

## 2012-13 Key Performance Indicators Report

Key Performance Indicators (KPI), Data Sources and Target Criteria were set July 30, 2012 by the 4.1 Task Force Committee. Original members were: Cheryl Rogers (Chair), Homer Hayes, Ken Murphy, Paul Monagan, Clayton Allen, Lisa Harper, Andi Liner, Janna Chancey and Jacque Messinger. The Committee determined that three years of data would be collected on each KPI to ascertain appropriateness of selected criteria. The committee reconvened October 24, 2013 to review collected data. Committee members present were: Cheryl Rogers (Chair), Ken Murphy, Paul Monagan, Tom Elder, Janna Chancey, Michelle Freeman, Joel Renaud and Jacque Messinger. Changes in the committee were due to personnel changes and other additions deemed necessary.

### STUDENT ACCESS

#### KPI 1: Enrollment

<b>Fall Enrollment on Official Census Date</b>	<b>1-3% increase</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 1.5% from Fall 2011 to Fall 2012 but decreased by 14.9% from Fall 2012 to Fall 2013 (Table 1). Enrollment Management observed that there had been a decrease in graduating seniors from our service area during that time period which may have been a determining factor.

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

<b>Headcount</b>	<b>FTIC/IPEDS*</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Fall 2011	<b>3,425</b>		
Fall 2012	<b>3,475</b>	50	<b>1.5%</b>
Fall 2013	<b>2,958</b>	-517	<b>-14.9%</b>

\*Includes both new, first time and new transfer-in students

Source: Fall census Headcount query, IRO, BANNER Student Information system

The committee reviewed this category and determined it is a viable measure, the target criterion is appropriate and the source of data is appropriate. It was also determined that overall census day final headcount be included. This addition provides a contextual measure to appropriately place the small sub-group of FT/FTIC students. The data indicate that overall enrollment was flat from Fall 2012 to Fall 2013 (Table 2).

**Table 2 - Fall Student Enrollment**

	<b>Census Enrollment</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Fall 2011	11,881		
Fall 2012	11,374	(507)	-4.3%
Fall 2013	11,308	(66)	-0.6%

Source: Fall census Headcount query, IRO, BANNER Student Information system

**Action Plan:**

- Continue to target service area graduating seniors for enrollment (marketing, advising, high school career fairs, etc.)
- Target out-of-district graduating seniors for enrollment
- Additional marketing on scholarship opportunities
- Focus on underserved areas within the service area
- Target students over 25

<b>Enrollment in distance education courses</b>	<b>1-3% increase</b>
---	----------------------

**Enrollment in Distance Education Courses:** Distance Education enrollment has steadily increased over the past three academic years (Table 3).

**Table 3 – Distance Education Enrollment History**

<b>Distance Education Enrollment 3 Year History</b>								
<b>DISTANCE</b>	Fall	Winter	Spring	Maymester	Summer I	Summer II	<b>Total</b>	<b>% Change</b>
AY 2011	9,419	0	10,509	314	1,791	1,391	<b>23,424</b>	
AY 2012	10,930	0	10,389	281	1,727	1,234	<b>24,561</b>	4.9%
AY 2013	13,296	406	10,307	349	1,756	1,213	<b>27,327</b>	11.3%

Source: IRO, BANNER Student Information system

The committee reviewed this category and determined it is a viable measure, the target criterion is appropriate and the data source is appropriate.

**Action Plan:**

- Continue to increase number of fully online course offerings
- Continue to offer completely online courses for Wintermester
- Expand online offerings for Maymester and summer sessions
- Expand fully online degree program offerings

## KPI 2: Gender Enrollment in Non-Traditional Programs

Gender Enrollment in Non-traditional Programs	Meet the State Average
---	------------------------

**Gender Enrollment in Non-Traditional Programs:** The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) monitors student participation in Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs in non-traditional fields. This is done as part of the Carl D. Perkins Grant reporting requirement. Perkins is satisfied with a 90% target rate for individual institutions. The measures indicate that there have been slight decreases over the past two academic years, showing academic year 2012 at 3.09% below the state average (Table 4).

