MEMORANDUM

To: ASC Members

From: Matt Petry

Date: March 13, 2015

Subject: Notes from March 12, 2015 ASC Teleconference on Performance Metrics Development

Members present via teleconference: Matt Petry, Larry Buchholtz, Lynnde Colling, Cheryl Heath, Carol Hoglund, Lisa Watson, Sheldon Flom, Marty Kelsey, Robyn Landen, Lindy Paskett, Jayne Myrick, Debbie Baker and Herry Andrews. There was no Executive Council representation, and Joe McCann was the only representative from both the Academic Affairs and Student Services Councils. No agenda was disseminated because the only item to be discussed during this special teleconference was performance metrics development.

Matt gave a brief history of performance metrics, essentially the initial use of just course completion rates, later augmented by course completion volumes weighted twice as much as rates. Advantages and disadvantages of both metrics were also mentioned. Matt then described the year-to-year increases in the amount of state aid funding subject to performance metrics. As outlined in Chapter 5 of the Commission's administrative rules, 15, 20 and 25 percent of variable costs state funding are subject to allocation via performance metrics for fiscal-years 2015, 2016 and 2017, respectively. Because variable costs funding makes up approximately 40 percent of all state funding, the "net" percentages of funding allocated by means of performance metrics is roughly 6, 8 and 10 percent for the same three years.

Given the inequities of "valuing" one-credit courses the same as three-credit courses, and Level I courses the same as Level III courses, it had been decided some time ago that course completion should be replaced by credit completion, and that credits completed should also be weighted by levels of instruction, just as they have been for purposes of calculating enrollment growth. Modeling of this metric, commonly referred to as successfully completed, weighted student credit hours, will begin within the next three weeks once the Commission's IT staff has finished standardization of all aggregated data for both Hathaway and non-Hathaway students. Matt suggested modeling the two most recent academic-years available.

This next step in the development of performance metrics aligns with the implementation timeline shown in the attached document prepared by the Executive Council (see the Column for "FY17"). However, because rules for course completion metrics had already been promulgated, and system-wide modeling of this new credit completion metric couldn't be completed in time to revise rules before July 1, 2015, the established course completion metrics will continue to be used for fiscal-year 2016, albeit at a higher percentage of all state funding, as alluded to above.

Assuming Commission approval, the next likely performance metrics to be modeled and implemented would be some variations of what the Executive Council terms performance metrics, or credentials produced, and placement metrics, or student transfers (again, see the attached document). These would be implemented beginning in fiscal-year 2018, with their relative weight of variable costs funding increasing from 15 percent in fiscal-year 2018 to 25 percent in fiscal-year 2020. These same escalating percentages would apply to successfully completed, weighted student credit hours, with the remainder of variable costs funding being allocated by average weighted credit hours, just as it is today; these average weighted credit hours are what the Executive Council has identified as its participation metric.

Sheldon asked if this further development of performance metrics satisfied a portion of what's mandated by Section 356 of the supplemental budget bill signed into law by Governor Mead the week before. Matt responded that it did not, primarily because that budget amendment requires the Joint Appropriations Interim Committee (JAIC) to "review the ***funding*** model for community colleges" (emphasis added), whereas the development of performance metrics addresses the allocation of appropriated funds. In short, the JAIC's review will consider sources of revenue, while the development of performance metrics will determine the means of distributing that revenue in support of student success.

Executive Council/President's Council Meeting
Performance Funding Metrics
September 16, 2014, Casper College

Proposed Implementation Timeline

Distribution of Variable Funding Based on Performance						
Details	**FY15**	**FY16**	**FY17**	**FY18**	**FY19**	**FY20**
% of Variable Funding	15% on volume of course completions	20% on weighted, successfully completed SCH's Learning Year #1	25% on weighted, successfully completed SCH's, Learning Year #2	70% Participation (current average weighted SCH's enrolled) 15% Progress (see metrics below) 15% Performance and Placement (see metrics below)	60% Participation (current average weighted SCH's enrolled) 20% Progress (see metrics below) 20% Performance and Placement (see metrics below)	50% Participation (current average weighted SCH's enrolled) 25% Progress (see metrics below) 25% Performance and Placement (see metrics below)

For FY16 and FY17

For FY16 and FY17, we agreed to use the same calculation of average weighted student credit hours (SCH's) that is currently used as the enrollment metric in the allocation formula as the "course completion" metric in the distribution of the portion of variable funding. This allows for continuity in the methodology for enrollment, but in this case the percentage of variable funding for that fiscal year will be distributed based on successfully completed weighted SCH's.

Participation Metrics – Average Weighted SCH's

Continue to use the current average weighted SCH's to allocate the portion of variable funds for participation. We all felt that our ability to get students to participate (our access mission) is a performance measure.

Progress Metrics

1. Successfully Completed, Weighted Student Credit Hours – The number of successfully completed (A, B, C, or P Grades) student credits hours weighted according to level (Level I, Level II, Level III). Averaged over the past two years??? (IS THAT HOW WE DO THE ENROLLMENT METRIC NOW?)
2. Credit Accumulation Milestones – Two Options (model both)
    a. Raw Number - The # of all students (degree-seeking?) in an academic year that successfully accumulate 12, 24, and 36 credit hours. Students may be counted more than one time in an academic year (e.g., student earning 12 credits in fall term, and another 12 in the spring).
    b. Percentage - The proportion of all degree-seeking students in an academic year that earn credits within that year placing them at or beyond 12, 24, or 36 credit hours. Students are only counted when they begin the year below the credit threshold and finish it having passed one or more thresholds (potential to have students be counted twice in an academic year – need to consider how that impacts the student cohort for this measure).

Performance Metric

1. Credentials Produced – Two Options (model both)
    a. Raw Number – The # of credentials earned by students/awarded by the college in an academic year. Include the aggregate total of all credential types. Also model or break out number of credentials earned by students at the following levels (all reported to IPEDS):
        i. Associate Degrees
        ii. Certificates of More Than One Year
        iii. Certificates of Less Than One Year
    b. Credential Production Rate – The ratio of the number of all credentials awarded during an academic year to the annualized FTE enrollment from degree-seeking students for the same year, as a percent. May also want to consider modeling only associates degrees and certificates of more than one year.

Placement Metric

1. Student Transfer – Two Options (model both)
    a. Raw Number – the # of students who earn at least 12 college-level credits within an academic year at a community college and successfully enroll at another institution (get data from the National Student Clearinghouse). Once we have solid job placement data we can focus this metric on students in transfer-related programs only and transfer to a four-year institution. The appropriate placement metric for students in applied/workforce programs is probably job placement. Some other things to consider modeling or disaggregating:
        i. Just the number of students who matriculate to a four-year institution.
        ii. Just the number of students who matriculate to a two-year institution.
        iii. Only consider students who earn at least 12 credits and do not enroll at the same institution but matriculate to a different one (not sure this will capture Casper's or LCCC's numerous students concurrently enrolled at the CC and UW).
    b. Transfer Rate – The proportion of degree-seeking (?) students enrolled at a community college during an academic year who have completed at least 12 credits at college-level and enroll at another institution of higher education in the subsequent fall (again, data from the Clearinghouse). We may want to model this as above:
        i. Just the number of students who matriculate to a four-year institution as the numerator.
        ii. Just the number of students who matriculate to a two-year institution as the numerator.
        iii. Only consider students who earn at least 12 credits and do not enroll at the same institution but matriculate to a different one (not sure this will capture Casper's or LCCC's numerous students concurrently enrolled at the CC and UW).