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Agenda

• Overview state performance funding model.

• Student snapshot AY 2016.

• Overview data related to college strategic plan areas: Access, Success and Resources. Three-year trends. Problem and opportunity observations.
Peer colleges for benchmarking

- Belmont
- Central Ohio Technical
- Edison State
- Eastern Gateway
- Rhodes State
- Zane State
- Marion Technical
- Northwest State
- Rio Grande
- Southern State
- Terra State
- Washington State
FY 2009-2013
Primarily enrollment-based with inclusion of success points (5% to 10%)
Stop Loss (99%-96%)

FY 2014
50% enrollment + 25% course completion + 25% success points
97% stop loss

FY 2015
Elimination of enrollment component
Combination of course completion (50%), success points (25%) & completion metrics (25%)
At-risk or access category application
No stop loss
Y 2016 Framework Summary

- **Cost-Based Completion Milestones**: 25%
- **Cost-Based Course Completion**: 50%
- **Success Points**: 25%

*All data averaged over three years*

*Access Category Weights Applied*

- **ADULT** (over age 25 at time of enrollment)
- **LOW-INCOME**, Pell Eligible (ever in college career)
- **MINORITY** (African American, Hispanic, Native American)
- **ACADEMICALLY UNDERPREPARED** (using remediation free standards, math only for FY 16)
Snapshot of students in AY 2015-16 (all)

- 3,776 unique students
- 60% female
- Average age = 23.8
- 7% minority (Department of Higher Ed definition)
- 41% Pell eligible
- 27% full-time in fall
- 60% technical major, 9% transfer major, 31% undeclared
Need to consider two populations.....
High school vs. post high school population

**High school**
- 1,221 unique students
- 54% female
- Average age = 16.9
- 4% minority
- Pell N/A
- 17% full-time
- 89% undeclared, 8% technical and 3% transfer

**Post high school**
- 2,555 unique students
- 62% female
- Average age = 27.1
- 9% minority
- 61% Pell eligible
- 32% full-time
- 85% technical, 12% transfer and 3% undecided
Access Strategies

• Foster a student-welcoming and community-collaborative culture (state access population focus, other groups)

• Provide affordable and viable learning opportunities in high demand and emerging technologies, transfers (program focus)

• Offer effective outreach and delivery – online/hybrid, outreach centers, early college, block scheduling and face-to-face (modality focus)
Credit Hours, FA 2013 - 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NCSC</th>
<th>OACC Peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>25,478</td>
<td>25,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>24,462</td>
<td>25,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015*</td>
<td>24,256</td>
<td>22,340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategy 1: welcoming and inclusive culture

Pct. of Headcount with at Least One Demographic Access Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Access group changes from 2014 to 2016

- Minority: -11%
- Age 25+: -24%
- Dev math: -26%
- Pell: -31%
Access populations – exclude CCP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>AY 2014</th>
<th>AY 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25+</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev math</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Access students as a % of completed FTE

- 2013-14: 79% (NC State), 79% (OACC Similar Size)
- 2014-15: 70% (NC State), 72% (OACC Similar Size)
- 2015-16: 60% (NC State), 71% (OACC Similar Size)

Legend:
- NC State
- OACC Similar Size
Problems

• Low demographics in service area
• Losing post high school populations
• Competing with improving economy
• Competition from colleges, universities, and online institutions
• CCSSE proves our students have very busy lives
• Risk seeing a reduction in a significant amount of subsidy related to access populations
• Potential risk to historical access mission of college
• Adults tend to be good students, but there are fewer of them
Opportunities

• Remaining stable in headcount and hours while peers declining
• Started forming some adult cohorts
• Programs on or affiliated with campus serving access groups (Solutions, Success Unlimited, TRIO)
• Students coming in better prepared for math
• Excellent scholarships to offer access populations (TFS to career tech)
• Excellent support services to offer access populations
• Marketing to adults: certificates, cohorts, credits for experience
• Satellite in Ashland County along the I-71 Corridor
Biggest student pool – high schools. Matriculators as % of headcount

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NCSC</th>
<th>OACC Similar Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional public high school graduating classes
Matriculators as Pct of Graduates

- 2013-14: 10%
- 2014-15: 11%
- 2015-16: 14%
Top feeders last three years of matriculators (career-tech students counted within home school)

• Madison (80)
• Shelby (61)
• Lexington (58)
• Mansfield Senior (57)
• Galion (55)
• Clear Fork (53)
• Ashland (51)
• Ontario (35)
Pct. High School Matriculators with Prior Credit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Early College Credit</th>
<th>Articulated Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 2012-13</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2013-14</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2014-15</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problems

• Shrinking high school population
• Intense competition for high school graduates (24% regional grads who attend a community college go somewhere other than NCSC)
• Image problem with higher education with many families
• Lack of understanding of value proposition NC State offers
• High school counselors too overwhelmed
• Dual enrollment system is complex for parents to navigate
• Students don’t plan ahead, parents don’t guide them
Opportunities

• Parents are weary of debt, but don’t qualify for Pell (Tuition Freedom)
• Built strong relationships with high school counselors through CCP program
• Helping CCP students think about educational pathways
• Cementing relationships with primary feeders – career tech centers
• Cheryl working with Mansfield Senior students
• Parent boot camps
• Focus on showing career (especially) and transfer pathways
Strategy 2: affordable and viable learning

Ratio of newer programs to total programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 2014</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2015</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2016</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New programs introduced

- AY 2014: 6 new programs introduced annually
- AY 2015: 3 new certificates, 3 new degrees introduced annually
- AY 2016: 6 new certificates, 11 new degrees introduced annually

Legend:
- Green bars: New certificates introduced annually
- Light green bars: New degrees introduced annually
Change in Headcount Majors, 2013-15

- Undecl/Tech Stud: 56%
- Liberal Arts: 36%
- Business/Ind/Tech: -12%
- Health Sciences: -20%
- Education/Public Service: -25%
Division sizes by major, avg. 2014-16

BIT: 862
EPPS: 387
HSCI: 1,296
LA: 291
Other: 934
Pre-health enrollment changes, 2014-16
Health program enrollment changes, 2014-16

OTAP: 21%
PHTA: 13%
PNUR: -18%
RNUR: -26%
RADS: -29%
RESP: -45%
Certificate majors (excludes Community Health Worker)
Change in % of service area residents attending other OACC colleges, FTE

- All Students: 1%
- Early College Students: 3%
- Post High School Students: 1%
- High School Matriculators: 4%
Problems

• Massive transition period of teaching out and starting up programs. Can be hard to get traction.
• Faculty turnover, especially in Public Service.
• Intense competition is limiting recruit pools, especially for health programs. Remaining students generally aren’t as strong.
• Accreditation has forced some health programs to increase entrance requirements.
• May be confusion amongst prospects about career goals.
• May be confusion between technical and transfer degrees for same discipline.
• Capturing more regional market share.
Opportunities

• Rework program offerings, such as is being done in BIT with computer science and engineering.
• Embed more Title IV certificates. Public Service program?
• Embed industrial certificates within the program.
• Continue working on advising model, especially with health science.
• Implement AS General degree for pre-health students.
• Clarify degree paths/advising between the technical and terminal so all parts of the college win.
• Analyzing if can offer programs that students are traveling out of area to obtain – if makes financial sense.
Strategy 3: alternate learning modes

PCT. OF CREDIT HOURS BY MODE

- Satellite
- Early College
- Distance
- Cohort

AY 2013-14
AY 2014-15
AY 2015-16
Early college

High School Sites Participating in Early College/CCP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sites Participating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 2013-14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2014-15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2015-16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hours consumed by CCP students in AY 2016

- On campus: 4,509 hours
- Online: 879 hours
- High School: 7,692 hours
Average early college success (Fall 2013-15)

- Early college - on campus: 97%
- Early college - online: 95%
- Early college - off campus: 98%
New students, no prior college credit. Both early college and transfer in.

- Fall 2013: 72%
- Fall 2014: 67%
- Fall 2015: 64%
Problems

• CCP not always same level of tuition as regular student
• Tuition formula always subject to change by state
• Risk of putting all eggs in CCP basket
• Soft skills challenges in classroom
• How to advise all off-campus students?
• Managing the mass of CCP students, especially off campus
• Ensuring advising and services to transfer in students
Opportunities

• Tuition Freedom Scholarship. We will make money back on subsidy formula.
• Advising CCP students, including off campus, on career pathways.
• Bridging our CCP program and our transfer-out articulations.
• Honors College.
• Expanding pool of adjuncts to teach on campus.
Distance Learning – Credit Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Online asynchronous</th>
<th>Hybrid/Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>6,722</td>
<td>2,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>6,794</td>
<td>2,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>6,897</td>
<td>2,137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distance course success rates

Distance - online asynchronous
Distance - synchronous/hybrid

2013-14: 79% 83%
2014-15: 82% 84%
2015-16: 81% 84%
Satellite – credit hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Satellite - Urban Center</th>
<th>Satellite - Crawford Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cohort – credit hours

- **2013-14**
  - Cohort - Post high school: 7,090
  - Cohort - CollegeNOW: 2,131

- **2014-15**
  - Cohort - Post high school: 7,073
  - Cohort - CollegeNOW: 2,585

- **2015-16**
  - Cohort - Post high school: 5,911
  - Cohort - CollegeNOW: 3,434
Problems

• Distance hours appear stuck, and hybrids are declining.
• Cohort hours are declining.
• Had to teach out our defacto cohort program, paralegal, due to low demand.
• Cohort programs take a lot of coordination to do it right.
Opportunities

• Encourage programs that have never taught distance to do so.
• Increase hybrid and flipped classroom methods.
• Place more strategic programs, like cohorts, at outreach centers.
• Encourage more programs to see if adopting the paralegal approach could work. Would lost FTE be offset by increased graduates?
• Study the business cohort program to see how model could be improved and expanded.
Success strategies

• Uphold a student-centered learning environment (measure with course success metrics including access breakouts)

• Foster student goal formation and completion (intermediate success milestones to completion)

• Maintain a culture of excellence (graduate and employer data)
Component 1: Course Completion (50%)

Cost-Based Calculation

- Average statewide cost based on level of course and subject area (aggregation of CIP codes)
- # of FTE who pass course * determined cost

Access category weight

- 15% for any student with one (or more) risk factors
Component 2: Success Points (25%)

Developmental Education Success
- # of Students completing developmental education Math and enrolling in first college-level math course (1 point)
- # of Students completing developmental education English & enrolling in first college-level English course (1 point)

12 Credit Hours
- # of students earning first 12 college-level credits (1 point)

24 Credit Hours
- # of students earning first 24 college-level credits (1 point)

36 Credit Hours
- # of students earning first 36 college-level credits (1 point)
Component 3: Completion Milestones (25%)

- Associate Degree Completions
- Certificate Completions
- Transfer w/ 12+credit hours

Cost-Based Model

Access Category Weights
- 25% for one access category
- 66% for two access categories
- 150% for three access categories
- 200% for four access categories
MAY THE ODDS BE EVER IN YOUR FAVOR
## Distribution of SSI by Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2015</strong></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2016</strong></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2017</strong></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course Success (Pass with a D or better)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCSC</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OACC Similar Size</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Improvements in course success

NCSC - Developmental: 8%
OACC Similar Size Developmental: 8%
NCSC - General: 6%
OACC Similar Size General: 1%
NCSC - Technical: 3%
OACC Similar Size Technical: 2%
On campus/online success rates

- 2013-14: 82%
- 2014-15: 84%
- 2015-16: 86%
Top improvements in technical course success, 2014-16, on campus/online

- Engineering - General: 13%
- Engineering - Industrial Technology: 11%
- Engineering - Mechanical: 10%
- Early Childhood Education: 7%
- Digital Media Technology: 6%
Top improvements in general education course success, 2014-16, on-campus/online

- First Year Experience: 15%
- Physics: 9%
- Behavioral Science: 7%
- English: 5%
- Chemistry: 4%
College-level math success, all students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NCSC</th>
<th>OACC Similar Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
College-level English success, all students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NCSC</th>
<th>OACC Sim Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Engineering technology course success, all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NCSC</th>
<th>OACC Similar Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other business course success, all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NCSC</th>
<th>OACC Similar Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problems

• Aren’t many
• Tending to see slight declines in course success across health science
• Both NCSC and OACC declined for nursing, but we declined more
Opportunities

• Developmental writing and reading have improved but are still lower than the peers (72% to 75%)
• Co-reqs and transition to MATH 0073 should help improve math success
• New policies such as academic withdrawal and mid-term grades
Credit completion by access – bad news

- Every category in # of credits completed has declined, but that is a factor of lower enrollment. Two year declines in completions for on-campus students (mostly enrollment driven):
  - Any access category: 20%
  - Minority: 12%
  - Adults: 28%
  - Pell: 29%
  - Dev math: 26%
Credit completion by access and cohorts

Improvement in On Campus Course Success, AY 2014-16

- All: 4%
- Minority: 7%
- Age 25+: 4%
- Pell: 4%
- Dev math: 5%
Year one credits completed by incoming post high school cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Year one GPA of incoming fall cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dev math sequence completion in one year, fall entering cohorts

- 2012 Cohort: 31%
- 2013 Cohort: 24%
- 2014 Cohort: 31%
Dev writing sequence completion in one year, fall entering cohorts

- 2012 Cohort: 50%
- 2013 Cohort: 40%
- 2014 Cohort: 42%
Dev reading sequence completion in one year, fall entering cohorts

- 2012 Cohort: 59%
- 2013 Cohort: 65%
- 2014 Cohort: 61%
Gateway completion in two years

- 2011 Cohort: 28% Math, 59% English
- 2012 Cohort: 28% Math, 56% English
- 2013 Cohort: 34% Math, 51% English
Completion of college-level credits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2B3. Entering cohort students completing college-level credits (dev excluded)</th>
<th>2012 Cohort</th>
<th>2013 Cohort</th>
<th>2014 Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete 12 within year</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete 24 within one year</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete 36 within 2 yrs (2011-13 cohort)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problems

- Primarily enrollment issue in terms of declining numbers.
- Sequence completion in writing and reading is an ongoing challenge area, even though the numbers are small.
- Huge difference in gateway completion between developmental and college-ready students.
- Lower minority course completion.
- Lower dev math average credits completed.
- Completion of 36 college credits within two years declining.
Opportunities

• Combining of MATH 0070 and 0072 to eliminate leakage.
• Continued implementation and improvement of math co-requisites through statistics pathway, as well as English labs.
• Continued use of embedded tutors in all developmental and gateway courses.
• Potential to combine writing and reading into single course.
• Continued enforced sequencing of dev and gateway first.
• Advising, advising, advising.
Persistence – fall to spring for entering post high school cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Persistence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fall to spring – access vs. no access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No Access</th>
<th>Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fall to fall persistence

2010: 51%
2011: 51%
2012: 55%
2013: 51%
2014: 57%
Average fall-to-fall persistence by access group (3 cohort years)

- Fall to fall - Minority: 43%
- Fall to fall - Age 25+: 50%
- Fall to fall - Pell: 50%
- Fall to fall - Dev Math: 49%
Graduate within three years

- 2010 Cohort: 12%
- 2011 Cohort: 14%
- 2012 Cohort: 14%
Graduation rate – 4 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 Cohort</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Cohort</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All students
Average graduation rates by access group

- All students: 18%
- Minority: 12%
- Age 25+: 21%
- Pell: 16%
- Developmental Math: 11%
Graduate, transfer or re-enroll in 3 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Access Group</th>
<th>No Access Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access Group
No Access Group
Benchmark comparison, three-year graduation rates for entering full-time students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NCSC</th>
<th>OACC Sim Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One-year certificates granted

AY 2013-14
- NCSC: 19
- OACC Similar Size: 65

AY 2014-15
- NCSC: 18
- OACC Similar Size: 61
Access completers to total completions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NCSC</th>
<th>OACC Similar Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 2012-13</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2013-14</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2014-15</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AY 2012-13, AY 2013-14, AY 2014-15
Problems

• Drop off of next term persistence for adults and minorities.
• Minorities and dev math significantly lag in fall to fall persistence.
• Overall graduation rates are low.
• Best performing subgroup for graduation (adults) are disappearing.
• Significant difference in cumulative success after three years between access and no access.
Opportunities

• Use of certificates to boost completion rates.
• Targeted efforts toward adult students given historical performance.
• Use supports such as TRIO to target completion toward all access groups.
• Remove all barriers to graduation, such as petition fee.
• Supplement petition process with auto-awards.
• Advising, advising, advising.
Completions – total degrees and major certs

AY 2013-14: 362
AY 2014-15: 378
AY 2015-16: 339
Ratio of degrees/major certs to on-campus FTE

• AY 2014 – 21%

• AY 2015 – 24%

• AY 2016 – 24%

• Looking at it this way, we were actually more efficient this year even though we produced fewer numerical degrees.
## Degree by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree by Type</th>
<th>AY 2014</th>
<th>AY 2015</th>
<th>AY 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Degrees - CollegeNOW</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Degrees - Other</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate of Arts/Science - Technical Focus*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other AA/AS Degrees</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top increases, programs > 10 graduates

Police Academy: 143%
Industrial Technology: 62%
Occupational Therapy: 44%
Management: 41%
Physical Therapist: 23%
Transfer one year within spring graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring graduates - all</th>
<th>AY 2013</th>
<th>AY 2014</th>
<th>AY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CollegeNOW</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Associate of Arts/Science</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top transfer programs

- CollegeNOW: 66%
- Other AA/AS: 57%
- Human Services: 43%
- Accounting: 27%
- Management: 23%
Graduation rates – top health science, within 2 years of gateway class

- Physical Therapist Assistant: 90%
- Occupational Therapy Assistant: 69%
- Respiratory Therapy: 67%
- Radiologic Sciences: 61%
CollegeNOW, within two years of entering

- CollegeNOW Bioscience: 76%
- CollegeNOW Engineering: 68%
- CollegeNOW Business: 91%
Other programs, within 4 years of entering college

- Paralegal: 46%
- Accounting: 33%
- Computer Information: 26%
- Visual Comm: 23%
- Mechanical Engineering: 22%
Problems

• Major credentials took a 10% drop.
• Given program transitions in BIT and enrollment challenges in other divisions, may get worse before it gets better.
• Transfer degrees outside of CNOW only about 4% of all degrees.
• Still relatively flat for transfer of graduates.
• Some programs really struggle with graduation rates.
Opportunities

• Establishing more structure to programs to force completion.
• Possible expansion of formal or informal CollegeNOW.
• On-campus degree completions building off of MVNU and Franklin models.
• Advising, advising, advising.
Graduate and employer satisfaction

• Concern that response rates are too low (three year average 15% for graduates and 40 employers annual)

• Taking that into account, 63% of graduates ranked us above average or better for quality of education as relating to job requirements. Thirty-two percent marked us average.

• Ninety-six percent of employers were satisfied or very satisfied with graduates they had recently hired.
Key graduate skills marked by employers as average or below

- Professionalism: 27%
- Written communication: 46%
- Cultural sensitivity: 37%
- Verbal communication: 39%
- Numerical skills: 36%
Highest avg. quarterly wage six months after graduation, AY 2012-14

- Engineering Technology: $11,101
- Registered Nursing: $10,065
- Industrial Technology: $9,651
- Physical Therapist Assistant: $9,329
- Occupational Therapist Assistant: $8,726
Average wages of graduates (2012-14) six months after graduating (N=945)
Largest increases in quarterly wages, 2012-14 graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Academy</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CollegeNOW Engineering</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average licensure rates for graduates

- Registered Nursing: 100%
- Licensed Practical Nursing: 100%
- Physical Therapist Assistant: 100%
- Radiological Science: 100%
- Occupational Therapy Assistant: 100%
- Respiratory Care: 98%
- Criminal Justice Police Academy: 100%
Problems

• Need to get better response on graduate and employer surveys. Maybe do a graduate survey as part of petition process.
• Concern over certain general education and soft skills by employers
• Overall wages dipped for graduates in most recent year, especially for health science
Opportunities

- Improved engagement of graduates and employers on needs (example, program advisory boards)
- Tracking average wages to identify highest growth programs
Resources strategies

• Be a great place to work

• Increase fiscal resources and accountability

• Align and optimize college assets and infrastructure
Be a great place to work

• Measured primarily via the “Campus Quality Survey” taken by employees

• Survey administered in 2003, 2005, 2011 and 2015

• Results reflect both individual questions and indexes that “roll up” results into general areas. The survey measures satisfaction in 8 different categories based on the performance gap between “what it should be” and “what it is.” The smaller the gap the better.

• Given wild swings in recent history, consider results over long term. Look at how the trend lines are moving.
Index – Employee training and recognition

![Graph showing employee training and recognition index from 2003 to 2015 for NC State and peer colleges. The graph includes linear trends for both NC State and peer colleges.]
Index – empowerment and teamwork

![Graph showing the index of empowerment and teamwork for NC State and Peer Colleges from 2003 to 2015. The graph includes a linear trend line for each.]
Index – customer focus

![Graph showing customer focus from 2003 to 2015 for NC State and Peer Colleges with linear trends]

- NC State
- Peer Colleges
- Linear (NC State)
- Linear (Peer Colleges)
Index – measurement and analysis
Index – strategic quality planning

[Bar graph showing data for NC State and Peer Colleges from 2003 to 2015.]

- NC State: 3, 3.2, 3.2, 3.8, 3.2
- Peer Colleges: 3.2, 3.3, 3.3, 3.2, 3.2

Lines indicate linear trends for both NC State and Peer Colleges from 2003 to 2015.
Index – quality assurance

![Index chart showing quality assurance scores for NC State and peer colleges from 2003 to 2015. The chart displays the linear trends for both institutions.](chart.png)
Index – quality productivity/improvement results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NC State</th>
<th>Peer Colleges</th>
<th>Linear (NC State)</th>
<th>Linear (Peer Colleges)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Index – top management leadership/support

![Graph showing the index of top management leadership/support from 2003 to 2015 for NC State and Peer Colleges, with a linear trend line for each. The y-axis represents the index values ranging from 0 to 5, and the x-axis represents the years 2003 to 2015. The bars indicate the index values for NC State and Peer Colleges, with NC State values being consistently higher than Peer Colleges, especially in 2011 where the index is 3.9 for NC State and 3.2 for Peer Colleges. The linear trend lines show a steady increase over the years.]
The Ten Smallest Performance Gaps (better results)

1. People feel their work is making a difference;
2. they have the freedom to express their ideas;
3. the college uses state and national data to compare its performance to others;
4. the mission, purpose and values are familiar to them;
5. the department meets as a team to coordinate work;
6. faculty and staff take pride in their work;
7. job performance is evaluated fairly;
8. someone at work has discussed their progress with them in the last 6 months;
9. the college believes in continuous quality improvement; and
10. administrators have confidence in the employee.
Strategic Planning Goals – State of the Mission
A Qualitative Evaluation - Resources

The Ten Largest Performance Gaps. This is the list we need to improve upon.