**Table 4 – Gender Enrollment in Non-Traditional Programs**

Actual Institutional Performance Compared to State Target by Program Year									
	2009-10			2010-11			2011-12		
	Actual	Target	90%/Target	Actual	Target	90%/Target	Actual	Target	90%/Target
State Target	22.43%	22.75%	20.48%	21.52%	23.00%	20.70%	21.33%	23.10%	20.79%
Tyler Junior College	20.97%	-1.78%	0.50%	18.08%	-4.92%	-2.62%	17.70%	-5.40%	-3.09%

Source: Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, Perkins core Indicator 5P1: Nontraditional Participation

The committee decided that Tyler Junior College (TJC) has no real control over gender-based enrollment. Therefore, TJC will continue to market technical programs to non-traditional populations but will delete this KPI for the future.

### KPI 3: Community Demographics

<b>Unduplicated Enrollment Demographics Mirror the Service Area</b>	<b>1-3% increase</b>
---	----------------------

**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. Looking purely by categorical order, the racial groups and gender variables are ranked the same. However, when taking percent of difference into consideration, we find that the African American and the female student population is over-represented compared to the service area demographic. White and Hispanic racial categories are under-represented as well as males. The increase in the ‘other’ racial category coincides with the decrease in both White (-4.1%) and African American (-1.0%). This is partially due to the inclusion of the new ‘multi-racial’ category implemented by the Federal Government in Fall 2010. Since its inception, a larger portion of the student population has reported being multi-racial.

**Table 5 – Service Area Enrollment Comparison**

<b>TJC Student Enrollment by Service Area Comparison</b>						
	FY 2012			FY 2013		
	TJC	Svc area	Difference	TJC	Svc area	Difference
White	58.7%	61.6%	-2.9	54.6%	61.1%	-6.5
African American	24.9%	16.5%	8.4	23.9%	18.0%	6.0
Hispanic	11.6%	19.1%	-7.5	15.3%	17.9%	-2.6
Other	4.7%	2.8%	2.5	6.2%	3.0%	3.2
Male	40.6%	49.4%	-8.8	42.1%	48.4%	-6.3
Female	59.4%	50.6%	8.8	57.9%	51.6%	6.3

THECB measure 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

The committee reviewed this category and determined it is a viable measure, the target criterion is appropriate and the data source is appropriate.

**Action Plan:**

- Market Honors program to attract a more diverse racial composition
- Continue CTG related enrollment initiatives that target Hispanic populations

<b>Faculty Demographics Mirror Student Demographics</b>	<b>1-3% increase</b>
---	----------------------

**Faculty Demographics Mirror the Diversity of the Student Population:** Looking purely by categorical order, the gender variables are ranked the same. Racial Categories both reflect high percentages for the White category, but the ‘Other’ category takes second place for faculty, rather than last place, as it did for students (Table 6). When taking percent of difference into consideration, we find that the White category is over-

represented (85.7%) compared to the student population (54.6%). One possible explanation for this over-representation of the White category may be the longevity of faculty. Many have taught at the College for twenty years or more and generally reflect the demographic at the time they were hired. Very few African-American or Hispanic faculty have been hired and any retirement or resignation from those categories reflects as a higher proportion of that category, causing a higher decrease in the overall percentage. While positions have been offered to African-Americans and Hispanics, the lure of better and more lucrative offers has drawn them to other institutions. As seen in the student population, the “Other” category has also affected faculty, with increased identification of the ‘multi-racial’ category.

**Table 6 – Faculty to Student Demographic Comparison**

TJC Faculty by Student Enrollment Comparison							
	Male	Female	White	African American	Hispanic	Other	
Difference	0.5	-0.5	31.1	14.1	10.7	1.7	
student population 2013	42.1%	57.9%	54.6%	23.9%	15.3%	6.2%	
Faculty	2011	40.7%	59.3%	84.0%	5.3%	3.2%	7.5%
	2012	40.0%	60.0%	87.0%	4.5%	3.4%	5.1%
	2013	42.6%	57.4%	85.7%	3.8%	2.6%	7.9%

The committee reviewed this category and determined it is a viable measure, the target criterion is appropriate and the data source is appropriate.

