

## 2014-15 Key Performance Indicators Report

Key Performance Indicators (KPI), Data Sources and Target Criteria were set initially July 30, 2012 by the 4.1 Task Force Committee. The Committee determined that three years of data would be collected on each KPI to ascertain appropriateness of selected criteria. For the 2014-2015 report, the KPI Review Committee **met June 6, 2016** to review collected data. Committee members present were: Cheryl Rogers and Jacque Messinger (Chairs), Juan Mejia, Ken Murphy, Tim Drain, Janna Chancey, Tam Nannen, Paul Monagan, Tom Johnson, Paige Parrish and Linda Gary. **It was decided that this report will serve as an executive summary for the Strategic Plan Report and be due in the spring of each academic year.**

**The committee reviewed all the Key Performance Indicators and determined that ten of them were viable measures, the target criterion was appropriate and the data source was appropriate. One KPI was determined not to be a viable measures for reasons stated later in this report.**

### STUDENT ACCESS

#### KPI 1: Enrollment

<b>Fall Enrollment on Official Census Date</b>	<b>FTIC Target: 2,491</b> <b>Overall Target: 11,281</b>
--	--

**Census Day Headcount:** Full-time/first time in college students (FT/FTIC–IPEDS cohort) were chosen to track increases in enrollment. The cohort increased by 5.9% from Fall 2012 to Fall 2013 but increased by 0.6% from Fall 2013 to Fall 2014. The cohort remained flat from Fall 2014 to Fall 2015 (Table 1). The target of 2,491 was not attained.

**Table 1- Fall Full-Time/First-Time in College Student Enrollment**

Headcount	FTIC/IPEDS*	Difference	% Change
Fall 2013	<b>2,452</b>	136	<b>5.9%</b>
Fall 2014	<b>2,466</b>	14	<b>0.6%</b>
Fall 2015	<b>2,464</b>	-2	<b>0.0%</b>

**\*includes ONLY new, first time full-time students**

Source: Fall census Headcount query, IRO via BANNER Student Information System

Overall census day final headcount is also measured in order to provide a contextual measure for appropriately placing the small sub-group of FT/FTIC students. The data indicate that overall enrollment was down 1.2% from Fall 2013 to Fall 2014 and down 2.1% from Fall 2014 to Fall 2015 (Table 2). The target of 11,281 was not attained.

**Table 2 - Fall Student Enrollment**

Headcount	Census Enrollment	Difference	% Change
Fall 2013	11,308	(66)	-0.6%
Fall 2014	11,169	(139)	-1.2%
Fall 2015	10,934	(236)	-2.1%

**Action Plan:**

- Recommend retaining current FTIC target and adjusting Overall target to 11,098 (1.5% increase).
- Refer to Strategic Plan Initiatives: 1.1.1-2-3-5-6-7-8, 1.2.2-4-5
- Continue to target service area graduating seniors for enrollment (marketing, advising, high school career fairs, etc.) (1.1.1, 1.1.2)
- Continue to target out-of-district graduating seniors for enrollment-(1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.6, 1.2.1, 2.2.2)  
Continue to increase marketing on scholarship opportunities (1.1.2, 2.3.4)
- Continue focusing on underserved areas within the service area (1.1.2)
- Continue to target students over 25 (1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.3.2)
- Target stop out students (1.1.2, 1.2.1) fits in this initiative
- Continue to target veterans (1.1.2)
- Continue to target retention (1.1.2, 1.2.1)
- Pilot MW/TR block schedule (1.1.1, 1.1.2) fits in this initiative
- Target CE students to transition to credit status (1.1.3, 1.1.6, 1.3.3, 2.1.2)
- Investigate enrolling dual credit and high school students by official census date (1.1.1) fits in this initiative
- Investigate maximizing program capacity (1.1.6? not sure where this fits)
- Investigate how many students are affected by the 150% rule (1.1.4, 1.1.5)
- Investigate how many students were on the housing waiting list (1.1.1, 1.2.1)

<b>Enrollment in distance education courses</b>	<b>Target: 16,694</b>
---	-----------------------

**Enrollment in Distance Education Courses:** Distance Education enrollment decreased slightly from academic year 2013 to academic year 2014. Another decrease of 9.5% was seen from academic year 2014 to academic year 2015. The target of 16, 694 was not attained. This decrease can be primarily attributed to the replacement of a completely online non-credit course, SDEV 0100, with EDUC 1300, which is taught face to face in addition to being online. It was decided that this measure will be broken out into two tables, fully online and Hybrid courses, in order to facilitate more in depth analysis.

