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**Statewide Mission and Philosophy – Strengthening Our Prosperity**

**Mission**
Texas state government must be limited, efficient, and completely accountable. It should foster opportunity and economic prosperity, focus on critical priorities, and support the creation of strong family environments for our children. The stewards of the public trust must be men and women who administer state government in a fair, just, and responsible manner. To honor the public trust, state officials must seek new and innovative ways to meet state government priorities in a fiscally responsible manner.

Aim high . . . we are not here to achieve inconsequential things!

**Philosophy**
The task before all state public servants is to govern in a manner worthy of this great state. We are a great enterprise, and as an enterprise, we will promote the following core principles:

- First and foremost, Texas matters most. This is the overarching, guiding principle by which we will make decisions. Our state, and its future, is more important than party, politics, or individual recognition.

- Government should be limited in size and mission, but it must be highly effective in performing the tasks it undertakes.

- Decisions affecting individual Texans, in most instances, are best made by those individuals, their families, and the local government closest to their communities.

- Competition is the greatest incentive for achievement and excellence. It inspires ingenuity and requires individuals to set their sights high. Just as competition inspires excellence, a sense of personal responsibility drives individual citizens to do more for their future and the future of those they love.

- Public administration must be open and honest, pursuing the high road rather than the expedient course. We must be accountable to taxpayers for our actions.

- State government has a responsibility to safeguard taxpayer dollars by eliminating waste and abuse and providing efficient and honest government.

- Finally, state government should be humble, recognizing that all its power and authority is granted to it by the people of Texas, and those who make decisions wielding the power of the state should exercise their authority cautiously and fairly.
Higher Education Statewide Goals and Benchmarks

Priority Goal
To prepare individuals for a changing economy and workforce by:

• Providing an affordable, accessible, and quality system of higher education; and
• Furthering the development and application of knowledge through teaching, research, and commercialization.

Benchmarks
• Percentage of first-time, full-time freshmen who graduate within four years
• Percentage of first-time, full-time freshmen who graduate within six years
• Percentage of two-year college students who transfer to four-year institutions
• Percentage of two-year transfer students who graduate from four-year institutions
• Percentage of first-time, full-time freshmen who graduate with an associate degree within three years
• Percentage of population age 24 years and older with vocational/technical certificate as highest level of educational attainment
• Percentage of population age 24 years and older with two-year college degree as highest level of educational attainment
• Percentage of population age 24 years and older with four-year college degree as highest level of educational attainment
• Number of baccalaureate graduates in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics
• Percentage of M.D. graduates remaining in Texas for residency
• Percentage of nursing graduates employed or enrolled in nursing graduate programs in Texas
• Texas public colleges and universities cost per student as a percentage of the national average
• Percentage change in average tuition and fees over past biennium
• Percentage of TEXAS grants recipients who graduate within six years
• Percentage of total federal research and development expenditures received by Texas institutions of higher education
• Percentage increase in research and development expenditures in emerging technologies over previous biennium

• Number of patents obtained in emerging technologies

• Number of patents obtained by institutions of higher education that are commercialized

• Number of private sector companies created as a result of activities at public institutions of higher education

• Administrative cost as percentage of total expenditures

**Agency Vision**

The THECB will be recognized as an international leader in developing and implementing innovative higher education policy to accomplish our mission.

**Agency Mission**

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board promotes access, affordability, quality, success, and cost efficiency in the state’s institutions of higher education, through *Closing the Gaps* and its successor plan, resulting in a globally competent workforce that positions Texas as an international leader in an increasingly complex world economy.

**Agency Philosophy**

The THECB will promote access to and success in quality higher education across the state with the conviction that access and success without quality is mediocrity and that quality without access and success is unacceptable.

The Coordinating Board’s core values are:

**Accountability:** We hold ourselves responsible for our actions and welcome every opportunity to educate stakeholders about our policies, decisions, and aspirations.

**Efficiency:** We accomplish our work using resources in the most effective manner.

**Collaboration:** We develop partnerships that result in student success and a highly qualified, globally competent workforce.

**Excellence:** We strive for preeminence in all our endeavors.
Agency Functions

The legislature outlined the Coordinating Board’s functions in SB 215 during the 83rd legislative session.

The Agency has the duty to take an active part in promoting quality education throughout the state by:

- providing a statewide perspective to ensure the efficient and effective use of higher education resources and to eliminate unnecessary duplication;
- developing and evaluating progress toward a long-range master plan for higher education and providing analysis and recommendations to link state spending for higher education with the goals of the long-range master plan;
- collecting and making accessible data on higher education in the state and aggregating and analyzing that data to support policy recommendations;
- making recommendations to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of transitions, including between high school and postsecondary education, between institutions of higher education for transfer purposes, and between postsecondary education and the workforce; and
- administering programs and trusteed funds for financial aid and other grants as necessary to achieve the state's long-range goals and as directed by the legislature.

The Coordinating Board leadership recognizes that the strategic plan should strike a balance between the focus on the long range master plan and on the responsibilities that the agency has in other aspects of higher education. There are several benefits that a sound, well-thought-out strategic plan will yield to the agency, among them, the allocation of resources and measurement of success that will hold staff accountable for daily activities. The 2015-2019 strategic plan represents a move towards goals and objectives that are more agency-specific.

Agency Structure

The Coordinating Board is the governing body of the THECB and references in this document to Coordinating Board refer to the Board and not the agency. The Board is comprised of nine members from all geographic regions of the state who are appointed to overlapping six-year terms by the Governor and confirmed by the Texas Senate. In addition, a student Board member, appointed by the Governor, serves for a one-year term and is a non-voting member. The Coordinating Board meets quarterly in Austin.

Board members appoint a Commissioner of Higher Education as the chief executive officer for the agency, which has 280.4 authorized full-time (FTE) positions. The Commissioner functions as the state's chief expert on higher education, making recommendations and carrying out higher education initiatives on behalf of the Coordinating Board.
The agency is organized into three primary units: Finance and Administration, Academic Planning and Policy, and Internal Audit. (The agency's organizational chart is provided in Appendix B.) The Finance and Administration Unit currently consists of three divisions: Business and Support Services, Information Solutions and Services (ISS) and Human Resources. The Academic Planning and Policy Unit consists of three divisions: Planning and Accountability, P-16 Initiatives, and Workforce, Academic Affairs and Research. The Internal Audit unit consists of two departments: Internal Audit and Compliance Monitoring. The agency established the Compliance Monitoring department in October 2012 as a result of the Sunset Commission recommendation.

**External/Internal Assessment**

This section provides results of the external and internal assessment conducted by the Coordinating Board and agency staff to meet agency planning goals and LBB strategic plan requirements. The external and internal assessment addresses the state higher education plan, *Closing the Gaps by 2015*, and agency operations, a specific recommendation of the Sunset review process. “The Sunset Commission also adopted a series of directives to focus the agency’s leadership on more strategically managing the agency’s operations. Most significantly, appointment of a single executive manager and revamping the agency’s strategic plan will help the agency’s management, stakeholders, and the Legislature narrow the agency’s priorities and understand how well the agency is performing”, (p. 33, *Final Results of Sunset Reviews 2012-2013*, Sunset Advisory Commission). The four goals developed as a result of the strategic planning process are in addition to the current goals aligned to the budget structure.

The agency enlisted the assistance of an external facilitator to guide the strengths, weakness, opportunity and threat (SWOT) assessment and to develop agency specific goals. The facilitator requested senior leaders identify the top three to four issues in the SWOT analysis. After a daylong session of brainstorming where the Coordinating Board envisioned itself in five years, senior leaders crafted four goals built on the SWOT analysis. The following table summarizes the external and internal assessment findings. The table is organized by strengths, challenges, opportunities, and obstacles. Each identified topic area or element includes a “focus” which was identified in the SWOT analysis and strategic planning session. These focus areas serve as the basis for developing the four broad goals added to strategic plan (Goals I-L). After the summary table is a discussion of target populations served, which is followed by the external and internal assessment. Each topic section of the assessment includes the bulleted "focus" found in the summary table and a detailed discussion of each identified element.

Following the internal and external assessment are the agency's Goals and Performance Measures as related to the agency budget structure. Note that although the focus areas serve as the building blocks for the strategic plan and are related to the agency's budget structure, they are not the same as the budget structure goals.
Target Populations

Explanation of Students, Institutions Served

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board works closely with the state's higher education institutions, public education entities, businesses, community groups, legislative personnel, and other government staff. Students and their parents are, directly and indirectly, provided services by the agency through functions such as loan administration services, online data resources, and THECB-administered grants that support programs on campuses. Texas' institutions of higher education directly serve the state's diverse population of students; meeting the education needs of those students and ensuring that the state has an educated populace to help support its economic and social goals are of primary importance to the agency.

Changes in Population Anticipated In Plan Timeframe

THECB staff closely monitors demographic changes in the state to better understand changing student populations. As seen in the chart below, 2010 census data indicate substantial changes to the racial and ethnic population of Texas between the 2000 and 2010, especially for the younger age groups. Whites are now a plurality and no longer a majority of the Texas population. Hispanics, an under-represented group in Texas higher education, made up 38 percent of the population in 2010 and 48 percent of the population aged 0-17. These changes, seen in Figures 2 and 3, illustrate the importance of institutional and agency efforts to meet goals for Hispanic student participation and success including support for the activities outlined in the Accelerated Action Plan which focus on Hispanic participation and success (see Internal Assessment section). The population shifts seen in the 0-17 year-old population will dramatically impact the college-aged populations that Texas higher education institutions serve long into the future.
Figure 2

Texas Racial and Ethnic Composition
2000 and 2010

2000

2010

Source: Texas State Data Center, U.S. Census Bureau 2000 and 2010 Census Counts

Figure 3

Texas Population
by Age and Race/Ethnicity
2010 Census

Source: Texas State Data Center, U.S. Census Bureau 2010 Census
The Coordinating Board recently invited Dr. Steve H. Murdock to present the demographic future of Texas to inform the next state higher education plan. As seen in Figure 4, by the year 2050, Murdock projects a large increase in younger Hispanics and describes in his book, *Changing Texas*, the long-term impacts if post-secondary educational attainment and state financial assistance do not increase over current levels.

*Given the state’s patterns of population growth, growth in the rates of college and university completion among minority students is essential to maintain a competitive workforce. However, the overall rates of in the number of students with financial need unmet by family resources are exceeding the rates of increase in the total number of students....With increasing numbers of students and increasing levels of unmet need, Texas may need to consider substantially increasing its level of assistance to students to ensure that there is a competitive workforce in the future (Murdock et al., 2014, p. 132).*

**Figure 4**

![Percent of Texas Population by Age Group and Ethnicity, 2050](image)

# External/Internal Assessment Summary Table

## Strengths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>What do we do well as an agency?</th>
<th>What is the impact of this strength on our Agency?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Maintain a nationally recognized data system</td>
<td>The Accountability system provides accurate data to policy makers, parents, students, and K-12 educators, media, institutions, and researchers, career and workforce educators. The Accountability system has no other comparable competitor for Texas higher education data. It provides the results for the state higher education plan, <em>Closing the Gaps by 2015</em>. The Accountability system data is the foundation of the annual Almanac. Agency staff partnered with a vendor to develop the Compare College TX app, using Almanac data, which provides cost, acceptance and six-year graduation rates for students and parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Formulate higher education policy to advance participation, success, excellence and research</td>
<td>THECB is regarded as a leader in higher education policy. Board members and Executive Officers communicate with the Governor, legislators and other stakeholders to affect policy changes. The agency has refined work systems to collect, analyze and disseminate data. The agency is responsible for developing the state higher education plan through an inclusive, broad-based group of stakeholders. Work has been underway for two years to develop the next state higher education plan. The agency has worked closely with Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) to exceed <em>Closing the Gaps by 2015</em> success goals, and has made significant progress toward achieving participation goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Progress on <em>Closing the Gaps</em></td>
<td>Successful achievement of <em>Closing the Gaps</em> positions the agency to develop the next higher education plan through 2030.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Recruit a capable workforce</td>
<td>Agency staff have capabilities in the following areas to meet the agency goals and serve customers, partners, and stakeholders: External Relations staff navigate the Texas legislature to inform legislation and achieve positive legislative outcomes; Division staff support IHEs on programmatic, finance, planning, reporting, financial aid, and rule matters; and Business Support Services staff assist borrowers through loan and loan repayment program life cycle. Additional staff in the business support area administer state financial aid, student loans, appropriations, private grants and federal funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>What challenges do we face as agency?</th>
<th>What is the impact of this challenge on our Agency?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Anticipate retirements and turnover</td>
<td>The agency will be slow to respond to higher education policy issues or experience skill gaps necessary to achieve vision and mission without a succession plan. The agency experienced greater employee turnover (not due to retirement) this year than in previous years. Attracting qualified applicants may be more challenging since Austin unemployment rate is 5.6%, below the state average of 6.5%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Have sufficient general revenue funds to sustain and improve existing technology</td>
<td>The agency will not be able to meet stakeholder and customer requirements without upgraded hardware and software. Improved technology will strengthen agency operations and allow staff to be used for other critical functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Align strategic planning processes and LBB Performance Measures</td>
<td>Continue work begun in 2012 to review agency performance measures, the agency budget structure, and alignment to 2015-2019 strategic plan. Gaps in alignment may impede resource allocation and organizational goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>What is happening outside our agency that we want to take advantage of?</th>
<th>What is the potential impact of this opportunity on the agency?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1</td>
<td>Outcomes based funding models</td>
<td>The Agency is positioned to build consensus among four-year institutions and legislators to bring about this change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2</td>
<td>Increased demand for data-driven policy</td>
<td>IHEs, ISDs and other stakeholders continue to look to the Agency to facilitate and inform decision-making processes using Agency-collected data in ways that can help improve participation, success, excellence and research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3</td>
<td>Partnership with Texas Workforce Commission to address adult basic education (ABE) to workforce solutions</td>
<td>The Agency can contribute expert knowledge on a coordinated long range action plan to align ABE, postsecondary education, and regional workforce needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>What is happening outside our agency that we must respond to?</td>
<td>What is the impact of this obstacle on our Agency?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1</td>
<td>Local vs. state perspective on higher education</td>
<td>As part of long-range state planning efforts for state higher education beyond <em>Closing the Gaps</em>, the Agency staff must include a deliberate analysis of how long-term goals might be framed and implemented in ways that diffuse the tensions between state and local stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2</td>
<td>Funding for higher education</td>
<td>Ensure that Texas recognizes that higher education is a public investment that can have a direct and lasting impact on the long-term fiscal and financial health of the state. The future of Texas, in terms of economic development and quality of life, is dependent on increasing higher education funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As part of The National Governors Association (NGA) initiative, *Complete to Compete*, the nation's governors recommended in 2010 that each state adopt a comprehensive data system with well-defined metrics to evaluate the performance of institutions of higher education. Texas set the standard for such accountability efforts when it launched its accountability system in 2004. In fact, Texas currently meets or exceeds most of the NGA recommendations, including using college completion data and reporting results annually.

In 2008, the state was formally recognized by the Education Sector's report *Ready to Assemble: Grading State Higher Education Accountability Systems*. The independent assessment of existing higher education accountability systems included evaluation of 21 categories related to the collection and use of data to affect improvement in higher education. Texas was one of only ten states in the nation to receive recognition for overall best practice for its accountability system.

Since data analysis and evaluation are key functions of the agency as they relate to the agency's core mission, recognition by peer states and independent assessment of the data system reinforces the efficiency and effectiveness of the agency in fulfilling its role.

Since the launch of *Closing the Gaps by 2015*, the agency has been charged with working more collaboratively with a number of other state agencies, such as the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC), on initiatives designed to help Texas achieve its higher education goals. The THECB has established informal, cooperative relationships with other agencies as well, to help advance the state's goals. These relationships allow the THECB to coordinate activities in ways that leverage the efforts of other agencies, avoid duplication, and develop a P-16-to-workforce framework for Texas.

One primary example of this type of coordination was the development and ongoing implementation of the *College and Career Readiness Standards*. Both TEA and the THECB worked together, utilizing vertical teams of high school and college faculty, to develop standards. This collaboration resulted in a set of high-quality college readiness standards that are among the first and most rigorous in the nation.
The creation of the state P-16 Council was another important step towards cementing cooperation between the two sectors of education and with other stakeholders who maintain a vested interest in improving quality and outcomes in K-12 and higher education. The P-16 Council not only offers a forum to identify challenges and solutions for improving education and workforce preparation in Texas, but it ensures the agencies align their activities, thereby avoiding duplication.

The increasingly collaborative relationship between the education and workforce sectors is critical for institutionalizing a true P-16-to-workforce pipeline in Texas. For example, TWC shares its employment database with the THECB so that students can be tracked into the workforce and followed through their careers.

**Focus: Progress on Closing the Gaps**

**Discussion**

The progress made on accomplishing the targets and goals of Closing the Gaps by 2015 is evidence of the agency’s overall effectiveness in meeting its primary objective: development and oversight of the state's higher education master plan. In June 2014, the THECB released its annual evaluation of progress related to the four goals outlined in Closing the Gaps. The substantial progress made and some of the remaining challenges in the areas of participation, success, and research are discussed below and shown in the charts that follow:

**Statewide Goal for Participation: By 2015, close the gaps in participation rates to add 630,000 more students.**

- The final statewide goal is within reach, but Texas will need to enroll approximately 27,000 more students in both fall 2014 and 2015 at public, independent, and career institutions to meet the goal. On average, more than 44,000 students have been added each year since fall 2000, but enrollment growth has slowed in recent years and fell by nearly 14,000 students in fall 2013.
- Enrollment at public two-year institutions fell by over 12,000 students in fall 2013, the second straight drop. Career school enrollment was down almost 10,000 students. Public four-year institutions (including health-related institutions) tempered some of the loss by adding more than 8,000 students to their headcount.
- African Americans reached the final enrollment target in fall 2009, six years before the final deadline. African Americans continued to add more students every year thereafter, except for a drop of about 4,500 students in fall 2013. Despite the drop, this population remained far above the 2015 target. Hispanics and whites, however, are not on track to reach their final targets. Hispanic enrollment growth is decelerating, with only 11,000 students added in fall 2013, and white enrollment dropped for the fourth consecutive year by the largest drop ever, more than 20,000 students.
- The gender gap in participation has grown for all three of the major racial/ethnic groups. African-American females continued to have the highest participation rate in Texas higher education in fall 2013 at 9.3 percent of their statewide population, but African-American males lagged that percentage by 3.5 percentage points. Hispanic and white females both
participated at a 6.1 percent rate of their populations, but Hispanic males participated at just a 4.3 percent rate and white males were only at 4.9 percent.

Statewide Goal for Success: By 2015, award 210,000 undergraduate degrees, certificates, and other identifiable student successes from high-quality programs. The 2015 goal requires awarding 93,765 more bachelor’s degrees, associate degrees, and certificates (BACs) than in 2000.

- Most goals and targets have been met. The major goal, 210,000 undergraduate awards by FY 2015, was met in FY 2011, and the number of awards has increased thereafter to nearly 243,000 in FY 2013.
- The targets for statewide associate degrees, African-American BACs, and statewide doctoral degrees were met in FY 2011. Targets for statewide bachelor’s degrees and Hispanic BACs were reached in FY 2012. The number of awards has continued to increase for all of these metrics. The target for allied health and nursing BACs was surpassed in FY 2013.
- The three remaining success targets – STEM BACs, overall initial teacher certifications, and teacher certifications for math and science – are far from reach. Both categories of teacher certifications would need to more than double to reach the targets.

Statewide Goal for Excellence: By 2015, substantially increase the number of nationally recognized programs or services at colleges and universities.

- *U.S. News & World Report (U.S. News)* has never ranked any Texas institution among the top 10 national public universities during the CTG period.
- Based on data in the 2012 report from The Center for Measuring University Performance (CMUP), The University of Texas at Austin (UT-Austin) was tied for 13th place and Texas A&M University (TAMU) was tied for 17th place among top public research universities. UT-Austin was last ranked in the top 10 in 2007 by the CMUP; TAMU has never been in the top 10. The CMUP does not compute ranking numbers, but their data can be used for this purpose.
- Despite the lack of top 10 rankings among Texas public institutions, there are many excellent, nationally recognized programs at these institutions. For example, the accounting programs at UT-Austin’s undergraduate and graduate business schools were ranked no. 1 among public and independent institutions in the 2014 “Best Colleges” publication from *U.S. News*, and its undergraduate business school marketing program was ranked no. 3. UT-Austin and TAMU had two “top five” undergraduate engineering programs in *U.S. News*. The program in health care law at the University of Houston was ranked no. 9.
- Several community colleges have been recognized for outstanding programs during the CTG period. Richland College was the first community college ever to win the prestigious Baldrige Award. Temple College’s Texas Bioscience Institute is an innovative program that has won several awards including a THECB Star Award in 2013. The Alamo Area Academies, which also targets STEM areas, is another example of excellence and innovation.
Statewide Goal for Research: By 2015, increase the level of federal science and engineering research and development obligations to Texas institutions to 6.5 percent of obligations to higher education institutions across the nation.

- Texas seemed to be on track for reaching the goal in FY 2003 when its federal obligations for science and engineering R&D to public and independent institutions were 6.1 percent of the national total. However, Texas institutions’ share never went higher than 5.9 percent thereafter, and in FY 2011 (the most recent year with available data), the share fell to 5.2 percent, the lowest since CTG began.
- Texas public universities and health-related institutions surpassed the 2015 CTG research target of $3 billion in R&D expenditures in FY 2008, when the institutions reported $3.1 billion in expenditures. Expenditures continued to climb and reached $3.79 billion in FY 2013.
- The Texas A&M Center for Innovation, a National Biosecurity Laboratory that opened in summer 2012, may enhance the state’s share of federal R&D obligations when those data are next released. A federal bio-containment laboratory, the Galveston National Laboratory located at the University of Texas Medical Branch, contributes to Texas’ share as well.

Texas remains poised to meet statewide Participation goal.
Texas has surpassed the statewide Success goal.

Expenditures for R&D continue to climb in support of statewide Research goal.
The Agency staff have capabilities in multiple areas to achieve the Coordinating Board mission and serve customers, partners, and stakeholders. The External Relations staff work closely with division staff to navigate the Texas legislature to inform legislation and achieve positive legislative outcomes. The Workforce, Academic Affairs and Research (WAAR) Division provides leadership, guidance, and resources for a variety of statutory and board-assigned activities including the review and approval of certificate and degree programs; administering state and federal grant programs that support career and technical education, engineering recruitment, health-related education and research, and basic research; and oversight of degree-granting institutions other than Texas public institutions. The Planning and Accountability Division coordinates the collection, analysis, and dissemination of higher education data, provides finance and resource planning support, and coordinates evaluations and conducts research related to higher education programs and policies. The P-16 Initiatives staff supports collaborative efforts and activities designed to improve student preparation for access to and success in college, postsecondary remedial education, educator preparation and quality in public and higher education, and other programs.

The Business Support Services administers state financial aid, student loans, loan repayment programs, exemptions and waivers, appropriations, private grants and federal funds. Business Support Services staff support borrowers through the loan and loan repayment program life cycle. The Office of General Counsel work closely with all Division staff developing rules. The Agency staff have developed a reputation for providing accurate and timely information to IHEs who need clarification or support complying with rules. The Academic Planning and Policy and Student Financial Aid staff provide regular training and consultation to IHEs on interpretation and implementation of rules. Business Support Services staff are responsible for handling logistics for all posted meetings held at the agency. Office of Internal Audit ensures the agency is in compliance with legal, financial and regulatory matters and conducts internal audit and compliance monitoring in accordance with established risk-based annual plans approved by the Board.

Under the leadership of the Assistant Commissioner/Chief of Staff/Alternative Dispute Coordinator, agency staff across functional areas have been trained in negotiated rulemaking and served as facilitators for negotiated rulemaking sessions on Compliance Monitoring, Texas B-on-Time (private institutions), Texas College Work Study, Tuition Equalization Grants (TEG), Texas Educational Opportunity Grant (TEOG), TEXAS Grant Program, Capital Projects, Primary Care Innovation Grant, Resident Physician Expansion Program, Exemptions to HB 5 College Prep Courses, and Texas Success Initiative Math Pathways. The Information Solution and Services staff manage the Data Center Services contract, develop and maintain in-house and third party software applications, manage technical services for all meetings that are webcast,
serve as liaison with divisions to translate business requirements for software solutions, and provide day-to-day support for over 200 onsite users. The Information Technology Steering Committee provides governance for all current and anticipated IT projects. Per statute, the Coordinating Board is responsible for administering the state of Texas Optional Retirement Program and is managed by Human Resources staff.

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board shall develop policies, practices, and procedures as necessary in accordance with applicable statutes to provide greater uniformity in the administration of the retirement annuity insurance program available to employees of Texas state colleges and universities through the optional retirement program (Texas Government Code, Section 830).

Human Resources staff are responsible for managing the hiring process, coordinating the annual performance appraisal, processing merit increases, overseeing employee relations including new employee orientation and terminations, conducting the annual enrollment process, processing leave and preparing staffing reports.

Over the last five years, the agency has deployed enterprise solutions to streamline contract processing and has demonstrated the ability to get state funds to individuals and entities effectively and efficiently through the loan program, loan repayment programs, and trusteeed funds. In 2012, the Loan Program deployed an enterprise solution that streamlined all phases of loan processing from application to loan repayment and seamless integration with the Office of the Attorney General for the litigation and collection of delinquent loans. In 2013 and 2014, the Loan Program enterprise solution was deployed to the Commissioner's Office to electronically archive agendas and minutes from 1957 to present, and to Human Resources to electronically archive terminated personnel files. From 2013 to 2014, Information Solution and Services staff migrated all existing SharePoint sites, many of which are used by IHEs to transmit required data, to SharePoint 2013. The deployment of managed print services in 2013 and upgrading agency staff to Outlook 365 and Office 2013 required extensive collaboration and training. In each of the deployments, agency staff developed new skills analyzing business processes and re-designing them to gain greater efficiencies as well as learning new software programs.

**Internal Assessment – Challenges**

**Focus: Anticipate retirements and turnover**

**Discussion**

Key economic and environmental factors affecting the agency's workforce over the next five years include: turnover, retention, and an aging workforce. The 2013 turnover rate for the Coordinating Board was 12.7 percent, 4.9 percent less than the statewide average of 17.6 percent.
Effective September 1, 2013, the agency is statutorily authorized 280.4 full-time equivalent (FTE) employees, down from 307.9 authorized FTEs for FY 2010. FTEs are managed carefully to ensure the ability to staff federal- and grant-funded initiatives and other positions that support the performance measures and mission of the THECB. Seventy-seven percent of the THECB workforce is over the age of 40 and 30% of the workforce will be eligible to retire within the next five years; 11.8 percent or 29 employees are eligible to retire today.

Trends and Factors Related to the Aging Workforce. Within the next several years as the economy slowly recovers, the competition to recruit and retain highly skilled employees will likely intensify. However, if the economic recovery involves a significant inflationary impact, many retirement eligible employees may need to postpone retirement. The agency must consider these different possibilities when planning workforce strategies.

Most demographic experts estimate that the number of people over age of 65 will double over the next few decades. Due to the aging workforce there is a need to develop non-traditional workplace and employment relationships, such as short term assignments. The agency's approach is to retain critical knowledge, provide educational opportunities, and use senior employees as mentors for less tenured staff.

Increasing Diversity. THECB continues to emphasize the need for workplace diversity and to strive for a workforce that is reflective of the ethnic and racial composition of the state's population. The recruitment sources for all job posting has recently been expanded to reach as many minority job seekers as possible and will continue to seek opportunities to enhance the sources of employment recruitment.

The agency also has potential issues with already reduced staff levels. Any additional decreases will be a potential threat to the quality of our work.

Focus: Obtain sufficient general revenue funds to sustain and improve information technology

Discussion

The backbone of the Coordinating Board’s daily activities and the ability to meet and exceed stakeholder expectations is predicated on sustaining and improving information technology. In the recent biennium, Exceptional Item requests, which are fundamental to achieving the mission, have been unfunded. The eight technology initiatives in the current strategic plan will be jeopardized without appropriate resources.

This is key to maintaining analytical ability for policy issues, to manage the loan programs and to calculate formula funding, among other tasks. Accuracy has not been effected, but speed has been an issue.
Focus: Align Strategic Planning Processes and LBB Performance Measures

Discussion

One of the recommendations made by Sunset Commission staff is to align the operating budget of the agency with the functions that the agency carries out on a day-to-day basis. THECB staff is committed to working with the Legislative Budget Board (LBB) on this process. This must occur in two phases. Phase 1 began in 2013-2014 when the Coordinating Board engaged in a strategic planning process to develop agency specific goals. The fiscal years 2015-2019 strategic plan and LBB performance measures include the Closing the Gaps by 2015 agency goals and the four agency specific goals: Collaboration, Funding, Policy and Success. Phase 2 of the alignment process requires the Coordinating Board to work with the LBB during 2014-2015 to prepare the fiscal year 2017-2021 strategic plan that will focus on the agency specific goals and include the next statewide higher education plan. The alignment of the agency strategic planning process and the LBB performance measures will provide clarity and transparency, as well as streamline internal operations.

External Assessment – Opportunities

Focus: Outcomes based funding models

Discussion

Now, more than ever, productivity in higher education is front and center on the national stage. Although participation in Texas higher education has improved dramatically since 2000, enrollment fell for the first time in 2013. Texas has exceeded its goal for success despite not yet having met its participation goal. However, the rate at which Texas students are graduating is not commensurate with the increasing need for an educated workforce that will help the state to become globally competitive. The success rates among Hispanics and African-Americans lag significantly behind those of their White peers. State data demonstrate that only 51 percent of Hispanic students and 41 percent of African-American students who initially enrolled full-time at a Texas public university in 2007 earned a baccalaureate degree or higher within six years. In contrast, 67 percent of White students earned a degree within the same timeframe.

Outcomes based funding for community colleges was passed in the 83rd Legislature. The task in the 84th Legislative session is to build consensus and implement outcomes based funding for four-year institutions.

Focus: Outcomes based funding models

Discussion

Four-Year Institutions- Each interim, the General Academic Institution Formula Advisory Committee (GAIFAC), composed of representatives of Texas public universities, examines the formulas that are used to allocate state funding among institutions. In line with the requirements of TEC 61.0593, this interim the committee was charged to, “study and make recommendations for alternative approaches to incorporating undergraduate student success
measures into the funding formulas. . . ” The GAIFAC recommendation is that some state funding for public universities be allocated among institutions on the basis of their relative performance on certain student success measures.

Outcomes funded above the base. The committee recommended creation of a $235 million outcomes-based funding pool to be allocated by the success metrics defined below. This pool should be outside of and in addition to the enrollment-based formula funding, and should only be funded if the base formulas are fully funded.

Phase-in: The model should be phased-in over three biennia, with no institution’s percentage of outcomes funding varying more than 0.5 percent from their percentage of undergraduate formula funding for the first biennium, and no more than 1 percent for the second biennium. Beyond that, the model should function without such restrictions.

Biennial Review: The model should be examined each interim to monitor the equity and effectiveness of the outcomes-based methodology, and to address any unanticipated impacts.

Student Success Metrics- Under the GAIFAC proposal, each institution earns points for their performance on seven student success metrics, with the points being used to determine each institution’s proportional share of outcomes-based funding. The proposed metrics measure actual outcomes (rather than institutional increases in performance), and use a three-year rolling average to determine each institution’s performance on each metric. The points are then scaled and weighted.

Scaling: Because the number of points generated by different metrics is very disproportionate, a multiplier is applied to the points generated by each metric to ensure all metrics are meaningful to the methodology.

Weighting: The proposal requires each institution to assign a percentage weight to each of their metrics, which will allow the institution to prioritize the metrics they consider most advantageous in determining their point total. The weights will sum to 100 percent, and the institution will assign a zero percent weight to one (and only one) metric. These weights would remain in place for three biennia. This incents institutions to identify and focus on those student success metrics most in line with their missions and the needs of their student populations.

Metric Definitions
Total Undergraduate Degrees: The total number of undergraduate degrees awarded by an institution. This directly incents institutions to increase degree completions, a primary goal of Closing the Gaps.

Undergraduate degrees adjusted by graduation rate: The institution’s total undergraduate degrees multiplied by its 6-year graduation rate (3-year graduation rate for upper-level institutions). The adjustment for graduation rate provides an incentive to have students graduate in a timely manner.

Undergraduate degrees per 100 undergraduate FTSE: The institution’s total undergraduate degrees divided by enrolled Full-Time Student Equivalents (FTSE) and multiplied by 100. FTSE represents aggregate enrollment at the institution, and captures both transfer students and
part-time students. This metric measures degree production relative to all undergraduate students, and provides a common basis for comparing and incentivizing degree productivity regardless of institutional size or mission.

**Undergraduate degrees to At-Risk Students:** The institution’s undergraduate degrees to students who meet criteria for being at higher risk for not completing. These include being a Pell grant recipient, having an SAT/ACT score below the national average, being enrolled part-time, having earned a GED, or first enrolling at age 20 or higher. (The Committee recommends continued study of at-risk factors to refine this metric in future biennia.) This measure incents institutions to adopt effective and efficient practices that will aid at-risk students to the completion of a degree.

**Retention (30, 60, and 90 SCH):** The institution’s count of each undergraduate student that completes their 30th, 60th, or 90th college-level semester credit-hour at that institution. The count does not include hours earned prior to the student enrolling at the institution. These measures are designed to incentivize the use of effective persistence policies.

**Focus: Increased Demand for Data-Driven Policy**

A primary function of the agency is to collect and analyze higher education data and to develop policy recommendations based on data. As cited previously, Texas, via the THECB, has been recognized as one of only 10 states receiving an overall "Best Practice" rating for its higher education accountability system.

Since launching the Accountability System in 2004, the agency has refined and expanded the scope of data and information, in addition to the formats in which they are provided. The system itself is deployed online via a fully searchable interface to support research needs. The THECB has also developed online resumes for each institution that synthesize the most relevant data and information for parents and policymakers in a quick and easy-to-use format. The *Closing the Gaps* dashboard provides interactive access to the most recent statewide data relative to the four higher education goals (www.txhighereddata.org/cltqdashboard). In spring 2011 the THECB released its first annual *Texas Public Higher Education Almanac* (www.thecb.state.tx.us/almanac) and has continued this publication. The Almanac represents a very significant step for disseminating higher education accountability data to the broader public, and its publication is unprecedented nationally. The THECB was able to obtain private donations to cover the cost for the development and distribution of the Almanac. In spring 2013 the THECB debuted *Compare College TX*, an interactive, mobile-friendly web tool designed to help users to compare average tuition and fees, acceptance and six-year graduation rates for Texas public universities and community colleges.

As one of the "best practice" states, Texas has the tools, data resources, and experience to be a leader in the national higher education data policy discussion. An example of the THECB’s potential in this area is the national concern with how graduation rates are calculated, a system developed decades ago which tracks first-time full-time students only. A recent Chronicle of Higher Education article notes:
Every year, the method by which the government measures the graduation rate gets further and further from what's actually happening on campuses. For example, about one-third of students now transfer from the college where they started, according to a recent report from the National Student Clearinghouse Research Center.

The THECB follows federal guidelines in reporting graduation rates, but since 1987, has also provided, in the Accountability System, graduation rates that include, for each institution, students who completed a degree elsewhere in the state. In addition, other ways of considering student completion have been developed and posted by the agency and are currently available on the data website, in the Texas Public Higher Education Almanac, and through the Accountability System. For example, students who complete a degree or award in 10 years, by part-time and/or full-time status at enrollment, by college readiness levels, and by number of hours completed prior to transfer are available.

The agency's extensive Accountability System and other data resources provide important context to policymakers, prospective students and parents, and the general public, as well as an assessment of institutional performance on a number of key measures. While this increased demand for data-driven policy is a positive trend, there is a concern that the agency will not have the resources or the capacity to continue supporting this important function in the future.

Focus: Partnership with other agencies to address adult basic education (ABE) to workforce solutions

Discussion

Texas faces serious challenges in developing the human capital of the least educated Texas citizens. First and foremost, Texas providers use a linear education model in adult education which lengthens the amount of time an adult learner must remain in basic skills classes before enrolling in postsecondary education and training programs. The linear education model is time consuming and ineffective in terms of promoting a more educated and better trained workforce. Currently, weak partnerships exist between community-based and faith-based adult education programs and higher education to promote transition to postsecondary education. Many community-based providers hold classes in their communities to mitigate barriers (e.g. transportation) to participation in adult education programs. However, for adult learners, this separation between the ABE programs and the postsecondary education or training programs at a community college is often viewed as a sea too untenable to navigate, if viewed at all.

The result of this leads to the second challenge, which is that adult learners in Texas ABE programs are not well-informed of the career pathways open to them after postsecondary education or training.

Third, with 3.8 million adults eligible for ABE services, adult education transition to, participation in, and success through postsecondary education and/or training is an economic issue for the state of Texas. The earning potential of adults with low literacy skills or with less than a high school diploma or GED is significantly lower than adults with some postsecondary education.
The key to increasing adult education alignment to postsecondary training programs is to ensure that adult education programs with an emphasis on transition services are available at every public community college district and technical institution. Institutions have greater access to students to promote postsecondary training programs and can leverage resources to provide advising, intensive English for academic purposes, intensive bridge programs, dual enrollment programs, and other critical support services to students enrolled in adult education programs.

Funds should also be made available to (1) significantly expand community and college literacy provider partnerships; (2) Integrate adult education delivery into workforce training; (3) Coordinate outreach and marketing campaigns to inform, educate, and encourage adult students to transition into postsecondary education and training programs.

The need for Adult Basic Education in Texas is significant. The solutions described above are not designed to supplant or replace existing services offered via TEA, but rather enhance and extend these services, with an emphasis on postsecondary workforce training and education.

External Assessment – Obstacles

Focus: Local vs. State Perspective on Higher Education

Discussion

As part of long-range state planning efforts for state higher education beyond Closing the Gaps, include a deliberate analysis of how long-term goals might be framed and implemented in ways that diffuse the tensions between state and local stakeholders. The THECB’s enabling statute confers upon the agency the mission of coordinating the effective and efficient utilization of resources in ways that avoid “costly duplication of program offerings, faculties and physical plants.” The agency's work is heavily influenced by this directive. Unfortunately, the challenge facing the state generally, and the agency specifically, is the persistent tension between what local communities want and what the state as a whole needs. For many years, local communities in Texas, represented by strong coalitions of institutional representatives, business leaders, and elected officials, have pressed for greater investment in local higher education infrastructure, to include new institutions, new programs, and new facilities. These investments can expand postsecondary educational opportunities in these communities and are often considered important anchors for local economic development efforts. In most cases, the rationale for such local investment is compelling. However, when measured against statewide needs and the availability of increasingly limited resources, investments of this type may not meet appropriate thresholds of justification. In fact, Gov. John Connally warned the first Board of the THECB of this very challenge in 1965:

The greatest risk you face is an institutionalized system, with each college or university grasping for its own ends without regard to the needs of the people of the whole state, and perhaps without being aware of those needs ... in Texas we have come to regard each college or university as a separate institution, striving independently for success.
In many cases regarded locally as a boon to the economy, it struggles to be all things to all people, willing to do almost anything that will assure its getting larger—larger in enrollment, larger in buildings, larger in number and level of degrees offered, larger in number of graduates, larger in number of alumni.

In executing its responsibility under statute, the THECB offers unbiased, data-driven, research-based analysis for all investment in the state. In some cases, this analysis does not support the goals of a particular local community. Increasingly, local communities turn to the Legislature to circumvent THECB analysis and authority, effectively undermining true statewide coordination of higher education investment. After more than 40 years, the tension described by Gov. Connally continues to exist and complicate the deployment of state resources for higher education.

Focus: Funding for Higher Education

Discussion

Not unlike the rest of state government, higher education generally, and the THECB specifically, experienced significant reductions in state resources for the 2012-2013 biennium. After a biennium marked by steep budget cuts, the 83rd Texas Legislative Session showed promise for reinvesting in higher education across the board, particularly in student financial aid programs that experienced significant reductions in funding last session. Most importantly, as Texas approaches the end of the landmark master plan for higher education, Closing the Gaps by 2015, this session offered an opportunity to create a policy framework for the state to begin planning for higher education beyond 2015.

To this end, the Legislature focused on a number of legislative initiatives during the session, to include:

- Implementing outcomes-based funding models for public community and technical colleges that place emphasis on student outcomes such as credentials awarded, transfers, and wages earned after graduation;
- Improving the efficacy, efficiency and availability of major student financial aid programs such as TEXAS Grants and the B-On-Time Loan Program;
- Directing greater cooperation and collaboration among the Texas Education Agency, the State Board of Education, the Texas Workforce Commission and the Coordinating Board to improve student outcomes throughout the P-16 pipeline and better align education and the workforce;
- Establishing a comprehensive framework for long-range planning for higher education in Texas;
- Expanding graduate medical education opportunities to meet workforce needs in healthcare, including a new medical school in South Texas; and
- Adopting statewide policies aimed at reducing time- and credits-to-degree while improving student outcomes.

This session was also marked by notable increases in funding for institutions of higher education and key programs. The general revenue appropriation to higher education for 2014-2015 was increased by $669 million, or 4.4 percent. Student financial aid, which experienced
significant reductions in the 2012-2013 biennium, benefitted from increased funding. Funding for the TEXAS Grant and Texas Educational Opportunity Grant programs was increased by 25 percent and 20 percent, respectively. Finally, formula funding for institutions of higher education was increased by 14.5 percent for health-related institutions, 2.9 percent for technical and state colleges and 2.1 percent for community colleges.

Texas has made great progress toward the goals outlined in Closing the Gaps by 2015, but momentum must be sustained, and in some critical areas progress must be accelerated. If budget reductions occur in the 2016-2017 biennium, particularly in areas such as student financial aid, it may create significant challenges as Texas works to become competitive nationally and globally by increasing higher education attainment.

While the higher education sector must share the burden of the state's fiscal and financial challenges, Texas must recognize that higher education is one of a very few public investments that can have a direct impact on the long-term fiscal and financial health of the state. In 2007, the Perryman Group conducted an economic impact assessment of what achieving the goals of Closing the Gaps would mean for Texas. The findings were unmistakably positive:

- Total economic activity (spending) would increase by $489B;
- Texas' gross state product would increase by $194B;
- Aggregate personal income would increase by $122B; and
- Total jobs created would increase by 1M

Overall, the study found that for every $1 the state invested in higher education in support of Closing the Gaps, the long term benefit was $8. So, even at a time when resources are increasingly limited, the state must find ways to continue investing in the one area that is an economic engine for Texas. The future of Texas, in terms of economic development and quality of life, is dependent on increasing higher education attainment, particularly as the state's demographics continue to change. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the 2009 unemployment rate among Texans with a Bachelor's degree was 4.0 percent. Among those with just a high school diploma, the rate was 8.7 percent. Increasing access to higher education and improving student outcomes will pay generational dividends. It is the THECB's role to chart a cost-effective path to the future prosperity of Texas.

Most of the threats to improving higher education participation and success are economic. This is somewhat ironic because not achieving higher education participation rates has equally threatening economic consequences. The state's total annual household income could drop by an estimated $60 billion annually by 2040 if the education level by underrepresented ethnic groups remains unchanged.
Agency Goals

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board has established the following goals for fiscal years 2015-2019.

Goal A: Coordinate Higher Education
Description: Close the gaps in participation, success, excellence, and research by coordinating higher education in Texas and promoting quality and access in all aspects of higher education.

Goal B: Close the Gaps by Improving Affordability
Description: Close the gaps in participation and success by providing trusteed funds to institutions and students through special programs designed to improve the affordability of higher education.

Goal C: Close the Gaps by Providing Trusteed Funds for Research
Description: Close the gaps in research by providing trusteed funds to institutions and students through special programs designed to enhance and facilitate research at Texas institutions.

Goal D: Close the Gaps by Providing Trusteed Funds for Health Care Education
Description: Close the gaps in Texas by providing trusteed funds to institutions and students through special programs designed to improve health care related to education.

Goal E: Baylor College of Medicine
Description: Baylor College of Medicine

Goal F: Close the Gaps by Providing Trusteed Funds to Improve Quality/Delivery
Description: Close the gaps in Texas higher education by providing trusteed funds to institutions through special programs designed to improve the quality and delivery of instruction and also increase the participation and success of Texans.

Goal G: Close the Gaps by Providing Federal Funding to Institutions and Students
Description: Close the gaps in participation and success by providing federal funds to institutions and students to improve higher education in Texas.

Goal H: Close the Gaps by Providing Tobacco Settlement Funds to Institutions
Description: Close the gaps in Texas higher education by providing tobacco settlement receipts to institutions through special programs.

Goal I: Indirect Administration
Description: Indirect Administration.

Goal J: Collaboration
Description: Develop collaborative partnerships with stakeholders designed to increase access, success, and quality in higher education
**Goal K. Funding**  
Description: Define and obtain funding by communicating the need and establishing relationships with key stakeholders.

**Goal L: Policy**  
Description: Serve as the primary resource for data and policy analysis.

**Goal M: Success**  
Description: Support and empower students to succeed.
Objectives and Outcome Measures, Strategies and Output, Efficiency, and Explanatory Measures

THECB Performance Measures

These revised measures represent the agency’s budget structure as approved by the Legislative Budget Board (LBB). Goals J through M were developed during the agency’s strategic planning process but will not be incorporated into the budget structure until the 2018-2019 biennium.

Goal A: Coordinate Higher Education
Description: Close the gaps in participation, success, excellence, and research by coordinating higher education in Texas and promoting quality and access in all aspects of higher education.

Objective 1: College Readiness and Success
Outcome Measures:
1. Percent Increase in Fall Student Headcount Enrollment
2. Percent Increase in Bachelor/Associates Degrees and Certificates
3. Percentage of Underprepared Public 2-year Students Graduating in 6 Years
4. Percentage of Underprepared University Students Graduating in 6 Years
5. College-level Course Success Rate of Underprepared University Students
6. Percentage of Underprepared Math Students Completing College-level Course
7. Percentage of Underprepared Reading Students Completing College-level Course
8. Percentage of Underprepared Writing Students Completing College-level Course
9. Percentage of University Students Graduating in 4 Years
10. Percentage of Public 2-Year Institution Students Graduating in 3 Years
11. Percentage of University Students Graduating within Six Years
12. Percentage of African-Amer. Univ. Students Graduating within 6 Years
13. Percentage of Hispanic University Students Graduating within Six Years
14. Train Institutions on State Financial Aid (NEW MEASURE)

Strategy 1: College Readiness and Success
Output Measures:
1. Increase in Fall Student Headcount Enrollment
2. Increase in the Number of Degrees and Certificates Awarded
3. Number of Non-Loan Financial Aid Awards
4. Amount of Non-Loan Financial Aid Distributed (in Millions)

Explanatory Measures:
1. Dollars Appropriated for Developmental Education
2. Percent for Developmental Education as a Percentage of Lower-division Instruction
3. Percentage of Faculty Who Are African-American
4. Percentage of Faculty Who Are Hispanic
5. Percentage of Anglo High School Grads Enrolled in Texas Public College or University
6. Percentage of African-American HS Grads Enrolled in Texas Public College or University
7. Percentage of Hispanic High School Grads Enrolled in Texas Public College or University
8. Percentage of Native American HS Grads Enrolled in Texas Pub College or University
9. Percentage of Asian-American HS Grads Enrolled in Texas Public College or University

**Strategy 2: State Loan Programs**

Efficiency Measures:
1. Default Rate on Hinson-Hazlewood Loans
2. Current Default Rate for the Hinson-Hazlewood State Loan Programs

Output Measures:
1. Number of Students Receiving Loans
2. Dollar Amount of Loans Made
3. Operating Expenses for the Hinson-Hazlewood Loan Program

**Strategy 3: Student Grants and Special Programs**

**Objective 2: Workforce, Academic Affairs, and Research**

Outcome Measures:
1. Texas' Share of Total Fed Funding to High Ed Inst. for R&D in Science/Engineering
2. Percentage Increase in Research Expenditures at Texas Public Institutions
3. Number of Commercialization Efforts Resulting from NHARP
4. Educational Achievement
5. Entered Employment Rate
6. Employment Retention Rate

**Strategy 1: Workforce, Academic Affairs, and Research**

Output Measures:
1. Number of Public University Programs, Health-Related Programs and Administrative Changes Reviewed
2. Number of Career School and College and Public 2-Year College Programs Reviewed
3. Dollars of Fed Obligations - R&D In Science and Engineering (in Millions)
4. Additional Dollars Resulting from NHARP Funding (in Millions)
5. Dollar Amount of Research Expenditures at Texas Public Institutions (in Millions)

**Objective 3: Planning, Information, & Evaluation**

Outcome Measures:
1. E&G Deferred Maintenance as Percent of E&G Building Replacement Value
2. Ninety Percent of All Information Requests will be Acted Upon within 10 Work Days.

**Strategy 1: Planning, Information, & Evaluation**

Efficiency Measures:
1. Percent of Requests for Computerized Information Responded To Within Three Days

**Strategy 2: Higher Education Policy Institute**

**Goal B: Close the Gaps by Improving Affordability**

Description: Close the gaps in participation and success by providing trusteed funds to institutions and students through special programs designed to improve the affordability of higher education.

**Objective 1: Financial Assistance**

Outcome Measures:
1. Percentage of Independent College Students Receiving Tuition Equalization Grants
2. Number of Students at Independent Colleges & Universities as % of Total Enroll
3. Percentage of Students Receiving Financial Aid Employed through Texas College Work Study Program
4. Percentage of Teach for Texas Loan Repay Program Recipients who Teach 3 Years

**Strategy 1: Towards EXcellence, Access and Success Grant Program**

Output Measures:
1. Number of Students Receiving TEXAS Grants
2. Percentage of TEXAS Grant Recipients with BA within Four Academic Years
3. Percentage of TEXAS Grant Recipients with BA within Six Academic Years
4. Persistence Rate TEXAS Grant Recipients After 1 Yr - Public University
5. Persistence Rate TEXAS Grant Recipients After 1 Yr - Public Community College
6. Persistence Rate TEXAS Grant Recipients After 1 Yr - Public Technical College

**Strategy 2: TEXAS B-On-Time Program**

Output Measures:
1. Percentage of Texas B-on-Time Loans Forgiven

**Strategy 3: Tuition Equalization Grants**

Output Measures:
1. Number of Students Receiving TEG Awards
2. Persistence Rate of TEG Recipients after One Academic Year
3. Percentage of TEG Recipients with Baccalaureate within Six Academic Years
4. Percentage of TEG Recipients Who Are Minority Students
5. Percentage of TEG Recipients Who Earn BA within Four Academic Years

**Strategy 4: Texas Educational Opportunity Grant Program**
**Strategy 5: College Work Study Program**
**Strategy 6: License Plate Scholarships Program**
**Strategy 7: Fifth-year Accounting Students Program**
**Strategy 8: Early High School Graduation Scholarship Program**
**Strategy 9: Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Scholarship Program**
**Strategy 10: Educational Aide Program**
**Strategy 11: Teach for Texas Loan Repayment Assistance**
**Strategy 12: Border Faculty Loan Repayment Program**
**Strategy 13: OAG Lawyers Loan Repayment Program**
**Strategy 14: Doctoral Incentive Program**
**Strategy 15: Engineering Recruitment Program**
**Strategy 16: Top 10 Percent Scholarships**
**Strategy 17: Texas Armed Services Scholarship Program**
**Strategy 18: Tuition Reimbursement for Children of Military Deployed to Combat**
**Strategy 19: Texas Career Opportunity Grants Program**
**Strategy 20: T-STEM Challenge Program**

---

**Goal C: Close the Gaps by Providing Trusteed Funds for Research**
Description: Close the gaps in research by providing trusteed funds to institutions and students through special programs designed to enhance and facilitate research at Texas institutions.

**Objective 1: Research Program**
**Strategy 1: Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program**
Output Measures:
1. Number of Students Receiving Ed and Exp through NHARP Projects
2. Number of NHARP Research Projects Funded

**Strategy 2: Texas Research Incentive Program**

---

**Goal D: Close the Gaps by Providing Trusteed Funds for Health Care Education**

**Objective 1: Provide Programs to Improve Health Care in Texas**
Description: Close the gaps in Texas by providing trusteed funds to institutions and students through special programs designed to improve health care related to education.
Outcome Measures:
1. Percentage of Family Practice Residency Program Completers in Medically Underserved Areas
2. Percentage of Family Practice Residency Program Completers Practicing in Texas

**Strategy 1: Family Practice Residency Program**
Output Measures:
1. Number of FPRP Residents Supported
2. Average Funding Per FPRP Resident

**Strategy 2: Preceptorship Program**

**Strategy 3: Primary Care Residency Program**

**Strategy 4: Graduate Medical Education Program**

**Strategy 5: Joint Admission Medical Program**

**Strategy 6: Physician Education Loan Repayment Program**
Output Measures:
1. Number of Physicians Receiving PELRP Payment (Including Federal Match)

**Strategy 7: Financial Aid for Professional Nursing Students**

**Strategy 8: Financial Aid for Licensed Vocational Nursing Students**

**Strategy 9: Dental Education Loan Repayment Program**

**Strategy 10: Professional Nursing Shortage Reduction Program**

**Strategy 11: Consortium of Alzheimer’s Disease Centers**

**Strategy 12: Texas Hospital-Based Nursing Education Partnership Grant Program**

**Strategy 13: Children’s Medicaid Loan Repayment Program**

**Strategy 14: Physician and Nurse Trauma Care**

---

**Goal E: Baylor College of Medicine**
Description: Baylor College of Medicine

Outcome Measures:
1. Percentage of Baylor College of Medicine Grads Entering TX Residency Programs
2. Percentage of Baylor College of Medicine Grads Entering Primary Care Residencies
3. Percentage of Students Passing Part 1 or Part 2 of the National Licensure Exam

**Strategy 1: Baylor College of Medicine - Undergraduate Medical Education (UGME)**
Output Measures:
1. Number of Texas Resident BCM Medical Students Funded
2. Average Amount Per BCM Student

**Strategy 2: Baylor College of Medicine Graduate Medical Education (GME)**

**Strategy 3: Baylor College of Medicine Tobacco Earnings from Perm Endowment Fund**

**Strategy 4: Tobacco Earnings from Perm. Health Fund for Baylor College of Medicine**

---

**Goal F: Close the Gaps by Providing Trusteed Funds to Improve Quality/Delivery**

**Objective 1: Provide Programs to Improve Delivery, Quality, and Access to Higher Ed**

Description: Close the gaps in Texas higher education by providing trusteed funds to institutions through special programs designed to improve the quality and delivery of instruction and also increase the participation and success of Texans.

Outcome Measures:
1. Pass Rate on State Cert Exams at Centers for Teacher Education at TADC Institutions

**Strategy 1: Developmental Education Program**

**Strategy 2: Centers for Teacher Education**

Output Measures:
1. Number of Candidates Admitted to Educator Prep Programs at TADC Institutions
2. Number of Candidates Recommended for Certification by TADC Educator Prep Programs.

**Strategy 3: Two-year Institution Enrollment Growth**

**Strategy 4: New Community College Campuses**

**Strategy 5: General Academic Institution Enrollment Growth**

**Strategy 6: African American Museum Internship**

**Strategy 7: Adult Basic Education Community College Grants**

**Strategy 8: Alternative Teaching Certificate Programs at Community Colleges**

**Strategy 9: College Readiness and Success Grants**

Output Measures:
1. Number of Students in CRI-Funded Programs
2. Number of Teachers/Faculty in CRI Funded Professional Development Programs

**Strategy 10: Higher Education Performance Incentive Initiative**
Goal G: Close the Gaps by Providing Federal Funding to Institutions and Students
Description: Close the gaps in participation and success by providing federal funds to institutions and students to improve higher education in Texas.

Objective 1: Administer Statewide Federal Grants Programs
- Strategy 1: Student Financial Assistance Programs
- Strategy 2: Career and Technical Education Programs
- Strategy 3: Teacher Quality Grants Programs
- Strategy 4: College Access Challenge Grants
- Strategy 5: Other Federal Grants Programs

Goal H: Close the Gaps by Providing Tobacco Settlement Funds to Institutions
Description: Close the gaps in Texas higher education by providing tobacco settlement receipts to institutions through special programs.

Objective 1: Permanent Funds
- Strategy 1: Tobacco Earnings - Minority Health Res and Ed to THECB
- Strategy 2: Tobacco Earnings - Nursing, Allied Health, Other to THECB

Objective 2: Endowment Funds
- Strategy 1: Baylor College of Medicine Tobacco Earnings from Perm Endowment Fund
- Strategy 2: Tobacco Earnings from Perm. Health Fund for Baylor College of Medicine

Goal I: Indirect Administration
Description: Indirect Administration.

Objective 1: Indirect Administration
Outcome Measures:
1. Time to Respond to Requests for Information from Legislators, Media, IHEs, Students & Public

Strategy 1: Central Administration
Strategy 2: Information Resources
Output Measures:
1. Time to Respond to Requests for Information from Legislators, Media, IHEs, Students & Public

Strategy 3: Other Support Services
Goal J: Collaboration
Description: Develop collaborative partnerships with stakeholders designed to increase access, success, and quality in higher education

Objective 1: Develop legislative recommendations and policies through shared interests and consensus
Outcome Measure:
1. Adoption of recommendations, introduction of joint legislative initiatives, and stakeholder involvement.

Strategy 1: Train staff in consensus building processes and practices appropriate to their duties.
Output Measure:
1. Number of staff trained on consensus building processes

Strategy 2: Develop internal and external processes for identifying legislative priorities and recommendations.
Output Measure:
1. Documented internal and external processes

Strategy 3: Conduct negotiated rulemaking as statutorily required and on other higher education issues.
Output Measure:
1. Number of negotiated rule making sessions

Strategy 4: Present at system governing boards meetings.
Output Measure:
1. Number of presentations to system governing boards

Objective 2: Message shared interests, policies, and legislative recommendations
Outcome Measures:
1. Media analytics
2. Number and variety of messengers
3. Number of joint statements with stakeholders as signatories.