1. There are no effective lines of communication between departments;
2. morale is low;
3. there is no special training to improve customer service;
4. employees are not rewarded for outstanding performance;
5. process for selecting/training/recognizing employees is not carefully planned;
6. there is no spirit of teamwork;
7. compensation is not fair;
8. written operation procedures don’t clearly define who is responsible;
9. employees suggestions are not used to improve; and
10. it is not easy to get information at the college.
Individual questions surveyed - top challenges identified

1. There are effective lines of communication between departments
2. Morale is high at the College as a whole
3. Employees are rewarded for outstanding job performance
4. Employees receive special training in improving customer service (third in this year’s survey)

- Then we conducted a follow-up survey to drill down further at fall 2015 convocation
Fall 2015 Convocation Survey
The college community identified three top challenges to the first question on department communication (43 out of 92 responses):

a. Departments are not talking to each other due to being busy and lack of time (16)
b. Departments are not talking to each other due to departmentalism (silos) (15)
c. Communication not cascading down from administration (12)
Fall 2015 Convocation Survey

The college community identified three top challenges to the second question on morale (47 out of 103 responses):

a. High workload (17)
b. Lack of appreciation/recognition/incentive (17)
c. Low pay/raises (13)
Fall 2015 Convocation Survey

The college community identified three top challenges to the third question on rewarding job performance (43 responses out of 56):

a. More on-going (non-monetary) recognition (20)
b. Pilot performance reward program (merit based, peer recognition) (13)
c. Low pay, minimal to no raises (10)
Problems and opportunities

• What has gone right to address these three areas in the past year?

• What has possibly not worked out?

• What else realistically could be done?
What College did the past year to address concerns

- System wide interdepartmental communication of the President’s Report and NCStatement
- Provided $20 per individual for Thanksgiving
- New health plan provided two-months holiday premium saving several hundred dollars in premiums for two months
- College closed for two weeks over the holidays allowing employees more family time with pay
- Established the 4-day summer schedule to allow for 3-day weekends
- Created an Earned-Time-Off for part-time faculty and staff
- The Student Success Leadership Institute team is made up of 60% faculty
- Faculty and staff associations are represented on Cabinet
- More faculty are participating in strategic planning
- Started the fun committee
Resources – Financial Ratio Composite Score

AY 2012-13: NCSC 2.7, OACC Sim Size 3.7
AY 2013-14: NCSC 3.8, OACC Sim Size 4.0
AY 2014-15: NCSC 4.0, OACC Sim Size 3.7
## Components of Fiscal Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary reserve subscore (expendable net position/operating expenses)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viability subscore (expendable net position/plant debt)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net income subscore (Change in total net position/revenues)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Institutional Vital Signs: NCSC vs. OACC

#### Primary Reserve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>NCSC</th>
<th>OACC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average = 37%**
Annual endowments

AY 2012-13
NCSC: $2,938,609
OACC Sim Size: $1,247,980

AY 2013-14
NCSC: $3,095,515
OACC Sim Size: $1,325,151

AY 2014-15
NCSC: $3,389,367
OACC Sim Size: $1,383,783
Emerald Club

- $300,584.23
  - Sponsorships (which include Hall of Excellence, Graduate Picnic, Alumni Newsletters): $53,000
  - Scholarships: $135,550.34
  - Unrestricted/Greatest Need: $94,988.89
Annual grant awards

- AY 2014: $3,833,222
- AY 2015: $5,911,601
- AY 2016: $2,853,858
Foundation and grants as % of operating funds

AY 2012-13: 4.6% Foundation, 6.4% Grants
AY 2013-14: 5.0% Foundation, 6.5% Grants
AY 2014-15: 7.0% Foundation, 8.0% Grants
Problems

• Still have very weak reserve. All it takes to wreck it is unforeseen emergency like a blown gas line.

