. The cohort will include all students who are new to Pratt Community College during the academic year. The Index is a summation of students who were retained in higher education, or who completed a program. This approach encompasses the entire success of a community college by tracking students after they leave the college.

<u>Outcome/Results:</u> Our results for second year students is a slight downward ward trend at 65.3% with a downward trend of 1.7% over the baseline. Despite this downward trend locally, statewide, we exceed all other Community Colleges in third year student success.

# Indicator 3: Increase the number of certificates and degrees awarded

**Description:** The number of certificates and degrees awarded will include all degrees and certificates to include successfully completed SAPP's and awarded certificate and degrees will include duplication based on student attainment. The data used for reporting will be obtained through reports already being collected through KBOR in the KHEDS system and will include Nursing Aide, Medication Aide, and Home Health Aide. PCC acknowledges that the overall number of certificates and degrees will decrease over the baseline data due to the reduction in Nursing program structure and capacity. We are confident that this number will increase starting in academic year 2016-2017.

<u>Outcome/Results:</u> Currently PCC is experiencing a downward trend in certificates awarded, however, this is due in part to our Nursing program, which contributed to greater gains in 2013 and greater reduction in 2014. This downward trend within our Nursing program is due in part to the PCC and WATC partnership agreement, which shifted NCLEX-PN programming exclusively to WATC and also resulted in a reduction in the number of students in our Nursing program for AY 2014 and 2015. We anticipate a continued decline in 2016 and 2017 as a result of measured reduction in our Nursing program to improve program quality and student success. We expect this trend to continue trending down slightly during the next two reporting cycles as we stabilize our PN and ADN program.

# Indicator 4: Increase fall to spring retention rate of students who enroll in developmental coursework (Writing, Reading, Math)

**Description:** These data will be self-reported. The measure tracks the percentage of entering full-time students who enroll in a developmental course during the fall term and subsequently enroll in the spring term. The denominator will represent fall term entering full-time students who certified in a developmental course, and numerator will be those students who were retained for the following spring term.

<u>Outcome/Results</u>: Due to PCC's emphasis on holistic instructional practices and a focus on the needs of our developmental students, we have been able to make consistent and continual growth in the number of students retained and succeeding in higher education specifically for our students enrolled in developmental coursework. With this concerted effort the results currently trend upward from a baseline of 77.4% to 78.3%.

# Indicator 5: Increase three year Graduation and Transfer Rates of First-time, Full-time, Degree-seeking students (IPEDS Cohort)

*Description:* These data will be self-reported. The denominator is all first-time, full-time, degree-seeking students who enter in the fall term. Students are tracked for three years and are deemed successful (numerator) if they either graduate with a certificate or associates diploma or transfer to an institution to continue their education.

<u>Outcome/Results:</u> Data reported is based on the fall of 2014 cohort group which demonstrated a 4.4% downward trend from the baseline. Despite this downward trend, it should be noted that with PCC's efforts and coordination of both effort and resources, students participating in athletic activities have a graduation + transfer rate of 71%. The success generated through our PASS program for athletes is being explored as an intervention to be made available to all First-time, Full-time, Degree-seeking students.

#### Indicator 6: Increase Success of developmental students in corresponding college-level class

**Description:** These data will be self-reported. The measure will evaluate the successful transition of developmental students into corresponding college-level courses. The specific transitions being monitored are Basic Writing (ENG098) to Composition I (ENG176); and Beginning Algebra (MTH076) to Intermediate Algebra (MTH 130) or Technical Mathematics (MTH126) or College Mathematics (MTH176). The denominator will be students that successfully (completed with an A, B, C or P grade) Basic Writing and/or Beginning Algebra in a fall term and enrolled in the college-level course by the following fall. The numerator will be those who successfully completed the corresponding college-level course.

Composition I is applicable to any degree at Pratt CC. The college-level math coursework is applicable to technical credentials (Associates in Applied Science and technical certificates). If a student seeks a general transfer credential, higher coursework in mathematics is necessary. Pratt CC recognizes that this indicator evaluates a small portion of its FTE. The institution also recognizes that transitioning students out of remediation is a problem that will not improve in the foreseeable future. Students are increasingly entering college with a need for remediation, while the Kansas economy continues to require work-ready credentialed employees. This indicator will prime Pratt CC's institutional processes to be better prepared to tackle both needs. In order to meet this indicator, the institution will utilize new and existing initiatives to provide support to this student population.

**Outcome/Results:** The fall of 2016 success rate of developmental students in corresponding college-level courses dropped by 6.4% from the baseline of 72.6%. The fall 2016 data from the English department indicates that 81% of the students enrolled in developmental English successfully completed the appropriate college level English course while for the math department during the fall of 2016 only 51% of the students enrolled in developmental math successfully completed the corresponding level math course. Despite this downward trend, it is noted that 92% of students enrolled in targeted developmental courses successfully completed their course and enrolled in the corresponding level college course in Math and English combined. Success in developmental courses opened the doorway of opportunity to gateway courses making it possible for students to experience a highly rigorous Math and English course. As access increases for developmental students, PCC notes that more effort will be expended in ensuring students are able to obtain success in both English and Math.

# Act on Naming of Academic Unit - KSU

#### Summary

Kansas State University requests approval to name an academic unit, the College of Engineering, after an individual. According to Board policy "academic units shall be named for an individual, individuals or business entity by the Board upon the recommendation of the chief executive officer of the state university and the Board Academic Affairs Committee. No public communication of a proposed name shall be made until the name is presented for consideration to the open meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee."