

PLANNING COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY

Monday, April 19, 2021

9:00 am

Zoom Web Conference

In Attendance: Dr. Ayodel Akinola, Amber Anaya, Anne Flesher, Alyssa Fromelius, Adine Stormoen, Amy Williams, Barbara Evans, Barbara Walden, Cheryl Cardoza, Cynthia Pierrott, Cecilia Vigil, Darian Richards, Elena Bubnova, Elise Bunkowski, Estela Gutierrez, Gwendolyn Clancy, Hieu Do, Heather Haddox, Dr. Julie Ellsworth, Dr. Joan Steinman, Dr. Karin Hilgersom, Kofi Poku, Kim Studebaker, Dr. Melissa Deadmond, Dr. Natalie Brown, Dr. Paul Allen, Thomas Dobbert, Dr. Tina Ruff, YeVonne Allen, Dr. Dana Ryan, Maggie Dostal, Valerie Kelley

Website Housekeeping: Update of President's Advisory Council Language

Dr. Dana Ryan reviewed with the Council the updated proposed changes to the TMCC Bylaws language. Edits were made based off of feedback from the Council at the March 2021 meeting and recommendations from the Faculty Senate. Language changes include adjusting section headings from "Organization" to "Governance" and Section B to Shared Governance and Planning with updates to B2: Planning Council. Following a motion to approve by YeVonne Allen with a second from Dr. Ayodele Akinola, the Council agreed unanimously to accept the changes. The language updates document may be viewed in the full minutes to be posted to the Planning Council webpage and changes will be reflected on the TMCC Bylaws webpage.

Key Performance Indicators Review and Goal Setting

Dr. Melissa Deadmond, Associate Dean of Assessment and Planning, gave a general review of changes to Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to the Council before members broke out into 30 minute individually KPI focused review groups where they discussed goals and priorities of the indicators. Each group reported back to the entire Council for additional discussion. The changes will be reviewed once more before being finalized at the May 2021 Planning Council meeting. Changes recommended by indicator can be viewed in the full minutes to be posted to the Planning Council Webpage.

Planning Council Committee Updates

- Academic and Student Services Committee
 - Estela Gutierrez, Vice President of Student Services and Diversity, noted the committee had not yet met since the last Planning Council meeting. At the next meeting they will be tackling dual enrollment. Estela further explained an NSHE task force is working to expand dual enrollment within the state by having a common goal and price point.
- Accreditation Committee
 - o Dr. Deadmond reported that work in preparing for our 7 year report continues. The committee will next be looking for groups to assist in writing standards. They will also focus on Standard 1C at the next meeting and welcome additional faculty involvement as part of the discussion.
- Budget Committee
 - No report at this time.
- Diversity Committee
 - o Adine Stormoen, Veterans Upward Bound Specialist, reported on projects and initiatives of the Diversity Committee including participation in the 2021 Northern Nevada Diversity Summit held April 8, a Book Club that has been planned for the year, the Faculty of Color Coalition Co-chair election, a "Digitize it, don't print it" resolution from the Sustainability Champions and Safe Zone training. It was also noted that the ADA Committee will present its annual report to the Planning Council at the May 2021 meeting.
- Enrollment Management Committee
 - o Associate Vice President Elena Bubnova, reported that the committee met on April 8 and are entering their busy season. The committee discussed Summer and Fall enrollment. Preliminary discussion on indicators are that the numbers are trending downward but hopefully following enrollment opening to all on April 22 we will see a correction. The committee recognizes that this is a challenging year as recruiters are not able to physically be in High Schools. Exploration into an initiative to identify student with accumulated credits without graduating has begun to see if it would be helpful in moving student along to finish their area of study. The Enrollment Management Committee will continue to work through the Summer as next year is an important count year.
- Facilities Committee
 - o Dr. Ayodele Akinola, Assistant Director of Facilities Operations, provided project updates to the Council including Red Mountain 325 Lab design, Meadowood South elevator modernization, Redfield paving and sealing and ongoing coordination for the TMCC and TMCC High School Commencement ceremonies.
- Technology Committee

Thomas Dobbert, Chief Technology Officer, reported that they are working on life cycle replacements. IT may ask for laptop loaners to be returned if needed for classrooms.

Constituency Updates

- Student Government Association
 - Darian Roberts, Student Government Association Vice President, reported on the events and initiatives of the SGA including a Caesar Chavez event they were able to co-host, health vending machine options research, a campus engagement project and continued focus on Open Education Resources. Also, SGA elections have closed and new officers will begin June 1.

Classified Council

o Amber Anaya, reporting on behalf of Classified Council President Julia Bledsoe, noted that the Council last met on April 15 where questions and concerns about Stage 3 were discussed. A Symposium BBQ will be held tentatively on July 22. The Council continues to work on creating a recipe book and exploring possible recipe feature to the Café Verde menu.

Faculty Senate

o Faculty Senate Chair, YeVonne Allen, noted that the Faculty Senate met on April 1. Amy Cavanaugh was confirmed as nominee for Chair Elect. At large senate voting for to additional seats opened today. Marynia Giren-Nivarro will Chair the Professional Standards Committee. Also at the April 1 meeting the Senate approved TMCC Bylaws revisions from the previous Planning Council meeting, addressed stance against proposed changes to the dual enrollment system and the Administrative Faculty Committee is looking at workspaces for home coming.

Next Meeting: Monday, May 10, 2021

Proposed Language Updates in TMCC Bylaws, Article III

https://www.tmcc.edu/president/tmcc-bylaws

Article III: Organization of the College

- Section A: Definitions
- Section B: Organization of the Administration
- Section C: Organization of the Faculty
- Section D: Organization of the Classified Staff
- Section E: Organization of Students
- Section F: Committees

Proposed Changes -

Article III: Shared Governance of the College

- Section A: Definitions
- Section B: Shared Governance &
 - Planning
- o Section C: Faculty Governance
- o Section D: Classified Staff
 - Governance
- o Section E: Student Governance
- o Section F: Committees

Suggested changes -

Section A: Definitions

- 1. **Academic Faculty.** Academic faculty means instructional, counseling and library faculty as defined by the Board of Regents Handbook. Faculty on a range-zero contract are not eligible for tenure or sabbatical leave. If range-zero faculty become tenure-track faculty, up to three years of uninterrupted full-time employment in range-zero position may apply toward tenure.
- 2. **Adjunct Faculty.** Adjunct faculty are persons qualified to provide special services to the College on a part-time volunteer basis and receive no compensation from the NSHE.
- 3. **Administrators.** Administrators are administrative faculty employed in executive, supervisory, or support positions as defined in the Board of Regents Handbook. Administrators are appointed by and serve solely at the pleasure of the President of the College.
- 4. **Classified Staff.** Classified staff are employed to provide technical, maintenance and clerical support to the administration and faculty. Terms and conditions of their employment are set forth in the NRS 281, 284 and NAC 281, 284.
- 5. **Department Chairs.** Department Chairs are academic faculty positions, which have additional administrative duties associated with the operations and management of a department/unit of the College. Department Chairs may have a reduced instructional workload, additional contracted days and/or stipends to compensate them for additional responsibilities. Department Chairs duties and compensation are further defined by the TMCC-NFA Contract
- 6. **Emeritus Faculty.** Emeritus/emerita status is an honor that may be awarded to full-time faculty who retire after distinguished and long-term achievement and service to TMCC. Recommendations for emeritus/emerita status will be based upon appropriate review processes and shall be approved by the President. Normally a minimum of ten years service is required prior to conferral of the title of emeritus/emerita. The President shall provide five working days notice to the institutional Faculty Senate prior to approving emeritus/emerita status.
- 7. Faculty. "Faculty" means the professional staff, as established in the NSHE Board of Regents Handbook.
- 8. Part-Time Faculty. A temporary part-time faculty member is an employee of TMCC who:
 - 8.1. Is issued a "letter of appointment" and is employed for a period of not more than ninety consecutive days; or
 - 8.2. Is issued a "letter of appointment" and is employed less than half-time for a period of more than ninety consecutive calendar days, but less than twelve months; or
 - 8.3. Is issued a "letter of appointment with benefits" and is employed half-time or more for a period of
 more than ninety consecutive calendar days, but less than twelve months.
- 9. **The President.** The President of TMCC is an officer of the NSHE. The duties and responsibilities of the President are set forth in the Bylaws of the Board of Regents. The President is responsible for the organization and operation of the College in conformance with the NSHE Board of Regents Handbook and with the Constitution and laws of the State of Nevada.
- 10. **Students.** Persons currently enrolled at TMCC are members of the student body.
- 11. **Temporary Faculty.** A temporary full-time faculty member is an employee of TMCC who is issued a temporary full-time contract for a period of up to one year.