**Action Plan:**

- Increase and/or expand advertisements in specific publications that target minority populations for potential faculty
- Investigate ethnic specific schools to recruit Master’s prepared graduates for potential faculty

# STUDENT SUCCESS

## KPI 4: Academic Success in Gateway Courses

Increase Number of Successful Completers in Gateway Math & English	1-3% increase
--	---------------

**Increase Number of Successful Completers:** The percent of students (Fall FTIC) who successfully (C or better) completed specified Mathematics courses has steadily increased and completion rates for English are improving. The introduction of modularized instruction in developmental math has streamlined individual students' paths through developmental courses and allowed students to proceed more quickly to gateway math courses. This strategy is being expanded to developmental reading and writing courses.

**Table 7 – Gateway Math completion – ATD Fall FTIC Students**

GATEWAY MATH COMPLETION RATES* - ATD COHORTS					
Year	Initial Cohort	Percent Completed Year 1	% Change	Percent Completed Year 2	Percent Completed Year 3
2010: Planning	4,059	15.7		20.9	23.5
2011: 1st Implementation	3,758	18.8	3.1	24.1	.
2012: 2nd Implementation	3,829	19.9	1.1	.	.

\*Completion with a grade of 'C' or better

Source: ATD TJC Annual Data Profile, Achieving the Dream Database

**Table 8 - Gateway English completion – ATD Fall FTIC Students**

GATEWAY ENGLISH COMPLETION RATES* - ATD COHORTS					
Year	Initial Cohort	Percent Completed Year 1	% Change	Percent Completed Year 2	Percent Completed Year 3
2010: Planning	4,059	27.4		31.1	32.5
2011: 1st Implementation	3,758	25.4	-2.0	31	.
2012: 2nd Implementation	3,829	27.4	2.0	.	.

\*Completion with a grade of 'C' or better

Source: ATD TJC Annual Data Profile, Achieving the Dream Database

The committee reviewed this category and determined it is a viable measure, the target criterion is appropriate and the data source is appropriate. Changes in THECB mandates will be adjusted for in subsequent years to incorporate additions of first level courses.

**Action Plan:**

- Continue to monitor success of modularized instruction in developmental math and English
- Monitor success of MATH 1414 which combines College Algebra and individualized instruction

**KPI 5: Hours Completed/Attempted (% C or better)**

Increase Number of Successful Completers	1-3% increase
--	---------------

**Increase the Number of Successful Completers:** For fall first time in college/transfer students, there has been an increase in the percent of credit hours completed versus credit hours attempted. Additionally, course credit hour completion with a grade of ‘C’ or better has also shown an increase. The Early Alert program, intrusive advising and the availability of peer tutors have helped retain students and assist them with successful course completion throughout the academic year.

**Table 9 – Fall FTIC Cohort Attempted Hours and Successful Completion Hours**

Cohort Year	Cohort*	Credits Attempted	Credits Completed	% Completed	Credits Completed with C or Better	% of Credits Completed with C or Better	Change from prior year
2010	4,059	93,467	80,233	85.84%	57,155	61.15%	0.18
2011	3,758	89,172	78,133	87.62%	55,154	61.85%	0.70
2012	3,829	86,779	75,487	87.00%	54,899	63.26%	1.41

Source: Achieving the Dream Database

The committee reviewed this category and determined it is a viable measure, the target criterion is appropriate and the data source is appropriate.