Strategy 1: Have regular staff face-to-face and virtual interaction with stakeholders.
Output Measure:
1. Number of face-to-face interactions with stakeholders
2. Number of virtual interactions (webinars) with stakeholders

Strategy 2: Develop and allocate staff and resources to define and disseminate messaging.
Output Measure:
1. Number of staff to define and disseminate messaging

**Strategy 3: Collect institutional input and feedback for the purpose of issuing white papers.**
Output Measure:
1. Quantitative and qualitative institutional feedback on needed white papers

---

**Goal K. Funding**
Description: Define and obtain funding by communicating the need and establishing relationships with key stakeholders

**Objective 1: Increase state financial aid funding**
Outcome Measure:
1. Percent of state financial aid funds appropriated

**Strategy 1: Communicate need and establish relationships with key stakeholders.**
Outcome Measure:
1. Number of meetings with key stakeholders on higher education funding needs

**Objective 2: Communicate resource needs for joint legislative priorities and maintain status as the state’s primary data and policy resource.**
Outcome Measure:
1. Number of meetings with key stakeholders on joint legislative priorities on THECB primary data and policy resource

**Strategy 1: Improve technology tools to keep stakeholders’ and funders informed and maximize input.**
Outcome Measure
1. Number of technology tools that support stakeholder communication improved

**Strategy 2: Engage stakeholders in formula funding needs**

**Strategy 3: Engage stakeholders in alternative funding models.**
Outcome Measure
1. Alternative funding model introduced during 84th legislative session

**Objective 3: Obtain funding to market and support access and success programs for students and to support necessary infrastructure**
Outcome Measure:
1. State appropriation for state financial aid programs
2. State appropriation for THECB information technology
Strategy 1: Conduct a landscape analysis of potential funding opportunities both locally and nationally.
Output Measure:
1. Funding Opportunity Landscape analysis report

Strategy 2: Increase development opportunities to improve access and success to scale current projects.
Output Measure:
1. Number of training sessions on Advise Texas to IHEs

Goal L: Policy
Description: Serve as the primary resource for data and policy analysis

Objective 1: Develop focused reports that impact critical topics

Strategy 1: Develop a process to identify and prioritize relevant reports and eliminate redundant and unneeded reports.
Outcome Measure:
1. Number of focused reports published.

Objective 2: Assure data quality and effective processes

Strategy 1: Form an internal task force to develop and implement data governance.
Strategy 2: Provide cross training for compliance monitors and staff with overlapping responsibility to ensure consistency and accuracy.
Strategy 3: Document processes and regularly update and disseminate written policies.
Outcome Measure:
1. Documentation of processes and data quality review activities

Objective 3: Use data for analysis targeted to mission and goals

Strategy 1: Develop internal fellows program that allows policy makers in agency to better understand data collection and analysis.
Outcome Measure:
1. Data produced and used for the development and support of agency goals.

Objective 4: Improve communication, data accessibility, and ease of use and understanding of data.

Strategy 1: Hold regular data use sessions for internal and external groups.
Strategy 2: Improve the design of web-based applications which provide end-user a better experience.

Strategy 3: Develop a systematic way to obtain customer feedback about data products and services.

Strategy 4: Make formal presentations to stakeholders and at national conferences

Outcome Measures:
1. Number of participants in training on accessing and using data
2. Number of data requests
3. Quantitative and qualitative feedback from data users

Goal M: Success
Description: Support and empower students to succeed

Objective 1: Analyze and publicize promising practices regarding tools, resources, and services that can be used to improve student access and success

Strategy 1: Provide tools, resources and services to students to better access and complete higher education.

Strategy 2: Improve communication with institutional administrators through meetings on promising practices.

Strategy 3: Obtain K-12 input on student needs.

Strategy 4: Collect institutional input and feedback for the purpose of issuing focused reports.
Outcome Measure: Number of institutions that have adopted promising practices.

Objective 2: Provide tools, resources and services to institutions of higher education and K-12 to achieve students’ postsecondary and workforce success

Strategy 1: Increase development opportunities to improve access and success to scale current projects.

Strategy 2: Re-engage P-16 Councils, local chambers, and other local service organizations to improve access, success, and quality policies
Outcome Measure:
1. College going rates for high school graduates
2. Number of college and university graduates
### Technology Resource Planning

#### Part 1: Technology Assessment Summary

The following table provides a description of the planned technology solutions that respond to the key factors that will affect the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (Coordinating Board, the agency).

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Continue enhancement of Financial Aid applications</td>
<td>Evaluate and select a product to replace current student loan system that is more cost efficient, more secure, and more easily supportable. A final recommendation will be provided to the Commissioner and the Board in July 2014. Create an online system for loan repayment applicants to significantly improve teachers, physicians and other borrowers to apply for loan repayment assistance in the future. College for All Texans site was launched in 2013 with a plethora of financial aid information now more easily discoverable due to a reorganization of content and a focus on audience based navigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expand and enhance data available for reporting and research</td>
<td>Pursue a complete re-architecture and rewrite of the system that gathers and disburses education data from all Texas education institutions to increase efficiency and be more user friendly and data format more conducive to increased reporting demands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enhance Electronic Communication and Collaboration Tools</td>
<td>The agency currently provides electronic desktop and communication tools, network facilities, and a secure environment for the Coordinating Board staff to work collaboratively internally and with external stakeholders. There is a need for increased bandwidth to accommodate the agency's move to a “cloud”-based email platform, increased use of web and cloud based technologies, and video-conferencing. More focused IT support and governance will be needed to support collaboration work sites such as SharePoint, access for mobile workers and telecommuters, electronic meetings, video-conferencing enhancements (required by SB 984 and HB 2414), and social networking tools. An effective means of addressing the requirement for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3. Number of college and university graduates who enter Texas workforce
greater stakeholder input and improving the quality of outreach efforts, without incurring significant travel expenses, is through the use of technology. The agency conducts a significant number of meetings annually involving board members, administrators and faculty from public and private institutions of higher education, and other stakeholders. The agency also makes extensive use of webcasting. Not all meetings require remote video participation, but the desire to utilize this type of technology has been clearly demonstrated by various segments of the organization. On several occasions, meetings have involved remote video participation by education experts from across the country and across the world. In its FY14-15 LAR submission, the agency submitted an exception item request to fund enhancements to its video-conferencing facilities, but the item was not approved.

4. Improved Governance and stakeholder engagement

As the volume of data collected by THECB increases, intuitive access to those data becomes as important as the availability of the data. Increasing use of content management systems for more timely and accurate management of content highlights the need for more standardization in the use of these tools and a more external focus for site design, including greater attention to the issue of EIR Accessibility compliance. Efforts are ongoing to evaluate the agency’s strategic plan for web presence including an increased use of social media to reach a larger audience, possible rebranding and restructuring of a majority of external websites, and integration of the various communication channels to increase citizen engagement. Collaborative website projects with other agencies, such as the Texas Education Agency (TEA), the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC) and external stakeholders offer the potential to create a more unified presence for constituents.

5. Expand the use of Business Intelligence (BI) reporting tools to leverage existing data repositories for internal and external use.

Agency staff have embraced ISS-provided business intelligence tools to such an extent that they are now generating and sharing reusable reports and dashboards with both internal staff and external stakeholders. A recent upgrade to Webfocus environment will place even more powerful tools in the hands of users, not only expanding the regularity with which these reporting capabilities are utilized, but also the manner in which data is clearly and quickly shared on multiple platforms.
| 6. Agency Information Security Initiatives | This technology initiative implements information security enhancements to the Agency IT infrastructure both at the Agency location and with services provided through the Data Center Services contract. The agency participated in a DIR sponsored Gartner security assessment that identified enhancements required to achieve the recommended due diligence level of IT security maturity. This initiative includes procedural and process enhancements along with information technology initiatives all focused on multiple disciplines within the Information Security domain. |
| 7. Agency Business Continuity Planning | Requirements for state agency continuity planning are established in the Texas Labor Code (Section 412.054), with additional information on information security rules related to information security standards in Rule §202.24 of the Texas Administrative Code. State agencies are required to maintain continuity plans and ensure that they are regularly updated and validated. As a member of the State Data Center Program, THECB is required to meet the minimum standards established by SORM on continuity planning. Elements of a continuity plan include identification of essential functions, delegating of authority, orders of succession, communications, vital records and data, and alternate operating locations; continuity planning ensures those resources will be available when needed through coordination with partners and stakeholders. |
| 8. Agency Involvement in State Data Center Services Contract | THECB is one of the state agencies required by HB1516 to use the state Data Center Services (DCS) contract. The first contract with Team for Texas required significant oversight and effort by THECB staff to ensure that even basic data center operations were maintained. The current vendors (Capgemini and Xerox) began operations on May 1, 2012 with full scale transition on July 1, 2012. We will continue to commit the necessary resources to monitor and manage as much as we are allowed. Where possible, we will take efforts to optimize our systems and environment within the DCS contract to minimize costs and maximize services to the IT applications/users. THECB will also utilize new technologies being developed for agencies in the DCS environment where they add value to IT needs. |
Part 2: Technology Initiative Alignment

1. **Initiative Name:** Name of the current or planned technology initiative

   Continue enhancement of Financial Aid applications

2. **Initiative Description:** Brief description of the technology initiative.

   This past year a committee was formed to evaluate and select a product to replace current student loan system with a more modern, more secure, more cost efficient, and more easily supportable system. A consensus was reached and communicated to management and a final recommendation will be provided to the Commissioner and the Board in July 2014.

   In addition, a current initiative is under way to create an online system for loan repayment applicants. This will make it significantly quicker and easier for teachers, physicians and other borrowers to apply for loan repayment assistance in the future.

   The redesigned College for All Texans site also was launched in 2013 with a plethora of financial aid information now more easily discoverable due to a reorganization of content and a focus on audience based navigation.

3. **Associated Project(s):** Name and status of current or planned project(s), if any, that support the technology initiative and that will be included in agency’s Information Technology Detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Loan System replacement project</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Loan Repayment system</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Agency Objective(s):** Identify the agency objective(s) that the technology initiative supports.

   A.1.2 State Loan Programs
   B.1.5-9 Financial Assistance
   I.1.2 Strategy: Indirect Administration- Information Resources
   K.3 Obtain funding to market and support access and success programs for students and to support necessary infrastructure

5. **Statewide Technology Priority(ies):** Identify the statewide technology priority or priorities the technology initiative aligns with, if any.

   - Security and Privacy
   - Cloud Services
   - Legacy Applications
   - IT Workforce
   - Virtualization
   - Data Management
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>• Business Continuity</th>
<th>• Mobility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Enterprise Planning and Collaboration</td>
<td>• Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Security and Privacy</td>
<td>• Legacy Applications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Anticipated Benefit(s):** Identify the benefits that are expected to be gained through the technology initiative. Types of benefits include:
- Operational efficiencies (time, cost, productivity)
- Citizen/customer satisfaction (service delivery quality, cycle time)
- Security improvements
- Foundation for future operational improvements
- Compliance (required by State/Federal laws or regulations)

- Operational efficiencies (time, cost, productivity) – more efficient loan application.
- Citizen/customer satisfaction (service delivery quality, cycle time) – increased service to loan applicants and other interested parties.
- Security improvements – secure and protect FERPA data.
- Compliance (required by State/Federal laws or regulations) – management of state loan system.

7. **Capabilities or Barriers:** Describe current agency capabilities or barriers that may advance or impede the agency’s ability to successfully implement the technology initiative.

The lack of viable Loan System alternatives in the marketplace may be a barrier.

1. **Initiative Name:** Name of the current or planned technology initiative.

Expand and enhance data available for reporting and research.

2. **Initiative Description:** Brief description of the technology initiative.

The agency is currently pursuing a complete re-architecture and rewrite of the system that gathers and disburse education data from all Texas education institutions. Planned improvements will make the system significantly more efficient and user friendly with a data format that will be more conducive to increased reporting demands.

3. **Associated Project(s):** Name and status of current or planned project(s), if any, that support the technology initiative and that will be included in agency’s Information Technology Detail.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name</strong></th>
<th><strong>Status</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redesign of Education Data Center online system</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Agency Objective(s):** Identify the agency objective(s) that the technology initiative supports.

I.1.2 Information Resources
L.2 Assure data quality and effective processes

5. **Statewide Technology Priority(ies):** Identify the statewide technology priority or priorities the technology initiative aligns with, if any.

- Security and Privacy
- Cloud Services
- Legacy Applications
- Business Continuity
- Enterprise Planning and Collaboration
- IT Workforce
- Virtualization
- Data Management
- Mobility
- Network
- Enterprise Planning and Collaboration
- Data Management

6. **Anticipated Benefit(s):** Identify the benefits that are expected to be gained through the technology initiative. Types of benefits include:

- Operational efficiencies (time, cost, productivity)
- Citizen/customer satisfaction (service delivery quality, cycle time)
- Security improvements
- Foundation for future operational improvements
- Compliance (required by State/Federal laws or regulations)

- Foundation for future operational improvements – by providing expanded and enhanced access to extensive educational data for research and reporting purposes, thus furthering the cause of education across the state.

7. **Capabilities or Barriers:** Describe current agency capabilities or barriers that may advance or impede the agency’s ability to successfully implement the technology initiative.

The amount of time and effort required to develop an entirely new EDC system is extensive and current ISS resources are limited.

1. **Initiative Name:** Name of the current or planned technology initiative.

Enhance Electronic Communication and Collaboration Tools

2. **Initiative Description:** Brief description of the technology initiative.
The agency currently provides electronic desktop and communication tools, network facilities, and a secure environment for the Coordinating Board staff to work collaboratively internally and with external stakeholders. There is a need for increased bandwidth to accommodate the agency’s move to a “cloud”-based email platform, increased use of web and cloud based technologies, and video-conferencing. More focused IT support and governance will be needed to support collaboration work sites such as SharePoint, access for mobile workers and telecommuters, electronic meetings, video-conferencing enhancements (required by SB 984 and HB 2414), and social networking tools. An effective means of addressing the requirement for greater stakeholder input and improving the quality of outreach efforts, without incurring significant travel expenses, is through the use of technology. The agency conducts a significant number of meetings annually involving board members, administrators and faculty from public and private institutions of higher education, and other stakeholders. The agency also makes extensive use of webcasting. Not all meetings require remote video participation, but the desire to utilize this type of technology has been clearly demonstrated by various segments of the organization. On several occasions, meetings have involved remote video participation by education experts from across the country and across the world. In its FY14-15 LAR submission, the agency submitted an exception item request to fund enhancements to its video-conferencing facilities, but the item was not approved.

3. Associated Project(s): Name and status of current or planned project(s), if any, that support the technology initiative and that will be included in agency’s Information Technology Detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automating the Agency Board Meeting Agenda Preparation/Review/Approval Process by using Laserfiche Version 9 Workflow Video conferencing infrastructure enhancements.</td>
<td>Waiting for Laserfiche upgrade project Pending funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Agency Objective(s): Identify the agency objective(s) that the technology initiative supports.

I.1.2 Information Resources

J.2.1 Message shared interests, policies, and legislative recommendations

L.4 Improve communication, data accessibility, and ease of use and understanding of data.

5. Statewide Technology Priority(ies): Identify the statewide technology priority or priorities the technology initiative aligns with, if any.

- Security and Privacy
- Cloud Services
- Legacy Applications
- Business Continuity
- Enterprise Planning and Collaboration
- IT Workforce
- Virtualization
- Data Management
- Mobility
- Network
1. **Initiative Name:** Name of the current or planned technology initiative.

   Improved Governance and stakeholder engagement.

2. **Initiative Description:** Brief description of the technology initiative.

   As the volume of data collected by THECB increases, intuitive access to those data becomes as important as the availability of the data. Increasing use of content management systems for more timely and accurate management of content highlights the need for more standardization in the use of these tools and a more external focus for site design, including greater attention to the issue of EIR Accessibility compliance. Efforts are ongoing to evaluate the agency's strategic plan for web presence including an increased use of social media to reach a larger audience, possible rebranding and restructuring of a majority of external
websites, and integration of the various communication channels to increase citizen engagement. Collaborative website projects with other agencies, such as the Texas Education Agency (TEA), the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC) and external stakeholders offer the potential to create a more unified presence for constituents.

3. Associated Project(s): Name and status of current or planned project(s), if any, that support the technology initiative and that will be included in agency's Information Technology Detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main agency site assessment and redesign</td>
<td>Planned - Sunset Review recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GovDelivery Implementation</td>
<td>Purchase is pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Agency Objective(s): Identify the agency objective(s) that the technology initiative supports.

I.1.2 Information Resources
J.2.1 Message shared interests, policies, and legislative recommendations

5. Statewide Technology Priority(ies): Identify the statewide technology priority or priorities the technology initiative aligns with, if any.

- Security and Privacy
- Cloud Services
- Legacy Applications
- Business Continuity
- Enterprise Planning and Collaboration
- IT Workforce
- Virtualization
- Data Management
- Mobility
- Network
- Data Management
- Mobility

6. Anticipated Benefit(s): Identify the benefits that are expected to be gained through the technology initiative. Types of benefits include:

- Operational efficiencies (time, cost, productivity)
- Citizen/customer satisfaction (service delivery quality, cycle time)
- Security improvements
- Foundation for future operational improvements
- Compliance (required by State/Federal laws or regulations)

- Operational efficiencies (time, cost, productivity) – will potentially reduce staff time required to respond to public inquiries and requests for information and data.
- Citizen/customer satisfaction (service delivery quality, cycle time) – reduce time required to respond to citizen inquiries by ensuring direct web access to agency information and data.
- Compliance (required by State/Federal laws or regulations) – ensure EIR accessibility compliance with state and federal requirements.

7. **Capabilities or Barriers:** Describe current agency capabilities or barriers that may advance or impede the agency’s ability to successfully implement the technology initiative.

Development and maintenance of some agency websites is external to agency. Decentralized site content management and control allows other agency departments to operate with relative independence with regard to content. This may present some challenges to IT department assurance of governance and accessible web presence. Agency IT staff need EIR accessibility tools and training. Efforts to undertake necessary enhancements to agency websites and to achieve accessibility compliance will require additional funding not currently allocated in agency’s IT budget.

| 1. **Initiative Name:** Name of the current or planned technology initiative. |
| Expand the use of Business Intelligence (BI) reporting tools to leverage existing data repositories for internal and external use. |

| 2. **Initiative Description:** Brief description of the technology initiative. |
| Agency staff have embraced ISS-provided business intelligence tools to such an extent that they are now generating and sharing reusable reports and dashboards with both internal staff and external stakeholders. A recent upgrade to Webfocus environment will place even more powerful tools in the hands of users, not only expanding the regularity with which these reporting capabilities are utilized, but also the manner in which data is clearly and quickly shared on multiple platforms. |

| 3. **Associated Project(s):** Name and status of current or planned project(s), if any, that support the technology initiative and that will be included in agency’s Information Technology Detail. |
| **Name** | **Status** |
| Webfocus 8 upgrade | complete |

| 4. **Agency Objective(s):** Identify the agency objective(s) that the technology initiative supports. |
| I.1.2 Strategy: Indirect Administration- Information Resources  
K.2.1 Strategy: Improve technology tools to keep stakeholders’ and funders informed and maximize input. |
### 5. Statewide Technology Priority(ies):
Identify the statewide technology priority or priorities the technology initiative aligns with, if any.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security and Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Continuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Planning and Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtualization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Planning and Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Anticipated Benefit(s):
Identify the benefits that are expected to be gained through the technology initiative. Types of benefits include:

- Operational efficiencies (time, cost, productivity)
- Citizen/customer satisfaction (service delivery quality, cycle time)
- Security improvements
- Foundation for future operational improvements
- Compliance (required by State/Federal laws or regulations)

- Operational efficiencies (time, cost, productivity) through improved capability to access, aggregate, and analyze data by staff and the public.
- Citizen/customer satisfaction (service delivery quality, cycle time)
- Foundation for future operational improvements by maintaining and expanding agency BI platform.

### 7. Capabilities or Barriers:
Describe current agency capabilities or barriers that may advance or impede the agency’s ability to successfully implement the technology initiative.

The agency has recently upgraded both the hardware and software components of the Business Intelligence tool which will lead to improved efficiency and productivity going forward.

### 1. Initiative Name:
Name of the current or planned technology initiative.

Agency Information Security Initiatives

### 2. Initiative Description:
Brief description of the technology initiative.

This technology initiative implements information security enhancements to the Agency IT infrastructure, both at the Agency location and with services provided through the Data Center Services contract. The agency participated in a DIR-sponsored Gartner security
assessment that identified enhancements required to achieve the recommended due diligence level of IT security maturity. This initiative includes procedural and process enhancements along with information technology initiatives all focused on multiple disciplines within the Information Security domain.

3. Associated Project(s): Name and status of current or planned project(s), if any, that support the technology initiative and that will be included in agency’s Information Technology Detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBID system redesign</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gartner initiatives</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Agency Objective(s): Identify the agency objective(s) that the technology initiative supports.

I.1.2 Information Resources
L.4 Improve communication, data accessibility, and ease of use and understanding of data.

5. Statewide Technology Priority(ies): Identify the statewide technology priority or priorities the technology initiative aligns with, if any.

- Security and Privacy
- Cloud Services
- Legacy Applications
- Business Continuity
- Enterprise Planning and Collaboration
- IT Workforce
- Virtualization
- Data Management
- Mobility
- Network

- Security and Privacy
- Cloud Services
- Data Management
- Network

6. Anticipated Benefit(s): Identify the benefits that are expected to be gained through the technology initiative. Types of benefits include:

- Operational efficiencies (time, cost, productivity)
- Citizen/customer satisfaction (service delivery quality, cycle time)
- Security improvements
- Foundation for future operational improvements
- Compliance (required by State/Federal laws or regulations)
The anticipated benefits include: security improvements, compliance, and foundation for future operational improvements. Specific initiatives within this project will improve the agency security posture with additional technical controls as well as process improvements in the System Development Life Cycle. The initiative provides compliance benefits with additional assurance that the agency is acting aggressively to protect privacy and confidentiality of personally identifiable information. Operational improvements are anticipated as enterprise grade tools are leveraged to improve vulnerability management and application assurance levels.

7. **Capabilities or Barriers:** Describe current agency capabilities or barriers that may advance or impede the agency’s ability to successfully implement the technology initiative.

The agency is implementing security enhancement initiatives with existing resources where feasible. Estimated costs provided by the Gartner assessment have been evaluated and strategies have been developed to implement solutions at reduced cost where possible. Additional funding is needed to achieve the scope prescribed by the 2013 Gartner Security Assessment. The agency will request funding in its LAR request for FY16/FY17.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. <strong>Initiative Name:</strong></th>
<th>Name of the current or planned technology initiative.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency Business Continuity Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. <strong>Initiative Description:</strong></th>
<th>Brief description of the technology initiative.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements for state agency continuity planning are established in the Texas Labor Code (Section 412.054), with additional information on information security rules related to information security standards in Rule §202.24 of the Texas Administrative Code. State agencies are required to maintain continuity plans and ensure that they are regularly updated and validated. As a member of the State Data Center Program, THECB is required to meet the minimum standards established by SORM on continuity planning. Elements of a continuity plan include identification of essential functions, delegating of authority, orders of succession, communications, vital records and data, and alternate operating locations; continuity planning ensures those resources will be available when needed through coordination with partners and stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Important Deadlines**

- **By October 31, 2014,** review current continuity plans and develop or revise them as needed to achieve the minimum standards defined by the State Office of Risk Management (SORM)
- **By October 31, 2014,** provide electronic copies of continuity plans, along with a completed Continuity Planning Crosswalk, to SORM. In addition, provide an electronic copy of any Memorandum of Agreement relating to the planned use of state facilities as alternate sites to the Texas Facilities Commission (TFC)
- **Beginning as soon as practicable,** but, no later than Fiscal Year 2015, conduct an annual exercise of agency continuity plans and report completion to SORM. Schedule and post exercise information on preparingtexas.org. Exercises should be compliant with the
Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) and should be sequential and progressive in terms of participants and objectives.

- By **October 31, 2014**, develop an agency-level continuity training program to ensure mission critical personnel are prepared to perform required continuity functions during an emergency.

3. **Associated Project(s):** Name and status of current or planned project(s), if any, that support the technology initiative and that will be included in agency’s Information Technology Detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency Business Continuity Planning Project</td>
<td>Research/Gap Analysis Phase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Agency Objective(s):** Identify the agency objective(s) that the technology initiative supports.

I.1.2 Information Resources

5. **Statewide Technology Priority(ies):** Identify the statewide technology priority or priorities the technology initiative aligns with, if any.

- Security and Privacy
- Cloud Services
- Legacy Applications
- Business Continuity
- Enterprise Planning and Collaboration
- IT Workforce
- Virtualization
- Data Management
- Mobility
- Network

- Business Continuity

6. **Anticipated Benefit(s):** Identify the benefits that are expected to be gained through the technology initiative. Types of benefits include:

- Operational efficiencies (time, cost, productivity)
- Citizen/customer satisfaction (service delivery quality, cycle time)
- Security improvements
- Foundation for future operational improvements
- Compliance (required by State/Federal laws or regulations)

- Compliance – state/federal laws and regulations; as a member of the State Data Center Program, THECB is required to meet the minimum standards established by SORM on continuity planning.
7. **Capabilities or Barriers:** Describe current agency capabilities or barriers that may advance or impede the agency’s ability to successfully implement the technology initiative.

The BCP coordination responsibility recently changed from HR to ISS. A full time resource is not available for this position. The person assuming this responsibility will require extensive training to meet state requirements.

1. **Initiative Name:** Name of the current or planned technology initiative.

Agency Involvement in State Data Center Services Contract

2. **Initiative Description:** Brief description of the technology initiative.

THECB is one of the state agencies required by HB1516 to use the state Data Center Services (DCS) contract. The first contract with Team for Texas required significant oversight and effort by THECB staff to ensure that even basic data center operations were maintained. The current vendors (Capgemini and Xerox) began operations on May 1, 2012 with full scale transition on July 1, 2012. We will continue to commit the necessary resources to monitor and manage as much as we are allowed. Where possible, we will take efforts to optimize our systems and environment within the DCS contract to minimize costs and maximize services to the IT applications/users. THECB will also utilize new technologies being developed for agencies in the DCS environment where they add value to IT needs.

3. **Associated Project(s):** Name and status of current or planned project(s), if any, that support the technology initiative and that will be included in agency's Information Technology Detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Data Center Services Contract</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Agency Objective(s):** Identify the agency objective(s) that the technology initiative supports.

I.1.2 Strategy: Indirect Administration- Information Resources

5. **Statewide Technology Priority(ies):** Identify the statewide technology priority or priorities the technology initiative aligns with, if any.

- Security and Privacy
- Cloud Services
- Legacy Applications
- Business Continuity
- IT Workforce
- Virtualization
- Data Management
- Mobility
- Network
With the exception of the IT Workforce priority, the DCS contract supports all of the above Statewide Technology Priorities either directly or indirectly as the vendor-maintained data centers houses production, test/development, and utility servers.

**6. Anticipated Benefit(s):** Identify the benefits that are expected to be gained through the technology initiative. Types of benefits include:
- Operational efficiencies (time, cost, productivity)
- Citizen/customer satisfaction (service delivery quality, cycle time)
- Security improvements
- Foundation for future operational improvements
- Compliance (required by State/Federal laws or regulations)

*Operational Efficiencies* (time, cost, productivity). One of the goals of DCS is to provide a long term efficient IT Operations infrastructure for statewide IT operations. The initial contract was not cost effective, did not improved productivity, and required addition THECB IT staffing. *Citizen/customer satisfaction* (service delivery quality, cycle time) - The current contract promises improved delivery of services with more granular service level agreements to ensure customer satisfaction. Security Improvements can be implemented within the DCS contract that would have been beyond what individual agencies, including THECB, could have afforded. The DCS contract also provides a broader foundation for future operational improvements by moving towards standardized process that support the ability to expanding services delivered. Compliance with State and Federal laws or regulations has been continued in the DCS environment.

**7. Capabilities or Barriers:** Describe current agency capabilities or barriers that may advance or impede the agency’s ability to successfully implement the technology initiative.

N/A
Appendix A – Agency Planning Process

The foundation of the Agency Planning process is the establishment of the Core and Expanded Strategic Planning Teams. The Core Strategic Planning Team is comprised of the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioners, Associate Commissioner, Assistant Commissioners, Director of Internal Audit, and Director of Human Resources. The Expanded Strategic Planning Team is comprised of General Counsel, Deputy Assistant Commissioners, Director of Loan Program Operations, Director of Loan Repayment Programs, Financial Analyst III, Senior Directors - P-16, Associate Director – Workforce, Academic Affairs and Research, Director – Information Solutions and Services, and Senior Director - External Relations. The Commissioner, Deputy Commissioners and Associate Commissioner are the Agency Leadership Team and involve a broad-based group to ensure that all facets of agency operations are considered and addressed in the fiscal years 2015-2019 strategic plan.