- 12. **TMCC-NFA Contract.** The TMCC Nevada Faculty Alliance (TMCC-NFA) has been elected as the sole and exclusive representative for purposes of collective bargaining activities as described in the <u>Board of Regents Handbook</u> (*Title 4, Chapter 4*), for all professional employees (including but not limited to instructional, counseling, and library faculty) employed by TMCC in the professional service of the System for a period exceeding six months at .50 FTE or more, but excluding adjunct faculty and administrative faculty. A bargaining agreement, called the TMCC-NFA Contract, has been duly entered into by both parties. The agreement controls certain aspects of professional employee rights, responsibilities, compensation and other working conditions for those faculty covered by the agreement.
- 13. **Unit Administrator.** A unit administrator is an administrator who evaluates academic and/or administrative faculty as defined in Article III, Section A, Numbers 1 and 3 of these Bylaws.

Section B: Shared Governance & Planning

The President's Cabinet and Planning Council. For the purpose of coordination of efforts and generating recommendations on matters of personnel policy, institutional mission, long-term planning and College policy, these Bylaws authorize the formation of an administrative group to be known as the President's Cabinet and a shared governance team to be known as the Planning Council.

1. President's Cabinet

- 1.1. Membership in the President's Cabinet. The President shall designate the composition of the President's Cabinet. President's Cabinet shall include the Chair (or Chairs' designee) of the Faculty Senate, Classified Council, and the Student Government association, and others designated by the President. The President shall serve as the chair of the President's Cabinet
- 1.2. Meetings of the President's Cabinet. The President shall establish a regular meeting schedule for the President's Cabinet to allow a forum for deliberation of matters of administrative concern, institutional mission, and College policy.
- 1.3. Actions of the President's Cabinet. President's Cabinet actions are advisory only; the President shall
 have final authority regarding all actions recommended by the President's Cabinet.

2. Planning Council

- 2.1. Membership in the Planning Council. The Planning Council represents both constituent groups and functional areas. The President shall serve as the Chair of the Planning Council.
 - A representative of the following constituent groups shall be included: Faculty Senate, Classified Council, Student Government, Nevada Faculty Alliance, and part-time faculty. Additional constituent group representation may be designated by the President.
 - 2. The functional members shall include members of the Leadership Team, Deans, Directors, Legal Counsel, and others designated by the President.
- o **2.2.** Meetings of the Planning Council. The President shall establish a regular meeting schedule for the Planning Council to allow a forum for deliberation of matters of strategic planning and College policy.
- 2.3. Actions of the Planning Council. Planning Council actions are advisory only; the President shall have final authority regarding all actions recommended by the Planning Council.
- 2.4. Subcommittees of the Planning Council. The Planning Council shall oversee a subcommittee structure to accomplish specific planning tasks or gather input. Subcommittees and/or task forces will be formed as needed. Subcommittees will provide regular status and progress updates to the Planning Council.
- 3. **Administrative Representation on Committees.** Whenever administrative participation is required on institutional committees, the President shall consider recommendations from the President's Cabinet regarding committee membership.
- 4. **Administrative Organization.** Creation, abolition or substantial alteration in the organization of administrative units within TMCC shall be approved only after prior consultation with the Faculty Senate. For those changes requiring Board approval under Title 4, Chapter 14, Section 10, final action shall require the approval of the Board of Regents upon the recommendation of the President through the Chancellor.

Section C: Faculty Governance

1. Faculty Senate. These Bylaws authorize the formation of a Faculty Senate as required by the NSHE Code.

- 2. Membership in the Faculty Senate. All faculty members of TMCC shall be represented in the Faculty Senate.
- 3. **Bylaws of the Faculty Senate**. The Faculty Senate shall develop bylaws for its governance. All such Faculty Senate Bylaws shall be in conformance with the TMCC Bylaws and the Board of Regents Handbook and approved by the President of the College. Where the Faculty Senate Bylaws conflict with the provisions of either of these documents, the Institutional Bylaws and Board of Regents Handbook shall prevail.
- 4. **Amendment of Bylaws of the Faculty Senate**. Faculty Senate Bylaws may be amended according to conditions set forth within those Bylaws. All amendments require the approval of the President of the College.
- 5. **Faculty Senate Representation at Board of Regents Meeting**. The Faculty Senate Chair shall be present at all regular Board of Regents meetings. The Faculty Senate Chair shall be the official spokesperson for the Faculty Senate of the College.
- 6. **Actions of the Faculty Senate**. When applicable, the recommendations of the Faculty Senate shall be transmitted to the President.
- 7. **Faculty Senate Committees**. The Faculty Senate may establish committees as set forth in the Faculty Senate Bylaws. Whenever possible and appropriate, faculty representatives will be included on institutional committees as provided for in these Bylaws.
- 8. **Faculty Senate Participation in Presidential Search**. Whenever a vacancy occurs or is about to occur in the position of President of TMCC, the NSHE Code provides for procedures to be followed. One of these procedures calls for the formation of an Institutional Advisory Committee. The Faculty Senate of TMCC shall nominate five faculty members for the Institutional Advisory Committee.
- Academic Faculty Participation in Recruitment. Whenever a vacant or new academic faculty position occurs, the
 full-time academic faculty shall be represented on the search committee in accordance with the TMCC-NFA
 Contract.

Section D: Classified Staff Governance

- 1. **Classified Council**. These Bylaws authorize the formation of an organization of classified staff to be known as the Classified Council.
- 2. **Membership in the Classified Council**. Persons employed at TMCC under the State of Nevada as classified employees are eligible for participation in the Classified Council.
- 3. **Bylaws of the Classified Council**. The Classified Council shall develop bylaws for its governance. All such Classified Council Bylaws shall be in conformance with the TMCC Bylaws and the Board of Regents Handbook and approved by the President of the College. Where the Classified Council Bylaws conflict with the provisions of either of these documents, the TMCC Bylaws and the Board of Regents Handbook shall prevail.
- 4. **Amendment of the Classified Council Bylaws**. Classified Council Bylaws may be amended according to conditions set forth within those Bylaws. All amendments require the approval of the President of the College.
- 5. **Actions of the Classified Council**. The Chairperson of the Classified Council shall communicate to the President of TMCC the results of Classified Council deliberations. Council actions are advisory only; the President shall have final decision regarding all actions recommended by the Classified Council.
- 6. **Classified Council Committees**. The Classified Council may establish committees as set forth in the Classified Council Bylaws. Whenever possible and appropriate, members of the classified staff will be included on institutional committees as provided for in these Bylaws.
- 7. Classified Staff Participation in Presidential Search. Whenever a vacancy occurs or is about to occur in the position of President of TMCC, the NSHE Code provides for procedures to be followed. One of these procedures calls for the formation of an Institutional Advisory Committee. The Classified Council shall nominate one classified employee for the Institutional Advisory Committee.

Section E: Student Governance

- 1. **Student Government Association (SGA)**. For the purpose of promoting student participation in the College community, these Bylaws authorize the formation of an association of students at TMCC, hereinafter referred to as SGA
- 2. **Membership in SGA**. Students currently enrolled at TMCC in any state-supported course are eligible for membership in SGA.
- 3. **Constitution/Bylaws of SGA**. SGA shall have a Constitution and/or Bylaws. All provisions of the SGA Constitution and/or Bylaws are subject to the approval of the President of TMCC and the NSHE Chancellor. The Constitution

and/or Bylaws shall be in conformance with the TMCC Bylaws and Board of Regents Handbook, and all rules, regulations, and policies as established by the Board of Regents and all applicable statutes of the State of Nevada. Where the Constitution and/or SGA Bylaws conflict with the provisions of either of these documents, the Institutional Bylaws and NSHE Handbook shall prevail.

- 4. **Amendment of the SGA Constitution/Bylaws**. Provisions for amendment of the SGA Constitution/Bylaws shall be included in the Constitution/Bylaws. Any amendment shall be subject to the approval of the President of TMCC and the NSHE Chancellor.
- 5. **SGA Representation at Board of Regents Meeting.** A representative of SGA may be present at all regular Board of Regents meetings. The SGA representative shall be the official spokesperson for the students of the College.
- 6. **Actions of SGA**. The President of SGA shall promptly forward to the SGA advisor the minutes and agenda of all meetings of the SGA Senate for review and appropriate action. The SGA advisor is recommended by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Student Services or his/her designee.
- 7. **Student Committees**. SGA may establish committees to deliberate student concerns. Whenever possible and appropriate, students will be included on institutional committees as provided for in these Bylaws.
- 8. **Student Participation in Presidential Search**. Whenever a vacancy occurs or is about to occur in the position of President of TMCC, NSHE Code provides for procedures to be followed. One of these procedures calls for the formation of an Institutional Advisory Committee. The SGA shall select one student representative for the Institutional Advisory Committee.

Section F: Committees

- 1. **Establishment of Committees**. The President may appoint committees to facilitate the administration of the College.
- 2. **Responsibilities of the Committees**. All committees advise the President who has final responsibility for institutional decisions.
- 3. **Composition of Committees**. The President may be guided by the following criteria for selection:
 - o **3.1**. The President will attempt to ensure that institutional groups affected by the committee recommendations shall have representation on the committee.
 - 3.2. The President will seek recommendations for nominations to committees from the organizational governing bodies of affected groups (Faculty Senate, Classified Council, Student Government Association, President's Cabinet and Planning Council).

	KPI's	Responsible for Providing Data	Initial Suggestion for Goal Setting, and Documenting thought Process	Short Term Goal/Long Term Target	Prior 4	Prior 3	Prior 2	Prior 1	SMP Report S	oring 2021		
Serve as an Open-Access Inst	titution								SMP Report S	pring 2021		
	KPI's			Goal/Target	Prior 4	Prior 3	Prior 2	Prior 1	Data Year	Value	Trend	
	1.1 Enrollment (Headcount)	IR	Enrollment Management		11,325	11,110	11,271	11,662	Fall 2020	10,665		Move to Access per Planning Council disussion.
	1.2 Enrollment reflecting the Hispanic distribution of Washoe		Equity, Inclusion, and Sustainability						н	ispanic population		
	County	IR		= Washoe County Rate			30%	32%	Fall 2020	TMCC: 31%		Added back ethinc distribution to show we're meeting Latino/Haspanic
	County		Office							Washoe: 25%		
	1.3 Number of Jump Start Students (excl TMHS)	IR	F		376	458	735	1.466	Fall 2020	1.668		
	1.3 Number of Jump Start Students (exci TMHS)	IK.	Enrollment Management		3/0	458	/35	1,400	Fall 2020	1,008		
	1.4 Enrollments in Non-Credit courses	Kathy Berry	Kathy Berry	2% annual increase	17,676	18,486	18,551	16,874	AY 2019-20	10,394		
												Not just EPIC - includes all non-credit at college (Safety Center, ABE, VU
Cultivate a welcoming, safe, a	and inclusive learning environment								SMP Report S	pring 2021		
	KPI's			Goal/Target	Prior 4	Prior 3	Prior 2	Prior 1	Data Year	Value	Trend	Notes
	2.1 Equally supportive of all racial/ethnic groups and genders. (Grad											
	outcomes survey)	IR	DEI	>=90%	94%	94%	94.5%	94%	AY 2019-20	94.5%		
	,,			< Average of aspirational peers (Everett								
	2.2 Clery violent crime incidents (response in narrative)	DEI	DEI	CC, CUNY Lehman, Santiago Canyon	0	0	0	0	2019	0 incidents		Limited to violent crimes (Clery definition);
	2.2 City voicint anne melacino (response in narrative)	521	DE1	College)								contract to violent crimes (etc.) actimation),
	2.3 Number of faculty and staff participating in:			conegey								
			n									
	Creating Accessible Content (webcollege and DRC)	Brandy Scarnati/Joan Steinman				29	23	24	AY 2020-21 8* (Sp	ring 2021 not done)		Includes more suggested disaggregagted metrics.
	Safe Zone (DEI and Counseling)	Joan Steinman	Joan Steinman			15	14	25				
1	Mental Health First Aid (counseling)	Joan Steinman	Joan Steinman									
	DEI Workshops (DEI, often in collaboration with others)	DEI	DEI	>= Previous Year					AY 2019-20 118 (u	induplicated)		
				Academic Faculty: >2% annually	faculty: 14.7%	faculty: 13.3%	faculty: 14 5% f	aculty: 16 5%		faculty: 17.5%		
	2.4 Percentage of ethnically diverse faculty and staff	IR	DEI	Administrative Faculty and Staff: >= previous		staff: 32.4%		staff: 36.4%	Fall 2020	staff: 37.7%		change to academic faculty to mirror to NASH; employee groups and th
	•			year	50.070	Maii. 32.476	Julii. 33.U%	55.470				
iccess												
Improve successful completion	on of student's educational goals								SMP Report S	ring 2021,		
· .	KPI's			Goal/Target	Prior 4	Prior 3	Prior 2	Prior 1	Data Year	Value	Trend	Notes
		IR	Academic Leadership		61.0%	65.7%	67.7%	67.0%	Fall 2014	67.5%		Make SAM 3.1
	3.1 SAM grad/transfer/still enrolled rate			67.5% goal - 70% target								
	3.2 IPEDS graduation rate	IR	Academic Leadership	29% goal - 32% target	31%	28%	30%	31%	Fall 2014	28%		change order of 3.1. Give SAM higher priority
1	IPEDS peer comparison group (median value)	IR			17%	19%	25%	26%	Fall 2014			
	3.3 College ScoreCard (started at TMCC and transferred in; 8 years											
	after attending)	IR	Academic Leadership									
		IR							Fall 2012			
	% Graduated		Academic Leadership	29% goal; 32% target						29%		
	% Withdrew	IR	Academic Leadership	43% goal					Fall 2012	43%		
	% Transferred	IR	Academic Leadership	26% goal					Fall 2012	26%		
	% Still Enrolled	IR	Academic Leadership	2% goal					Fall 2012	2%		
	A Still Elli Olled	IIK.	Academic Leadership	276 godi					Fall 2012	2.70		
	3.3 Degrees and certificates awarded	IR	Academic Leadership	2223 goal; 2500 target	2,431	2,389	2,508	2,478	AY 2019-20	2,547		Presidents performance metric for evaluation (P&G Manual Ch. 2, Secti
	3.4 Fall-to-Fall retention of new, full-time degree-seekers	IR										
	(at TMCC)	IK	Academic Leadership	63% goal; 70% target	63%	61%	63%	66%	Fall 2019	59%		Opening up to other groups creates noise in the data. Cover course com
	3.5 Fall-to-Fall persistence of new, full-time degree-seekers											
	(at any institution)	IR	Academic Leadership	67% goal; 74% target	67%	66%	66%	70%	Fall 2019	62%		
	(at any institution)											
	3.6 Successful completion of gateway math & English courses	IR	Academic Leadership	Math: 70%; English 73%	math: 59%	math: 62%	math: 62%	math: 71%		math: 73%		
	so Succession completion of gateway matri & English courses	IIK.	Academic Leadership	Iviatii. 70%, Eligiisii 73%	English: 75%	English: 74%	English: 74%	English: 79%	Fall 2020	English: 79%		
	3.7 Course completion for job upgrade and personal interest	IR										
	students	IK	Academic Leadership	87% goal and target	87%	89%	78%	86%	Fall 2020	87%		
	3.8 Special Populations											
						Prior 3	Prior 2	Prior 1		Value	Trend	
	preparation with high-quality instruction				Prior 4	Prior 3	Prior 2	Prior 1	Data Year	value	irena	Notes
	4.1 General Education learning outcomes (GELO) achievement											
	(Percent of students assessed at >= Proficient)								SMP Report S			
	Communications	Melissa Deadmond	ASA (already set at 70%)	>=70%	N/A	67.6%	68.9%	68.9%	2019-20	71.4%		
	Critical Thinking	Melissa Deadmond	ASA (already set at 70%)	>=70%	N/A	66.1%	65.4%	68.2%	2019-20	71.5%		
	Information Literacy	Melissa Deadmond	ASA (already set at 70%)	>=70%	N/A	57.4%	57.4%	60.7%	2019-20	61.4%		
	People & Cultural Awareness	Melissa Deadmond	ASA (already set at 70%)	>=70%	N/A	71.8%		74.7%	2019-20	76.3%		
	Quantitative Reasoning	Melissa Deadmond	ASA (already set at 70%)	>=70%	N/A	61.2%	62.8%	62.9%	2019-20	64.5%		
. Provide student support serv	vices that correlate with student success								SMP Report S	pring 2021		
	KPI's				Prior 4	Prior 3	Prior 2	Prior 1	Data Year	Value	Trend	Notes
					F1101 4	FIIOI 3	FIIOI Z	FIIOI I	Data Icai	value	Hellu	Notes
	5.1 Advising: total graduated, transferred, or still-enrolled (Advised	IR	Natalie Brown		72% vs 61%	72% vs 62%	75% vs 60%	72% vs 58%	2019-20	71% vs 59%		
	v. non-advised)											
,	v. noir-auviseu)											
		IP.	Brandy Searcast		95% w 700	96% w 774	9592 us 700/	86% w 770	2019-20			
	s.2 TLC: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored)	IR	Brandy Scarnati		86% vs 78%	86% vs 77%	85% vs 79%	86% vs 77%	2019-20	87% vs 80%		
,												
:	5.2 TLC: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 5.3 Counseling: F/F persistence (used counseling v. did not use	IR IR/Joan Steinman	Brandy Scarnati Joan Steinman			86% vs 77% 59% vs 41%		86% vs 77% 60% vs 40%	2019-20 2019-20	87% vs 80% 57% vs 37%		
	s.2 TLC: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored)											Notor
: :hievement Gap	5.2 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 5.3 Counseling: F/F persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling)								2019-20	57% vs 37%		Notes
: hievement Gap . Close achievement gaps acro	TLC: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) Counseling: F/F persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) underserved student populations				61% vs 41%	59% vs 41%	62% vs 39%	60% vs 40%	2019-20 SMP Report S	57% vs 37%		
: hievement Gap . Close achievement gaps acro	5.2 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 5.3 Counseling: F/F persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling)			Goal/Target					2019-20	57% vs 37%	Trend	
: : :hievement Gap . Close achievement gaps acro	TLC: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) Counseling: F/F persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) underserved student populations			Goal/Target	61% vs 41%	59% vs 41%	62% vs 39% Prior 2	60% vs 40%	2019-20 SMP Report S	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value	Trend	
: hievement Gap Close achievement gaps acro	1.2 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 1.3 Counseling: F/F persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 2.5 counseling) 2.5 counseling tutoristic state of the counseling v. did not use counseling v. di		Joan Steinman		61% vs 41%	59% vs 41%	62% vs 39%	60% vs 40%	2019-20 SMP Report S Data Year	57% vs 37%	Trend	Notes
chievement Gap . Close achievement gaps acro	22 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 23 Courseling: F/F persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 25 counseling: 26 counseling: 27 counseling: 28 counseling:			Goal/Target Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate	61% vs 41%	59% vs 41%	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28%	60% vs 40% Prior 1 H: 28%	2019-20 SMP Report S	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value H: 32%	Trend	
chievement Gap Close achievement gaps acro	s.2 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) s. Counseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) soss underserved student populations KPI's 6.1 Graduation rate by: Hispanic population (compared to cohort)	IR/Joan Steinman	Joan Steinman DEI	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate	61% vs 41%	59% vs 41%	62% vs 39% Prior 2	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31%	SMP Report S Data Year	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value	Trend	Notes
chievement Gap . Close achievement gaps acro	1.2 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 1.3 Counseling: F/F persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 2.5 counseling) 2.5 counseling v. did not use v. did no		Joan Steinman		61% vs 41%	59% vs 41%	Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20%	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21%	2019-20 SMP Report S Data Year	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value H: 32% cohort: 28% HM: 28%	Trend	Notes
thievement Gap Close achievement gaps acro	s.2 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) s.3 Courselings //F persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) soss underserved student populations KBYs 6.1 Graduation rate by: Hispanic population (compared to cohort) Hispanic male population (compared to cohort)	IR/Joan Steinman	Joan Steinman DEI	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate	61% vs 41%	59% vs 41%	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28%	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31%	SMP Report S Data Year	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value H: 32%	Trend	Notes Male graduation rate removed
chievement Gap 6. Close achievement gaps acro	22 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 23 Courseling: F/F persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 25 underserved student populations 26 KPP's 26.1 Graduation rate by: Witspanic population (compared to cohort) Witspanic male population (compared to cohort) 6.2 Fall-to-Fall retention of Firstgen, new, full-time degree-seekers	IR/Joan Steinman	Joan Steinman DEI DEI	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate	61% vs 41% Prior 4	59% vs 41% Prior 3	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20% cohort: 30%	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21% cohort: 31%	SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value H: 32% cohort: 28% HM: 28% cohort: 28%	Trend	Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Covid, first gen persistence was the same or better as non-first gen.
chievement Gap Close achievement gaps acro	s.2 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) s.3 Courselings //F persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) soss underserved student populations KBYs 6.1 Graduation rate by: Hispanic population (compared to cohort) Hispanic male population (compared to cohort)	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR	Joan Steinman DEI	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate	61% vs 41% Prior 4	59% vs 41%	Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20%	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21%	SMP Report S Data Year	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value H: 32% cohort: 28% HM: 28%	Trend	Notes Male graduation rate removed
hievement Gap Close achievement gaps acro	22 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 23 Courseling: F/F persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 25 underserved student populations 26 KPP's 26.1 Graduation rate by: Witspanic population (compared to cohort) Witspanic male population (compared to cohort) 6.2 Fall-to-Fall retention of Firstgen, new, full-time degree-seekers	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR	Joan Steinman DEI DEI	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate	61% vs 41% Prior 4	59% vs 41% Prior 3	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20% cohort: 30%	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21% cohort: 31%	SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value H: 32% cohort: 28% HM: 28% cohort: 28%	Trend	Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Covid, first gen persistence was the same or better as non-first gen.
hievement Gap Close achievement gaps acro	22 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 23 Courseling: F/F persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 25 underserved student populations 26 KPP's 26.1 Graduation rate by: Witspanic population (compared to cohort) Witspanic male population (compared to cohort) 6.2 Fall-to-Fall retention of Firstgen, new, full-time degree-seekers	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR	Joan Steinman DEI DEI	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate	61% vs 41% Prior 4	59% vs 41% Prior 3	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20% cohort: 30%	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21% cohort: 31%	SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value H: 32% cohort: 28% HM: 28% cohort: 28%	Trend	Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Covid, first gen persistence was the same or better as non-first gen.
hievement Gap Close achievement gaps acro	1.2 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 1.3 Courseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 2.5 counseling: State v. did not use counseling v. did not use v. did not u	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR IR	Joan Steinman DEI DEI	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate	61% vs 41% Prior 4	59% vs 41% Prior 3	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20% cohort: 30%	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21% cohort: 31%	SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014 Fall 2019	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value H: 32% cohort; 28% HM: 28% cohort: 28% 57% vs 60%	Trend	Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Covid, first gen persistence was the same or better as non-first gen.
chievement Gap	22 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 23 Courseling: F/F persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 25 underserved student populations 26 KPP's 26.1 Graduation rate by: Witspanic population (compared to cohort) Witspanic male population (compared to cohort) 6.2 Fall-to-Fall retention of Firstgen, new, full-time degree-seekers	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR IR	Joan Steinman DEI DEI	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate = IPDES cohort rate	61% vs 41% Prior 4 64% vs 61%	59% vs 41% Prior 3 63% vs 60%	Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20% cohort: 30% 62% vs 63%	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21% cohort: 31%	SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value H: 32% cohort; 28% HM: 28% cohort: 28% 57% vs 60%		Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Cond, first gen parallelene was the same or better as non-first gen. Fall 19 to Fall 29 shows the first pest cond rate and the trend has reversed.
chievement Gap Close achievement gaps acro	1.2 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 1.3 Courseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 2.5 counseling: State v. did not use counseling v. did not use v. did not u	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR IR	Joan Steinman DEI DEI	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate	61% vs 41% Prior 4	59% vs 41% Prior 3	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20% cohort: 30%	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21% cohort: 31%	SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014 Fall 2019	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value H: 32% cohort; 28% HM: 28% cohort: 28% 57% vs 60%		Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Covid, first gen persistence was the same or better as non-first gen.
chievement Gap Close achievement gaps acro Develop innovative program	1.2 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 1.3 Courseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 2.5 counseling: State v. did not use counseling v. did not use v. did not u	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR IR	Joan Steinman DEI DEI	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate = IPDES cohort rate Goal/Target	61% vs 41% Prior 4 64% vs 61%	59% vs 41% Prior 3 63% vs 60%	Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20% cohort: 30% 62% vs 63%	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21% cohort: 31%	SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014 Fall 2019	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value H: 32% cohort; 28% HM: 28% cohort: 28% 57% vs 60%		Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Coold, first gen parastence was the same or better as non-first gen. Fail 19 to Fail 25 shows the first post-coold rate and the trend has reversed.
chievement Gap i. Close achievement gaps acro li gaps ac	12 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 13 Courseling: Fif persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: State of the counseling v. did not use the counseling v.	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR IR IR IR	Joan Steinman DEI DEI DEI Academics	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate = IPDES cohort rate Goal/Target goal - 1407 (ave); target - 1477	61% vs 41% Prior 4 64% vs 61%	59% vs 41% Prior 3 63% vs 60%	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20% cohort: 30% 62% vs 63% Prior 2	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21% cohort: 31% 66% vs 66% Prior 1 1387	SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014 Fall 2019 SMP Report S Data Year 2019-20	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value H: 32% chlort: 28% chlort: 28% 57% vs 60% pring 2021 Value 1303		Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Codd, first gen persistence was the same or better as non-first gas. Fail 19 to fall 30 shows the first post-codd rate and the trend has reversed.
chievement Gap 5. Close achievement gaps acro 7. Develop innovative program	12 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 13 Courseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: The persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 16 counseling: The persistence (used counseling v. did not use v. did not used to counseling v. did not used to cohort) 16 counseling: The persistence (at Talket) 16 counseling: The persistence (used to cohort) 16 counseling: Talket (used to cohort) 17 counseling: Talket (used to cohort) 18 counseling: Talket (used to cohort) 1	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR IR	Joan Steinman DEI DEI	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate = IPDES cohort rate Goal/Target	61% vs 41% Prior 4 64% vs 61%	59% vs 41% Prior 3 63% vs 60%	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20% cohort: 30% 62% vs 63% Prior 2	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21% cohort: 31% 66% vs 66%	SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014 Fall 2019 SMP Report S Data Year	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value H: 32% cohort: 28% HM: 28% cohort: 28% 57% vs 60% pring 2021 Value		Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Codd, first gen percistence was the same or better as non-first gen. Fall 19 to fall 30 shows the first post-codd rate and the frend has reversed.
Achievement Gap 6. Close achievement gaps acro 7. Develop innovative program	12 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 13 Courseling: Fif persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: Fif persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: Fif persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 16 counseling: Fif persistence (used counseling) 17 counseling: Fif persistence (used counseling) 18 cou	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR IR IR IR IR Barb Walden	Joan Steinman DEI DEI DEI Academics Barb Walden	Mispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate = IPDES cohort rate Goal/Target goal - 1407 (ave); target - 1477 1-2 per year goal; 35 target	61% vs 41% Prior 4 64% vs 61%	59% vs 41% Prior 3 63% vs 60%	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20% cohort: 30% 62% vs 63% Prior 2	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21% cohort: 31% 66% vs 66% Prior 1 1387 25	2019-20 SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014 Fall 2014 Fall 2019 SMP Report S Data Year 2019-20 2020-21	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value H: 32% Cohort, 28% Cohort, 28% 57% vs 60% pring 2021 Value 1303 30	Trend	Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Covid, first gen persistence was the same or better as non-first gen. Fall 19 to Fall 30 shows the first post-covid rate and the trend has reversed.
chievement Gap 5. Close achievement gaps acro 7. Develop innovative program	12 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 13 Courseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: State of the counseling v. did not use v. did	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR IR IR Barb Walden Barb Walden	Joan Steinman DEI DEI DEI Academics Barb Walden Barb Walden	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate = IPDES cohort rate Goal/Target goal - 1407 (ave); target - 1477 1-2 per year goal; 35 target 845 goal; 970 target	61% vs 41% Prior 4 64% vs 61%	59% vs 41% Prior 3 63% vs 60%	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20% cohort: 30% 62% vs 63% Prior 2	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21% cohort: 31% 66% vs 66% Prior 1 1387	2019-20 SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014 Fall 2014 Fall 2019 SMP Report S Data Year 2019-20 2020-21	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value H: 32% cohort; 28% cohort: 28% cohort: 28% cohort: 28% yring 2021 Value 1303 30 770	Trend	Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Covid, first gen persistence was the same or better as non-first gen. Fall 19 to Fall 30 shows the first post-covid rate and the trend has reversed.
chievement Gap Close achievement gaps acro Close achievement gaps achiev	12 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 13 Courseling: Fif persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: Fif persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: State of the counseling v. did not use v. did not u	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR IR IR IR IR Barb Walden	Joan Steinman DEI DEI DEI Academics Barb Walden	Mispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate = IPDES cohort rate Goal/Target goal - 1407 (ave); target - 1477 1-2 per year goal; 35 target	61% vs 41% Prior 4 64% vs 61%	59% vs 41% Prior 3 63% vs 60%	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20% cohort: 30% 62% vs 63% Prior 2	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21% cohort: 31% 66% vs 66% Prior 1 1387 25	2019-20 SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014 Fall 2014 Fall 2019 SMP Report S Data Year 2019-20 2020-21	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value H: 32% Cohort, 28% Cohort, 28% 57% vs 60% pring 2021 Value 1303 30	Trend	Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Covid, first gen persistence was the same or better as non-first gen. Fall 19 to Fall 20 shows the first post coold rate and the trend has reversed.
chievement Gap Close achievement gaps acro Close achievement gaps acro Develop innovative program	12 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 13 Courseling: Fif persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: Fif persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: State of the counseling v. did not use v. did not u	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR IR IR Barb Walden Barb Walden	Joan Steinman DEI DEI DEI Academics Barb Walden Barb Walden Kathy Berry	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate = IPDES cohort rate Goal/Target goal - 1407 (ave); target - 1477 1-2 per year goal; 35 target 845 goal; 970 target	61% vs 41% Prior 4 64% vs 61%	59% vs 41% Prior 3 63% vs 60%	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20% cohort: 30% 62% vs 63% Prior 2	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21% cohort: 31% 66% vs 66% Prior 1 1387 25	2019-20 SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014 Fall 2014 Fall 2019 SMP Report S Data Year 2019-20 2020-21	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value H: 32% cohort; 28% cohort: 28% cohort: 28% cohort: 28% yring 2021 Value 1303 30 770	Trend	Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Covid, first gen persistence was the same or better as non-first gen. Fall 19 to Fall 20 shows the first post coold rate and the trend has reversed.
chievement Gap Close achievement gaps acro Cose achievement gaps acro Develop innovative program	12 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 13 Courseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: State of the counseling v. did not use v. did	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR IR IR Barb Walden Kathy Berry	Joan Steinman DEI DEI DEI Academics Barb Walden Barb Walden	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate = IPDES cohort rate Goal/Target goal - 1407 (ave); target - 1477 1-2 per year goal; 35 target 845 goal; 970 target	61% vs 41% Prior 4 64% vs 61%	59% vs 41% Prior 3 63% vs 60%	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20% cohort: 30% 62% vs 63% Prior 2	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21% cohort: 31% 66% vs 66% Prior 1 1387 25	2019-20 SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014 Fall 2014 Fall 2019 SMP Report S Data Year 2019-20 2020-21	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value H: 32% cohort; 28% cohort: 28% cohort: 28% cohort: 28% yring 2021 Value 1303 30 770	Trend	Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Covid, first gen persistence was the same or better as non-first gen. Fall 19 to Fall 20 shows the first post coold rate and the trend has reversed.
chievement Gap Close achievement gaps acro Cose achievement gaps acro Develop innovative program	12 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 13 Courseling: Fif persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: Fif persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: State of the counseling v. did not use the counseling v. did not use the counseling v. did not not use the counseling v. did not use v.	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR IR IR Barb Walden Kathy Berry	Joan Steinman DEI DEI DEI Academics Barb Walden Barb Walden Kathy Berry	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate = IPDES cohort rate Goal/Target goal - 1407 (ave); target - 1477 1-2 per year goal; 35 target 845 goal; 970 target	61% vs 41% Prior 4 64% vs 61% Prior 4 1473	59% vs 41% Prior 3 63% vs 60% Prior 3 1431	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20% cohort: 30% EM: 20% See 26% See 26% Prior 2 1439	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21% cohort: 31% F6% vs 66%	2019-20 SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014 Fall 2019 SMP Report S Data Year 2019-20 2020-21 2020-21 2019/20	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value H: 32% Cohort: 28% 57% vs 60% pring 2021 Value 1303 30 770 274	Trend	Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Coxid, first gen perotitence was the same or better as non-first gen. rail 39 to rail 30 altimate the first post-coxid rate and the trend has reversed. Notes (TMCC and employer-sponsored; number came from presentation and
chievement Gap Close achievement gaps acro	12 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 13 Courseling: Fif persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: Fif persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: State of the counseling v. did not use v. did not u	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR IR IR Barb Walden Kathy Berry	Joan Steinman DEI DEI DEI Academics Barb Walden Barb Walden Kathy Berry	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate = IPDES cohort rate Goal/Target goal - 1407 (ave); target - 1477 1-2 per year goal; 35 target 845 goal; 970 target	61% vs 41% Prior 4 64% vs 61%	59% vs 41% Prior 3 63% vs 60%	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20% cohort: 30% 62% vs 63% Prior 2	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21% cohort: 31% 66% vs 66% Prior 1 1387 25	2019-20 SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014 Fall 2014 Fall 2019 SMP Report S Data Year 2019-20 2020-21	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value H: 32% cohort; 28% cohort: 28% cohort: 28% cohort: 28% yring 2021 Value 1303 30 770	Trend	Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Coold, first gen percistence was the same or better as non-first gen. rail 39 to fall 30 showe the first poet coold rate and the trend has reversed. Notes (TMCC and employer-sponsored; number came from presentation and
chievement Gap Close achievement gaps acro Develop innovative program	12 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 13 Courseling: Fif persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: Fif persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: State of the counseling v. did not use the counseling v. did not use the counseling v. did not not use the counseling v. did not use v.	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR IR IR Barb Walden Kathy Berry Barb Walden	Joan Steinman DEI DEI DEI Academics Barb Walden Barb Walden Kathy Berry Sidney Sullivan; EPIC	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate = IPDES cohort rate Goal/Target goal - 1407 (ave); target - 1477 1-2 per year goal; 35 target 845 goal; 970 target	61% vs 41% Prior 4 64% vs 61% Prior 4 1473	59% vs 41% Prior 3 63% vs 60% Prior 3 1431	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20% cohort: 30% EM: 20% See 26% See 26% Prior 2 1439	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21% cohort: 31% F6% vs 66%	2019-20 SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014 Fall 2019 SMP Report S Data Year 2019-20 2020-21 2019-20 Data Year	57% vs 37% Pring 2021 Value H: 32% Cohort 28% Cohort 28% Fring 2021 Value 1303 30 770 274 Value	Trend	Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Coold, first gen periatence was the same or better as non-first gen. rail 15 to rail 20 shows the first post coold rate and the trend has reversed. Notes (TMCC and employer-sponsored; number came from presentation and
chievement Gap Close achievement gaps acro Develop innovative program	12 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 13 Courseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 25 counseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 26 counseling: Section (used to be counseling) 27 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 28 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 28 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 29 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 20 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 21 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 22 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 23 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 24 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 25 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 26 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 27 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 28 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 28 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 29 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 20 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 21 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 22 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 23 counseling: Section (used to counseli	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR IR IR Barb Walden Kathy Berry	Joan Steinman DEI DEI DEI Academics Barb Walden Barb Walden Kathy Berry	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate = IPDES cohort rate Goal/Target goal - 1407 (ave); target - 1477 1-2 per year goal; 35 target 845 goal; 970 target	61% vs 41% Prior 4 64% vs 61% Prior 4 1473	59% vs 41% Prior 3 63% vs 60% Prior 3 1431	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20% cohort: 30% EM: 20% See 26% See 26% Prior 2 1439	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21% cohort: 31% F6% vs 66%	2019-20 SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014 Fall 2019 SMP Report S Data Year 2019-20 2020-21 2020-21 2019/20	57% vs 37% pring 2021 Value H: 32% Cohort: 28% 57% vs 60% pring 2021 Value 1303 30 770 274	Trend	Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Coold, first gen periatence was the same or better as non-first gen. rail 15 to rail 20 shows the first post coold rate and the trend has reversed. Notes (TMCC and employer-sponsored; number came from presentation and
chievement Gap Close achievement gaps acro Develop innovative program	12 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 13 Courseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 14 Counseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 16 Counseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 16 Counseling: FF persistence (used counseling) 16 Counseling: FF persistence (used counseling) 17 Counseling: FF persistence (used counseling) 18 Counseling: FF p	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR IR IR Barb Walden Kathy Berry Barb Walden	Joan Steinman DEI DEI DEI Academics Barb Walden Barb Walden Kathy Berry Sidney Sullivan; EPIC	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate = IPDES cohort rate Goal/Target goal - 1407 (ave); target - 1477 1-2 per year goal; 35 target 845 goal; 970 target	61% vs 41% Prior 4 64% vs 61% Prior 4 1473	59% vs 41% Prior 3 63% vs 60% Prior 3 1431	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20% cohort: 30% EM: 20% See 26% Frior 2 1439	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21% cohort: 31% F6% vs 66%	2019-20 SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014 Fall 2019 SMP Report S Data Year 2019-20 2020-21 2019-20 Data Year	57% vs 37% Pring 2021 Value H: 32% Cohort 28% Cohort 28% Fring 2021 Value 1303 30 770 274 Value	Trend	Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Coold, first gen periatence was the same or better as non-first gen. rail 15 to rail 20 shows the first post coold rate and the trend has reversed. Notes (TMCC and employer-sponsored; number came from presentation and
chievement Gap Close achievement gaps acro Develop innovative program	12 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 13 Courseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: State of the counseling v. did not use the counseling v. did not use the counseling v. did not not persistence v. did not not persistence v. did not not not persistence v. did not not not persistence v. did not	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR IR IR Barb Walden Kathy Berry Barb Walden	Joan Steinman DEI DEI DEI Academics Barb Walden Barb Walden Kathy Berry Sidney Sullivan; EPIC	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate = IPDES cohort rate Goal/Target goal - 1407 (ave); target - 1477 1-2 per year goal; 35 target 845 goal; 970 target	61% vs 41% Prior 4 64% vs 61% Prior 4 1473	59% vs 41% Prior 3 63% vs 60% Prior 3 1431	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20% cohort: 30% EM: 20% See 26% Frior 2 1439	Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% HM: 21% cohort: 31% F6% vs 66%	2019-20 SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014 Fall 2019 SMP Report S Data Year 2019-20 2020-21 2019-20 Data Year	57% vs 37% Pring 2021 Value H: 32% Cohort 28% Cohort 28% Fring 2021 Value 1303 30 770 274 Value	Trend	Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Coxid, first gan persistence was the same or better as non-first gan. rail 19 to rail 29 shows the first post coxid rate and the trend has reversed. Notes (TMCC and employer-sponsored; number came from presentation and
chievement Gap Close achievement gaps acro Develop innovative program	12 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 13 Courseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 25 counseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 26 counseling: Section (used to be counseling) 27 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 28 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 28 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 29 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 20 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 21 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 22 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 23 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 24 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 25 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 26 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 27 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 28 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 28 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 29 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 20 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 21 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 22 counseling: Section (used to counseling) 23 counseling: Section (used to counseli	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR IR IR Barb Walden Kathy Berry Barb Walden	Joan Steinman DEI DEI DEI Academics Barb Walden Barb Walden Kathy Berry Sidney Sullivan; EPIC	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate = IPDES cohort rate Goal/Target goal - 1407 (ave); target - 1477 1-2 per year goal; 35 target 845 goal; 970 target	61% vs 41% Prior 4 64% vs 61% Prior 4 1473	59% vs 41% Prior 3 63% vs 60% Prior 3 1431	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% HM: 20% cohort: 30% EM: 20% See 26% Frior 2 1439	60% vs 40% Prior 1 H: 28% cohort: 31% H: 28% cohort: 31% 66% vs 66% Prior 1 187 25 600	2019-20 SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014 Fall 2019 SMP Report S Data Year 2019-20 2020-21 2019-20 Data Year	57% vs 37% Pring 2021 Value H: 32% Cohort 28% Cohort 28% Fring 2021 Value 1303 30 770 274 Value	Trend	Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Coold, first gan persistence was the same or better as non-first gan. Fall 15 to rail 30 shows the first post coold rate and the trend has reversed. Notes (TMCC and employer-sponsored; number came from presentation and
chievement Gap Close achievement gaps acro Develop innovative program Develop innovative program Promote student learning the	12 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 13 Courseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 25 underserved student populations 26 KP's 26 G. Graduation rate by: 16 Hispanic population (compared to cohort) 27 Hispanic male population (compared to cohort) 28 Hispanic male population (compared to cohort) 29 Application (and population (compared to cohort) 20 Application (and population (compared to cohort) 20 Application (and population (compared to cohort) 21 Amortion (and population) 22 Inamber of Employers sponsoring TMCC Apprenticeships (cumulative) 23 Another of TMCC Apprentices (cumulative) 23 Application (and population) 24 EMPC Career certificate completions 25 Highlights of work with regional employers (qualitative) 26 Inamber of TMCC Apprentices (cumulative) 27 Application (and population) 28 Highlights of work with regional employers (qualitative) 28 Inamber of Students involved in research and experiential learning projects on campus 28 Landron of Students involved in research and experiential learning projects on campus	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR IR IR Barb Walden Kathy Berry Barb Walden Kathy Berry Barb Walden	Joan Steinman DEI DEI DEI Academics Barb Walden Barb Walden Kathy Berry Sidney Sullivan; EPIC Academics	Mispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate = IPDES cohort rate Goal/Target goal - 1407 (ave); target - 1477 1-2 per year goal; 35 target 845 goal; 370 target increase 2% annually	61% vs 41% Prior 4 64% vs 61% Prior 4 1473	59% vs 41% Prior 3 63% vs 60% Prior 3 1431	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohort: 30% cohort: 30% cohort: 30% Prior 2 1439 Prior 2	60% vs 40% Prior 1 H: 28% cohert 31% HM: 21% cohert 31% FM: 21% cohert 31% FM: 25 60% Prior 1 1387 25 600 Prior 1	2019-20 SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014 Fall 2019 SMP Report S Data Year 2019-20 2020-21 2020-21 2019-20 Data Year 2019-20 Ista Currency	57% vs 37% Pring 2021 Value II: 32% cohort: 28% Will: 28% cohort: 28% Value 300 770 274 Value 79 value	Trend	Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Coold, first gan persistence was the same or better as non-first gan. Fall 15 to rail 30 shows the first post coold rate and the trend has reversed. Notes (TMCC and employer-sponsored; number came from presentation and
chlevement Gap Close achievement gaps acro Develop innovative program Promote student learning the	12 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 13 Courseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 15 counseling: St.	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR IR IR Barb Walden Kathy Berry Barb Walden Julie Ellsworth	Joan Steinman DEI DEI DEI Academics Barb Walden Barb Walden Kathy Berry Sidney Sullivan; EPIC Academics	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate = IPDES cohort rate Goal/Target goal - 1407 (ave): target - 1477 1-2 per year goal, 35 target 845 goal; 970 target increase 2% annually	61% vs 41% Prior 4 64% vs 61% Prior 4 1473	59% vs 41% Prior 3 63% vs 60% Prior 3 1431 Prior 3	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohert: 30% H:htt: 20% cohert: 30% H:htt: 20% cohert: 30% Prior 2 1439 Prior 2	60% vs 40% Prior 1 H. 28% cohort: 31% NM: 21% cohort: 31% Cohort	2019-20 SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014 Fall 2019 SMP Report S Data Year 2019-20 2020-21 2020-21 2019/20 Data Year 2019-20 Lata currency 2019/20	57% vs 37% Pring 2021 Value 16: 32% Cohort: 28% Cohort: 28% Cohort: 28% Cohort: 28% Value 1303 30 770 274 Value 79 value 74	Trend	Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Covid, first gen persistence was the same or better as non-first gen. Fall 19 to Fall 20 shows the first post-covid rate and the trend has reversed. Notes (TMCC and employer-sponsored; number came from presentation and Notes Would like to see that number double every two hears. Research project
Achievement Gap 6. Close achievement gaps acro 7. Develop innovative program 8. Promote student learning the	12 T.C.: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored) 13 Courseling: FF persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling) 25 underserved student populations 26 KP's 26 G. Graduation rate by: 16 Hispanic population (compared to cohort) 27 Hispanic male population (compared to cohort) 28 Hispanic male population (compared to cohort) 29 Application (and population (compared to cohort) 20 Application (and population (compared to cohort) 20 Application (and population (compared to cohort) 21 Amortion (and population) 22 Inamber of Employers sponsoring TMCC Apprenticeships (cumulative) 23 Another of TMCC Apprentices (cumulative) 23 Application (and population) 24 EMPC Career certificate completions 25 Highlights of work with regional employers (qualitative) 26 Inamber of TMCC Apprentices (cumulative) 27 Application (and population) 28 Highlights of work with regional employers (qualitative) 28 Inamber of Students involved in research and experiential learning projects on campus 28 Landron of Students involved in research and experiential learning projects on campus	IR/Joan Steinman IR IR IR IR Barb Walden Kathy Berry Barb Walden Kathy Berry Barb Walden	Joan Steinman DEI DEI DEI Academics Barb Walden Barb Walden Kathy Berry Sidney Sullivan; EPIC Academics	Mispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate = IPDES cohort rate Goal/Target goal - 1407 (ave); target - 1477 1-2 per year goal; 35 target 845 goal; 370 target increase 2% annually	61% vs 41% Prior 4 64% vs 61% Prior 4 1473	59% vs 41% Prior 3 63% vs 60% Prior 3 1431	62% vs 39% Prior 2 H: 28% cohert: 30% H:htt: 20% cohert: 30% H:htt: 20% cohert: 30% Prior 2 1439 Prior 2	60% vs 40% Prior 1 H: 28% cohert 31% HM: 21% cohert 31% FM: 21% cohert 31% FM: 25 60% Prior 1 1387 25 600 Prior 1	2019-20 SMP Report S Data Year Fall 2014 Fall 2019 SMP Report S Data Year 2019-20 2020-21 2020-21 2019-20 Data Year 2019-20 Ista Currency	57% vs 37% Pring 2021 Value II: 32% cohort: 28% Will: 28% cohort: 28% Value 300 770 274 Value 79 value	Trend	Notes Male graduation rate removed NOTE pre-Coold, first gan persistence was the same or better as non-first gan. Fall 15 to rail 30 shows the first post coold rate and the trend has reversed. Notes (TMCC and employer-sponsored; number came from presentation and