**Table 3 – Distance Education Enrollment History**

<b>Distance Education Unduplicated Course Enrollment 3 Year History</b>							
<b>DISTANCE</b>	Fall	Winter	Spring	Maymester	Summer	<b>Total</b>	<b>% Change</b>
AY 2013	8,130	406	5,604	349	1911	<b>16,400</b>	11%
AY 2014	7,161	565	6,455	377	1971	<b>16,529</b>	-0.7%
AY 2015	6,710	697	5,286	367	1898	<b>14,958</b>	-9.5%

Source: IRO, BANNER Student Information system

**Action Plan:**

- Recommend adjusting the target to compensate for the changes in course composition (15,182/1.5% increase).
- Refer to Strategic Plan Initiatives: 1.1.1-5-6-7-8, 1.2.2-4-5

- Continue to increase number of fully online course offerings (1.1.7, 1.2.1, 1.2.4)
- Continue to offer completely online courses for Wintermester (1.1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.4)
- Continue expansion of online offerings for Maymester and summer sessions (1.1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.4)
- Continue expansion of fully online degree program offerings (1.1.7, 1.2.1, 1.2.4)
- Analyze online testing process (1.2.1, 1.2.4)

## KPI 2: Community Demographics

### Unduplicated Enrollment Demographics Mirror the Service Area

**Unduplicated Student Enrollment Demographics Mirror the Service Area:** The THECB monitors the demographics of the overall student enrollment against the demographics of the institution’s service area. This is also part of the THECB Closing The Gaps (CTG) initiative. The African American student population is over-represented and the male student population is under-represented compared to the service area demographic for both years. African American students have increased in the disparity by .4% for FY2015. White and Hispanic racial categories are under-represented as well. The targets were not attained for White, Hispanic or male. African American students increased .6% points above the target.

**Table 4 – Service Area Enrollment Comparison**

White	Targets: 55.4%
African American	25.1%
Hispanic	14.3%
Male	42.3%

TJC Student Enrollment by Service Area Comparison						
	FY 2014			FY 2015		
	TJC	Svc area	Difference	TJC	Svc area	Difference
White	56.0%	60.3%	-4.3%	54.9%	59.6%	-4.7%
African American	25.4%	16.6%	8.8%	25.7%	16.6%	9.2%
Hispanic	14.4%	20.2%	-5.8%	15.7%	20.8%	-5.1%
Male	41.9%	49.5%	-7.9%	40.8%	50.4%	-8.8%

THECB measures the gap between demographic groups in the service area and enrollment and then calculates a Service Difference (% enrolled-% population).

Source: THECB Accountability System Participation-Contextual Measures: Service Area Representation

### Action Plan:

Part of TJC’s strategic plan is to increase the enrollment of traditionally underserved populations, including Hispanic and African American students. Attainment of a matching service area representation runs counter to TJC’s commitment to the surrounding community and service area and our initiatives for increasing these underserved populations. Therefore, it was determined that this indicator be removed from the annual report and retired from the strategic plan effective June 2016.