**Action Plan:**

- Continue to expand Early Alert Program
- Complete implementation of Degree Works to help students and advisors track progress towards degrees and certificates
- Add EDUC 1300 Study Skills course for FT/FTIC students which would combine information technology/computer science, mass communications, information literacy, learning theory, learning styles, and competencies for successful college students
- Continue intrusive advising
- Continue and expand peer-tutoring and group-tutoring opportunities

## KPI 6: Success and Persistence

Increase Fall to Fall Retention Rates	Attain 50%
---------------------------------------	------------

**Student Retention (Fall to Fall IPEDS FT/FTIC Cohort):** The data in Table 10 represent a steady increase in fall to fall retention for the fall FT/FTIC cohort. The percentage of returning Fall FT/FTIC students has steadily increased and is above 50%. Intrusive advising, Degree Works, retention specialists and faculty guidance have all contributed by encouraging student completion. Early Alert and Peer Tutoring programs have provided additional student support also contributing to retention.

**Table 10 – IPEDS FT/FTIC Retention Rates**

IPEDS Retention Rates Fall Full Time/First Time Students Completing by or Returning in the Subsequent Fall Term		
Year	Full Time	Difference
2009	45.0%	
2010	49.0%	4.0%
2011	51.0%	2.0%

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

The committee reviewed this category and determined it is a viable measure, the target criterion is appropriate and the data source is appropriate.

### Action Plan:

- Market “Commit to Complete” to students and faculty
- Complete implementation of Degree Works to help students and advisors track progress towards degrees and certificates
- Require students to declare a major by the completion of 30 hours
- Continue to use retention specialists to identify and target at-risk students
- Add EDUC 1300 Study Skills course for all FT/FTIC students



## KPI 7: Licensure/Certification Exams Passed

Licensure/Certification Exam Pass Rate	Meet the State Average
--	------------------------

**Licensure/Certification Exams Passed:** Of the ten programs selected for examination, six met or exceeded the state average exam pass rate. The four programs which were below the state average submitted action plans for improvement of pass rates.

**Table 11 – Annual Licensure Report**

Report Year		2010			2011			2012			State Avg 2012	% Diff
Major	CIP	Exam Taken	Exam Passed	Success	Exam Taken	Exam Passed	Success	Exam Taken	Exam Passed	Success		
Sign Language Interpretation and Translation	16160300	5	5	100.00%	1	1	100.00%	1	1	100.00%	68.00%	32.00
Dental Hygiene/Hygienist	51060200	22	22	100.00%	17	16	94.12%	25	25	100.00%	97.06%	2.94
Health Inf /Medical Records Technology/ Technician	51070700	4	4	100.00%	4	2	50.00%	6	4	67.00%	72.72%	-5.72
Respiratory Care Therapy/ Therapist	51090800	20	20	100.00%				30	26	87.00%	90.60%	-3.60
Surgical Technology/ Technologist	51090900	16	10	62.50%	21	16	76.19%	11	7	64.00%	85.63%	-21.63
Diagnostic Medical Sonography/ Sonographer and Ultrasound	51091000	11	9	81.82%	9	7	77.78%	10	10	100.00%	96.31%	3.69
Radiologic Technology/ Science - Radiographer	51091100	23	23	100.00%	16	16	100.00%	18	18	100.00%	97.44%	2.56
Clinic/Medical Laboratory Technician	51100400	6	6	100.00%	6	6	100.00%	18	16	89.00%	85.38%	3.60
Registered Nursing/Reg Nurse	51380100	105	95	90.48%	109	97	88.99%	119	112	95.00%	92.20%	2.80
Licensed Practical/ Vocational Nurse Training	51390100	159	140	88.05%	115	96	83.48%	169	153	91.00%	91.64%	-0.64

The committee decided for subsequent reporting to expand the number of programs selected from 10 to 16 to align with the Annual Licensure Report from the state. The target criterion is appropriate and the data source is appropriate.