The strategic planning process takes place over several months and provides opportunity for the Coordinating Board members to review, evaluate and revise the strategic plan as it is developed. The following timeline outlines key planning actions and when they occur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>PLANNING ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| November 2013     | Core Strategic Planning Team prioritizes SWOT in preparation for planning session  
THECB Board reviews, evaluates, and revises mission, vision, values, goals, objectives and strategies at annual retreat |
| December 2013     | Expanded Strategic Planning Team develops objectives and strategies for agency goals  
THECB Board provides additional strategic plan input at quarterly Board meeting |
<p>| January 2014      | THECB Board provides additional strategic plan input at quarterly Board meeting |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 2014</td>
<td>Agency staff participate in Strategic Plan Town Hall meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>LBB releases Fiscal Years 2015-2019 Strategic Plan instructions. At April 2014 quarterly meeting, THECB Board authorizes board chair, vice chair and chair of Agency Operations Committee to approve Strategic Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Prepare Fiscal Years 2015-2019 Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Agency submits Fiscal Years 2015-2019 Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C – Five-year Projections for Outcomes

**Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board**

**Projected Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective A.1.: Close the gaps in participation and success by adding 630,000 more students by 2015; and by awarding 210,000 undergraduate degrees, certificates, and other identifiable student successes from high quality programs.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage increase in fall student headcount enrollment since fall 2000</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage increase in bachelor's degrees, associates degrees, and certificates awarded since those awarded fall 1999 through summer 2000</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of underprepared public two-year college students graduating in six years</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of underprepared university students graduating in six years</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-level course success rate of underprepared university students</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of underprepared math students who successfully complete the related college-level course</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of underprepared reading students who successfully complete the related college-level course</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of underprepared writing students who successfully complete the related college-level course</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of university students graduating within four years</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of public two-year college students graduating within three years</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of university students graduating within six years</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of African American university students graduating within six years</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Hispanic university students graduating within six years</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train institutions on state financial aid</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective A.2.: Coordinate and evaluate university programs, community and technical college programs, and health programs; promote quality in all aspects of public higher education, including teaching, research, and public service.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas' share of total U.S. federal obligations to higher education institutions for research and development in science and engineering</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage increase in research expenditures at Texas public institutions of higher education</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of patents, licenses, copyrights, and other commercialization efforts resulting from Advanced Research Program funding</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Achievement Rate: Percent of workforce program participants receiving a degree or credential through completion of an instructional program</td>
<td>25.30%</td>
<td>25.44%</td>
<td>25.58%</td>
<td>25.72%</td>
<td>25.86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Entered Employment Rate:
Percent of workforce program participants entering employment after exiting the program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>86.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>86.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>86.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>86.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>87.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment Retention Rate:
Percent of workforce program participants retaining employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>92.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>93.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>94.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>94.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>95.59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcomes

<p>| Objective A.3.: Close the higher education gaps by providing planning, including developing and maintaining a plan for higher education, information services, and a performance and accountability system; providing capable and creative leadership in higher education; and promoting the creative, efficient, and effective management of the state's higher education resources. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Critical deferred maintenance in Educational and General space as a percentage of the total Educational and General building replacement value |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>.05%</td>
<td>.05%</td>
<td>.05%</td>
<td>.05%</td>
<td>.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Planning and Accountability division receives many requests for information and data. The performance that will be measured is that of these requests are acted upon within 10 work days. The actions that the division staff is required to perform vary depending on the request. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objective B.1.: Provide programs which make financial assistance available to Texas students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of independent college students receiving Tuition Equalization Grant (TEG) awards</td>
<td>21.91%</td>
<td>21.80%</td>
<td>21.69%</td>
<td>21.59%</td>
<td>21.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students attending independent colleges and universities as a percentage of total enrollment</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students receiving financial aid who are employed through Texas College Work-Study Program</td>
<td>55.79%</td>
<td>54.69%</td>
<td>53.62%</td>
<td>52.62%</td>
<td>51.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Teach for Texas Loan Repayment Program recipients serving in underserved areas for three years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective D.1.: Provide programs to improve health care in Texas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Baylor College of Medicine graduates entering Texas residency programs.</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Baylor College of Medicine graduates entering primary care residency programs</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Baylor College of Medicine students passing part 1 or part 2 of the National Licensing Exam on the first attempt</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Family Practice Residency Program completers practicing in medically underserved areas or health professional shortage areas</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Family Practice Residency Program completers practicing in Texas</td>
<td>70.60</td>
<td>70.50</td>
<td>70.50</td>
<td>70.50</td>
<td>70.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective E.1.: Provide programs to improve the quality and delivery of higher education and increase the participation and success of Texans.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass rate on State Certification Exams at Centers for Teacher Education at Texas Association of Developing Colleges Institutions</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective H.1.: Indirect Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days it takes to respond to requests for data and information from legislators, the media, institutions, students, and the general public.</td>
<td>3-7 days</td>
<td>7-10 days</td>
<td>3-7 days</td>
<td>7-10 days</td>
<td>3-7 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

Strategy-Related Measures Definitions
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dollars Appropriated for Developmental Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculation Method: **N**  Target Attainment: **L**  Priority: **M**

Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01-01 EX 01

**Key Measure:** **Y**  **New Measure:** **N**  **Percentage Measure:** **N**

**BL 2016 Definition**
Total dollars appropriated to institutions for course-based developmental education during the fiscal year. Beginning in FY04, no money was appropriated to institutions based on students who demonstrated college readiness after having failed one or more parts of TSI assessment.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**
Contact hours are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions, and the State Auditor’s Office performs enrollment audits on a sample of that data.

**BL 2016 Data Source**
CBM002--TSI Report; CBM004--Class Report (Contact Hours for Public Two-Year Colleges and SCH for Universities); CBM00C Class Report (Contact Hours for Public Two-Year Colleges, Continuing Education).

**BL 2016 Methodology**
Contact hours at public two-year colleges are multiplied by the applicable formula funding rate. Semester credit hours at universities are multiplied by the weight for developmental education and the funding rate. Trusteed funds are allocated on a headcount basis for students that demonstrate college readiness.

**BL 2016 Purpose**
This measure provides feedback regarding state funding to address deficiencies in students’ academic preparation for college. Colleges with open door admissions policies enroll students from a wide array of backgrounds and levels of preparation and with differing goals.
### Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

#### Strategy-Related Measures Definitions
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>$ for Developmental Ed. as % of Lower-division Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** C  
**Target Attainment:** L  
**Priority:** M  
Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01-01 EX 02

**Key Measure:** Y  
**New Measure:** N  
**Percentage Measure:** Y

**BL 2016 Definition**
Total dollars appropriated to institutions for course-based developmental education during the biennium, divided by the total dollars appropriated to institutions for lower-division instruction. Beginning in FY04, no money was appropriated to institutions based on students who demonstrated college readiness after having failed one or more parts of a TSI assessment.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**
Contact hours are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions, and the State Auditor’s Office performs enrollment audits on a sample of that data. Calculation is biennial rather than annual.

**BL 2016 Data Source**
CBM002--TSI Report; CBM004--Class Report (Contact Hours for Public Two-Year Colleges and SCH for Universities); CBM00C Class Report (Contact Hours for Public Two-Year Colleges, Continuing Education).

**BL 2016 Methodology**
Appropriations for developmental education divided by appropriations for lower-division instruction. Contact hours at public two-year colleges are multiplied by the applicable formula funding rate. Semester credit hours at universities are multiplied by the applicable weight and the funding rate. Trusteed funds (if appropriated) are allocated on a headcount basis for students that demonstrate college readiness.

**BL 2016 Purpose**
This measure provides feedback regarding the relationship between state funding to: (1) address deficiencies in students’ academic preparation for college; and (2) provide lower-division instruction. Colleges with open door admissions policies enroll students from a wide array of backgrounds and levels of preparation and with differing goals.
## Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

### Strategy-Related Measures Definitions

84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code: 781</th>
<th>Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>1 Coordinate Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1 College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1 College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>EX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>3 Percentage of Faculty Who Are African-American</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** C  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** M  
Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01-01 EX 03

**Key Measure:** N  
**New Measure:** N  
**Percentage Measure:** Y

**BL 2016 Definition**
Number of African-American faculty members teaching in Texas public colleges and universities in the fall semester of the fiscal year divided by the total number of faculty members during the same period.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**
Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions.

**BL 2016 Data Source**
Information provided by the Faculty Report (CBM008) prepared by Educational Data Center using data reported by the institutions.

**BL 2016 Methodology**
Take the number of African-American faculty members teaching in Texas public colleges and universities in the fall semester of the fiscal year and divide that number by the total number of faculty members during the same period.

**BL 2016 Purpose**
Provides information on how the state is doing at supplying a diverse group of role models for students.
### Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

**Strategy-Related Measures Definitions**
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No. 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No. 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No. 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type: EX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No. 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Percentage of Faculty Who Are Hispanic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** C  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** M

**Cross Reference:** Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01-01 EX 04

**BL 2016 Definition**

Number of Hispanic faculty members teaching in Texas public colleges and universities in the fall semester of the fiscal year divided by the total number of faculty members during the same period.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions.

**BL 2016 Data Source**

Information provided by the Faculty Report (CBM008) prepared by Educational Data Center using data reported by the institutions.

**BL 2016 Methodology**

Take the number of Hispanic faculty members teaching in Texas public colleges and universities in the fall semester of the fiscal year and divide that number by the total number of faculty members during the same period.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

Provides information on how the state is doing at supplying a diverse group of role models for students.
## Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

### Strategy-Related Measures Definitions

84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>% Anglo High School Grads Enrolled in Tex Public College or University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** N  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** M

Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01-01 EX 05

**Key Measure:** N  
**New Measure:** N  
**Percentage Measure:** Y

### BL 2016 Definition

Percentage of Anglo Texas public high school students who graduated in the previous fiscal year and who enrolled in Texas public or independent colleges and universities in the following fall.

### BL 2016 Data Limitations

Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions and by the Texas Education Agency. Students with invalid SSNs are not included.

### BL 2016 Data Source

Enrollment data are reported by public institutions of higher education and compiled by the Educational Data Center (Student Report CBM001). Data on public high school graduates are reported by the Texas Education Agency.

### BL 2016 Methodology

Take the number of Anglo Texas public high school students who graduated in the previous fiscal year and who enrolled in Texas public or independent colleges and universities in the following fall and divide that number by the total number of Anglo Texas public high school students who graduated in the previous fiscal year. Students with invalid SSNs are not included.

### BL 2016 Purpose

It is important to have a student body that is representative of the Texas population. This measure provides an indication of how well public institutions of higher education are doing in these efforts.
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Strategy-Related Measures Definitions
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code</th>
<th>Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>781</td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>1  Coordinate Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1  College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1  College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>EX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>6  % African-Amer. HS Grads Enrolled in Tex Public College or University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BL 2016 Definition
Percentage of African-American Texas public high school students who graduated in the previous fiscal year and who enrolled in Texas public or independent colleges and universities in the following fall.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions and by the Texas Education Agency. Students with invalid SSNs are not included.

BL 2016 Data Source
Enrollment data are reported by public institutions of higher education and compiled by the Educational Data Center (Student Report CBM001). Data on public high school graduates are reported by the Texas Education Agency.

BL 2016 Methodology
Take the number of African-American Texas public high school students who graduated in the previous fiscal year and who enrolled in Texas public or independent colleges and universities in the following fall and divide that number by the total number of African-American Texas public high school students who graduated in the previous fiscal year. Students with invalid SSNs are not included.

BL 2016 Purpose
It is important to have a student body that is representative of the Texas population. This measure provides an indication of how well public institutions of higher education are doing in these efforts.
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Strategy-Related Measures Definitions
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>% Hispanic High School Grads Enrolled in Tex Public College or Univ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculation Method: N
Target Attainment: H
Priority: M
Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01-01 EX 07

Key Measure: N
New Measure: N
Percentage Measure: Y

BL 2016 Definition
Percentage of Hispanic Texas public high school students who graduated in the previous fiscal year and who enrolled in Texas public or independent colleges and universities in the following fall.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions and by the Texas Education Agency. Students with invalid SSNs are not included.

BL 2016 Data Source
Enrollment data are reported by public institutions of higher education and compiled by the Educational Data Center (Student Report CBM001). Data on public high school graduates are reported by the Texas Education Agency.

BL 2016 Methodology
Take the number of Hispanic Texas public high school students who graduated in the previous fiscal year and who enrolled in Texas public or independent colleges and universities in the following fall and divide that number by the total number of Hispanic Texas public high school students who graduated in the previous fiscal year. Students with invalid SSNs are not included.

BL 2016 Purpose
It is important to have a student body that is representative of the Texas population. This measure provides an indication of how well public institutions of higher education are doing in these efforts.
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Strategy-Related Measures Definitions
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>781</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>% Native American HS Grads Enrolled in Tex Pub College or University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** N  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** M  
**Cross Reference:** Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01-01 EX 08

**BL 2016 Definition**
Percentage of Native American Texas public high school students who graduated in the previous fiscal year and who enrolled in Texas public or independent colleges and universities in the following fall.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**
Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions and by the Texas Education Agency. Students with invalid SSNs are not included.

**BL 2016 Data Source**
Enrollment data are reported by public institutions of higher education and compiled by the Educational Data Center (Student Report CBM001). Data on public high school graduates are reported by the Texas Education Agency.

**BL 2016 Methodology**
Take the number of Native American Texas public high school students who graduated in the previous fiscal year and who enrolled in Texas public or independent colleges and universities in the following fall and divide that number by the total number of Native American Texas public high school students who graduated in the previous fiscal year. Students with invalid SSNs are not included.

**BL 2016 Purpose**
It is important to have a student body that is representative of the Texas population. This measure provides an indication of how well public institutions of higher education are doing in these efforts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>% Asian-Amer. HS Grads Enrolled in Tex Public College or University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** N  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** M  
**Cross Reference:** Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01-01 EX 09  
**Key Measure:** N  
**New Measure:** N  
**Percentage Measure:** Y

**BL 2016 Definition**  
Percentage of Asian-American Texas public high school students who graduated in the previous fiscal year and who enrolled in Texas public or independent colleges and universities in the following fall.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**  
Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions and by the Texas Education Agency. Students with invalid SSNs are not included.

**BL 2016 Data Source**  
Enrollment data are reported by public institutions of higher education and compiled by the Educational Data Center (Student Report CBM001). Data on public high school graduates are reported by the Texas Education Agency.

**BL 2016 Methodology**  
Take the number of Asian-American Texas public high school students who graduated in the previous fiscal year and who enrolled in Texas public or independent colleges and universities in the following fall and divide that number by the total number of Asian-American Texas public high school students who graduated in the previous fiscal year. Students with invalid SSNs are not included.

**BL 2016 Purpose**  
It is important to have a student body that is representative of the Texas population. This measure provides an indication of how well public institutions of higher education are doing in these efforts.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increase in Fall Student Headcount Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** N  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** H  

- **Key Measure:** Y  
- **New Measure:** N  
- **Percentage Measure:** N  

**Cross Reference:** Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01-01 OP 01

**BL 2016 Definition**

Increase in fall student headcount enrollment since Fall 2000.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

Data are not available until February of the following year.

**BL 2016 Data Source**

Data on public institutions will come from the Coordinating Board CBM001 student reports and data on independent institutions will come from the Independent Colleges and Universities of Texas (ICUT).

**BL 2016 Methodology**

Data reported for Texas higher education institutions for the current fall minus the enrollment in Fall 2000.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

This measure provides an indication of the state’s progress towards the first goal, Closing the Gaps in Participation: By 2015, close the gaps in participation rates across Texas to add 630,000 more students.
### Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

**Strategy-Related Measures Definitions**
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in the Number of Degrees and Certificates Awarded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** N  **Target Attainment:** H  **Priority:** H  
Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01-01 OP 02

**Key Measure:** Y  **New Measure:** N  **Percentage Measure:** N

**BL 2016 Definition**
Increase in the number of bachelor's degrees, associate's degrees, and certificates reported since those awarded Fall 1999 through Summer 2000 (reported Fall 2000).

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**
Data are not available until February of the following year.

**BL 2016 Data Source**
Data on public institutions will come from the Coordinating Board CBM009 degrees reported each fall for the preceding academic year. Data on independent institutions will come from the Independent Colleges and Universities of Texas (ICUT).

**BL 2016 Methodology**
Data reported for Texas higher education institutions minus those reported Fall 2000 for bachelor's degrees, associate's degrees, and certificates awarded.

**BL 2016 Purpose**
This measure provides an indication of the state’s progress towards the second goal, Closing the Gaps in Success: By 2015, award 210,000 undergraduate degrees, certificates, and other identifiable student successes from high quality programs.
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Strategy-Related Measures Definitions
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code: 781</th>
<th>Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>3   Number of Non-Loan Financial Aid Awards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** C  **Target Attainment:** H  **Priority:** M

Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01-01 OP 03

**Key Measure:** N  **New Measure:** N  **Percentage Measure:** N

---

**BL 2016 Definition**

Number of awards made during the fiscal year through non-loan financial aid programs administered by or funded through the Coordinating Board.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

For campus-based programs, we are relying on unaudited institutional reports. However, we have no reason to question the accuracy of these reports.

(Note on Desired Performance: The target is based on historic funding and award patterns. Annual fluctuations can be caused by changes in funding from the state and changes in the awarding philosophy of the institutions which make awards. Colleges may choose to give (1) larger awards to fewer students, or (2) smaller awards to more students. If they choose to exercise the first option, performance will be below the target; if they exercise the second option, performance will be above the target.)

**BL 2016 Data Source**

Data are obtained from reports submitted by institutions and from Coordinating Board-generated reports.

**BL 2016 Methodology**

Sum the year-end number of awards made in the various programs.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

This measure provides feedback on the grant, scholarship, work-study, loan repayment, and exemption programs administered by or funded through the Coordinating Board. It is an aggregate of all such programs.
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**Strategy-Related Measures Definitions**

84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Goal No.</th>
<th>Objective No.</th>
<th>Strategy No.</th>
<th>Measure Type</th>
<th>Measure No.</th>
<th>Calculation Method</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cross Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>781</td>
<td>Higher Education Coordinating Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01-01 OP 04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BL 2016 Definition**

Dollar amount of funds distributed through the programs other than loans that were administered by or funded through the Coordinating Board during the fiscal year.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

Institution-reported data are not audited, but we have no reason to question their accuracy.

**BL 2016 Data Source**

Data are obtained from reports submitted by institutions and from Coordinating Board-generated reports.

**BL 2016 Methodology**

Calculate the year-end award totals.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

This measure provides feedback on the grant, scholarship, work-study, loan repayment and exemption programs administered by or funded through the Coordinating Board. It is an aggregate of all such programs.
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#### Strategy-Related Measures Definitions
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th><strong>Higher Education Coordinating Board</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Close Gaps in Participation and Success by Administering Loan Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>EF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Default Rate on Hinson-Hazlewood Loans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation Method:</th>
<th>Target Attainment:</th>
<th>Priority:</th>
<th>Cross Reference:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01-02 EF 01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Measure:** Y  
**New Measure:** N  
**Percentage Measure:** Y

**BL 2016 Definition**

Percentage of all Hinson-Hazlewood loans that borrowers fail to repay (including those that are paid by the guarantor).

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

All information is maintained in-house on Coordinating Board computers, so the data are highly reliable.

**BL 2016 Data Source**

Data are obtained from the Analysis of Loans Report generated by the Coordinating Board's Student Loan Information System.

**BL 2016 Methodology**

Determine the sum of all loans in the following statuses: uncollectible, judgment, claims and default, and historical claims paid. This sum is divided by the total life of program value (principle, interest, and fees paid and due) to determine the default rate.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

This measure provides an indication of the Coordinating Board’s collection standards and ability to work closely with Hinson-Hazlewood borrowers to help prevent them from defaulting on their loans. When defaults occur, the Coordinating Board provides substantial assistance to the Attorney General’s Office in filing suit and securing judgments.
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Strategy-Related Measures Definitions
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Close Gaps in Participation and Success by Administering Loan Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>EF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Current Default Rate for the Hinson-Hazlewood State Loan Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculation Method: N  Target Attainment: L  Priority: M  Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01-02 EF 02
Key Measure: N  New Measure: N  Percentage Measure: Y

BL 2016 Definition
Default Rate for the Hinson-Hazlewood State Loan Programs

BL 2016 Data Limitations
All information is maintained in-house on Coordinating Board computers, minimal data limitations.

BL 2016 Data Source
Data are obtained from the Coordinating Board’s Student Loan Information System.

BL 2016 Methodology
Use the most recent May 1 to May 1 time period and evaluate defaults of loans that have been in repayment in the prior 24 months. Example: For the 2012 default calculation, include all State Loans that entered into repayment between 05/01/2009 (05/1/20xx-3 years) and 05/01/2010 (05/01/20xx-2 years) and are currently in repayment, delinquent or deferment. The default percentage is calculated by taking the amount of disbursed loans of those in default (greater than 180 days past due) and dividing it by the total disbursed amount.

BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides current performance of the Hinson-Hazlewood College Student Loan Portfolio.
### Higher Education Coordinating Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Close Gaps in Participation and Success by Administering Loan Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of Students Receiving Loans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** C  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** M  
**Cross Reference:** Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01-02 OP 01

**BL 2016 Definition**
Number of student loans originated through the Hinson-Hazlewood College Student Loan Program during the fiscal year.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**
All information is from in-house programs through which loans are processed, so data are highly accurate.

**BL 2016 Data Source**
Information is from the Analysis of Loans Report generated by the Coordinating Board's Student Loan Information System.

**BL 2016 Methodology**
Data are pulled directly from the Analysis of Loans Report generated by the Coordinating Board's Student Loan Information System.

**BL 2016 Purpose**
This measure provides feedback on the Hinson-Hazlewood College Student Loan Program.
## Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

### Strategy-Related Measures Definitions

84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Close Gaps in Participation and Success by Administering Loan Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Dollar Amount of Loans Made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** C  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** M  
**Cross Reference:** Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01-02 OP 02

**Key Measure:** N  
**New Measure:** N  
**Percentage Measure:** N

**BL 2016 Definition**
Dollar amount of Hinson-Hazlewood College Student Loan Program loans disbursed during the fiscal year.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**
All information is from in-house programs through which loans are processed, so data are highly accurate.

**BL 2016 Data Source**
Information is from the Analysis of Loans Report generated by the Coordinating Board's Student Loan Information System.

**BL 2016 Methodology**
Data are pulled directly from the Analysis of Loans Report generated by the Coordinating Board's Student Loan Information System.

**BL 2016 Purpose**
This measure provides feedback on the Hinson-Hazlewood College Student Loan Program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code: 781</th>
<th>Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>1  Coordinate Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1  College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>2  Close Gaps in Participation and Success by Administering Loan Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>3  Operating Expense for Hinson-Hazlewood Loan Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** N  
**Target Attainment:** L  
**Priority:** M  
**Cross Reference:** Agy 781  083-R-S70-1  01-01-02  OP 03

**Key Measure:** N  
**New Measure:** N  
**Percentage Measure:** Y

**BL 2016 Definition**
Operating Expenses for the Hinson-Hazlewood Loan Program

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**
All information is maintained in-house on Coordinating Board computers, minimal data limitations.

**BL 2016 Data Source**
Data are obtained from the Coordinating Board’s Student Loan Information System and the Coordinating Board’s Business office.

**BL 2016 Methodology**
Total all operating expenses & other fees (admin, liquidity, rating, etc.) divided by the aggregate student loan principal & interest receivable balance.

**BL 2016 Purpose**
This measure provides the most recent performance on the Hinson-Hazlewood College Student Loan Program.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Workforce Academic Affairs and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Workforce, Academic Affairs, and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td># of Public Univ Pgms, Health-Related Pgms and Admin. Changes Reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** C  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** M  
**Cross Reference:** Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-02-01 OP 01  
**Key Measure:** N  
**New Measure:** N  
**Percentage Measure:** N

**BL 2016 Definition**  
The number of reviews conducted during the fiscal year of existing and proposed academic programs, health-related degree programs, and proposed administrative changes at public universities and health-related institutions, including regular performance reviews, reviews of proposed new programs and administrative changes, and reviews of programs slated to be phased out.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**  
Although the Coordinating Board reviews all programs within a four-year cycle (review of mission statements and Table of Programs), the number reviewed per year will fluctuate based on the number of requests from institutions for administrative changes and new programs during the fiscal year, yearly review of low-producing programs that do not meet minimum graduate requirements, and review of all new doctoral programs for the first five years following the implementation of the new degree program. The Coordinating Board also periodically conducts large-scale reviews of certain categories of degree programs (e.g., doctoral programs), which will abnormally raise the reported figure for the reporting period in which the large-scale review is completed.

**BL 2016 Data Source**  
The data for existing programs are derived from the program inventory database and data reported by institutions on their CBM-009 graduate reports. Data on proposed programs and administrative changes come from a database that tracks proposal receipts, details, and completions.

**BL 2016 Methodology**  
“Academic degree programs” includes all programs identified in the Coordinating Board university program inventory as “majors.” BA/BS, MA/MS, and PhD/EdD degree program groups in the same discipline are considered to be a single “degree program” at the respective level. Degree programs identified as “being phased out” are not included. “Joint” or “federated” programs are included for each institution granting the degrees. Only proposal reviews which are completed during the reporting period are reported for that period.

**BL 2016 Purpose**  
The Coordinating Board is required by statute to review all programs every four years. Reviews of existing programs consist of quantitative and qualitative analyses based on degree productivity and other factors. The reviews cause institutions to focus on student demand for programs and on the efficiency and effectiveness of programs. Reviews may result in the phase-out, consolidation, or improvement of existing degree programs.
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**Strategy-Related Measures Definitions**  
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1  
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Workforce Academic Affairs and Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Workforce, Academic Affairs, and Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td># of Career School and College and Public 2-Year College Pgm's Reviewed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Calculation Method: C  
#### Target Attainment: L  
#### Priority: M  
#### Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-02-01 OP 02  
#### Key Measure: N  
#### New Measure: N  
#### Percentage Measure: N

**BL 2016 Definition**

Number of reviews of proposed programs and revisions to existing programs at institutions granting associate degrees and certificates, including community, technical, and state colleges; career colleges/schools; and universities during the fiscal year.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

The number of reviews conducted during any particular reporting period will vary depending on the number of requests received from institutions for new programs or revisions to existing programs.

(Note on Desired Performance: The number reviewed per year fluctuates based on the number of requests from institutions for new programs and/or revisions to existing programs during the fiscal year. With streamlining of new program approval and revisions of existing programs, the number of requests should decrease over time. The desired performance is the actual number of requests received.)

**BL 2016 Data Source**

The Coordinating Board compiles and maintains a database containing the number of reviews conducted.

**BL 2016 Methodology**

This measure is calculated by summing the number of requests for program approval and revision during a reporting period. “Technical programs” includes all technical programs identified in the Coordinating Board’s current workforce/education/technical program inventory. Only the reviews that are completed during the reporting period are reported for that period.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

Reviews for approval of new programs and for revisions to existing programs consist of evaluating quantitative and qualitative measures of program quality based on productivity, need (including statewide distribution), adequacy, and cost effectiveness. Revisions to existing programs may be required due to labor market changes or technological advances. New programs are developed by the institutions in response to the labor market and needs of business and industry.
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**Strategy-Related Measures Definitions**
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Workforce Academic Affairs and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Workforce, Academic Affairs, and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dollars of Fed Obligations - R&amp;D In Sci and Engineering (in Millions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** C  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** M  
**Cross Reference:** Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-02-01 OP 03

**BL 2016 Definition**
Dollar value of federal obligations for research and development in science and engineering to Texas universities and health-related institutions (in millions).

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**
Data are reported by 21 federal agencies. Not all federal agencies report their obligations to the National Science Foundation. The data reflect federal support given to the institutions and not expenditures. The data are reported according to the federal fiscal year: October 1-September 30. Support to private institutions is included. The data are generally available by July of the second year following the fiscal year being reported.

**BL 2016 Data Source**
Federal agencies report their obligations for science and engineering support at higher education institutions to the National Science Foundation. The data are available from the National Science Foundation's web site (WebCASPAR).

**BL 2016 Methodology**
Data reported for Texas higher education institutions are aggregated. The actual value reported here is for two years prior to the current year.

**BL 2016 Purpose**
This measure provides an indication of the institutions' progress towards the fourth goal, Closing the Gaps in Research: By 2015, increase the level of federal science and engineering research and development obligations to Texas institutions to 6.5 percent of obligations to higher education institutions across the nation, from 5.5 percent in FY2000.
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**Strategy-Related Measures Definitions**  
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1  
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

## Higher Education Coordinating Board

<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>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>781</td>
<td>Higher Education Coordinating Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Workforce Academic Affairs and Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Workforce, Academic Affairs, and Research</td>
<td>Additional Dollars Resulting from NHARP Funding (in Millions)</td>
<td>Data are reported by the institutions.</td>
<td>Grantees provide data to the institutions on grants completed during the previous year. Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions on final reports for each research project. The collected data are compiled and maintained by the Coordinating Board.</td>
<td>This measure provides feedback on the state-funded Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP) by indicating some of the leveraging of other sources of support for research developed under these programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** N  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** M  

Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-02-01 OP 04  
Key Measure: N  
New Measure: N  
Percentage Measure: N
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Strategy-Related Measures Definitions
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency:</td>
<td>Higher Education Coordinating Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Goal No.**: 1
  - Coordinate Higher Education
- **Objective No.**: 2
  - Workforce Academic Affairs and Research
- **Strategy No.**: 1
  - Workforce, Academic Affairs, and Research
- **Measure Type**: OP
- **Measure No.**: 5
  - $ Amt of Research Expenditures at Tx Public Institutions (in Millions)

**Calculation Method**: N

**Target Attainment**: H

**Priority**: M

**Cross Reference**: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-02-01 OP 05

**Key Measure**: N

**New Measure**: N

**Percentage Measure**: N

**BL 2016 Definition**

Total expenditures for the conduct of research and development at public higher education institutions for most recently completed state fiscal year (in millions).

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

Data are reported by institutions.

*(Note on Desired Performance: The amount of research expenditures reported by the institutions is dependent upon external factors, including federal grant programs and availability of private funds for research.)*

**BL 2016 Date Source**

Data reported by the institutions are compiled and maintained by the Coordinating Board. The information is published in the Coordinating Board’s annual report titled "Research Expenditures."

**BL 2016 Methodology**

Total expenditures for the conduct of research and development reported by each institution for the previous state fiscal year are aggregated.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

This measure provides an indication of research activities for the public higher education institutions in the state.
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Strategy-Related Measures Definitions
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provide Planning, Information Svcs and Performance/Accountability Sys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning, Information Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>EF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>% of Requests for Computerized Info Responded To Within Three Days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** N  **Target Attainment:** H  **Priority:** M

**Key Measure:** N  **New Measure:** N  **Percentage Measure:** Y

**Cross Reference:** Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-03-01 EF 01

**BL 2016 Definition**

Number of internal and external requests for information contained in the databases maintained on the agency's servers responded to by the Educational Data Center (EDC) and Educational Data Analysis Support Center (EDASC) personnel within three business days divided by the total number of requests.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

The number is dependent upon customers wanting information. As more information is made available via the web, the need may not be as frequent.

**BL 2016 Data Source**

Information Technology Services Project Tracking System (TRAX).