# STUDENT SUCCESS

## KPI 3: Number of Students Who Complete Developmental Work

Increase Number of Success Points in Developmental Courses	1-3% increase
--	---------------

**Increase Number of Success Points:** The percent of First Time in College (FTIC) students who successfully completed specified developmental mathematics, reading and writing courses and become College Ready are included in the new Success Points funding measures from the state Accountability system. Table 5 represents that completion of developmental math decreased by 17 points from AY2013 to AY2014 and 103 from AY2014 to AY2015. Tables 6 and 7 represent that both English and Writing student readiness have decreased substantially. One reason for these decreases are TSI cutoff scores having been raised therefore lowering the number of students who are placed into developmental reading and writing. All three measures allow the FTIC student three years to become College Ready. The targets for English and Reading were not attained, while Math was 107 points above target.

**Table 5 – Developmental Math – THECB Success Points (1 point per student)**

<b>Math</b>	<b>Target: 313</b>
-------------	--------------------

MATH READINESS COMPLETION POINTS			
Academic Year	Points Awarded	Difference	% difference
2013	307		
2014	317	17	5.5%
2015	420	103	32.5%

Source: THECB Accountability System-Community Colleges Performance-Success Points

**Table 6 - Developmental English – THECB Success Points (.5 points per student)**

<b>English</b>	<b>Target: 345</b>
----------------	--------------------

ENGLISH READINESS (WRITING) COMPLETION POINTS			
Academic Year	Points Awarded	Difference	% difference
2013	339		
2014	291	-48	-14.2%
2015	212	-79	-27.2%

Source: THECB Accountability System-Community Colleges Performance-Success Points

**Table 7 - Developmental Reading – THECB Success Points (.5 points per student)**

<b>Reading</b>	<b>Target: 410</b>
----------------	--------------------

<b>READING READINESS COMPLETION POINTS</b>			
<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>% difference</b>
2013	401		
2014	331	-70	-17.5%
2015	272	-59	-17.8%

Source: THECB Accountability System-Community Colleges Performance-Success Points

**Action Plan:**

- Recommend changing targets to reflect 1.5% increase from 2015 actual points awarded.
- Refer to Strategic Plan Initiatives: 1.1.8, 1.2.1-5, 1.3.1-2
- Continue monitoring success of MATH 1414 (1.2.1, 1.2.5, 1.3.1)
- Continue monitoring initial input of student intent on applications (1.3.1)
- Continue to update TSI complete list (1.3.1)
- Continue to increase tutoring for math (1.1.8-nothing specific to math, 1.2.5-not specific to tutoring)

## KPI 4: Academic Success in Gateway Courses

Increase Number of Success Points in Gateway Math & English	1-3% increase
---	---------------

**Increase Number of Success Points:** The percent of points for students who successfully completed specified Mathematics courses increased in both years from AY2013 to AY2014 and AY2014 to AY2015, while completion rates for Writing increased from AY2013 to AY2014, but decreased for AY2014 to AY2015. Gateway reading increased from both AY2013 to AY2014 and AY2014 to AY2015. This increase can be attributed to the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) which focused on reading. The target for Writing was not attained (13 points below), while Math was 156 points above target and Reading was 345 points above target.

**Table 8 – Gateway Math completion – THECB Success Points (1 point per student)**

Gateway Math	Target: 1,810
--------------	---------------

COLLEGE LEVEL MATH COMPLETION POINTS			
Academic Year	Points Awarded	Difference	% difference
2013	1,793		
2014	1,924	131	7.3%
2015	1,966	42	2.2%

Source: THECB Accountability System-Community Colleges Performance-Success Points

**Table 9 - Gateway Writing completion – THECB Success Points (.5 points per student)**

Gateway Writing	Target: 1,258
-----------------	---------------

COLLEGE LEVEL WRITING COMPLETION POINTS			
Academic Year	Points Awarded	Difference	% difference
2013	1341		
2014	1,444	103	7.7%
2015	1,245	-199	-13.8%

Source: THECB Accountability System-Community Colleges Performance-Success Points

**Table 10 - Gateway Reading completion – THECB Success Points (.5 points per student)**

<b>Gateway Reading</b>	<b>Target: 1,355</b>
------------------------	----------------------

<b>COLLEGE LEVEL READING COMPLETION POINTS</b>			
<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>% difference</b>
2013	1,245		
2014	1,411.5	166.5	13.4%
2015	1,700	288.5	20.4%