**Action Plan:**

- Health Information Technology

- Conduct program orientation before the student's (Freshman) first semester and discuss the exam and the importance of taking the exam
- Add a section to every HIT course focusing on the RHIT exam
- Purchase RHIT Exam Review textbook as part of capstone course
- Offer a free "Preparing to Study for the RHIT Exam" workshop
- Set up a scholarship fund for HIT students who are economically disadvantaged and need assistance with exam fees
- LVN Nursing
  - Begin to look at a program remediation system that will help with NCLEX style questions
  - Develop curriculum committees to ensure that the information is taught consistently across each site and ensure consistency with the Detailed Test Plan
  - Increase awareness of up-to-date information, in regards to testing
  - Make the test review at the end of the semester mandatory
  - Require NCLEX style questions within each course, as early as first semester
- Respiratory Care
  - Purchase updated test preparation software
- Surgical Technology
  - Build the cost of the exam, professional membership, and certification exam review book into the spring tuition
  - Start giving a review exam each month, starting in September
  - Purchase the Northstar Learning Surgical Technology exam review software
  - Make the certification review exam a major grade
  - Require students to take a practice exam
  - Travel to Collin Community College, which has a 100% pass rate, to get ideas for changes

## KPI 8: Number of Graduates

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

**All Programs, Certificates, Degrees and Core Completers:** The data in Table 12 indicate increases in all areas except Core Complete, which decreased by 4.9%, for the comparison from academic year 2011 to academic year 2012. The change in Core Complete success is mostly likely due to a change in the process that identifies students who have completed the core. During academic year 2010 this process identified students that were excluded from previous reporting, artificially increasing the success rate for the year. Once the students were identified and the student transcript was marked with the core complete indicator, the number of students leveled off in the two subsequent years, as was expected. Overall there has been a 4.4% decline in awards with the largest percentage attributed to Core Complete, which dropped 10.1% from 2012 to 2013. Certificates have increased slightly, which can most likely be attributed to newly added certificate programs.

**Table 12 – Degrees and Certificates Awarded History**

Degrees and Certificates Awarded by Academic Year					
	2010-11	2011-12	% Change	2012-13	% Change
Degrees	1,126	1,262	12.1%	1,236	-2.1%
Certificates	648	766	18.2%	773	0.9%
Core Complete	1,301	1,237	-4.9%	1,112	-10.1%
Total Overall	3,075	3,265	6.2%	3,121	-4.4%

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

The committee reviewed this category and determined it is a viable measure, the target criterion is appropriate and the data source is appropriate.

### Action Plan:

- Market “Commit to Complete” to students and faculty
- Complete implementation of Degree Works to help students and advisors track progress towards degrees and certificates
- Implement an automatic degree audit process to identify and award degrees and certificates
- Require students to declare a major by the completion of 30 hours
- Use retention specialists to identify and target at-risk students
- Add a career exploration unit to study-skills courses
- Work with area universities to articulate Reverse-Transfers
- Use Technical Pathways Coordinators (Tech Prep advisors) to visit area high schools

## KPI 9: Number of Students who Transfer to Four-Year Institutions

Increase the Number of Students who Transfer to Four-Year Institutions	1-3% increase
--	---------------

**Number of Students who Transfer to Four Year Institutions:** The number of students who transfer to four-year institutions within three years (150% of time) has steadily increased. The data also indicate that there has been a continued increase in the number of successive Fall cohorts of FT/FTIC students tracked by IPEDS for this measure (Table 13). Tyler Junior College has also joined the National Student Clearinghouse which allows TJC to track students who transfer to over 3500 member colleges and universities.

**Table 13 – 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	Transfer	% Transfer	% Change
2007	1,717	486	28.3%	-0.4%
2008	1,963	610	31.1%	9.8%
2009	2,097	681	32.5%	4.5%

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

The committee reviewed this category and determined it is a viable measure, the target criterion is appropriate and the data source is appropriate.

### Action Plan:

- Continue to track students through the National Student Clearinghouse
- Reverse transfer initiative mandated by THECB will assist in finding previously untraceable transfer students

### OTHER DECISIONS:

Since the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board will begin tracking success points for partial funding of community colleges next year, the committee recommends that the following Key Performance Indicators be added:

- Complete Developmental Work
- 15 Credits 1 Term College-Level
- 30 Credits 1 Year College-Level
- Transfer to University after Completing 15 Semester Credit Hours