**BL 2016 Methodology**

There is a project tracking system that helps monitor the requests submitted to Educational Data Center for processing. Informal requests are captured from e-mails, phone calls, faxes, or other written correspondence. These are logged daily/weekly into the project tracking system. Each quarter the counts are made for the performance measures.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

This measure provides an indication both of the responsiveness of EDC and EDASC staff to requests for information and of the amount of requests received that can be responded to within three business days (minimal programming needed).
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Strategy-Related Measures Definitions
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Close the Gaps by Improving Affordability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide Programs Which Make Financial Assistance Available to Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Towards Excellence, Access and Success Grant Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of Students Receiving Texas Grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Measure: Y  New Measure: N  Percentage Measure: N

BL 2016 Definition
Total number of students receiving TEXAS Grant Program awards through public institutions during the fiscal year.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
All reports are prepared by the institutions and certified by the Directors of Student Financial Aid.

(Note on Desired Performance: The target is an estimate based on historic funding and award patterns. Annual fluctuations can be caused by changes in funding from the state and changes in the enrollment patterns of students who receive awards. Larger awards will go to fewer students if they enroll on a full-time basis. Smaller awards will go to more students if they enroll only on a 3/4 basis. Under the first scenario, performance will be below target; under the second scenario, performance will be above target.)

BL 2016 Data Source
Information is obtained from periodic reports prepared by institutions.

BL 2016 Methodology
Sum the data from periodic reports prepared by institutions.

BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides feedback on the TEXAS Grant Program.
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Strategy-Related Measures Definitions
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Goal No.</th>
<th>Objective No.</th>
<th>Strategy No.</th>
<th>Measure Type</th>
<th>Measure No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>781</td>
<td>Higher Education Coordinating Board</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculation Method: C  Target Attainment: H  Priority: H
Key Measure: Y  New Measure: N  Percentage Measure: Y

Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 02-01-01 OP 02

BL 2016 Definition
Percentage of TEXAS Grant recipients who entered Texas public institutions of higher education in the fall term four years ago as first-time, full-time undergraduates who have received baccalaureate degrees from Texas public and independent institutions of higher education since that date.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
Enrollment data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions and do not include students who transfer to an out-of-state institution or who were enrolled less than full-time when they first entered college. Reports on TEXAS Grant recipients are certified by the Directors of Student Financial Aid. Enrollment data are captured in the fall semester, so TEXAS Grant recipients who enroll for the first time in the spring semester will not be included in this measure.

BL 2016 Data Source
Enrollment data are reported by the public and independent institutions and compiled by the Educational Data Center (Graduation Rates Report). Reports on TEXAS Grant recipients are submitted by institutional Offices of Student Financial Aid.

BL 2016 Methodology
Track incoming TEXAS Grant recipients who were first-time, full-time summer/fall entering undergraduates for four years. Take the number of them that graduate from a Texas institution of higher education during the four-year period and divide by the total number of TEXAS Grant recipients in that cohort.

BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides an indication of the effectiveness of the TEXAS Grant Program in retaining and graduating students.
### BL 2016 Definition

Percentage of TEXAS Grant recipients who entered Texas public institutions of higher education in the fall term six years ago as first-time, full-time undergraduates who have received a baccalaureate degree from a Texas public or independent institution of higher education since that date.

### BL 2016 Data Limitations

Enrollment data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions and do not include students who transfer to an out-of-state institution or who were enrolled less than full-time when they first entered college. Reports on TEXAS Grant recipients are certified by the Directors of Student Financial Aid. Enrollment data are captured in the fall semester, so TEXAS Grant recipients who enroll for the first time in the spring semester will not be included in this measure.

### BL 2016 Data Source

Enrollment data are reported by the public and independent institutions and compiled by the Educational Data Center (Graduation Rates Report). Reports on TEXAS Grant recipients are submitted by institutional Offices of Student Financial Aid.

### BL 2016 Methodology

Track incoming TEXAS Grant recipients who were first-time, full-time summer/fall entering undergraduates for six years. Take the number of them that graduate during that six-year period from a Texas institution of higher education and divide by the total number of TEXAS Grant recipients in that cohort.

### BL 2016 Purpose

This measure provides an indication of the effectiveness of the TEXAS Grant Program in retaining and graduating students.
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Strategy-Related Measures Definitions
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close the Gaps by Improving Affordability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Programs Which Make Financial Assistance Available to Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towards Excellence, Access and Success Grant Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence Rate TEXAS Grant Recipients After 1 YR - Public Univ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Measure: N  New Measure: N  Percentage Measure: Y

**BL 2016 Definition**

The percentage of TEXAS Grant recipients who received an initial award while enrolled as first-time, full-time undergraduates at a Texas public university the summer/fall term of the previous fiscal year who were also enrolled at a public or independent Texas institution of higher education in the fall semester of the current fiscal year.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

Enrollment data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions and do not include students who transfer to an out-of-state institution or students who were enrolled less than full-time when they first entered college. Reports on TEXAS Grant recipients are certified by the Directors of Student Financial Aid. Enrollment data are captured in the fall semester, so TEXAS Grant recipients who enroll for the first time in the spring semester will not be included in this measure.

**BL 2016 Data Source**

Enrollment data are reported by the institutions and compiled by the Educational Data Center (CBM001). Reports on TEXAS Grant recipients are submitted by institutional Offices of Student Financial Aid.

**BL 2016 Methodology**

The number of TEXAS Grant recipients who received initial awards at a Texas public university in the summer/fall term of the previous fiscal year is divided into the number of such students who were also enrolled at a Texas public or independent institution of higher education in the fall semester of the current fiscal year.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

This measure provides an indication of the effectiveness of the TEXAS Grant Program in retaining students at public universities after one academic year.
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Strategy-Related Measures Definitions
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

---

**Agency Code:** 781  
**Agency:** Higher Education Coordinating Board

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal No.</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Objective No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strategy No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Measure Type</th>
<th>OP</th>
<th>Measure No.</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Measure:** N  
**New Measure:** N  
**Percentage Measure:** Y

---

**BL 2016 Definition**

The percentage of TEXAS Grant recipients who received an initial award while enrolled as first-time, full-time undergraduates at a Texas public community college in the summer/fall term of the previous fiscal year who were also enrolled at a Texas public or independent institution of higher education in the fall semester of the current fiscal year.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

Enrollment data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions and do not include students who transfer to an out-of-state institution or students who were enrolled less than full-time when they first entered college. Reports on TEXAS Grant recipients are certified by the Directors of Student Financial Aid. Because enrollment data are captured in the fall semester, retention is measured from fall to fall, so TEXAS Grant recipients who enroll for the first time in the spring semester will not be included in this measure.

**BL 2016 Data Source**

Enrollment data are reported by the institutions and compiled by the Educational Data Center (CBM001). Reports on TEXAS Grant recipients are submitted by institutional Offices of Student Financial Aid.

**BL 2016 Methodology**

The number of TEXAS Grant recipients who received initial awards at a Texas public community college in the summer/fall term of the previous fiscal year is divided into the number of such students who were also enrolled at a Texas public or independent institution of higher education in the fall semester of the current fiscal year.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

This measure provides an indication of the effectiveness of the TEXAS Grant Program in retaining students at public community colleges after one academic year.
### Higher Education Coordinating Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Close the Gaps by Improving Affordability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>Provide Programs Which Make Financial Assistance Available to Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>Towards Excellence, Access and Success Grant Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>Persistence Rate TEXAS Grant Recipients After 1 Yr - Pub Tech Coll</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** C  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** M  
Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 02-01-01 OP 06

**BL 2016 Definition**
The percentage of TEXAS Grant recipients who received an initial award while enrolled as a first-time, full-time undergraduate at a Texas public technical college in the summer/fall semester of the previous fiscal year who were also enrolled at a Texas public or independent institution of higher education in the fall semester of the current fiscal year.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**
Enrollment data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions and do not include students who transfer to an out-of-state institution or students who were enrolled less than full-time when they first entered college. Reports on TEXAS Grant recipients are certified by the Directors of Student Financial Aid. Because enrollment data are captured in the fall semester, retention is measured from fall to fall, so TEXAS Grant recipients who enroll for the first time in the spring semester will not be included in this measure.

**BL 2016 Data Source**
Enrollment data are reported by the institutions and compiled by the Educational Data Center (CBM001). Reports on TEXAS Grant recipients are submitted by institutional Offices of Student Financial Aid.

**BL 2016 Methodology**
The number of TEXAS Grant recipients who received initial awards at a Texas public technical college in the summer/fall term of the previous fiscal year is divided into the number of such students who were also enrolled at a Texas public or independent institution of higher education in the fall semester of the current fiscal year.

**BL 2016 Purpose**
This measure provides an indication of the effectiveness of the TEXAS Grant Program in retaining students at public technical colleges after one academic year.
Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Close the Gaps by Improving Affordability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide Programs Which Make Financial Assistance Available to Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Texas B-ON-Time Program - Public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>% TX B-on-Time Loans Forgiven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** C  **Target Attainment:** H  **Priority:** M  
**Key Measure:** N  **New Measure:** N  **Percentage Measure:** Y

**Cross Reference:** Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 02-01-02 OP 01

**BL 2016 Definition**

The percentage of Texas B-On-Time Loan Program recipients who have had their loans forgiven.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

N/A

**BL 2016 Data Source**

Coordinating Board student loan database.

**BL 2016 Methodology**

Total number of individuals who are eligible for loan forgiveness divided by the total number of Texas B-On-Time Loan Program recipients calculated in cohort groups.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

This measure provides an indication of the effectiveness of the Texas B-On-Time Loan Program in retaining and graduating students on time.
### Agency Code: 781  
**Higher Education Coordinating Board**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal No.</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Objective No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strategy No.</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Measure Type</th>
<th>OP</th>
<th>Measure No.</th>
<th>Number of Students Receiving TEG Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** C  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** M  
**Cross Reference:** Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 02-01-03 OP 01

**BL 2016 Definition**

Number of students attending independent colleges in Texas who received grants through the Tuition Equalization Grants Program (TEG) during the fiscal year.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

Information is submitted at the end of the year by the institutions participating in the program. We have no reason to question the accuracy of the institutions.

(Note: The target is based on historic funding and award patterns. Annual fluctuations can be caused by changes in funding from the state and changes in the awarding philosophy of the institutions which make awards. Colleges may choose to give (1) larger awards to fewer students, or (2) smaller awards to more students. If they choose to exercise the first option, performance will be below the target; if they exercise the second option, performance will be above the target.)

**BL 2016 Data Source**

Data are obtained from the year-end reports submitted to the Coordinating Board by the institutions.

**BL 2016 Methodology**

Compile information from TEG year-end reports submitted by the institutions.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

This measure provides feedback on the Tuition Equalization Grants (TEG) Program.
### Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Close the Gaps by Improving Affordability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide Programs Which Make Financial Assistance Available to Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tuition Equalization Grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Persistence Rate of TEG Recipients after One Academic Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** N  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** M  
**Cross Reference:** Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 02-01-03 OP 02  
**Key Measure:** N  
**New Measure:** N  
**Percentage Measure:** Y

#### BL 2016 Definition
The percentage of Tuition Equalization Grants (TEG) recipients who were first-time, full-time undergraduates at an independent institution of higher education in Texas in the fall semester of the previous fiscal year and who were also enrolled at a public or independent institution of higher education in Texas in the fall semester of the current fiscal year.

#### BL 2016 Data Limitations
Enrollment data do not include students who transfer to an out-of-state institution or who enrolled less than full-time when they first entered college. Enrollment data are captured in the fall semester, so TEG recipients who enroll for the first time in the spring semester will not be included in this measure.

#### BL 2016 Data Source
Enrollment data are from the CBM enrollment reports submitted to the Coordinating Board by public and independent institutions. TEG recipients are identified from year-end reports submitted to the Coordinating Board by institutions.

#### BL 2016 Methodology
The number of TEG recipients enrolled as first-time, full-time undergraduates in the previous fall term, divided into the number of such students who are enrolled in Texas public and independent institutions of higher education in the fall term of the current year, expressed as a percentage.

#### BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides feedback on the effect of state funding of the Tuition Equalization Grants (TEG) Program.
Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

Strategy-Related Measures Definitions
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Close the Gaps by Improving Affordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide Programs Which Make Financial Assistance Available to Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tuition Equalization Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>% TEG Recipients with Baccalaureate within Six Academic Years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** N  **Target Attainment:** H  **Priority:** M  Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 02-01-03 OP 03

**Key Measure:** N  **New Measure:** N  **Percentage Measure:** Y

**BL 2016 Definition**

Percentage of Tuition Equalization Grants (TEG) recipients who entered independent institutions of higher education in Texas during the fall term six years ago as first-time, full-time undergraduates who have received a baccalaureate degree from institutions of higher education in Texas since that date. (TEG awards are only available to students attending independent institutions of higher education in Texas.)

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

Enrollment data do not include students who transfer to out-of-state institutions or who enrolled on less than a full-time basis when they first entered college. Enrollment data are captured in the fall semester, so TEG recipients who enroll for the first time in the spring semester will not be included in this measure.

**BL 2016 Data Source**

Enrollment data are from the CBM enrollment reports submitted to the Coordinating Board by public and independent institutions. TEG recipients are identified from year-end reports submitted to the Coordinating Board by institutions.

**BL 2016 Methodology**

Track TEG recipients who are first-time, full-time fall term entering undergraduates for six years. Take the number that graduate from a public or independent institution of higher education in Texas during the six-year period and divide by the total cohort.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

This measure provides an indication of the effectiveness of the Tuition Equalization Grants (TEG) Program in retaining and graduating students.
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Strategy-Related Measures Definitions
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Close the Gaps by Improving Affordability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide Programs Which Make Financial Assistance Available to Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tuition Equalization Grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>% TEG Recipients Who are Minority Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** N  **Target Attainment:** H  **Priority:** H  Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 02-01-03 OP 04

**Key Measure:** Y  **New Measure:** N  **Percentage Measure:** Y

**BL 2016 Definition**
Percentage of Tuition Equalization Grants (TEG) recipients enrolled in independent institutions of higher education in Texas during the prior fiscal year who are African-American, Hispanic, Asian-American, or Native American (excluding internationals). (TEG awards are only available to students attending independent institutions of higher education in Texas.)

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**
N/A

**BL 2016 Data Source**
Enrollment data are provided through the CBM enrollment reports submitted to the Coordinating Board by the institutions. TEG recipients are identified from year-end reports submitted to the Coordinating Board by institutions.

**BL 2016 Methodology**
Take the number of Tuition Equalization Grants (TEG) recipients during the prior fiscal year who are African-American, Hispanic, Asian-American, or Native American (excluding internationals) and divide it by the total number of Tuition Equalization Grants (TEG) recipients enrolled (excluding internationals) during the same time period.

**BL 2016 Purpose**
This measure provides feedback on the Tuition Equalization Grants (TEG) Program. More detailed information is available in the Coordinating Board’s Financial Aid Database Report which includes a table that indicates the percentage of each ethnic group at each TEG institution that receives TEG awards.
### Higher Education Coordinating Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Goal No.</th>
<th>Objective No.</th>
<th>Strategy No.</th>
<th>Measure Type</th>
<th>Measure No.</th>
<th>BL 2016 Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>781</td>
<td>Higher Education Coordinating Board</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Close the Gaps by Improving Affordability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide Programs Which Make Financial Assistance Available to Students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tuition Equalization Grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** N  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** H  
**Cross Reference:** Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 02-01-03 OP 05

**Key Measure:** Y  
**New Measure:** N  
**Percentage Measure:** Y

**BL 2016 Definition**

Percentage of Tuition Equalization Grants (TEG) recipients who entered independent institutions of higher education in Texas during the fall term four years ago as first-time, full-time undergraduates who have received baccalaureate degrees from public or independent institutions of higher education in Texas since that date. (TEG awards are only available to students attending independent institutions of higher education in Texas.)

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

Enrollment data do not include students who transfer to an out-of-state institution or who were enrolled less than full-time when they first entered college. Enrollment data are captured in the fall semester, so TEG recipients who enroll for the first time in the spring semester will not be included in this measure.

**BL 2016 Data Source**

Enrollment data are from CBM enrollment reports submitted to the Coordinating Board by public and independent institutions. TEG recipients are identified from year-end reports submitted to the Coordinating Board by institutions.

**BL 2016 Methodology**

Track incoming TEG recipients who were first-time, full-time fall entering undergraduates for four years. Take the number that graduate from a public or independent institution of higher education in Texas during that four-year period and divide by the total cohort.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

This measure provides an indication of the effectiveness of the Tuition Equalization Grants (TEG) Program in retaining and graduating students.
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#### Strategy-Related Measures Definitions
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Close the Gaps by Providing Trusteed Funds for Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide Programs to Promote Research at Texas Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td># Students Receiving Ed and Exp through NHARP Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td># Students Receiving Ed and Exp through NHARP Projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** C  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** H  
**Cross Reference:** Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 03-01-01 OP 01

**Key Measure:** N  
**New Measure:** N  
**Percentage Measure:** N

**BL 2016 Definition**  
Number of postdoctoral, graduate, and undergraduate students who worked on Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program projects as reported in final technical progress reports. The number includes students who were supported with grant funds as well as students who were supported through other means while they worked on the NHARP research projects.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**  
Data are reported by the institutions.

(Note on Desired Performance: This measure is largely dependent upon external factors such as the number of research projects funded during the biennium.)

**BL 2016 Data Source**  
Grantees provide data to the institutions on grants completed during the previous year. Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions on final reports for each research project. The collected data are compiled and maintained by the Coordinating Board.

**BL 2016 Methodology**  
Data reported to the Coordinating Board by each institution are aggregated. Because of the grant funding cycle, this measure is reported only in odd fiscal years.

**BL 2016 Purpose**  
This measure provides feedback on the Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP).
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Strategy-Related Measures Definitions
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Close the Gaps by Providing Trusteed Funds for Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide Programs to Promote Research at Texas Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number of NHARP Research Projects Funded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method: N**  **Target Attainment: H**  **Priority: M**

Key Measure: Y  New Measure: N  Percentage Measure: N

Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 03-01-01 OP 02

**BL 2016 Definition**
Number of Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program grant requests funded during the fiscal year. Grants for projects involving multiple institutions are counted as multiple grants.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**
N/A

(Note on Desired Performance: The funding available for this program is a finite amount that is appropriated by the Texas Legislature. External review panels determine the number of projects to be funded with the available funding. Maximum award amounts are used and vary by scientific field.)

**BL 2016 Data Source**
Projects are selected for funding by external review panels. Data on the funded projects are compiled and maintained by the Coordinating Board.

**BL 2016 Methodology**
Data on the number of projects funded are compiled and maintained by the Coordinating Board. Because of the grant funding cycle, this measure is reported only in even fiscal years.

**BL 2016 Purpose**
This measure provides feedback on the Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP). In addition to the program's long-range impact on economic development in Texas, some immediate benefits have been realized. National attention has focused on Texas research. Texas universities have attracted outstanding research scientists and stimulated a new commitment to research by faculty as a whole. Our industrial base is enhanced through cooperative research arrangements, and faculty and students receive training in fields critical to the future of Texas. Institutions receiving grants have successfully generated additional research funds from outside sources far exceeding their NHARP awards.)
### Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

**Strategy-Related Measures Definitions**
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Close the Gaps by Providing Trusteed Funds for Health Care Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide Programs to Improve Health Care in Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Family Practice Residency Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of FPRP Residents Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** N  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** M  
Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 04-01-01 OP 01

**Key Measure:** Y  
**New Measure:** N  
**Percentage Measure:** N

**BL 2016 Definition**
Number of residents supported by the Family Practice Residency Program (FPRP) during the fiscal year.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**
The Coordinating Board regularly audits the directors’ reports for accuracy.

**BL 2016 Data Source**
Residency program directors certify to the Coordinating Board each September the number of FPRP full-time equivalent (FTE) residents in training.

**BL 2016 Methodology**
This measure is a headcount of the total number of residents supported by the Family Practice Residency Program during the fiscal year.

**BL 2016 Purpose**
This measure provides feedback on the Family Practice Residency Program and serves as an evaluative indicator of the program’s success.
### Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

**Strategy-Related Measures Definitions**  
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1  
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Goal No.</th>
<th>Objective No.</th>
<th>Strategy No.</th>
<th>Measure Type</th>
<th>Measure No.</th>
<th>Calculation Method</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cross Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>781</td>
<td>Higher Education Coordinating Board</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 04-01-01 OP 02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BL 2016 Definition**
Total trusteed appropriation for the Family Practice Residency Program (excluding the support programs) during the fiscal year divided by the number of residents supported.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**
The Coordinating Board regularly audits the directors’ reports for accuracy.

**BL 2016 Data Source**
Residency program directors certify to the Coordinating Board each September the number of FPRP full-time equivalent (FTE) residents in training. This information is the basis for allocation of funds.

**BL 2016 Methodology**
Take the total number of residents during the fiscal year and divide by the total appropriated amount (excluding the support programs) for the fiscal year.

**BL 2016 Purpose**
This measure provides feedback on the Family Practice Residency Program and serves as an evaluative indicator of the program’s success.
### Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

#### Strategy-Related Measures Definitions
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Close the Gaps by Providing Trusteed Funds for Health Care Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide Programs to Improve Health Care in Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Physician Education Loan Repayment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of Physicians Receiving PELRP Payment (Including Federal Match)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** C  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** M  

Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 04-01-06 OP 01

**Key Measure:** N  
**New Measure:** N  
**Percentage Measure:** N

**BL 2016 Definition**
Number of physicians currently receiving loan repayment assistance for working for the Texas Department of State Health Services, the Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services, the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, the Texas Youth Commission, or in a health professional shortage area (HPSA).

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**
N/A

(Note on Desired Performance: Performance will vary and is dependent on the amount of funding provided and the number of applications received from physicians.)

**BL 2016 Data Source**
Data are obtained from a database maintained by the Coordinating Board.

**BL 2016 Methodology**
Sum the number of awards made to physicians through the program for the current award year.

**BL 2016 Purpose**
This measure provides feedback on the Physician Education Loan Repayment Program.
### Agency Code: 781
### Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal No.</th>
<th>Objective No.</th>
<th>Strategy No.</th>
<th>Measure Type</th>
<th>Measure No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of Texas Resident BCM Medical Students Funded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** N  **Target Attainment:** H  **Priority:** M  **Cross Reference:** Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 05-01-01 OP 01

**Key Measure:** N  **New Measure:** N  **Percentage Measure:** N

---

**BL 2016 Definition**

Number of Texas resident undergraduate medical students at Baylor College of Medicine funded by the undergraduate medical education program per Sections 61.091, 61.092, and 61.093 of the Texas Education Code during the fiscal year.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

The Coordinating Board is dependent on Baylor College of Medicine to provide enrollment numbers.

(Note on Desired Performance: The procedure for determining the number of students to be funded is specified in the enabling legislation and is the actual number of Texas resident undergraduate medical students enrolled at Baylor College of Medicine during the fiscal year.)

**BL 2016 Data Source**

Reported by Baylor College of Medicine to the Coordinating Board.

**BL 2016 Methodology**

This measure is a headcount of the number of Texas resident undergraduate medical students at Baylor College of Medicine funded by the undergraduate medical education program during the fiscal year.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

This measure provides information on the number of Texas resident medical students at Baylor College of Medicine funded by the state.
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Strategy-Related Measures Definitions
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code: 781</th>
<th>Goal No.</th>
<th>Baylor College of Medicine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Baylor College of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Baylor College of Medicine - Undergraduate Medical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Average Amount Per BCM Student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculation Method: N  Target Attainment: H  Priority: M

Key Measure: N  New Measure: N  Percentage Measure: N

Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 05-01-01 OP 02

BL 2016 Definition
An amount equal to the average annual state tax support per undergraduate medical student at the established public medical schools (per Section 61.092 of the Texas Education Code), multiplied by the number of bona fide Texas resident undergraduate medical students enrolled at Baylor College of Medicine. The Coordinating Board may never disburse an amount exceeding the amount appropriated by the Texas Legislature for the undergraduate medical education program.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
The Coordinating Board is dependent on the institutions to provide cost allocation information related to fringe benefits and infrastructure.

(Note on Desired Performance: The procedure for determining the amount to be disbursed is specified in the enabling legislation. The actual amount allocated cannot exceed the trusteed appropriation and is determined by actual appropriations and actual enrollment of Texas resident undergraduate medical students at Baylor College of Medicine for the fiscal year.)

BL 2016 Data Source
General Appropriations Act, Annual Financial Reports, and operating budgets from The University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston and Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas. Information pertaining to the allocation of costs for fringe benefits and infrastructure is obtained from the institutions. Information pertaining to General Revenue applicable to the Instruction and Operations formula comes from the Legislative Budget Board work papers.

BL 2016 Methodology
The procedure for determining the amount to be disbursed is specified in the enabling legislation, and is an amount equal to the average annual tax support per undergraduate medical student at two public medical schools in The University of Texas System (the Medical Branch at Galveston and Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas) multiplied by the number of Texas resident undergraduate medical students enrolled by Baylor College of Medicine in September of the year of disbursement. The actual amount allocated cannot exceed the trusteed appropriation, and is determined by actual appropriations and actual enrollment of Texas residents for the fiscal year.

BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides information on the level of state funding per Texas resident medical student at Baylor College of Medicine.
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Strategy-Related Measures Definitions
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency Code: 781  
Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board  
Goal No. 6  
Objectives No. 1  
Strategy No. 3  
Measure Type OP  
Measure No. 1  

Provide Programs to Improve Delivery, Quality, and Access to Higher Ed  
Centers for Teacher Education  
# Candidates Admitted to Educator Prep Programs at TADC Institutions

Calculation Method: N  
Target Attainment: H  
Priority: M  
Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 06-01-03 OP 01

Key Measure: N  
New Measure: N  
Percentage Measure: N

BL 2016 Definition
Number of junior, senior, and post-baccalaureate candidates admitted into the five Texas Association of Developing Colleges (TADC) educator preparation programs during the academic year (September 1 – August 31), including an individual accepted on a contingency basis.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
N/A

BL 2016 Data Source
Data are provided by institutional end-of-year reports.

BL 2016 Methodology
This measure is a headcount of the number of junior, senior, and post-baccalaureate candidates admitted into the five Texas Association of Developing Colleges (TADC) educator preparation programs during the academic year (September 1 - August 31), including an individual accepted on a contingency basis.

BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides feedback on admissions into educator preparation programs at the Texas Association of Developing Colleges (TADC) institutions.
### Agency Code: 781  
Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal No.</th>
<th>Objective No.</th>
<th>Strategy No.</th>
<th>Measure Type</th>
<th>Measure No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6         | 1             | 3            | OP           | 2           | Close the Gaps by Providing Trusteed Funds to Improve Quality/Delivery  
Provide Programs to Improve Delivery, Quality, and Access to Higher Ed  
Centers for Teacher Education  
# Candidates Recommended for Certification by TADC Educator Prep Pgms. |

**Calculation Method:** N  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** H  
**Cross Reference:** Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 06-01-03 OP 02  
**Key Measure:** N  
**New Measure:** N  
**Percentage Measure:** N  

**BL 2016 Definition**  
Number of candidates, both undergraduate and post-baccalaureate, who successfully complete all requirements of a state-approved educator preparation program at the five Texas Association of Developing Colleges (TADC) institutions during the academic year (September 1 - August 31), and are recommended for certification.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**  
N/A

**BL 2016 Data Source**  
Data are provided by institutional end-of-year reports.

**BL 2016 Methodology**  
This measure is a headcount of the number of candidates, both undergraduate and post-baccalaureate, who successfully complete all requirements of a state-approved educator preparation program at the five Texas Association of Developing Colleges (TADC) institutions during the academic year (September 1 - August 31), and are recommended for certification.

**BL 2016 Purpose**  
This measure provides feedback on candidates recommended for certification through educator preparation programs at the Texas Association of Developing Colleges (TADC) institutions.
## Agency Code: 781
### Higher Education Coordinating Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal No.</th>
<th>Objective No.</th>
<th>Strategy No.</th>
<th>Measure Type</th>
<th>Measure No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Close the Gaps by Providing Trusteed Funds to Improve Quality/Delivery**

**Provide Programs to Improve Delivery, Quality, and Access to Higher Ed**

**College Readiness and Success Grants**

**Number of Students in CRI-Funded Programs**

**Calculation Method:** C  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** H  
**Cross Reference:** Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 06-01-10 OP 01

**BL 2016 Definition**

Total Numbers of students in agency-sponsored college readiness initiatives funded under the College Readiness Initiative Strategy.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

N/A

**BL 2016 Data Source**

Data are collected by the Coordinating Board or provided by the institutions on evaluation forms developed by the Coordinating Board.

**BL 2016 Methodology**

Figures from each of the currently funded programs are added together to obtain the total number of students served each year.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

This measure reflects how many pre-college students are being served by college readiness initiatives currently funded under the College Readiness Initiative Strategy to increase college readiness and decrease the need for developmental education.
### Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

**Strategy-Related Measures Definitions**  
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1  
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Close the Gaps by Providing Trusteed Funds to Improve Quality/Delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide Programs to Improve Delivery, Quality, and Access to Higher Ed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>College Readiness and Success Grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number of Teachers/Faculty in CRI Funded Professional Development Pgm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method: C**  
**Target Attainment: H**  
**Priority: M**  
Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 06-01-10 OP 02

**BL 2016 Definition**

Total number of K-12 teachers and higher education faculty participating in professional development as part of college sponsored initiatives currently funded under the College Readiness Initiative Strategy.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

N/A

**BL 2016 Data Source**

Data are collected by the Coordinating Board or is provided by the institutions on evaluation forms developed by the Coordinating Board.