Source: THECB Accountability System-Community Colleges Performance-Success Points

**Action Plan:**

- Recommend changing targets to reflect 1% increase from 2015 actual points awarded.
- Refer to Strategic Plan Initiatives: 1.1.8, 1.2.1-5, 1.3.1-2
- Continue monitoring success of MATH 1414 (1.2.1, 1.2.5, 1.3.1)
- Continue monitoring initial input of student intent on applications (1.3.1)
- Continue to update TSI complete list (1.3.1)
- Continue to increase tutoring for math (1.1.8-nothing specific to math, 1.2.5-not specific to tutoring)
- Continue to update list of gateway courses (1.3.1)
- Evaluate Technical Math to TSI courses (1.1.8, 1.3.1)

## KPI 5: Award Points for Students Who Complete 15 Credits of College Level Courses

Increase Number of Students Who Complete 15 Credit Hours	Target: 3,619
--	---------------

**Increase the Number of Students Who Complete 15 Credit Hours:** There was a 3.6% increase for students who completed 15 Semester credit hours during AY 2014 compared to AY 2013. This decreased by 6.6% for AY2015. The target of 3,619 was not attained.

**Table 11 – Students Completing 15 Semester Credit Hours - THECB Success Points (1 point per student)**

AWARD POINTS FOR STUDENTS COMPLETING 15 SEMESTER CREDIT HOURS			
Academic Year	Points Awarded	Difference	% difference
2013	3,583		
2014	3,713	130	3.6%
2015	3,467	-249	-6.6%

Source: THECB Accountability System-Community Colleges Performance-Success Points

### Action Plan:

- Recommend changing target to reflect 1.5% increase from 2015 actual points awarded.
- Refer to Strategic Plan Initiatives: 1.1.3-4-5-6-7, 1.2.1-2-4-5, 1.3.1-2
- Continue marketing Commit to Complete to students and faculty (1.3.2)
- Continue Holistic Advising (1.1.1, 1.1.5)
- Continue and expand peer, group and faculty tutoring opportunities (1.1.5, 1.1.8, 1.2.1)
- Pilot new Early Alert program (1.2.1)
- Develop Career Pathways (1.1.6, 2.2.5, 2.2.6)
- Complete implementation of Degree Works (1.1.5)
- Continue to use retention specialists to identify and target at-risk students(1.2.1, 1.3.2)
- Develop and market Level 1 Certificates (1.1.7)
- Initiate follow-up measures for Commit to Complete students (1.3.2)



## KPI 6: Award Points for Students Who Transfer With At Least 15 Semester Credit Hours

Increase Points Awarded for Students Who Transfer With At Least 15 Semester Credit Hours	Target: 2,632
--	---------------

**Increase the Number of Students Transferring with 15 SCH:** Success points awarded for students who transferred to a University after completing 15 semester credit hours at TJC decreased slightly during AY2014 compared to AY 2013 but increased by 2.2% in AY2015. The target of 2,632 was not attained.

**Table 12 – Points Awarded for Students Transferring after Completing 15 Semester Credit Hours – THECB Success Points (2 points per student)**

POINTS AWARDED FOR STUDENTS TRANSFERRING WITH 15 SEMESTER CREDIT HOURS			
Academic Year	Points Awarded	Difference	% difference
2013	2510		
2014	2492	-18	-0.07%
2015	2546	54	2.2%

Source: THECB Accountability System-Community Colleges Performance-Success Points

### Action Plan:

- Recommend changing target to reflect 1.5% increase from 2015 actual points awarded.
- Refer to Strategic Plan Initiatives: 1.1.3-6-7, 1.2.1-2-4-5, 1.3.1-2
- Develop Articulation Agreements
- Continue Career Coach to help students decide on majors
- Continue marketing Commit to Complete to students and faculty (1.3.2)
- Continue Holistic Advising (1.1.1, 1.1.5)
- Continue and expand peer, group and faculty tutoring opportunities (1.1.5, 1.1.8, 1.2.1)
- Pilot new Early Alert program (1.2.1)
- Develop Career Pathways (1.1.6, 2.2.5, 2.2.6)
- Complete implementation of Degree Works (1.1.5)