• Foundation is doing great with endowment, but is struggling somewhat with day to day operating funds.

• Grants are temporary. Some large ones like TAECT are nearing completion or weaning grant funds like Title III.

• Grants cannot supplant normal day to day operations.
Opportunities

- Use grant funds to develop sustaining programs and structures, like we did with engineering overhaul with Title III funds.
- Use grant funds to purchase capital equipment.
- Use grant funds as a bridge for new hiring, with goal of using student retention and performance funding for ongoing. Strategy of Title III.
Costs and staffing

Student Term FTE to Full-Time Faculty

- All FTE
- On Campus FTE

Year | All FTE | On Campus FTE
--- | --- | ---
Fall 2013 | 29 | 27
Fall 2014 | 30 | 27
Fall 2015 | 34 | 29
Student FTE to all full-time faculty and staff

- Fall 2013: 11
- Fall 2014: 11
- Fall 2015: 11
On campus student FTE per full-time employees (exclude grant funded staff)

- Fall 2013: 12
- Fall 2014: 11
- Fall 2015: 11
Change in unrestricted costs per FTE, 2013-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>NCSC</th>
<th>OACC Sim Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Costs</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unrestricted costs per FTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AY 2012-13</th>
<th>AY 2013-14</th>
<th>AY 2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCSC</td>
<td>$9,229</td>
<td>$9,125</td>
<td>$9,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OACC Sim Size</td>
<td>$7,787</td>
<td>$7,879</td>
<td>$8,251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AY 2012-13  AY 2013-14  AY 2014-15
Problems

• Costs per FTE are still higher than peers – trying to keep up with falling FTE
• Both personnel and benefit costs per FTE higher than the peers
• Equipment costs per FTE lower than the peers
• Travel/entertainment (eg, professional development) are lower than the peers
Opportunities

• Get more FTE!
Facilities – Square footage per FTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NCSC</th>
<th>OACC Sim Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 2012-13</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2013-14</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2014-15</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ratios of all FTE vs. On-campus FTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AY 2013</th>
<th>AY 2014</th>
<th>AY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Square footage per FTE</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square footage per on-campus FTE</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plant maintenance as Pct. of operating costs

AY 2012-13: 6.5%, 8.0%
AY 2013-14: 7.5%, 9.2%
AY 2014-15: 7.8%, 8.8%
## Key facility costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Description</th>
<th>AY 2013</th>
<th>AY 2014</th>
<th>AY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility employee cost per square foot</td>
<td>$2.05</td>
<td>$2.08</td>
<td>$2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kehoe/Urban gas cost per square foot</td>
<td>$0.17</td>
<td>$0.26</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kehoe/Urban electric cost per square foot</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$1.18</td>
<td>$1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared services cost per main campus (NCSC and shared buildings) square foot</td>
<td>$5.15</td>
<td>$5.34</td>
<td>$4.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IT as percentage of operating costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NCSC</th>
<th>Other Community Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 2012-13</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2013-14</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2014-15</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- NCSC
- Other Community Colleges
Training expenditures per IT staff

AY 2013-14
- NCSC: $284
- Other Community Colleges: $620

AY 2014-15
- NCSC: $297
- Other Community Colleges: $649
Problems

• Square footage to FTE is 54% higher than the peer average.
• Square footage to on-campus FTE is risen 25% in last two years.
• Electricity costs have risen 76% in last two years.
• Natural gas costs have risen 37% in last two years.
Opportunities

• Strategically filled critical facility positions while holding shared services costs flat.