Responsible for Establishing



d by a class.Involved in field-based research initiated by a faculty

Group 1 - Access: KPI's 1.1-1.4

Names:

Modifications were made to KPI's based on suggestions from last month's Planning Council meeting and those individuals or groups responsible for providing data and establishing an initial suggestion for setting short-term (2 years) and long-term targets (5 years) were identified in the President's Cabinet. We are asking that you discuss these initial suggestions where available and either affirm or propose a new short-term goal and long-term target. if no initial suggestion has yet been made, please make one. Please document your rationale/notes of your discussion.

Access

Serve as an Open-Access Institution									Report	
KPI's	Responsible for Providing Data	Responsible for Establishing Initial Suggestion for Goal Setting, and Documenting thought Process	Short Term Goal/Long Term Target	Prior 4	Prior 3	Prior 2	Prior 1		ng 2021 Value	Trend
1.1 Enrollment (Headcount)	IR	Enrollment Management		11,325	11,110	11,271	11,662	Fall 2020	10,665	
1.2 Enrollment reflec ng the Hispanic distribu on of Washoe County	IR	Equity, Inclusion, and Sustainability Office	= Washoe County Rate			His: 30%	His: 32%	Fall 2020	Hispanic popula on TMCC: 31% Washoe: 25%	
1.3 Number of Jump Start Students (excl TMHS)	IR	Enrollment Management	15% Short Term /20% Long Term	376	458	735	1,466	Fall 2020	1,668	
1.4 Enrollments in Non-Credit courses	Kathy Berry	Kathy Berry	2% annual increase	17,676	18,486	18,551	16,874	AY 2019-20	10,394	

- 1.1 Maybe eliminate headcount and change to align to STEM plan
- 1.2
- 1.3 Q: How or why did enrollment #'s increased substantially over the past four years? We suggest that whatever was done to increase enrollment, that it be continued to meet short and long term goals.
 - Suggestion from Gwen: provide training and encouraging faculty to teach Jump Start and dual enrollment students attending TMCC
- 1.4

Planning Council 4-19-21 Group 2 - Access: KPI's 2.1-2.4

Names:

Modifications were made to KPI's based on suggestions from last month's Planning Council meeting and those individuals or groups responsible for providing data and establishing an initial suggestion for setting short-term (2 years) and long-term targets (5 years) were identified in the President's Cabinet. We are asking that you discuss these initial suggestions where available and either affirm or propose a new short-term goal and long-term target. if no initial suggestion has yet been made, please make one. Please document your rationale/notes of your discussion.

Access

2. Cultivate a welcoming, safe, and inclusive lea	arning environm	ent							Report ng 2021	
KPI's	Responsible for Providing Data	Responsible for Establishing Initial Suggestion for Goal Se ng, and Documenting thought Process	Short Term Goal/Long Term Target	Prior 4	Prior 3	Prior 2	Prior 1	Data Year	Value	Trend
2.1 Equally supportive of all racial/ethnic groups and genders. (Grad outcomes survey)	IR	DEI	>=90%	94%	94%	94.5%	94%	AY 2019-20	94.5%	
2.2 Clery violent crime incidents (response in narrative)	DEI	DEI	< Average of aspirational peers (Everett CC, CUNY Lehman, Santiago Canyon College)	0	0	0	0	2019	0 incidents	
2.3 Number of faculty and staff participating in:										
Creating Accessible Content (webcollege and DRC)	Brandy Scarnati/Joan Steinman	Brandy Scarnati/Joan Steinman	>= Previous Year		29	23	24	AY 2020-21	8* (Spring 2021 not done)	
Safe Zone (DEI and Counseling)	Joan Steinman	Joan Steinman	>= Previous Year		15	14	25			

lental Health First Aid ounseling)	Joan Steinman	Joan Steinman	>= Previous Year					
El Workshops (DEI, o en in ollaboration with others)	DEI	DEI	>= Previous Year				AY 2019-20	118 (unduplicat ed)
4 Percentage of ethnically verse faculty and staff	IR	DEI	Academic Faculty: >2% annually Administrative Faculty and Staff: >= previous year	:	faculty : 14.5% staff: 33.0%	: 16.5% staff:	Fall 2020	faculty: 17.5% staff: 37.7%

- 2.1 meeting goal, suggestion: if one of the measures dips below 90%, it should be addressed
- 2.2 Maybe add Grad Outcome Survey response to "TMCC provides a safe campus environment"? (98%)
- 2.3 How do you measure when you have different faculty and staff than who you began with (year over year)? Will measure faculty/staff completions use of sign-in sheets to track attendance
- 2.4 Suggestion from Diversity Committee would like to disaggregate Academic Faculty and Administrative Faculty and Staff, specify numbers across the chart for more clarity, possibly list all three separately

Group 3 - Success: KPI's 3.1-3.8

Names:

Modifications were made to KPI's based on suggestions from last month's Planning Council meeting and those individuals or groups responsible for providing data and establishing an initial suggestion for setting short-term (2 years) and long-term targets (5 years) were identified in the President's Cabinet. We are asking that you discuss these initial suggestions where available and either affirm or propose a new short-term goal and long-term target. if no initial suggestion has yet been made, please make one. Please document your rationale/notes of your discussion.