## KPI 7: Award Points for Students Who Complete 30 Credits of College Level Courses

Increase Number of Students Who Complete 30 Credit Hours	Target: 2,336
--	---------------

**Increase the Number of Students Who Complete 30 Credit Hours:** There was a 0.1% increase for students who completed 30 Semester credit hours during AY 2014 compared to AY 2013 (up 24 students) and down 1.4% for AY2015. Overall, this was 32 fewer points than the prior year. The increased number of transfers after 15 hours (KPI 6) may have had the unintended consequence of causing a reduction in 30 hour transfers. The target of 2,336 was not attained.

**Table 13 – Award Points for Students Completing 30 Semester Credit Hours – THECB Success Points (1 point per student)**

AWARD POINTS FOR STUDENTS COMPLETING 30 SEMESTER CREDIT HOURS			
Academic Year	Successful Completers	Difference	% difference
2013	2,313		
2014	2337	24	0.1%
2015	2305	-32	-1.4%

Source: THECB Accountability System-Community Colleges Performance-Success Points

### Action Plan:

- Recommend changing target to reflect 1.5% increase from 2015 actual points awarded (2,339).
- Refer to Strategic Plan Initiatives: 1.1.3-4-5-6-7, 1.2.1-2-4-5, 1.3.1-2
- Continue marketing Commit to Complete to students and faculty (1.3.2)
- Continue Holistic Advising (1.1.1, 1.1.5)
- Continue and expand peer, group and faculty tutoring opportunities (1.1.5, 1.1.8, 1.2.1)
- Pilot new Early Alert program (1.2.1)
- Develop Career Pathways (1.1.6, 2.2.5, 2.2.6)
- Complete implementation of Degree Works (1.1.5)
- Continue to use retention specialists to identify and target at-risk students(1.2.1, 1.3.2)

## KPI 8: Hours Completed/Attempted (% C or better)

Increase Number of Successful Completers	Target: 89%
--	-------------

**Increase the Number of Successful Completers:** The Fall 2013 first time in college/transfer student cohort demonstrated an increase in the percent of credit hours completed versus hours attempted. However, the percent of students completing coursework with a “C” or better has actually decreased slightly by .73 percentage points. The Fall 2014 student cohort remained flat in percent of hours completed compared to hours attempted, but had a 1.56% increase in percent of hours completed with a C or better when compared to the Fall 2013 cohort. The target of 89% was not attained.

**Table 14 – Fall FTIC Cohort Attempted Hours and Successful Completion Hours**

Fall	Cohort*	Credits Attempted	Credits Completed	% Completed	Credits Completed with C or Better	% of Credits Completed with C or Better	Change from prior year
2012	3,829	86,779	75,487	86.99%	54,899	63.26%	1.41
2013	3,411	77,164	67,620	87.63%	48,249	62.53%	-.73
2014	3,476	78,726	68,762	87.34%	50,453	64.09%	1.56

Source: ATD Cohort/IRO data pull from Banner SIS/All First Time Students for the Fall Cohort

### Action Plan:

- Recommend changing target to reflect 1.5% increase from 2015 actual percent completed.
- Refer to Strategic Plan Initiatives: 1.1.3-6-7, 1.2.1-2-4-5, 1.3.1-2
- Pilot new Early Alert program (1.2.1)
- Complete implementation of Degree Works (1.1.5)
- Continue Holistic Advising (1.1.1, 1.1.5)
- Continue and expand peer, group and faculty tutoring opportunities (1.1.5, 1.1.8, 1.2.1)
- Continue evaluation of completion down to the program level

## KPI 9: Success and Persistence

Increase Fall to Fall Retention Rates	Target: 54%
---------------------------------------	-------------

**Student Retention (Fall to Fall IPEDS FT/FTIC Cohort):** The data in Table 15 represent an increase in fall to fall retention for the Fall 2013 FT/FTIC cohort as well as for the Fall 2014 cohort. The percentage of returning Fall FT/FTIC students has recovered from the Fall 2012 decrease and is back above 50%, increasing to 54.7% for the Fall 2014 cohort. Holistic advising, Degree Works, retention specialists, addition of EDUC 1300, cohort/block scheduling and faculty guidance have all contributed by encouraging student completion. Early Alert and Faculty/Peer Tutoring programs have provided additional student support also contributing to retention. The target of 54% was attained.