**BL 2016 Methodology**

Figures from each of the currently funded programs are added together to obtain the total number of teachers and faculty participating each year.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

This measure reflects how many K-12 teachers and higher education faculty are participating in college readiness initiatives currently funded under the College Readiness Initiative Strategy to increase pre-college students’ college readiness and to decrease the need for developmental education.
### Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

**Strategy-Related Measures Definitions**  
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1  
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Indirect Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indirect Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Central Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Type</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td># of Requests from Legislators, Media, IHEs, Students &amp; General Public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** C  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** M  
**Cross Reference:** Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 09-01-01 OP 01

**BL 2016 Definition**  
Number of requests for data and information

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**  
None.

**BL 2016 Data Source**  
Customer Relationship and Feedback Tracking System (CRAFT)

**BL 2016 Methodology**  
CRAFT is a computerized system designed to help manage customer contacts and information.

**BL 2016 Purpose**  
To help the agency keep track of the number of data and information requests it receives on an annual basis in order to improve services to constituents.
## Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

### BL 2016 Definition

Percent increase in fall student headcount enrollment since Fall 2000.

### BL 2016 Data Limitations

Data are not available until February of the following year.

### BL 2016 Data Source

Data on public institutions will come from the Coordinating Board CBM001 student reports and data on independent institutions will come from the Independent Colleges and Universities of Texas (ICUT).

### BL 2016 Methodology

Data reported for Texas higher education institutions for the current fall minus the Fall 2000 enrollment divided by the Fall 2000 enrollment.

### BL 2016 Purpose

This measure provides an indication of the state’s progress towards the first goal, Closing the Gaps in Participation: By 2015, close the gaps in participation rates across Texas to add 630,000 more students.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>College Readiness and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent Increase in Fall Student Headcount Enrollment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Method:** N  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** H  
**Cross Reference:** Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01 OC 01

**Key Measure:** Y  
**New Measure:** N  
**Percent Measure:** Y
Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency Code: 781  Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board
Goal No. 1  Coordinate Higher Education
Objective No. 1  College Readiness and Success
Outcome No. 2  Percent Increase in Bachelor/Associates Degrees and Certificates

Calculation Method: N  Target Attainment: H  Priority: H  Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01 OC 02
Key Measure: Y  New Measure: N  Percent Measure: Y

BL 2016 Definition
Percent increase in bachelor's degrees, associate's degrees, and certificates awarded since those awarded Fall 1999 through Summer 2000.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
Data are not available until February of the following year.

BL 2016 Data Source
Data on public institutions will come from the Coordinating Board CBM009 degrees reported each fall for the preceding academic year. Data on independent institutions will come from the Independent Colleges and Universities of Texas (ICUT).

BL 2016 Methodology
Data reported for Texas higher education institutions minus those reported Fall 2000 for bachelor's degrees, associate's degrees, and certificates awarded divided by the Fall 2000 reported bachelor's degrees, associate's degrees, and certificates awarded.

BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides an indication of the state’s progress towards the second goal, Closing the Gaps in Success: By 2015, award 210,000 undergraduate degrees, certificates, and other identifiable student successes from high quality programs.
Agency Code: 781  
Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board

Goal No. 1 Coordinate Higher Education
Objective No. 1 College Readiness and Success
Outcome No. 3 % Underprepared Public 2-year Students Graduating in 6 Years

Calculation Method: N  
Target Attainment: H  
Priority: M  
Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01 OC 03

Key Measure: N  
New Measure: N  
Percent Measure: Y

BL 2016 Definition
Of the public two-year college first time summer/fall entering undergraduates who were not TSI-exempted and failed the initial TSI test, the percent who were awarded a baccalaureate or associate degree, certificate, or progress measure within six years.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions and do not include students who go on to attend and graduate from an out-of-state institution. The State Auditor’s Office performs enrollment audits on a sample of that data. Some students defer testing for documented reasons. The success of underprepared students who graduate in more than six years is not reflected with this methodology. Students persisting in higher education but who have not been awarded a degree, certificate, or progress measure, as well as continuing education students, are excluded.

BL 2016 Data Source
Data are from the cohort (summer/fall entering undergraduates) that entered six years prior as certified by the institutions and compiled by the Educational Data Center (CBM001 and CBM002).

BL 2016 Methodology
(a) Take the number of first-time summer/fall entering undergraduates at public two-year colleges (from CBM001). (b) Determine the number who took the initial TSI test and did not pass it (from CBM002). (c) Of those students, determine the number who were awarded a baccalaureate or associate degree, certificate, or progress measure within six years. (d) Divide the number of students in (c) by the number of students in (b) and express it as a percentage.

BL 2016 Purpose
Provides information on the success of institutions in regards to successful completion by underprepared students.
Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency Code: 781
Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board
Goal No. 1
Objective No. 1
Outcome No. 4

Calculation Method: N
Target Attainment: H
Priority: M
Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01 OC 04
Key Measure: N
New Measure: N
Percent Measure: Y

BL 2016 Definition
Of the university first time summer/fall entering undergraduates who were not TSI-exempted and failed the initial TSI test, the percent who were awarded a baccalaureate degree or higher within six years.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions and do not include students who go on to attend and graduate from an out-of-state institution. The State Auditor’s Office performs enrollment audits on a sample of that data. Some students defer testing for documented reasons. The success of underprepared students who graduate in more than six years is not reflected with this methodology. Students persisting in higher education but who have not been awarded a degree are excluded.

BL 2016 Data Source
Data are from the cohort (summer/fall entering undergraduates) that entered six years prior as certified by the institutions and compiled by the Educational Data Center (CBM001 and CBM002).

BL 2016 Methodology
(a) Take the number of first-time summer/fall entering undergraduates at universities (from CBM001). (b) Determine the number who took the initial TSI test and did not pass it (from CBM002). (c) Of those students, determine the number who were awarded a baccalaureate degree or higher within six years. (d) Divide the number of students in (c) by the number of students in (b) and express it as a percentage.

BL 2016 Purpose
Provides information on the success of institutions in regards to successful completion by underprepared students.
Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency Code: 781  
Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board

Goal No. 1  
Objective No. 1  
Outcome No. 5  

Calculate Method: C  
Target Attainment: H  
Priority: M  

Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01 OC 05

Key Measure: N  
New Measure: N  
Percent Measure: N

BL 2016 Definition
The percent of underprepared students at four-year institutions who successfully complete a related college-level course within three years if they tested above the deviation or four years if they tested under the deviation.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions. The success of underprepared students who do not attempt a general education core curriculum course within the allotted years is not reflected with this methodology. Transfer and continuing students are excluded.

BL 2016 Data Source
Data are from the latest cohort (summer/fall entering undergraduates) as reported annually by the institutions and compiled by the Educational Data Center (CBM001 and CBM002).

BL 2016 Methodology
(a) For each of the three TSI subject areas (math, reading and writing), determine the number of first-time summer/fall entering undergraduates at four-year institutions who were not TSI-waived, not TSI-exempted, and who took and failed the initial TSI test. (b) Determine the number of these students who earn an A, B, or C in a related general education core curriculum course within three years if they tested above the deviation or four years if they tested under the deviation. (c) Total the number of students in all three subject areas in the initial cohort. (d) Total the number who received an A, B, or C. (e) Divide the number of students in (d) by the number of students in (c) and express as a percentage.

BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides an indication of the effectiveness of developmental education programs at four-year institutions in preparing underprepared students to succeed in college-level courses.
Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency Code: 781  Agency:  Higher Education Coordinating Board
Goal No. 1  Coordinate Higher Education
Objective No. 1  College Readiness and Success
Outcome No. 6  % Underprepared Math Students Completing College-level Course

Key Measure: N  New Measure: N  Percent Measure: N

BL 2016 Definition
Percentage of underprepared math students who successfully complete the related college-level course.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions and do not currently include data on students who transfer to an out-of-state institution. Some students defer testing for documented reasons. Students who record their student intent as 4 or 5 are not included. Students getting a level 2 certificate are not included.

BL 2016 Data Source
Data are from the latest cohort (summer/fall entering undergraduates) as reported annually by the institutions and compiled by the Educational Data Center (CBM001 and CBM002).

BL 2016 Methodology
(a) Take the number of first-time summer/fall entering undergraduates (from CBM001). (b) Determine the number who took an initial TSI test and did not pass it (from CBM002) or were not exempted. (c) Of those students, determine the number who did not meet the TSI obligation. Underprepared students are given three years if they tested above the deviation and four years if they tested under the deviation to successfully complete. (d) Of those students, determine the number who completed a college-level math course. To “successfully complete” the first college-level course, the student must earn an A, B, or C in a related general education core curriculum course. (e) Divide (d) by (c) and express it as a percentage.

BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides an indication of underprepared students’ intermediate progress toward the Success Goal of Closing the Gaps.
Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency Code: 781  Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board

Goal No. 1  Coordinate Higher Education
Objective No. 1  College Readiness and Success
Outcome No. 7  % Underprepared Reading Students Completing College-level Course

Calculation Method: C  Target Attainment: H  Priority: M  Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01 OC 07
Key Measure: N  New Measure: N  Percent Measure: N

BL 2016 Definition
Percentage of underprepared reading students who successfully complete the related college-level course.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions and do not currently include data on students who transfer to an out-of-state institution. Some students defer testing for documented reasons. Students who record their student intent as 4 or 5 are not included. Students getting a level 2 certificate are not included.

BL 2016 Data Source
Data are from the latest cohort (summer/fall entering undergraduates) as reported annually by the institutions and compiled by the Educational Data Center (CBM001 and CBM002).

BL 2016 Methodology
(a) Take the number of first-time summer/fall entering undergraduates (from CBM001). (b) Determine the number who took an initial TSI test and did not pass it (from CBM002) or were not exempted. (c) Of those students, determine the number who did not meet the TSI obligation. Underprepared students are given three years if they tested above the deviation and four years if they tested under the deviation to successfully complete. (d) Of those students, determine the number who completed a college-level reading course. To “successfully complete” the first college-level course, the student must earn an A, B, or C in a related general education core curriculum course. (e) Divide (d) by (c) and express it as a percentage.

BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides an indication of underprepared students’ intermediate progress toward the Success Goal of Closing the Gaps.
Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency Code: 781  
Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board

Goal No. 1  
Coordinate Higher Education

Objective No. 1  
College Readiness and Success

Outcome No. 8  
% Underprepared Writing Students Completing College-level Course

Calculation Method: C  
Target Attainment: H  
Priority: M  
Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01 OC 08

Key Measure: N  
New Measure: N  
Percent Measure: N

BL 2016 Definition
Percentage of underprepared writing students who successfully complete the related college-level course.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions and do not currently include data on students who transfer to an out-of-state institution. Some students defer testing for documented reasons. Students who record their student intent as 4 or 5 are not included. Students getting a level 2 certificate are not included.

BL 2016 Data Source
Data are from the latest cohort (summer/fall entering undergraduates) as reported annually by the institutions and compiled by the Educational Data Center (CBM001 and CBM002).

BL 2016 Methodology
(a) Take the number of first-time summer/fall entering undergraduates (from CBM001). (b) Determine the number who took an initial TSI test and did not pass it (from CBM002) or were not exempted. (c) Of those students, determine the number who did not meet the TSI obligation. Underprepared students are given three years if they tested above the deviation and four years if they tested under the deviation to successfully complete. (d) Of those students, determine the number who completed a college-level writing course. To “successfully complete” the first college-level course, the student must earn an A, B, or C in a related general education core curriculum course. (e) Divide (d) by (c) and express it as a percentage.

BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides an indication of under prepared students’ intermediate progress toward the Success Goal of Closing the Gaps.
### Agency Code: 781
### Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board
### Goal No. 1
#### Coordinate Higher Education
### Objective No. 1
#### College Readiness and Success
### Outcome No. 9
#### % University Students Graduating in 4 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation Method</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cross Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01 OC 09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Measure</th>
<th>New Measure</th>
<th>Percent Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BL 2016 Definition
Number of students who entered Texas public universities four years ago as first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduates (taking at least 12 semester credit hours) who received a baccalaureate or above degree during that four-year period divided by the total number of students who entered Texas public universities four years ago as first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduates (taking at least 12 semester credit hours).

#### BL 2016 Data Limitations
Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions. The State Auditor’s Office performs enrollment audits on a sample of that data. We do not have data on students who go on to attend and graduate from an out-of-state institution.

#### BL 2016 Data Source
Information provided by the Graduation Rates Report prepared by the Educational Data Center using data reported by the institutions.

#### BL 2016 Methodology
Track incoming first-time, full-time, degree-seeking summer/fall entering undergraduates by SSN for four years. Take the number that graduate from a Texas public or independent institution and divide by the total cohort.

#### BL 2016 Purpose
Provides information on the success of institutions in regards to successful completion by students.
Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency Code: 781  Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board
Goal No. 1  Coordinate Higher Education
Objective No. 1  College Readiness and Success
Outcome No. 10  % Public 2-Year Institution Students Graduating in 3 Years

Key Measure: Y  New Measure: N  Percent Measure: Y

BL 2016 Definition
Number of students who entered Texas public two-year colleges three years ago as first-time, full-time, credential-seeking undergraduates (taking at least 12 semester credit hours) who received a degree or certificate during that three-year period divided by the total number of students who entered Texas public two-year colleges three years ago as first-time, full-time, credential-seeking undergraduates (taking at least 12 semester credit hours).

BL 2016 Data Limitations
Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions. The State Auditor’s Office performs enrollment audits on a sample of that data. We do not have data on students who go on to attend and graduate from an out-of-state institution.

BL 2016 Data Source
Information provided by the Graduation Rates Report prepared by the Educational Data Center using data reported by the institutions.

BL 2016 Methodology
Track incoming first-time, full-time, credential-seeking summer/fall entering undergraduates who have declared an intent to obtain a degree or certificate by SSN for three years. Take the number that graduate from a Texas public or independent institution and divide by the total cohort of students who had declared intent to obtain degree or certificate.

BL 2016 Purpose
Provides information on the success of public two-year institutions in regards to successful completion by students.
Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency Code: 781       Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board
Goal No. 1          Coordinate Higher Education
Objective No. 1         College Readiness and Success
Outcome No. 11         Percentage of University Students Graduating within Six Years
Key Measure: Y   New Measure: N   Percent Measure: Y

BL 2016 Definition
Number of students who entered Texas public universities six years ago as first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduates (taking at least twelve semester credit hours) who received a baccalaureate or above degree during that six-year period divided by the total number of students who entered Texas public universities six years ago as first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduates (taking at least twelve semester credit hours).

BL 2016 Data Limitations
Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions. The State Auditor’s Office performs enrollment audits on a sample of that data. We do not have data on students who go on to attend and graduate from an out-of-state institution.

BL 2016 Data Source
Information provided by the Graduation Rates Report prepared by the Educational Data Center using data reported by the institutions.

BL 2016 Methodology
Track incoming first-time, full-time, degree-seeking summer/fall entering undergraduates at Texas public institutions by SSN for six years. Take the number that graduate from a Texas public or independent institution and divide by the total cohort.

BL 2016 Purpose
Provides information on the success of institutions in regards to successful completion by students.
Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

Objective Outcome Definitions Report
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency Code: 781
Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board
Goal No. 1
Coordinate Higher Education
Objective No. 1
College Readiness and Success
Outcome No. 12
Percentage of African-Amer. Univ. Students Graduating within 6 Years

Calculation Method: N
Target Attainment: H
Priority: M
Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01 OC 12
Key Measure: N
New Measure: N
Percent Measure: Y

BL 2016 Definition
Number of African-American students who entered Texas public universities six years ago as first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduates (taking at least 12 semester credit hours) who received a baccalaureate or above degree during that six-year period divided by the total number of African-American students who entered Texas public universities six years ago as first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduates (taking at least 12 semester credit hours).

BL 2016 Data Limitations
Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions. The State Auditor’s Office performs enrollment audits on a sample of that data. We do not have data on students that go on to attend and graduate from an out-of-state institution.

BL 2016 Data Source
Information provided by the Graduation Rates Report prepared by the Educational Data Center using data reported by the institutions.

BL 2016 Methodology
Track incoming first-time, full-time, degree-seeking summer/fall entering undergraduates at Texas public institutions by SSN for six years. Take the number of African-American students that graduate from a Texas public or independent institution and divide by the total number of African-American students in that cohort.

BL 2016 Purpose
Provides information on the success of institutions in regards to successful completion by African-American students.
Agency Code: 781  
Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board  
Goal No. 1  
Objective No. 1  
Outcome No. 13  

Calculation Method: N  
Target Attainment: H  
Priority: M  
Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-01 OC 13  
Key Measure: N  
New Measure: N  
Percent Measure: Y  

**BL 2016 Definition**  
Number of Hispanic students who entered Texas public universities six years ago as first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduates (taking at least 12 semester credit hours) who received a baccalaureate or above degree during that six-year period divided by the total number of Hispanic students who entered Texas public universities six years ago as first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduates (taking at least 12 semester credit hours).

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**  
Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions. The State Auditor’s Office performs enrollment audits on a sample of that data. We do not have data on students that go on to attend and graduate from an out-of-state institution.

**BL 2016 Data Source**  
Information provided by the Graduation Rates Report prepared by the Educational Data Center using data reported by the institutions.

**BL 2016 Methodology**  
Track incoming first-time, full-time, degree-seeking summer/fall entering undergraduates at Texas public institutions by SSN for six years. Take the number of Hispanic students that graduate from a Texas public or independent institution and divide by the total number of Hispanic students in that cohort.

**BL 2016 Purpose**  
Provides information on the success of institutions in regards to successful completion by Hispanic students.
Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code: 781</th>
<th>Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome No.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Measure: N  New Measure: N  Percent Measure: N

**BL 2016 Definition**
Provide accurate and timely information on state financial aid programs (to 100% of FA offices).

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**
Most training events will require manual tracking.

**BL 2016 Data Source**
A log will be maintained to track and report results.

**BL 2016 Methodology**
Number of institutions contacted divided by total number of institutions.

**BL 2016 Purpose**
Assure all participating institutions receive up to date information and training.
Agency Code: 781  
Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board

Goal No. 1  
Coordinate Higher Education

Objective No. 2  
Workforce Academic Affairs and Research

Outcome No. 1  
Texas' Share of Total Fed Funding to High Ed Inst. for R&D in Sci/Eng

Calculation Method: C  
Target Attainment: H  
Priority: H  
Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-02 OC 01

Key Measure: N  
New Measure: N  
Percent Measure: N

BL 2016 Definition
Texas' share of total U.S. federal obligations to higher education institutions for research and development in science and engineering.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
Data are reported by 21 federal agencies. Not all federal agencies report their obligations to the National Science Foundation. The data reflect federal support given to the institutions and not expenditures. The data are reported according to the federal fiscal year: October 1 - September 30. Support to independent institutions is included. The data are generally available by July of the second year following the fiscal year being reported.

BL 2016 Data Source
Federal agencies report their obligations for science and engineering support at higher education institutions to the National Science Foundation. The data are available from the National Science Foundation's web site (WebCASPAR).

BL 2016 Methodology
Data reported for Texas higher education institutions are aggregated. This value is expressed as a percentage of the federal obligations for research and development in science and engineering to higher education institutions across the nation. The actual value reported here shows the share of federal obligations for two years prior to the current year.

BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides an indication of the institutions' progress towards the fourth goal, Closing the Gaps in Research: By 2015, increase the level of federal science and engineering research and development obligations to Texas institutions to 6.5 percent of obligations to higher education institutions across the nation, from 5.5 percent in FY2000.
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OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency Code: 781  Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board
Goal No. 1  Coordinate Higher Education
Objective No. 2  Workforce Academic Affairs and Research
Outcome No. 2  Percentage Increase in Research Expenditures at TX Public Institutions

Calculation Method: N  Target Attainment: H  Priority: M  Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-02 OC 02
Key Measure: N  New Measure: N  Percent Measure: Y

BL 2016 Definition
Percentage increase in total expenditures for the conduct of research and development for the previous state fiscal year as compared to those of the fiscal year previous to that, as reported by Texas public general academic institutions and health science centers.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
Data are reported by institutions.
(Note on Desired Performance: The amount of research expenditures reported by the institutions is dependent upon external factors, including federal grant programs and availability of private funds for research.)

BL 2016 Data Source
Data reported by the institutions are compiled and maintained by the Coordinating Board. The information is published in the Coordinating Board’s annual report titled “Research Expenditures.”

BL 2016 Methodology
The total expenditures for the conduct of research and development for the previous state fiscal year is compared to the total expenditures of the fiscal year previous to that (expressed as a percentage).

BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides an indication of research activities for each public higher education institution in the state.
### BL 2016 Definition

Total number of patent applications accepted by the U.S. Patent Office, copyright applications accepted by the Library of Congress, licensing agreements, and other agreements that are intended to provide income to an institution as a result of the transfer of intellectual property derived from Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program funding.

### BL 2016 Data Limitations

Data are reported by the institutions.

(Note on Desired Performance: This measure is dependent upon external factors.)

### BL 2016 Data Source

Grantees provide data to the institutions on grants completed during the previous year. Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions on final reports for each research project. The collected information is maintained by the Coordinating Board.

### BL 2016 Methodology

Data reported to the Coordinating Board by each institution are aggregated. Because of the grant funding cycle, this measure is reported only in odd fiscal years.

### BL 2016 Purpose

This measure provides feedback on the state-funded Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP) by indicating the number of commercialization efforts resulting from these research programs.
Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency Code: 781 Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board
Goal No. 1 Coordinate Higher Education
Objective No. 2 Workforce Academic Affairs and Research
Outcome No. 4 Educational Achievement

Calculation Method: N Target Attainment: H Priority: M Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-02 OC 04
Key Measure: N New Measure: N Percent Measure: Y

BL 2016 Definition
Percent of program completers at public two-year colleges who receive a workforce education or academic degree or certificate within six years of entering an instructional program.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
Final data are not available until at least one year after program completion.

BL 2016 Data Source
Data are collected through automated reporting systems.

BL 2016 Methodology
Data are submitted annually in the fall by colleges, and the information is reviewed and certified. Data on May graduates are measured in late spring of the following year and used to calculate six-year graduation rates from the Coordinating Board data reports CBM001, CBM009 and CBM00A. The numerator is the number of fall cohort first-time students in public two-year colleges receiving a degree or certificate. The denominator is the number of students in the entire fall cohort. The numerator is divided by the denominator and the result is expressed as a percentage.

BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides an indicator of the educational achievement for students at public two-year colleges.
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OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABESt)

Agency Code:  781  
Agency:  Higher Education Coordinating Board

Goal No.  1  Coordinate Higher Education
Objective No.  2  Workforce Academic Affairs and Research
Outcome No.  5  Entered Employment Rate

Calculation Method: N  
Target Attainment: H  
Priority: M  
Cross Reference: Agy 781  083-R-S70-1  01-02  OC 05
Key Measure: N  
New Measure: N  
Percent Measure: Y

BL 2016 Definition
Percent of program completers in workforce education programs at community and technical colleges who enter employment within one year of completion or continue in higher education, with or without concurrent employment.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
Final data are not available until at least one year after program completion.

BL 2016 Data Source
Data are collected through automated reporting systems and interagency coordination.

BL 2016 Methodology
After data are submitted annually in the fall by colleges, the information is reviewed and certified. The Coordinating Board data reports CBM001, CBM009, and CBM00A are matched by the Coordinating Board to Unemployment Insurance wage records. The numerator is the number of program completers who enter employment within one year of completion or continue in higher education. The denominator is the number of program completers. The numerator is divided by the denominator and the result is expressed as a percentage.

BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides an indicator of the effectiveness of the workforce education programs at community and technical colleges.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code</th>
<th>Agency Code: 781</th>
<th>Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinate Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Workforce Academic Affairs and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome No.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Employment Retention Rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation Method</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-02 OC 06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BL 2016 Definition**

The percent of program completers in workforce education programs at community and technical colleges retaining employment.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

N/A

**BL 2016 Data Source**

Data are collected through automated reporting systems and interagency coordination.

**BL 2016 Methodology**

The Coordinating Board data reports CBM001, CBM009, and CBM00A are matched by the Coordinating Board to Unemployment Insurance wage records for the fourth quarter after program completion. The numerator is the number of program completers who graduated from workforce education programs at community and technical colleges in May and who entered employment and retained employment in the fourth quarter after program completion. The denominator is the number of completers who entered employment. The numerator is divided by the denominator and the result is expressed as a percentage.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

This measure provides an indication of the effectiveness of workforce education programs at community and technical colleges.
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OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency Code: 781  
Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board

Goal No. 1  
Coordinate Higher Education

Objective No. 3  
Provide Planning, Information Svcs and Performance/Accountability Sys

Outcome No. 1  
E&G Deferred Maintenance as Percent of E&G Building Replacement Value

Calculation Method: N  
Target Attainment: L  
Priority: M  
Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-03 OC 01

Key Measure: N  
New Measure: N  
Percent Measure: Y

BL 2016 Definition
Dollar amount of critical deferred maintenance in educational and general space at public universities, health-related institutions, and technical colleges as a percentage of educational and general building replacement value. Critical deferred maintenance consists of projects that place facilities, occupants, or missions at risk if left undone.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
Data are reported to the Coordinating Board by the institutions. Building replacement costs are estimates.

BL 2016 Data Source
Reported by institutions annually on October 15 in the Integrated Campus Planning System (ICPS) maintained by the Coordinating Board.

BL 2016 Methodology
A percentage is obtained by dividing the total dollar amount of critical deferred maintenance in all educational and general space at all public universities, health-related institutions, and technical colleges by the total replacement value of all educational and general buildings.

BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides feedback on the total level of critical deferred maintenance in educational and general space. Each institution's critical deferred maintenance value is used as a factor in the Coordinating Board's approval process for institutional construction requests.
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OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

---

Agency Code: 781  
Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board

Goal No. 1  
Coordinate Higher Education

Objective No. 3  
Provide Planning, Information Svcs and Performance/Accountability Sys

Outcome No. 2  
Requests Acted Upon Within 10 Days

Calculation Method: C  
Target Attainment: H  
Priority: M  
Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 01-03 OC 02

Key Measure: N  
New Measure: N  
Percent Measure: N

---

**BL 2016 Definition**

Informal date service requests – WEB based tracking document created by staff to assign an information request to the appropriate staff person.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

The staff is limited to providing information only for data that is currently available and which they are allowed access.

**BL 2016 Data Source**

Data sources will vary according to the request. Determination of the date the request is acted on will be tracked in the TRAX system as the request date, start date, and finish date.

**BL 2016 Methodology**

Methodology will vary based on the requirements.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

Measure the performance of the THECB to provide timely responses to information requests.
### Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

**Objective Outcome Definitions Report**

84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code</th>
<th>Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>2 Close the Gaps by Improving Affordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1 Provide Programs Which Make Financial Assistance Available to Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome No.</td>
<td>1 % Independent College Students Receiving Tuition Equalization Grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation Method</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cross Reference</th>
<th>Key Measure</th>
<th>New Measure</th>
<th>Percent Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 02-01 OC 01</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BL 2016 Definition**

Percentage of students attending independent colleges in Texas who received grants through the Tuition Equalization Grants Program (TEG) during the fiscal year. (TEG awards may only go to students attending independent institutions.)

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

Unduplicated enrollment figures for a fiscal year are not available until after the due date of the year-end performance measures. Therefore, the percentage is calculated using fall term enrollment numbers only.

**BL 2016 Data Source**

Enrollment data are from the CBM reports submitted to the Coordinating Board by the institutions. The number of awards comes from year-end TEG reports submitted by the institutions.

**BL 2016 Methodology**

The number of students attending independent colleges in Texas who received grants through the Tuition Equalization Grants Program during the fiscal year is divided by the total number of students attending independent colleges in Texas during the fall term of the fiscal year, expressed as a percentage.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

This measure provides feedback on the effect of state funding of the Tuition Equalization Grants (TEG) program.
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OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency Code: 781  Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board
Goal No.  2  Close the Gaps by Improving Affordability
Objective No.  1  Provide Programs Which Make Financial Assistance Available to Students
Outcome No.  2  # Students at Independent Colleges & Universities as % of Total Enroll

Calculation Method: N  Target Attainment: H  Priority: M  Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 02-01 OC 02
Key Measure: N  New Measure: N  Percent Measure: Y

BL 2016 Definition
Number of credit students attending independent colleges and universities in Texas during the fall semester of the fiscal year divided by the total number of credit students attending public and independent colleges and universities in Texas during the fall semester of the fiscal year.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
Enrollment data from the institutions and ICUT are not audited but we have no reason to question their accuracy.

BL 2016 Data Source
Enrollment data for most institutions are from the Independent Colleges and Universities of Texas (ICUT). For non-ICUT institutions, the enrollment data are provided directly by the institutions.

BL 2016 Methodology
The number of credit students attending independent colleges and universities in Texas during the fall semester of the fiscal year is divided by the total number of credit students attending public and independent colleges and universities in Texas during the fall semester of the fiscal year.

BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides feedback on the percentage of all Texas higher education students who attend independent colleges and universities.
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OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency Code: 781 Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board
Goal No. 2 Close the Gaps by Improving Affordability
Objective No. 1 Provide Programs Which Make Financial Assistance Available to Students
Outcome No. 3 % Students Rec. FA Employed through Texas College Work Study Program
Calculation Method: N Target Attainment: H Priority: H Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 02-01 OC 03
Key Measure: Y New Measure: N Percent Measure: Y

BL 2016 Definition
Number of students enrolled in Texas public and independent colleges who received part of their salaries paid through the Texas College Work-Study Program during the fiscal year divided by the total number of students enrolled in Texas public and independent colleges during the fiscal year who received need-based financial aid during the fiscal year.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
Information is submitted to the Coordinating Board by the institutions at the end of the year. Data are not audited but we have no reason to question their accuracy. The number of aid recipients is estimated on the basis of the number of recipients reported in the prior year’s Financial Aid Database Report (FADB). The current year FADB is not certified until after the due date of year-end performance measures.