**Table 15 – IPEDS FT/FTIC Retention Rates**

IPEDS Retention Rates Fall Full Time/First Time Students Completing by or Returning in the Subsequent Fall Term		
Fall Year	Full Time	Difference
2012	47.0%	-4.0%
2013	53.0%	6.0%
2014	54.7%	1.7%

Source: IPEDS/NCES Annual Reports; TJC BANNER Student Information System, IRO system query

### Action Plan:

- Recommend changing target to reflect 1.5% increase from 2015 actual percent retained.
- Refer to Strategic Plan Initiatives: 1.1.3-4-5-6-7, 1.2.1-2-4-5, 1.3.1-2
- Continue marketing Commit to Complete to students and faculty (1.3.2)
- Complete implementation of Degree Works (1.1.5)
- Continue to use retention specialists to identify and target at-risk students(1.2.1, 1.3.2)
- Continue and expand peer, group and faculty tutoring opportunities (1.1.5, 1.1.8, 1.2.1)
- Continue to increase and track cohort programs (1.1.7, 1.2.1)

## KPI 10: Number of Graduates

Increase in the Number of Graduates/Completers	1-3% increase
--	---------------

**All Programs, Certificates, Degrees and Core Completers:** The data in Table 16 indicate increases in all areas except Core Complete for AY2015, which decreased by 3.5%. Overall, there has been an 8% increase in awards with the largest percentage attributed to certificates, which gained 44.9% from AY2014 to AY2015. The targets for Degrees and Core Complete were not attained while Certificates were attained. The increase in degrees and certificates could have had an indirect effect on core completers, causing their decline.

**Table 16 – Degrees and Certificates Awarded - THECB Success Points (2 points per award)**

Degrees	Target: 1,425
Certificates	627
Core Complete	1,149

Degrees and Certificates Awarded by Academic Year					
	2012-13	2013-14	% Change	2014-15	% Change
Degrees	1,236	1,411	14.2%	1,424	1.0%
Certificates	773	621	-19.7%	900	44.9%
Core Complete	1,112	1,138	2.3%	1,098	-3.5%
Total Overall	3,121	3,170	1.6%	3,422	8.0%

Source: THECB Data - Success Measures - Degrees Awarded - <http://www.txhighereddata.org/>

For degrees awarded in critical STEM and Health Sciences fields, one of the Success Point measures from the state Accountability system (Table 17), there were 18 fewer points awarded during AY2015 than in AY 2014.

**Table 17 – Degrees (Success Points Awarded) in Critical Fields –  
THECB Success Points (2.25 points per award)**

POINTS AWARDED IN CRITICAL FIELDS (STEM/Health Sciences)			
Academic Year	Award Points	Difference	% difference
2013	1,750	-9	-.0%
2014	1,460	-290	-16.6%
2015	1,442	-18	-1.2%

Source: THECB Accountability System-Community Colleges Performance-Success Points

**Action Plan:**

- Recommend changing target to reflect 1.5% increase from 2015 actual awards.
- Recommend target of 1,456 (1% increase) for STEM Success Points awarded.
- Refer to Strategic Plan Initiatives: 1.1.3-6-7
  
- Continue marketing Commit to Complete to students and faculty (1.3.2)
- Complete implementation of Degree Works (1.1.5)
- Implement an automatic degree audit process to identify and award degrees and certificates (1.3.3)
- Continue to use retention specialists to identify and target at-risk students(1.2.1, 1.3.2)
- Continue working with area universities to articulate Reverse-Transfers (1.3.2, 2.2.5, 2.2.6)
- Investigate new STEM degrees (1.1.6, 1.2.2)
- Continue to increase Technical Dual Credit (1.2.1, 2.2.2)
- Develop faculty tutoring in Sciences and Math(1.2.2)
- Develop Career Pathways (1.1.6, 2.2.5, 2.2.6)
- Package more Marketable Skills and Level 1 stackable certificates (1.1.7)

## KPI 11: Number of Students who Transfer to Four-Year Institutions

Increase the Number of Students who Transfer to Four-Year Institutions

Target: 560

**Number of Students who Transfer to Four Year Institutions:** The percentage of students who transfer to four-year institutions within three years (150% of time) is down by 1.4% from the Fall 2010 cohort to the Fall 2011 cohort (Table 17). The Fall 2012 is also down by 2.2%. The target of 560 was attained.

**Table 18 – IPEDS FT/FTIC Transfer Rates Within 150% of Time**

IPEDS Transfer Rates Fall Full Time/First Time Students Transferring within 150% of time				
Year	Fall Cohort	Transfers	% of Cohort Transferring	% Change from prior year
2010	2,227	693	31%	-1.4%
2011	1,864	554	30%	-1.4%
2012	2,251	620	28%	-2.2%

Source: IPEDS/NCES Annual Reports; TJC BANNER Student Information System, IRO system query

### Action Plan:

- Recommend changing target to reflect 1.5% increase from 2012 actual transfers.
- Refer to Strategic Plan Initiatives: 1.1.3-6-7, 1.2.2-4-5, 1.3.1-2-3
- Continue to promote reverse transfer (1.3.2)

## KPI 12: Number of Partnerships and Collaborative Efforts with Business and Industry

Increase the Number of Partnerships and Collaborative Efforts with Business and Industry

These are new measures established in conjunction with the Vision 2020 Strategic Plan. This is the first year for the measures, therefore data is establishing a baseline for future measurement.

**Table 19 – Number of Partnerships at the end of the Academic Year**

Partnerships	Target: TBD
--------------	-------------

Academic Year	Number	Difference	% Change
2015	351		%
			%
			%

**Table 20 – Number of Collaborative Efforts at the end of the Academic Year**

Collaborative Efforts	Target: TBD
-----------------------	-------------

Academic Year	Number	Difference	% Change
2015	11		%
			%
			%

**Table 21 – Number of New Programs Based on Service Area Need**

New Programs	Target: TBD
--------------	-------------

Academic Year	Number	Difference	% Change
2015	8		%
			%
			%

### Action Plan:

- Maintain current levels, adding where possible.
- Refer to Strategic Plan Initiatives: 2.2.4, 2.2.7, 2.2.8
- Identify partnerships with industry and business (2.1.1)



## KPI 13: Number of Partnerships and Collaborative Efforts with ISDs and IHEs

### Increase the Number of Partnerships and Collaborative Efforts with ISDs and IHEs

These are new measures established in conjunction with the Vision 2020 Strategic Plan. This is the first year for the measures, therefore data is establishing a baseline for future measurement.

**Table 22 – Number of Partnerships with ISDs**

<b>ISDs</b>	<b>Target: TBD</b>
-------------	--------------------

<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>% Change</b>
2015	22		%
			%
			%

**Table 23 – Number of Partnerships with IHEs**

<b>IHEs</b>	<b>Target: TBD</b>
-------------	--------------------

<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>% Change</b>
2015	10		%
			%
			%

#### **Action Plan:**

- Refer to Strategic Plan Initiatives: 2.2.2-3-5-6
- Increase dual credit sites (2.2.2)
- Expand Early College High School (2.2.2)
- Continue to increase partnerships with IHEs via articulation agreements (in conjunction with NTCCC project) (2.2.5, 2.2.6)

## KPI 14: Community Participation in TJC Sponsored or Instituted Events

Increase Community Participation in TJC Sponsored or Instituted Events	Target: TBD
--	-------------

This is a new measure established in conjunction with the Vision 2020 Strategic Plan. This is the first year for the measure, therefore data is establishing a baseline for future measurement.