(Note on Desired Performance: The target is based on historic funding and award patterns. Annual fluctuations can be caused by changes in funding from the state and changes in the awarding philosophy of the institutions which make awards. Colleges may choose to give (1) larger awards to fewer students, or (2) smaller awards to more students. If they choose to exercise the first option, performance will be below the target; if they exercise the second option, performance will be above the target.)

BL 2016 Data Source
The number of work-study awards and the total number of aid awards for the year come from year-end reports submitted by the institutions.

BL 2016 Methodology
The number of students enrolled in Texas public and independent colleges who received part of their salaries paid through the Texas College Work-Study Program (basic program plus mentorship program) during the fiscal year is divided by the total number of students enrolled in Texas public and independent institutions of higher education during the prior fiscal year who received need-based financial aid.

BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides feedback on the effect of funding the Texas College Work-Study Program.
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OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency Code: 781       Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board
Goal No. 2       Close the Gaps by Improving Affordability
Objective No. 1       Provide Programs Which Make Financial Assistance Available to Students
Outcome No. 4       % Teach for Texas Loan Repay Prog. Recip. Teach 3 Years

Key Measure: N       New Measure: N       Percent Measure: Y

BL 2016 Definition
The percentage of Teach for Texas Loan Repayment recipients who have provided eligible teaching service for three consecutive years since receiving their first loan repayment.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
Data is not available for recipients who continue to provide eligible teaching service but do not continue to participate in the loan repayment program.

BL 2016 Data Source
Teaching data are reported by the public school that employs the teacher.

BL 2016 Methodology
The number of Teach for Texas Loan repayment recipients who, for the current academic year, received their third loan repayment award divided by the number of first-year recipients in the same cohort two years earlier.

BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides feedback on the impact of the Teach for Texas Loan Repayment Program.
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OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency Code: 781  
Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board

Goal No.  4  
Close the Gaps by Providing Trusteed Funds for Health Care Education

Objective No.  1  
Provide Programs to Improve Health Care in Texas

Outcome No.  1  
% Family Practice Residency Pgm Completers in Medic Underserved Areas

Calculation Method: N  
Target Attainment: H  
Priority: H  
Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 04-01 OC 01

Key Measure: N  
New Measure: N  
Percent Measure: Y

BL 2016 Definition

The number of Family Practice Residency Program completers who are currently practicing in Texas counties or portions of counties that are designated as Health Professional Shortage Areas (HPSAs) or Medically Underserved Areas (MUAs) divided by the total number of program completers who are currently practicing in Texas.

BL 2016 Data Limitations

(1) Coordinating Board data as reflected by the CBM 00R and Family Practice Residency Roster data are reviewed for completeness and accuracy by Coordinating Board staff; (2) Data collection incompatibility between the Coordinating Board and the Texas Medical Board.

BL 2016 Data Source

(1) CBM 00R completed by residency program or health-related institution official; (2) Texas Medical Board; (3) Texas Department of State Health Services list of federally designated Primary Care Health Professional Shortage Areas (HPSAs) and Medically Underserved Areas (MUAs).

BL 2016 Methodology

The number of Family Practice Residency Program completers who are currently practicing in Texas counties or portions of counties that are designated as Health Professional Shortage Areas (HPSAs) or Medically Underserved Areas (MUAs) is divided by the total number of program completers who are currently practicing in Texas and then expressed as a percentage.

BL 2016 Purpose

This measure provides feedback on the Family Practice Residency Program. It is a goal of the program to achieve a better distribution of family physicians throughout the state and to improve medical care in underserved areas.
## Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

### OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

---

**Agency Code:** 781  
**Agency:** Higher Education Coordinating Board

**Goal No.** 4  
**Close the Gaps by Providing Trusteed Funds for Health Care Education**

**Objective No.** 1  
**Provide Programs to Improve Health Care in Texas**

**Outcome No.** 2  
**Percent Family Practice Residency Pgm Completers Practicing in Texas**

**Calculation Method:** N  
**Target Attainment:** H  
**Priority:** H  
**Cross Reference:** Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 04-01 OC 02

**Key Measure:** N  
**New Measure:** N  
**Percent Measure:** Y

### BL 2016 Definition
The number of known living Family Practice Residency Program completers who are currently licensed to practice medicine in Texas divided by the number of all completers of the program whether or not living or currently licensed to practice medicine in Texas.

### BL 2016 Data Limitations
1. Coordinating Board data as reflected by the CBM 00R and Family Practice Residency Roster data are reviewed for completeness and accuracy by Coordinating Board staff; 2. Data collection incompatibility between the Coordinating Board and the Texas Medical Board.

### BL 2016 Data Source
1. CBM 00R completed by residency program or health-related institution official; 2. Texas Medical Board.

### BL 2016 Methodology
The number of known living Family Practice Residency Program completers who are currently licensed to practice medicine in Texas is divided by the number of all completers of the program whether or not living or currently licensed to practice medicine in Texas and then expressed as a percentage.

### BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides feedback on the Family Practice Residency Program. It is a goal of the program to achieve a better distribution of family physicians throughout the state and to improve medical care in underserved areas.
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OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency Code: 781  Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board
Goal No. 5  Baylor College of Medicine
Objective No. 1  Baylor College of Medicine
Outcome No. 1  % of Baylor College of Medicine Grads Entering TX Residency Programs

Key Measure: Y  New Measure: N  Percent Measure: Y

BL 2016 Definition
Number of Baylor College of Medicine’s MD graduates who were awarded their degrees during the fiscal year and who entered the first year of residency training programs in Texas divided by the total number of Baylor College of Medicine’s MD graduates who were awarded their degrees during the fiscal year.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
The Coordinating Board is dependent on Baylor College of Medicine to provide the information.

BL 2016 Data Source
Baylor College of Medicine.

BL 2016 Methodology
The number of Baylor College of Medicine’s MD graduates who were awarded their degrees during the fiscal year and who entered the first year of: (1) the institution’s affiliated residency training programs; or (2) other residency training programs in Texas, regardless of institutional affiliation, is divided by the total number of Baylor College of Medicine’s MD graduates who were awarded their degrees during the fiscal year.

BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides feedback on the effect of state funding of Baylor College of Medicine students. It is a goal of this program to encourage Baylor students to remain in Texas upon graduation.
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OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency Code: 781  
Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board
Goal No. 5  
Baylor College of Medicine
Objective No. 1  
Baylor College of Medicine
Outcome No. 2  
% Baylor College of Medicine Grads Entering Primary Care Residencies

Calculation Method: C  
Target Attainment: H  
Priority: H  
Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 05-01 OC 02
Key Measure: Y  
New Measure: N  
Percent Measure: Y

BL 2016 Definition
Number of Baylor College of Medicine’s MD graduates who were awarded their degrees during the fiscal year, and who entered an in-state or out-of-state medical residency in family medicine, geriatrics, categorical general internal medicine, emergency medicine, general pediatrics, or obstetrics/gynecology, divided by the total number of Baylor College of Medicine’s MD graduates who were awarded their degrees during the fiscal year.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
The Coordinating Board is dependent on Baylor College of Medicine to provide the information.

BL 2016 Data Source
Baylor College of Medicine.

BL 2016 Methodology
The number of Baylor College of Medicine’s MD graduates who were awarded their degrees during the fiscal year, and who entered an in-state or out-of-state medical residency in family medicine, geriatrics, categorical general internal medicine, emergency medicine, general pediatrics, medicine/pediatrics, or obstetrics/gynecology, is divided by the total number of Baylor College of Medicine’s MD graduates who were awarded their degrees during the fiscal year.

BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides feedback on the effect of state funding of Baylor College of Medicine students. It is a goal of this program to encourage Baylor students to enter primary care residencies upon graduation.
Agency Code: 781  Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board
Goal No. 5  Baylor College of Medicine
Objective No. 1  Baylor College of Medicine
Outcome No. 3  % Students Passing Part 1 or Part 2 of the National Licensing Exam

Calculation Method: C  Target Attainment: H  Priority: M  Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 05-01 OC 03
Key Measure: N  New Measure: N  Percent Measure: Y

BL 2016 Definition
The number of students passing part 1 or part 2 of the USMLE or COMLEX/NBOME on the first attempt during the fiscal year, divided by the total number of students taking part 1 or part 2 for the first time during the fiscal year.

BL 2016 Data Limitations
The Coordinating Board is dependent on Baylor College of Medicine to provide the information.

BL 2016 Data Source
Data provided by Baylor College of Medicine and produced by the National Board of Medical Examiners.

BL 2016 Methodology
The number of students passing part 1 or part 2 of the USMLE or COMLEX/NBOME on the first attempt during the fiscal year is divided by the total number of students taking part 1 or part 2 for the first time during the fiscal year.

BL 2016 Purpose
This measure provides information on the quality of education provided by Baylor College of Medicine.
### Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

**OBJECTIVE OUTCOME DEFINITIONS REPORT**  
84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1  
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code: 781</th>
<th>Agency: Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No. 6</td>
<td>Close the Gaps by Providing Trusteed Funds to Improve Quality/Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No. 1</td>
<td>Provide Programs to Improve Delivery, Quality, and Access to Higher Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome No. 1</td>
<td>Pass Rate on State Cert Exams at Centers for Teacher Educ at TADC Inst</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Measure: Y</td>
<td>New Measure: N</td>
<td>Percent Measure: Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BL 2016 Definition**

Of those students recommended by Texas Association of Developing Colleges (TADC) institutions to take the Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TExES), the percentage of program completers with acceptable initial pass rates.

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

N/A

**BL 2016 Data Source**

Data are provided by institutional end-of-year reports.

**BL 2016 Methodology**

The calculation of the pass rate is the number of successful (i.e., passing) last attempts made by candidates who have finished the specified preparation program requirements divided by the total number of last attempts made by those candidates. The pass rate is based on the examinations required to obtain certification in the field(s) for which the candidate serves his or her internship, student teaching, clinical teaching or practicum.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

This measure provides feedback on the final pass rates of students prepared at the five TADC Centers for Teacher Education.
### Appendix D – Performance Measures Definitions

**Objective Outcome Definitions Report**

84th Regular Session, Base Recon, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code:</th>
<th>781</th>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Higher Education Coordinating Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal No.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Goal:</td>
<td>Indirect Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Objective:</td>
<td>Indirect Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Outcome:</td>
<td>Response Time To Requests for Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation Method:</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Target Attainment:</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Priority:</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Cross Reference: Agy 781 083-R-S70-1 09-01 OC 01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Measure:</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>New Measure:</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent Measure:</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BL 2016 Definition**

Time (in days) to respond to requests for data and information

**BL 2016 Data Limitations**

None.

**BL 2016 Data Source**

Customer Relationship and Feedback Tracking System (CRAFT)

**BL 2016 Methodology**

CRAFT is a computerized system designed to help manage customer contacts and information.

**BL 2016 Purpose**

To help the agency keep track of the time (in days) it takes to respond to requests for data and information it receives in order to assess the agency’s effectiveness in serving its key customers.
Appendix E – Workforce Plan

Agency Overview

The Texas College and University System Coordinating Board was established in 1965 to provide unified planning and development of a comprehensive system of higher education. In 1987 The Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System was renamed the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.

Since being created by the Texas Legislature in 1965, the Board has worked to achieve excellence for the college education of Texas students. The Board provides statewide leadership in achieving excellence in college education through efficient and effective use of resources and the elimination of unnecessary duplication in program offerings, faculties, and campus facilities.

Effective September 1, 2013, the agency is statutorily authorized 280.4 full-time equivalent (FTE) employees, an increase of 5 FTEs from FY 2013. SB 215 included a provision to add the compliance monitoring function with 4 FTEs and $665,000 additional dollars to support this function. Full-time equivalent employees are managed carefully to ensure the ability to staff for federal and grant funded initiatives and other positions that support the vision, mission, goals and performance measures of the Coordinating Board.

Workforce Trends and Factors

Key economic and environmental factors affecting the agency's workforce over the next five years include: turnover, retention, and an aging workforce. The 2013 statewide turnover rate was 17.6 percent for regular full- and part-time classified employees. The statewide turnover rate represents an increase of .3 percent over the 2012 turnover rate of 17.3 percent. The 2013 turnover rate for the Coordinating Board was 12.7 percent, 4.9 percent less than the statewide average.

During fiscal year 2013, statewide retirements increased 10.3 percent over fiscal 2012. Seventy-eight percent of the Coordinating Board workforce is over the age of 40 and 34 percent of the workforce will be eligible to retire within the next five years.

Within the next several years the slow economy will likely continue to recover and the competition to recruit and retain highly skilled employees will intensify. However, if the economic recovery involves a significant inflationary impact, many retirement eligible employees may need to postpone retirement. The Coordinating must consider these different possibilities when planning workforce strategies.

Most demographic experts estimate that the number of people over age of 65 will double over the next few decades. Due to the aging workforce there is a need to develop nontraditional workplace and employment relationships, such as short term assignments. The agency's approach is to retain critical knowledge, provide educational opportunities, and use senior employees as mentors for less tenured staff.
Increasing Diversity

The Coordinating Board continues to emphasize the need for workplace diversity and to strive for a workforce that is reflective of the ethnic and racial composition of the population. The recruitment sources for all job posting has recently been expanded to reach as many minority job seekers as possible and will continue to seek opportunities to enhance the sources of employment recruitment.

Current Workforce Profile

Critical Workforce Skills

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board employs many well-qualified individuals, some with highly specialized skills unique to the agency. There are a number of skills that are critical to the agency's ability to operate effectively, efficiently, and consistently meet the agency's performance measures as well as legislative mandates. These current critical workforce knowledge and skills include the following:

- Knowledge of higher education programs in general;
- Formula Funding and Curriculum Review;
- Legal Expertise;
- Student Loan Bonds;
- Governmental Accounting;
- Project Management;
- Research and Data Analysis;
- Leadership/Management; and
- Information Technology;

Workforce Demographics

The agency currently has a total employee head count of 236 employees in comparison to August 31, 2011, when the total head count was 265. The following charts profile the Agency's workforce that includes both the full and part-time employees. The Coordinating Board's workforce is comprised of 64 percent females and 36 percent males. The gender breakdown is marginally changed since 2011. Seventy-eight percent of the workforce is over the age of 40. Forty-six percent of employees have five years or less service with the Coordinating Board. Notably, in August 2011 the workforce over age 40 was 77 percent as compared to 78 percent as of August 2013.
Workforce Demographic Breakdown as of August 31, 2013

Gender of Workforce

- Male: 36%
- Female: 64%

Tenure in Workforce (in years)

- Under 2: 15%
- 2 - 5: 31%
- 6 - 10: 19%
- 11 - 20: 25%
- 21 - 30: 8%
- Over 30: 1%
Agency Workforce by Job Category:

The following table compares, by EEO Category, African American, Hispanic, and female staffing to the statewide civilian workforce as reported by the Texas Workforce Commission Civil Rights Division.

As of August, 2013, the Coordinating Board's percentages of African American employees in the job categories of Administrative Support and Paraprofessional are representative of the state civilian workforce. However, the agency is under-represented by one person in the Official/Administration and Professional categories, and by four persons in the Technical job category.

Hispanics are representative of the state civilian workforce in the job categories of Official/Administration, Professional, Administrative Support and Paraprofessional but under-represented by four persons in the Technical category.

Females are under-represented in the categories of Official/Administration and Technical by one person; in all other categories females are representative of the civilian workforce.
The agency will continue to enhance recruitment efforts to produce a diverse pool of qualified applicants that reflect the appropriate statewide civilian workforce. The agency will develop an EEO Workforce Action Plan to set-out details for the recruitment, hiring and retention of a workforce that reflects the statewide civilian workforce. The EEO Workforce Action Plan will be regularly reviewed to determine what is working and what initiatives can be added to increase the effectiveness of the plan.

**Employee Turnover**

The State Auditor's Office states, in its annual report on Classified Employee Turnover, three trends that influence employee turnover:

1. During the past five years, turnover has gradually increased from 14.4 percent in fiscal year 2009 to 17.6 percent in fiscal year 2013.

2. Texas had the largest increase in jobs in the nation compared to October 2012. According to the Office of the Comptroller of Public Accounts' Biennial Revenue Estimate 2014-2015, job growth in Texas is projected to outpace the growth in the Texas labor force and result in a continuing decline in unemployment in fiscal years 2014 and 2015.

3. Retirements continued to be a significant portion of separations and accounted for 18.4 percent of total separations in fiscal year 2013. Separations due to retirement
increased by 10.3 percent from fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2013. Retirements increased by 48.2 percent in fiscal year 2013 when compared to five years ago in fiscal year 2009 (SAO Report No. 14-701, p. ii).

Recruitment and retention strategies must be developed and monitored to keep up with the agency's workforce dynamics. According to data from the State Auditor's Office, better pay and benefits continues to be cited among the top reasons employees left employment from their respective state agencies.

Within the next two years the agency plans to analyze and restructure an updated Classification and Pay Plan that will consider market data in the development of the plan. This proposed plan will be developed with the focus of competitive salaries. This action will better equip the agency with the information to improve and align positions with the agency-established philosophy for managing the Plan and with the ability to be competitive.

The following chart compares the Coordinating Board turnover rates to that of the state turnover rate for the last eight years. The agency's turnover has been generally lower than the state's turnover rate with the exception of FY 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Agency Turnover Rate</th>
<th>State Turnover Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Turnover by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age groups under 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age groups between 30 and 39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age groups between 40 and 49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages groups between 50 and 59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age groups over 60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Turnover by Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency tenure under 2 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency tenure between 2 and 5 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency tenure between 6 and 10 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency tenure between 11 and 20 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency tenure between 21 and 30 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency tenure over 30 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Turnover by Ethnicity and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Retirement Eligibility

Retirement from the Coordinating Board does not account for the majority of separations; however, over the next five years it will become critical as the pool of retirement eligible employees increases.

## Projected Retirement Eligibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EEO Classification</th>
<th>Current Workforce</th>
<th>% of Workforce</th>
<th>FY 14</th>
<th>FY 15</th>
<th>FY 16</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
<th>FY 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officials/Administration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para-Professional</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that 78 percent of the Coordinating Board workforce is over the age of 40 and up to 34 percent (81 employees) of the workforce will be eligible to retire in the next five years, requires a serious plan of action to develop and monitor a succession plan for upper level management replacements. The possibility of significant numbers of retirements over the next five years and the expectation that many of these retirements will represent the loss of very highly skilled employees, with specific experience and specialized backgrounds, may require a proactive plan of action to train internal replacements as well as enhance external recruitment. The Coordinating Board will be challenged to replace these retirees with the high skills and education levels necessary to perform the research and analysis functions required.
As identified in the past, predicting future turnover based on retirement eligibility can be difficult. An employee's eligibility to retire is not an accurate indicator of his or her election to retire. Factors that play a major role in the decision to retire could be income requirements, eligibility for insurance, and social security benefits. Regardless of these factors, the agency must be prepared to effectively address future and potential talent and institutional knowledge loss.

**Strategic Goals and Objectives:**

The Coordinating Board's focus for immediate workforce planning initiatives for the next two to five years is on the possibility of large numbers of agency retirements. In addition, there is an initiative to study and develop a viable compensation plan to address agency workforce needs. The agency will develop initiatives to enhance diversity in the applicant pool. A response to the economic outlook requires consideration of possible effects of budget deficits and how the next legislative session may affect the agency workforce.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workforce Plan: Strategic Goals and Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 1: Retention &amp; Recruitment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 2: Alternative to Loss of Critical Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- To ensure that critical positions and functions within the organization have been identified and determine how to address the specific situation.
- Provide assessment tools to division personnel to identify critical position and critical functions performed in the divisions
- Identify employees who could potentially fill critical functions or positions
- Identify agency workforce needs, i.e., skills, education, experience, etc.
| Goal 3: Economic Conditions | **To be prepared in the eventuality that the next legislative session presents budget and or program cuts.**  
To provide quality, thoughtful information for consideration of alternatives. |
| Objective | |
| Strategies | • Monitor legislative issues and provide an alert on issues of concerns  
• Discuss concerns that may affect the agency workforce and identify possible actions |
| Goal 4: HUB Usage | **Contract with Historically Underutilized Businesses (HUBs) to the greatest extent possible**  
Award contracts to the HUBs in Texas in sufficient quantities to meet or exceed HUB participation targets. |
| Objective | |
| Strategies | • Continue to seek bids from at least two certified HUB vendors for all competitive purchases.  
• Update and maintain directories of certified HUB vendors to facilitate bidding processes.  
• Participate in at least two HUB Economic Opportunity Forums per year. |
| Goal 5: Optional Retirement Program | **Communicate the possibility to move Optional Retirement Program (ORP) from THECB to another state agency**  
To work with External Relations on possible legislation to change ORP statute from THECB administration to another state agency. |
| Objective | |
| Strategies | • Communicate the scope of the Optional Retirement Program administration to External Relations.  
• Propose alternative solution to free up Human Resources staff to address critical agency responsibilities. |
Appendix F – Survey of Employee Engagement

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board participated in the Survey of Employee Engagement. The survey is used as a means of improving the organization as a place to work by assessing employee attitudes toward the agency, identifying employee perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the agency, and identifying areas that could be improved. Out of 231 employees who were invited to take the survey, 163 (71 percent) responded. According to the survey analysis, “At 71%, your response rate is considered high. High rates mean that employees have an investment in the organization, want to see the organization improve, and generally have a sense of responsibility to the organization. With this level of engagement, employees have high expectations from Leadership to act on the survey results” (p. 3).

The following chart shows the agency’s workplace constructs that are areas of strength and the comparison to agencies of similar size.

These workplace constructs can be summarized as follows:

- **Physical Environment**
  Work setting is safe and staff have adequate tools and resources
- **Strategic**
  Agency is able to seek out and work with relevant external entities
  Agency creates programs attuned to changing environment
- **Benefits**
  Package plays positive role in attracting and retaining employees
  Health care, vacation, retirement are appealing and provide appropriate flexibility
  Comparable to other jobs, selected to meet individual needs, staff understand benefits plan

In contrast, the following chart shows the agency's workplace constructs that are areas of concern and the comparison to agencies of similar size.

These workplace constructs can be summarized as follows:

- **Pay**
  May not meet comparable positions in similar organizations
  May not be appropriately set to work demands, experience and ability
  May not keep pace with cost of living increases

- **Internal Communication**
  Information does not arrive timely and difficult to find needed facts
  May not be using appropriate technology to facilitate communication
Diversity
Agency may not understand and use creativity coming from individual differences to strengthen organization

The agency has identified a work group that will develop and implement strategies that improve internal communications. Agency leaders consider the survey a valuable tool for improving agency operations. The goal is to sustain the high level of employee participation and improve the internal communications score when the survey is administered again in 2015.
Appendix G – Historically Underutilized Business Plan

In accordance with the Texas Government Code, Chapter 2161, the Texas Administrative Code, Title 34, Part 1, Chapter 20, Subchapter B, Rule§20.15, and the State of Texas Disparity Study, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board is committed to including Historically Underutilized Businesses (HUBs) in the procurement process. All businesses have an equal opportunity to participate in the procurement process with the Coordinating Board.

The Coordinating Board ensures that contracting opportunities for minority and women-owned businesses exist in the agency. The Coordinating Board reported positive results for Fiscal Years 2012 and 2013 with 39.62 percent and 22 percent, respectively, of HUB participation. For the past 18 fiscal years, the Coordinating Board has exceeded the overall statewide average percentage of HUB goals.

Goal

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board is dedicated and committed to including Historically Underutilized Businesses (HUBs) in the procurement process and will continue to make a good faith effort to utilize HUB vendors through four key elements: (1) executive management support; (2) a strong emphasis on HUB vendor solicitation; (3) educating the Coordinating Board employees on the HUB program; and (4) HUB vendor outreach. The agency’s annual goal is to exceed the overall statewide average percentage of HUB participation.

Objectives

Executive Management Support

1. The Coordinating Board will build and maintain HUB vendor relationships, and will identify and contract with a minimum of five new qualified and capable HUB vendors each year.

2. The agency will support inclusion of HUB subcontracting plans in all solicitations in excess of $50,000 to encourage subcontracting when such opportunities exist.

3. The agency will sponsor and support a HUB Mentor-Protégé agreement as well as promote the Statewide HUB Mentor-Protégé program by adding a statement of support to formal procurement solicitations highlighting such opportunities.
Agency Staff Education

The agency will educate workgroups through senior management directives on the agency policy regarding the use of HUB vendors to the fullest extent possible.

HUB Vendor Solicitation

1. The Coordinating Board will offer to provide to all potential contractors a resource list of certified HUB vendors available for subcontracting opportunities for contracts over $50,000.

2. The agency will use good faith efforts to solicit HUB vendors on contract solicitations and will utilize a qualified and capable HUB vendor for contracts under $5,000 to the fullest extent possible.

HUB Vendor Outreach

1. The agency will invite HUB vendors to deliver technical and business presentations as potential contractors, with at least one such HUB presentation conducted per year.

2. The agency will sponsor or co-sponsor an Economic Opportunity Forum when significant new opportunities for outside vendors exists.

3. The agency will participate in at least two external HUB Economic Opportunity Forums per year.

4. The agency established partnerships through Memorandums of Cooperation with Texas Association of African American Chambers of Commerce (TAAACC) and Texas Association of Mexican American Chambers of Commerce (TAMACC) for fiscal year 2014.

External/Internal assessment

The Coordinating Board will continue to make a good faith effort to utilize HUBs through four key elements: (1) executive management support; (2) a strong emphasis on HUB vendor solicitation; (3) educating Coordinating Board employees about the HUB Program; and (4) HUB vendor outreach. A variety of factors, both internal and external, impact and contribute to the goal of increased participation of Historically Underutilized Businesses in Coordinating Board contracts.
Executive Management Support: Opportunities

Increased awareness of the benefits and contributions provided by conducting business with HUB vendors at all levels of management throughout the agency improves the contracting process.

- Coordinating Board members, as leaders throughout the state, understand and support HUB outreach.

Agency Staff Education: Opportunities

- Agency knowledge of the HUB program can lead to additional HUB contracting opportunities.

HUB Vendor Solicitation: Opportunities

- Increasing the number of awarded HUB vendor contracts.
- Increasing the number of contract awards among HUB vendor groups.
- Establishing partnerships through Memorandums of Cooperation with TAAACC and TAMACC.
- Changing statewide HUB reportable object codes so HUBS currently used in categories can be reported.

HUB Vendor Solicitation: Threats

- Underutilization of HUB goals, due to certain HUB categories not correlating to the agency mission and funding.
- Underutilization of HUB goals due to HUB vendors focusing on larger opportunities within state government.
- Underutilization of HUB goals, from possible increased competition for state contracts due to current economic conditions.
- HUBS are used but are not reportable object codes

HUB Vendor Outreach Opportunities

- Network of state agencies leading HUB economic forums encourages development of HUB relationships and contracts.
- Increasing the number of HUB-qualified businesses from which to select.

HUB Vendor Outreach: Threats

- Reduced opportunities to recruit new HUB vendors due to regional or geographic limitations.
- Subject matter expertise for some professional and consultant service contracts may limit HUB vendor participation.
**STRATEGIES**

The Coordinating Board will persist in working towards increased use of HUB vendors in procurement contracts and subcontracts in the categories of professional services, other services, and commodities, as applicable. In support of these goals, the agency identified the following strategies to improve its HUB Program:

Executive Management Support:

- Assist HUB vendors in their ability to compete for contracts by providing procurement guidance and information.
- Stress agency goals regarding HUB vendor participation and support the inclusion of HUB subcontracting plans in all solicitations in excess of $50,000 whenever subcontracting opportunities exist.
- Support external and internal HUB Economic Opportunity Forums to foster outreach;
- Develop and implement a HUB Mentor Protégé Program to promote long-term relationships between prime contractors and HUB vendors
- Continue to maintain a monthly HUB reporting system in order to track HUB utilization; and
- Submit a HUB supplemental letter, with the Coordinating Board's HUB semiannual and annual reports to the Comptroller of Public Accounts.

HUB Vendor Solicitation:

- Allow for maximum participation by all businesses by specifying reasonable and realistic contract specifications, terms, and conditions consistent with the agency's requirements.
- Provide potential contractors with references or sources of certified HUBs available for subcontracting opportunities.
- Utilize all available HUB directories in the appropriate vendor criteria for procurement opportunities.

HUB Vendor Outreach:

- Invite HUB vendors to deliver technical and business presentations regarding their capability to do business with the Coordinating Board;
- Inform the public of the Coordinating Board contract opportunities by sponsoring or co-sponsoring HUB Economic Opportunity Forums when significant new opportunities for outside vendors exists and
- Participate in external HUB Economic Opportunity Forums with the purpose of identifying HUBs capable of providing goods and services and to make procurement opportunities available.
Appendix H - Workforce Development System Strategic Plan

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's Strategic Plan includes this appendix, which summarizes the agency's work with the Texas Workforce Investment Council (TWIC). Topics in this appendix are based upon the TWIC Strategy Statement included in Advancing Texas: Strategic Plan for the Texas Workforce Development System (FY2010-FY2015).

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Strategy Statement

One goal of the Coordinating Board is to assist universities, health-related institutions, community, state, and technical colleges, and individuals in achieving career and workforce-relevant education through program approval, advocacy for funding needs, financial aid, and funding innovative projects, such as early college high schools with a career and technical education focus.