**Table 24 – Number of Sponsored or TJC Instituted Events**

Academic Year	Number	Difference	% Change
2015	86		%
			%
			%

### Action Plan:

- Refer to Strategic Plan Initiatives: 2.1.2, 2.2.1
- Continue tracking events through the Special Events Office (2.1.2)
- Track all activities, athletic events and programs that offered on the TJC campus that are open to the public (2.1.2)

## KPI 15: Financial Revenue from State, Local and Student as well as Other Revenue Streams

### Increase Financial Revenue

These are new measures established in conjunction with the Vision 2020 Strategic Plan. This is the first year for the measures, therefore data is establishing a baseline for future measurement.

**Table 25 – Increase in Foundation Revenue Stream**

<b>Foundation Revenue</b>	<b>Target: TBD</b>
---------------------------	--------------------

Academic Year	Amount	Difference	% Change
2015	\$4,886,234	\$2,861,237	141.3%
			%
			%

**Table 26 – Number of Grants and Grant Revenues**

<b>Grants</b>	<b>Target: TBD</b>
---------------	--------------------

Academic Year	Number of Grants	Difference	% Change	Revenues	Difference	% Change
2015	14	2	18.0%	\$486,584	\$150,000	57.0%
			%			%
			%			%

#### Action Plan:

- Recommend establishing target to reflect 1.5% increase from 2015 number.
- Refer to Strategic Plan Initiatives: 2.2.8, 2.3.1-2-3-4

## KPI 16: Fiscal Responsibility

### Optimize Fiscal Responsibility

These are new measures established in conjunction with the Vision 2020 Strategic Plan. This is the first year for the measures, therefore data is establishing a baseline for future measurement.

**Table 27 – Instructional Expenditures per FTE Student**

<b>Instructional</b>	<b>Target: 46%</b>
----------------------	--------------------

Academic Year	Number	Difference	% Change
2015	46.6%		%
			%
			%

Source: THECB Accountability System-Community Colleges Performance-Institutional Efficiency and Effectiveness

**Table 28 – Institutional Support Expenditures (per FTE Student)**

<b>Institutional Support</b>	<b>Target: 20.2%</b>
------------------------------	----------------------

Academic Year	Number	Difference	% Change
2015	19.6%		%
			%
			%

Source: THECB Accountability System-Community Colleges Performance-Institutional Efficiency and Effectiveness

**Table 29 – Academic Support Expenditures (per FTE Student)**

<b>Academic Support</b>	<b>Target: 4.7%</b>
-------------------------	---------------------

Academic Year	Number	Difference	% Change
2015	4.7%		%
			%
			%

Source: THECB Accountability System-Community Colleges Performance-Institutional Efficiency and Effectiveness

**Table 30 – Average Class Size (Fall term)**

<b>Class Size</b>	<b>Target: 23</b>
-------------------	-------------------

<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>% Change</b>
2015	23		%
			%
			%

Source: LBB Performance Measures Report

**Table 31 – Percent of Contact Hours Taught by Full Time Faculty (Fall term)**

<b>Contact Hours</b>	<b>Target: 78%</b>
----------------------	--------------------

<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>% Change</b>
2015	78.5%		%
			%
			%

Source: LBB Performance Measures Report

**Table 32 – FTE Student to FTE Faculty Ratio (Fall term)**

<b>FTE Ratio</b>	<b>Target: 22:1</b>
------------------	---------------------

<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>% Change</b>
2015	19:1		%
			%
			%

Source: THECB Accountability System-Community Colleges Performance-Institutional Efficiency and Effectiveness

**Action Plan:**

- Recommend targets remain unchanged.
- Refer to Strategic Plan Initiatives: 2.2.7, 2.3.2-3, 3.1.1-2-3-4-5-6, 3.2.1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8