The agency's primary focus within the career and workforce system is the community, state, and technical colleges, which serve as the hub of career and workforce education and training in Texas higher education. This will be accomplished by:

- Achieving the Closing the Gaps goals by increasing student participation rates and successes from high quality programs, including undergraduate degrees and certificates related to career and workforce needs;
- Coordinating data, information, and analysis with the Texas Education Agency (TEA), the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC), and other workforce-system partners;
- Undertaking legislative advocacy for higher education needs;
- Coordinating statewide college- and career-readiness standards and their implementation with the Texas Education Agency;
- Coordinating efforts to enhance and integrate career technical education pathways at two-year and four-year public institutions;
- Coordinating adult basic education, and secondary and postsecondary transitions with the Texas Education Agency and the Texas Workforce Commission; and
- Coordinating programs for special populations and nontraditional students with the state's community, state, and technical colleges that are supported by federal funds (e.g., Carl D. Perkins).
Integrated Workforce Development System Strategic Planning

Texas Government Code, Chapters 2308.104 and 2308.1015, provide that the Texas Workforce Investment Council (TWIC) shall develop a single strategic plan for the Texas workforce system, and that the strategic plan must include goals, objectives, and performance measures for the workforce development system and those state agencies that administer workforce programs. The code further mandates that, upon approval of the strategic plan by the Governor, each agency administering a workforce program shall use that strategic plan in developing the agency’s operational plan. The Governor approved Advancing Texas: Strategic Plan for the Texas Workforce Development System (FY 2010-FY 2015) on October 23, 2009. An update to the plan, incorporating input from all partner agencies, was considered by TWIC in March 2012 and subsequently approved by the Governor on May 24, 2012.

Part 1 Long-term objectives (LTO)

LTO Reference No: S3 Key Actions/Strategies/Outcomes for FY 2010-2015

*Education and training partners will have the infrastructure necessary (policies, procedures, data, processes, rules, and capabilities) to facilitate the effective and efficient transfer of academic and technical dual-credit courses from high schools to community and technical colleges and four year institutions.*

The Coordinating Board, in cooperation with the Texas Education Agency, is continuing to work to improve the level of information provided to parents and students regarding workforce and academic dual-credit programs. TEA and THECB have also contracted with the Texas A&M University’s Education Research Center to conduct a study on the cost effectiveness of, and the funding mechanisms available for, dual-credit courses. These two agencies are working to coordinate data collection and analysis to improve the quality and tracking data available for dual-credit students to ensure the quality, rigor, and availability of dual-credit courses statewide.

In fall 2013, 107,598 students enrolled in dual-credit courses, up from 90,364 students in fall 2010, an increase of 17,234. The majority of these enrollments, 103,128 were at community or technical colleges.

House Bill 5, 83rd Legislature, Regular Session, replaced the minimum, recommended, and distinguished high school graduation plans with the foundation high-school graduation plan and allows for additional career and technical education courses to be used to satisfy high-school curriculum requirements. Additional dual-credit enrollment increases are anticipated because of the expanded partnership opportunities made available through this legislative change.

Senate Bill 31, 83rd Legislature, Regular Session, limited funding to institutions of higher education for dual-credit courses to core-curriculum courses, career or technical education courses in a certificate program or associate degree, or foreign language. Limiting dual-credit course offerings to these...
courses maximizes the likelihood a course will transfer from a community college to a university or prepare students for a career. No enrollment change is anticipated to result from this legislation.

Dual-credit opportunities for students have expanded and additional expansion is anticipated while maximizing effective and efficient course delivery.

LTO Reference No: C3 Key Actions/Strategies/Outcomes for FY 2010-2015

Design and implement integrated Adult Education and workforce skills training programs to enhance employment outcomes for the English language learner population.

The Coordinating Board, in cooperation with the Texas Workforce Commission and the Texas Education Agency, is continuing to increase the number of public two-year institutions with programs that support the integration of adult education and workforce training skills for students transitioning from Adult Education and Literacy (AEL) programs to postsecondary education. These programs support adult second language learners and General Educational Development (GED) certificate seekers in AEL, students in alternative high school completion programs (e.g. Drop-out Recovery), and students assessed at below secondary school skill levels and identified as unsuccessful in traditional Developmental Education coursework. Collaboration with these agencies supports the transition and success of unprepared and underrepresented students in postsecondary education by co-enrolling them in contextualized basic skills instruction and workforce training programs that lead to credentials of value in their regional market.

Specifically, the Accelerate Texas program offers students greater access to entry-level career pathways by providing structured support for English language learners, and/or students pursuing a GED certificate. Accelerate Texas programs are designed to integrate or contextualize basic reading, math, or writing skills with workforce training. Since 2010, the program has served 3,929 students at 21 community and technical colleges. The top three workforce industries for Accelerate Texas students are health professions (42%), business (21%), and precision production (12%). These colleges have awarded 2,792 certificates of completion or the students have earned a state or national certification. As of May 2014, 88 percent (N = 465) of ESL students in the Accelerate Texas program completed a certificate.

Part 2 Issues and Opportunities

Current Issues

- Semester Credit Hour (SCH) limits on associate degree programs, specifically associate of applied science degrees
- Expansion of career and technical education (CTE) dual-credit partnerships and CTE focused early college high schools (ECHS)
Semester Credit Hour Limitations

House Bill 215, 83rd Legislature, Regular Session, limited the maximum number of semester credit hours required to complete an associate degree to the minimum number of hours required by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges, currently 60 SCH. All associate degrees are required to comply with these limits by the start of the fall 2015 semester unless a compelling academic reason to exceed 60 SCH has been identified. The goal of the change is to accelerate the time to degree completion and the opportunity for greater employment success for students.

The Coordinating Board staff has provided each community and technical college with a list of their currently approved degrees and instructions for revising the program inventory or submitting a proposal detailing the compelling academic reason why the program should exceed 60 SCH. Working with all of the community and technical colleges to revise their approved awards will create a significant amount of work for board staff in the coming months.

In addition to providing guidance to the institutions concerning these revisions, the Guidelines for Instructional Programs in Workforce Education (GIPWE) was rewritten to reflect the lower SCH limits for associate degrees. GIPWE is the instructional manual community and technical colleges use to develop associate of applied science degree programs.

The impact of working with the institutions to revise their associate-degree programs to 60 SCH will last for about two years.

Reauthorization of the Carl D. Perkins

The reauthorization of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (Perkins) is a current topic of discussion in Washington, DC. Perkins is the primary federal legislation that provides funding to community and technical colleges for career and technical education (CTE). We are monitoring the activities of Congress as the discussion about reauthorization of the legislation becomes more intense. Numerous revisions to the legislation have been proposed during the last couple of years. One proposal would allow the governor of each state to allocate the money based on state-identified needs.

Coordinating Board staff develop numerous requests for applications each year as part of managing the state’s Perkin’s funding. Each community and technical college receives a basic allocation, or basic grant, and additional leadership projects are also funded. For FY 2014. Coordinating Board staff are currently managing 71 separate Perkin’s grant projects.

Expansion of Career and Technical Education focused Early College High Schools

In response to House Bill 5, 83rd Legislature, Regular Session, and other legislation specific to enhancing career and technical education opportunities for high school students, the Coordinating Board developed a request for applications for early college high schools with a CTE focus. A total of 21 applications were submitted, and four separate projects were selected for funding. Preparing students for the workforce is expected to remain a priority topic in the
coming years. Continued development of projects to promote efficient and effective workforce education is expected to require staff time and resources.

**Emerging Opportunities**

- Educational Pathway Alignment
- Accelerating degree completion and shortening time to degree
- Applied Baccalaureate Degrees

**Pathway Alignment**

In the state of Texas and nationally, business and industry leaders are sounding the alarm that there are not enough skilled workers to meet the demands of the growing economy. Georgetown University’s Center on Education and Workforce estimates that by 2020 65 percent of all US jobs will require postsecondary education and/or skills. Job growth for associate’s degree is projected increase by 19 percent between now and 2018. Employers struggle to fill many high-wage, high-skill jobs in areas such as advanced manufacturing, computer technology, and the health sciences, often referred to as middle-skill workers. Many of these positions require more than a high school diploma but less than a bachelor’s degree. The shortage of middle-skill workers is expected to grow in the coming years as more baby boomers retire.

According to Complete College America, less than 30 percent of full-time community-college students complete an associate’s degree in three years. Part-time students have much lower completion rates.

Time to degree is an issue of concern. Completion rates are usually measured in terms of three and six years for programs designed to complete in two and four years, respectively. Increasingly, completion rates are described in five- and ten-year intervals.

An emerging theory, called the “structured hypothesis,” argues that community-college students who are offered efficient pathways are less likely to repeat college courses and deviate from their original academic goals.

Collectively, the need for high-skill workers to replace the retiring baby boomers, coupled with the limited number of students who earn certificate or degrees, suggests a strong need for clearer pathways between high school, college, and careers that lead to direct labor market entry are needed. Well-defined pathways with seamless linkages between secondary and postsecondary education would address the issue of students not being adequately prepared academically.

One consistent challenge to on-time completion is attributable to the loss of credit hours when making the transition from one institution to another. All courses transfer, but not all apply to a student’s major. Three particular initiatives, two of which are in statute, addresses the applicability of courses to degrees/majors – Core Curriculum, Voluntary Transfer Compacts, Fields of Study (FOS), and Programs of Study (POS). The Core Curriculum has been revised to reduce the number of required semester credit hours and align learning outcomes for completed coursework.
The Voluntary Transfer Compacts are sequences of lower division courses in defined fields that when taken at a two-year institution, participating four-year institutions have agreed to apply to the appropriate degree. However, they are voluntary, unlike FOS, which are in statute.

Several FOS have been developed. However, the existing ones are either obsolete or rapidly becoming obsolete, and additional FOS remain to be developed. The result is that many institutions do not use them and increasingly have not even heard of them. FOS need to be reviewed and revised on a periodic basis to account for changes in disciplines and advances in knowledge. FOS meet the requirement of the “structured hypothesis” by providing a clear pathway from the coursework taken at a two-year college to the coursework taken at a four-year college culminating in a bachelor’s degree.

CTE-specific Programs of Study (POS), developed with input from business and industry, would provide clearer pathways for students, but still be flexible enough to meet the needs of the local community. Statewide alignment of CTE programs will help students transfer from one college in the state to another without having to repeat courses or miss the opportunity of enroll in courses because the sequence of courses at one school does not align with the sequence of courses at another school.

The proposed POS would be developed by bringing together subject matter experts to work on horizontal and vertical alignment of courses to create a seamless pipeline between high school and college, afford greater dual-credit and transfer opportunities, and allow re-entry points for students who have stopped or dropped out of school. The programs of study will provide students opportunities to earn degrees and certificates faster and to build one credential upon another.

Once developed, FOS and POS collectively will create the framework for P-16 alignment and has the potential to shorten the time to degree and improve degree completion rates. This proposed project to develop new and revise existing FOS and POS will build the bridges that guide students from high-school to college and then into the workforce. Alignment of the P-16 pipeline would attract more students to in-demand, middle-skill careers and make student advising easier.

Staff propose the development of FOS and POS to align public community and technical college (CTC) CTE programs with business and industry identified standards to ensure seamless pathways between high school and college CTE programs and direct labor market entry. Further, staff recommend funding be provided to develop FOS and POS and once developed, ensure accuracy through periodic review.

**Accelerating Education**

**Prior Learning Assessment**

A recent article, “The Growing Importance of Prior Learning Assessment in the Degree-Completion Toolkit,” defines prior learning assessment (PLA) as the process by which an individual’s learning is assessed and evaluated for purposes of granting college credit, certification, or advanced standing toward further education or training. Prior learning assessment is not a new concept in higher education, however, it is becoming an important topic. The current emphasis is driven by several different factors, including the large number of veterans returning from overseas, the state and national emphasis on degree completion, and the increasing number of nontraditional educational service
providers, such as Kahn Academy.

In higher education today, adults are returning to school to complete a degree or credential they began earlier, begin a degree after spending time in the workforce, or change careers. College-level learning acquired outside the classroom—on the job, in corporate training, in the military, or through self-guided study—can be assessed for college credit that can be applied to their educational goals. Additionally, the Department of Education recommends PLA strategies to help displaced adult workers obtain academic credit for knowledge and skills learned outside the classroom, decreasing the time required to earn a certificate or other credential and reenter the workforce.

**Micro-Credentialing and Badges**

Another article, “Giving Credit Where and When It Is Due: Adventures in Digital Credentials and Badges,” discusses how non-degree granting organizations are credentialing students with digital badges. Micro-credentials and badges allow students to provide evidence of knowledge and skills acquired through a wide range of life activity, often at the task or activity level, and at a pace that keeps up with individuals who are always learning—even outside the class. The concepts of micro-credentialing and badging in higher education are analogous to the just-in-time inventory systems developed by business and industry in the 1980s. As an overly simplified example, students can learn the skill they need tomorrow today.

**Competency-Based Education**

Western Governors University (WGU) website describes their competency-based education (CBE) model as a having a “prove it” mentality. Each degree at WGU is both a collection of courses and a collection of competencies. Each competency is associated with the knowledge and skills students need in order to be successful. Similar to prior learning assessment, CBE allows students to master content at an accelerated pace. Students who enter a program with an existing level of knowledge or skill are allowed to document specific competencies through direct assessment or another means and thus progress more rapidly than is possible in a traditional semester or clock-hour program. CBE programs often target student populations similar to those discussed in the PLA section above.

Many institutions of higher education, particularly community and technical college workforce programs, are developing and offering CBE programs

**The Impact on Coordinating Board staff**

Prior learning assessment, micro-credentialing and badges, and competency-based education models are all potential game changers for the traditional model of higher education. The historical higher education model is built on the concept of “seat time.” Classes are structured to fit into a 16-week semester, often scheduled at a time convenient for the instructor or institution, not the student. Not only is the model itself built on inflexible time durations, the traditional higher education funding formula is based on the number of contact hours that a student receives instruction. Emergent educational models discard the concept of seat time and instead depend on the demonstration of mastery of necessary knowledge and skills.

As these emergent models become the new norm, or at least assimilated into the current model,
Coordinating Board staff will need to evolve and adapt as well. To the extent that these models transform the way that colleges function, they will transform the Coordinating Board’s oversight of higher education in the state of Texas.

**Applied Baccalaureate Degrees**

Texas has seen significant expansion of higher education in recent years. Yet many workforce-development needs, particularly those requiring additional baccalaureate degrees, remain unmet in some areas of the state. Employers and students are calling for additional programs to develop workplace skills and to provide opportunities for career advancement. Increasing workers’ levels of education still further would also benefit individuals and society. Baccalaureate-level needs have been served primarily by universities, sometimes in partnership with community colleges, where a large percentage of students complete the first portion of their degree programs. Community colleges are particularly important for first-generation college students from low-income families and for older students, many of whom work while enrolled in classes.

States are increasingly exploring a greater role for community colleges in baccalaureate-level education. As of 2014, 17 states including Texas allow at least some community colleges to offer bachelor’s degrees. Texas currently limits this authority to three community colleges. On May 22, 2013, the Texas Legislature approved Senate Bill 414, mandating a study to consider further expanding community college baccalaureate degrees in Texas. The Coordinating Board asked the RAND Corporation to partner with the Texas Higher Education Policy Institute (HEPI) to conduct the study.

The completed study was approved by the Board in July 2014 and forwarded to the legislature. Statutory change will be required before additional community and technical colleges can offer baccalaureate degrees. If community and technical colleges are granted additional baccalaureate degree granting authority in the upcoming legislative session, it is anticipated that Coordinating Board staff will receive additional degree program submissions from the colleges, thus increasing staff workload.
Appendix I – Report on Customer Service

Executive Summary

Texas Government Code, Section 2114, requires state agencies and institutions of higher education to develop customer service standards and implement customer satisfaction assessment plans. By June 1 of every even-numbered year, a report on customer service is submitted to the Governor’s Office of Budget, Planning and Policy and the Legislative Budget Board.

This report provides a general description of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB), its Compact with Texans, and a list of external customers. It also provides the information-gathering methods used to assess the agency’s performance on its customer service standards, an analysis of the findings, a table of customer service quality elements, a list of FY 2013 - 2014 estimated performance measures, and suggestions for improvements.

Overall, 54 percent of the survey respondents were satisfied with the services they received from the agency. The majority of the comments and suggestions for improvements centered on the need for THECB staff to provide more courteous and thorough responses to requests for information as well as improvements to the content and user-friendliness of the agency’s website.

Since the FY 2011 - 2012 Customer Service Report, the THECB has implemented a new system to track customer service and student complaints called the Customer Relationship and Feedback Tracking (CRAFT) System. The CRAFT System is a web-based application that organizes, tracks, and automates all customer-related contacts with the agency, including contacts via email, telephone, and the Internet. The agency anticipates that, when fully implemented, the CRAFT System will allow agency employees to track all customer inquiries and provide an efficient and effective way of responding to customers and monitoring the quality of staff responses.
Agency Description

Created by the Texas Legislature in 1965 to ensure quality and efficiency in public higher education, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) works closely with the state’s higher education institutions, public education entities, businesses, community groups, and other stakeholders to achieve the goals of the state’s higher education plan, Closing the Gaps by 2015.

Closing the Gaps has four goals:

- Close the Gaps in Participation - By 2015, close the gaps in participation rates across Texas by enrolling 630,000 more students.
- Close the Gaps in Success - By 2015, award 210,000 undergraduate degrees, certificates, and other identifiable student successes from high quality programs.
- Close the Gaps in Excellence - By 2015, substantially increase the number of nationally recognized programs or services at colleges and universities in Texas.
- Close the Gaps in Research - By 2015, increase the level of federal science and engineering research and development obligations to Texas institutions to 6.5 percent of obligations to higher education institutions across the nation.

The THECB performs the following major functions to carry out its mission and statutory obligations:

- Provides a statewide perspective for efficient and effective use of higher education resources and eliminates unnecessary duplication;
- Develops and evaluates progress toward a long-range higher education master plan and provides analysis and recommendations to link state higher education spending to long-range master plan goals;
- Collects and makes accessible state higher education data and aggregates and analyzes data to support policy recommendations;
- Makes recommendations to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of transitions between high school and postsecondary education, between institutions of higher education for transfer purposes, and between postsecondary education and the workforce; and
- Administers programs and trusteed funds for financial aid and other grants to achieve the state’s long-range goals.

These and other functions affect the state’s higher education community, including over 1.6 million students, 148 public and private institutions of higher education (includes 50 public community college districts; 38 public four-year universities; 3 public state colleges; 4 campuses in the Texas State Technical College System; 9 public health-related institutions; and 44 non-
profit, independent institutions of higher education), for-profit career colleges and schools, business entities, community-based organizations, educational associations, the media, public school districts, researchers, other state agencies, and state/federal legislative offices.

**Compact with Texans**

The THECB is committed to meeting the highest customer service standards. By way of its *Compact with Texans*, the THECB is committed to professional service, responsiveness, effective communication, and follow-through with customers. Customers can expect THECB employees to be courteous, knowledgeable, and efficient when providing services. The THECB is dedicated to the continual improvement of service delivery, using customer comments to help improve services and minimize response times.

Standard response times for agency services, not related to financial aid, are as follows:

- General information requests not requiring research and analysis are acknowledged and answered within one day. Information requests that require either new data to be collected or existing data to be compiled in a new format may require additional days to respond.
- Information requests requiring research are processed within 10 working days.
- Academic and technical degree program proposals submitted by public institutions of higher education are deemed complete within five working days upon receipt of the proposal. Doctoral program proposals are considered within one year following submission of a completed proposal.

Response times for financial aid services are as follows:

- Responses to the majority of phone calls for the loan programs, student grants and special programs, and loan repayment programs are provided in less than two minutes.
- During peak periods, response times to calls made to a loan representative are approximately four to six minutes.
- Requests for loan deferments and correspondence regarding loan accounts are processed within seven working days.
- Loan applications are processed within three working days.
- Payments are applied to accounts the same day they are received.
- Loan repayment program applications are acknowledged and receive first review within five working days.
- Responses to online loan repayment program inquiries are provided within three working days.
- Requests for loan repayment program data are generally answered within one working day, unless additional research is needed.
- Loan repayment award payments are requested within five working days of the final application review.
Customers may file a complaint related to THECB activities with the agency’s customer relations representative. The customer relations representative refers complaints and inquiries to the appropriate agency personnel for resolution and maintains a tracking system. When complaints are not resolved within 10 working days, the customer relations representative intervenes to facilitate resolution, referring the matter to the appropriate assistant commissioner if necessary. Matters not able to be resolved by an assistant commissioner are forwarded to the Commissioner for resolution. For quality control, the customer relations representative may follow up on complaints that have been resolved by a division.

Current, former and prospective students may file a complaint against an institution of higher education in Texas only after exhausting the institution’s grievance/complaint process. All submitted complaints must include a completed student complaint form, a signed Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) Consent and Release form, and a THECB Consent and Agreement Form. Submitted complaints regarding students with disabilities are also required to have a signed Authorization to Disclose Medical Record Information form. These forms are available on the agency’s website.

**Inventory of External Customers**

The following table is an inventory of the THECB’s external customers organized by strategies listed in the 2014-2015 General Appropriations Act. A brief description of the types of services provided to external customers is also provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Customer</th>
<th>Description of Services Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Coordinate Higher Education (A.1.1. - A.3.2.)</td>
<td>Students, institutions of higher education, policymakers, businesses, community and educational organizations, researchers, public citizens</td>
<td>Implement initiatives in partnership with other institutions/organizations to increase the number of students enrolling in and graduating from Texas institutions of higher education. Administer and process low-interest loans, grants, and special programs for students pursuing a certificate or degree program at public and private institutions of higher education. Implement and administer initiatives to increase the college readiness of public high school graduates to prepare them to successfully complete a college-entry course or to enter the skilled workforce. Provide strategic planning, information (data and research), and evaluation of programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Information-Gathering Methods

The data collection method utilized was a Likert-scale survey (see Attachment A) made available from the THECB’s Website. A link to the survey is also automatically provided in the agency’s responses to online requests for information. Survey responses were collected from September 1, 2013, through May 1, 2014. Out of 6,046 individuals who were surveyed, only 172 responded, yielding a 0.03 percent response rate. Due to the low response rate, confidence intervals and standard errors could not be determined. The THECB’s diverse customers make a statistically valid sample impractical. Further, limited information was collected on the assessment of the quality of the THECB’s facilities and complaint process. Because of the types of services the agency provides, almost all of the THECB’s customers rely on services provided at a distance and do not physically access agency facilities. In addition, the majority of the complaints the agency receives are in regard to an institution of higher education rather than the agency itself.
Analysis of Findings

Demographics

Respondents were self-categorized as: student (34 percent), public citizen (19 percent), parent (15 percent), public institution of higher education (13 percent), career college or school (4 percent), private institution of higher education (4 percent), researcher (2 percent), educational association (2 percent), business entity (2 percent), state or federal legislative office (1 percent), public school district (1 percent), community-based organization (1 percent), and the news media (1 percent). The remaining respondents did not answer this question.

The gender breakdown of respondents was 50 percent female and 46 percent male; 4 percent did not respond to this question. The racial/ethnic backgrounds of the respondents were as follows: Anglo American/White – 48 percent; Hispanic – 19 percent; African American – 12 percent; Other – 13 percent; No response – 8 percent.

Sixty-seven percent of the respondents indicated that they had contact with THECB staff once within the last 12 months; 26 percent had contact two to five times over the same time period; and 6 percent had contact five or more times. Fifty-five percent of the respondents indicated that they had interaction with the agency for one year or less; 20 percent had interaction with the agency for two to five years; and 25 percent had interaction with the agency for five years or more.

Results by Performance Measure

Customers were asked to indicate how strongly they agree or disagree with each of the following statements as they relate to the services they received, and were asked to skip those items that did not apply. Fifty-four percent of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement “Overall, I am satisfied with my experience,” while 14 percent agreed; 4 percent disagreed; 23 percent strongly disagreed; and 5 percent were neutral. The tables on the next several pages provide the results for each performance measure.
Overall Satisfaction – "Overall, I am satisfied with my experience."

Facilities – "If I visited the facility, it was clean and orderly."
**Staff Knowledge** – "If I interacted with staff, staff members were knowledgeable and helpful."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Courtesy** – "If I interacted with staff, staff members were courteous and professional."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Received Information – “If requested, I received the information I needed to obtain services.”

Website – “If I visited the website, it was easy to use, well organized, and contained accurate information.”
Complaints – “If I filed a complaint, it was handled in a reasonable and timely manner.”

Request for Services – “If I called, wrote, emailed, or made a request for services, it was handled in a reasonable and timely manner.”
Printed Material—"If I received printed material, it provided thorough and accurate information."
Table of Customer-Determined Service Quality Elements

This table summarizes survey results for all customer-determined service quality elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If I visited the facility, it was clean and orderly.</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I interacted with staff, staff members were knowledgeable and helpful.</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I interacted with staff, staff members were courteous and professional.</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If requested, I received the information I needed to obtain services.</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I visited the website, it was easy to use, well organized, and contained accurate information.</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I filed a complaint, it was handled in a reasonable and timely manner.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I called, wrote, emailed, or made a request for services, it was handled in a reasonable and timely manner.</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I received printed material, it provided thorough and accurate information.</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with my experience.</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table identifies FY 2013 - 2014 estimated customer service performance measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Surveyed Customer Respondents Expressing Overall</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Services Received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Surveyed Customer Respondents Identifying Ways to</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Service Delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Customers Surveyed</td>
<td>6,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Customers Served</td>
<td>1.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Customer Surveyed</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanatory Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Customers Identified</td>
<td>1.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Customer Groups inventoried</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Complaints and Suggested Improvements**

Out of 6,046 inquiries received from September 1, 2012, to May 1, 2014, 32 were categorized as complaints. Most of these complaints were against a Texas institution of higher education. Three complaints were against the agency and were related to student financial aid.

Out of the 172 respondents to the customer service survey, 79 provided comments. Twenty-eight (or 35.4 percent) of the comments received were favorable towards the quality and efficiency of the agency’s customer service; 32 (or 40.5 percent) were negative. Twenty-four of the 79 respondents provided suggestions for improvements. These suggestions mostly focused on the need for website improvements, particularly for student loan borrowers. Specifically, respondents suggested providing more information on the website about loan accounts such as payment history; making the website more user-friendly for borrowers to make online loan payments and to update personal contact information; and to lessen the amount of information available on the website in order for users to navigate it more easily. Other suggestions included the need to
improve the professional courtesy of customer service representatives and to provide more direct, accurate, and thorough responses to customer inquiries.

Next Steps/Conclusion

The THECB is committed to improving the quality and efficiency of its customer service. To address complaints relating to the agency’s website, THECB staff will seek funding to redesign the website in order to make it more user-friendly. Additionally, the agency recently launched a new web-based application called the Customer Relationship and Feedback Tracking (CRAFT) System. The CRAFT System is a centralized database that organizes, tracks, and automates all customer-related contacts, including contacts via email, telephone, and the Internet. When an inquiry is recorded in the system, an automatic due date is assigned to that inquiry based on the level of priority and in accordance with the agency’s Compact with Texans.

The CRAFT System is based on a work flow capability in which staff can delegate tasks and activities to other staff who have the expertise and oversight to follow-up on a particular inquiry. The system maintains a complete documentation of all actions related to a particular inquiry and provides standard reports to track performance measures. The system also has a strong query capability based on type of inquiry, customer, etc.

The agency launched the CRAFT System in February 2014 in a few departments. Training of loan program staff was completed as of May 2014. Ultimately, the loan program staff will be the largest group of users of the system because this department gets the bulk of customer inquiries. Staff members within other agency departments will be trained over the next several months, and the agency-wide implementation of the CRAFT System is scheduled to be completed before the end of 2014.

As of April 2014, 98 inquiries had been entered into the new system. Of those 98 inquiries, 83 have been resolved and 15 were in progress. Of those 98 inquiries, 23 were student complaints against an institution of higher education; 22 were from the media; 9 were from the Texas Legislature; and the remainder were from the general public, including parents and businesses. Agency staff anticipate that the CRAFT System will provide an efficient and effective way of responding to customer inquiries as well as improve the ability to monitor the timeliness and quality of staff responses.

Customer Service Survey

To better serve you, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board appreciates you taking the time to complete this survey.

Please note:

- For each of the following statements, select the one which most clearly reflects your answer. You may skip items that do not apply.
- This survey is anonymous and we do not collect information which allows for identification of individuals.
- If you do not have any experience with an item, mark "N/A" or "Not Applicable".
How many times have you had contact with the THECB staff in the past 12 months?

- Once  
- 2-5  
- 5 or more

Indicate how long you have interacted with this agency.

- 1 year or less  
- 2-5 years  
- 5 or more years

Which customer type would you consider yourself (mark only one):

- Business Entity
- Career College or School
- Community-Based Organization
- Educational Association
- News Media
- Parent
- Private Institution of Higher Education
- Public Citizen
- Public Higher Education Institution
- Public School District
- Other Texas State Agency
- Researcher
- State or Federal Legislative Office
- Student
Indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following regarding the service you received and please skip those which do not apply:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If I visited the facility, it was clean and orderly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I interacted with staff, staff members were knowledgeable and helpful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I interacted with staff, staff members were courteous and professional.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If requested, I received the information I needed to obtain services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I visited the website, it was easy to use, well organized, and contained accurate information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I filed a complaint, it was handled in a reasonable and timely manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I called, wrote, emailed, or made a request for services, it was handled in a reasonable and timely manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I received printed material, it provided thorough and accurate information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with my experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provide any suggestions to improve the quality of our customer service:

My race/ethnicity is:
- African-American
- Anglo-American/White
- Asian-American/Native American
- Mexican-American/Hispanic
- Multiracial/Other

My gender is:
- Female
- Male