Success

3. Impro	ve successful completion of student's o	educational goal	s							Report g 2021	
	KPI's	Responsible for Providing Data	Responsible for Establishing Initial Suggestion for Goal Setting, and Documenting thought Process	Short Term Goal/Long Term Target	Prior 4	Prior 3	Prior 2	Prior 1	Data Year	Value	Trend
	3.1 SAM grad/transfer/s II enrolled rate	IR	Academic Leadership	67.5% goal - 70% target	61.0%	65.7%	67.7%	67.0%	Fall 2014	67.5%	
	3.2 IPEDS gradua on rate	IR	Academic Leadership	29% goal - 32% target	31%	28%	30%	31%	Fall 2014	28%	
	IPEDS peer comparison group (median value)	IR			17%	19%	25%	26%	Fall 2014		
	3.3 College ScoreCard (started at TMCC and transferred in; 8 years after attending)										
	% Graduated	IR	Academic Leadership	29% goal; 32% target					Fall 2012	29%	
	% Withdrew	IR	Academic Leadership	43% goal					Fall 2012	43%	
	% Transferred	IR	Academic Leadership	26% goal					Fall 2012	26%	

% S II Enrolled	IR	Academic Leadership	2% goal					Fall 2012	2%	
3.3 Degrees and cer ficates awarded	IR	Academic Leadership	2223 goal; 2500 target	2,431	2,389	2,508	2,478	AY 2019-20	2,547	
3.4 Fall-to-Fall reten on of new, full- me degree-seekers (at TMCC)	IR	Academic Leadership	63% goal; 70% target	63%	61%	63%	66%	Fall 2019	59%	
3.5 Fall-to-Fall persistence of new, full- me degree-seekers (at any ins tu on)	IR	Academic Leadership	67% goal; 74% target	67%	66%	66%	70%	Fall 2019	62%	
3.6 Successful comple on of gateway math & English courses	IR	Academic Leadership	Math: 70%; English 73%	math: 59% English : 75%	math: 62% English : 74%	math: 62% English : 74%	math: 71% Englis h: 79%	Fall 2020	math: 73% English: 79%	
3.7 Course comple on for job upgrade and personal interest students	IR	Academic Leadership	87% goal and target	87%	89%	78%	86%	Fall 2020	87%	

- 3.1-Missing a metric for part-time students completing 15 units per year. Perhaps breaking it out. Or we recommend enrollment management plan take part-time students into consideration specifically and set a goal for part-time students.
- 3.2
- 3.3-Should this be changed to a percentage instead of a number since enrollment could affect this number?
- Does the graduation rate include certificate programs?
- Can we lower the withdrawal goal? For example, 32% graduation rate, lower the withdrawal rate accordingly. 40% withdrawal rate?
- 3.4
- 3.5
- 3.6

- 3.7
- 3.8

Group 4/5 - Success: KPI's 4.1 and 5.1-5.3

Names:

Modifications were made to KPI's based on suggestions from last month's Planning Council meeting and those individuals or groups responsible for providing data and establishing an initial suggestion for setting short-term (2 years) and long-term targets (5 years) were identified in the President's Cabinet. We are asking that you discuss these initial suggestions where available and either affirm or propose a new short-term goal and long-term target. if no initial suggestion has yet been made, please make one. Please document your rationale/notes of your discussion.

Success

4. Foster student learning and	I preparation wit	h high-quality ins	struction		Prior 4	Prior 3	Prior 2	Prior 1	Data Year	Value	Trend
outcomes (GEI	lucation learning .O) achievement dents assessed at	Responsible for Providing Data	Responsible for Establishing Initial Suggestion for Goal Setting, and Documenting thought Process	Short Term Goal/Long Term Target						Report	
Communication	าร	Melissa Deadmond	ASA (already set at 70%)	>=70%	N/A	67.6%	68.9%	68.9%	2019-20	71.4%	
Critical Thinking	g	Melissa Deadmond	ASA (already set at 70%)	>=70%	N/A	66.1%	65.4%	68.2%	2019-20	71.5%	
Information Lit	eracy	Melissa Deadmond	ASA (already set at 70%)	>=70%	N/A	57.4%	57.4%	60.7%	2019-20	61.4%	
People & Cultu	ral Awareness	Melissa Deadmond	ASA (already set at 70%)	>=70%	N/A	71.8%	72.3%	74.7%	2019-20	76.3%	
Quantitative Re	easoning	Melissa Deadmond	ASA (already set at 70%)	>=70%	N/A	61.2%	62.8%	62.9%	2019-20	64.5%	

5. Provide student support services that correlate with student success			SMP Report	
• •			-	

								Spri	ng 2021	
KPI's	Responsible for Providing Data	Responsible for Establishing Initial Suggestion for Goal Setting, and Documenting thought Process	Short Term Goal/Long Term Target	Prior 4	Prior 3	Prior 2	Prior 1	Data Year	Value	Tren d
5.1 Advising: total graduated, transferred, or still-enrolled (Advised v. non-advised) Mandatory advising of degree-seekers	IR	Natalie Brown	80%/95%	72% vs 61%	72% vs 62%	75% vs 60%	72% vs 58%	2019-20	71% vs 59%	
5.2 TLC: course pass rate (tutored v. not tutored)	IR	Brandy Scarnati	87%/90%	86% vs 78%	86% vs 77%	85% vs 79%	86% vs 77%	2019-20	87% vs 80%	
5.3 Counseling: F/F persistence (used counseling v. did not use counseling)	IR/Joan Steinman	Joan Steinman	60%/65%	61% vs 41%	59% vs 41%	62% vs 39%	60% vs 40%	2019-20	57% vs 37%	

- 4.1
 - Communications
 - o Critical Thinking
 - o People & Cultural Awareness
 - o Quantitative Reasoning
- 5.1 Advising degree-seekers. Change to mandatory advising of degree-seekers. 80% short-term and 95% long-term. F/F persistence?
- 5.2 Add F/F persistence?
- 5.3

Group 6 - Close Achievement Gaps: KPI's 6.1-6.2

Names:

Modifications were made to KPI's based on suggestions from last month's Planning Council meeting and those individuals or groups responsible for providing data and establishing an initial suggestion for setting short-term (2 years) and long-term targets (5 years) were identified in the President's Cabinet. We are asking that you discuss these initial suggestions where available and either affirm or propose a new short-term goal and long-term target. if no initial suggestion has yet been made, please make one. Please document your rationale/notes of your discussion.

Close Achievement Gaps

6. Close achie	vement gaps across underserved	student populat	ions							Report	
	KPI's	Responsible for Providing Data	Responsible for Establishing Initial Suggestion for Goal Setting, and Documenting thought Process	Short Term Goal/Long Term Target	Prior 4	Prior 3	Prior 2	Prior 1	Data Year	ng 2021 Value	Tre nd
	6.1 Graduation rate by:										
	Hispanic population (compared to cohort)	IR	DEI	Hispanic rate = IPEDS cohort rate			H: 28% cohor t: 30%	H: 28% coho rt: 31%	Fall 2014	H: 32% cohort: 28%	
	Hispanic male population (compared to cohort)	IR	DEI	Hispanic male rate = IPEDS cohort rate			HM: 20% cohor t: 30%	HM: 21% coho rt: 31%	Fall 2014	HM: 28% cohort: 28%	
	6.2 Fall-to-Fall retention of Firstgen, new, full-time degree-seekers (at TMCC)	IR	DEI	= IPEDS cohort rate	64% vs 61%	63% vs 60%	62% vs 63%	66% vs 66%	Fall 2019	57% vs 60%	

• 6.1

Question: Why are these numbers are being measured against Fall 2014 rather than something more current.

Answer: After taking on bachelor's degree, it changed the way cohorts are followed. These are now 6 year time periods, which was reset at the time of adding the bachelor's. To look at four data points - you are looking at 2012, 2013, 2014 graduation rates. Each is reported to IPEDS at 3 years but now, also, at 6 years (so there is some duplication).

6.1.2

Due to COVID, it's been reported that enrollment among hispanic males has dropped, along with all other demographics. The question this brings up is whether this is an attainable goal. Is there a way/opportunity to measure this decline compared to declines in other demographic areas? YA - we want the latinx population to be mirroring the population and that we should be striving for the average of ALL demographics, not against a specific demographic. CCardoza - we saw it as a double-check to make sure there was not a disproportionate change among hispanic males. YA - focus on hispanic males was to ensure a large enough and stable enough "n" to be trackable over time. Other demographics have a very small "n".

COVID dips are factored into many of the short-term goals to help get the college back on track.

• 6.2

President Question - language of "=IPEDS cohort rate" is confusing as a reader. Elena suggested possibly relabeling for clarity since there is a different method in reporting the data between the 6-year cohort and the second cohort.

We suggest there might be a "yellow" designation for 6.2 to indicate that we are approaching this goal given that 57% is quite close to 60%. YA/President agreed that these are close and should be denoted that we are making progress toward this. MD - right now the color just represents the trends in the numbers. Once the report is completed, these will have a yellow to show movement from the initial to the goal.

Overall, we do not suggest changes to the responsibilities because we believe that DEI and IR are the correct entities to measure these data.

Group 7 - Workforce: KPI's 7.1-7.4

Names:

Modifications were made to KPI's based on suggestions from last month's Planning Council meeting and those individuals or groups responsible for providing data and establishing an initial suggestion for setting short-term (2 years) and long-term targets (5 years) were identified in the President's Cabinet. We are asking that you discuss these initial suggestions where available and either affirm or propose a new short-term goal and long-term target. if no initial suggestion has yet been made, please make one. Please document your rationale/notes of your discussion.

Workforce

		Decreasible for Establishing Initial Compaction				+
KPI's	Responsible for Providing Data	tor Goal Seing, and Documenting thought	Short Term Goal/Long Term Target	Prior 4	Prior 3	P
7.1 workforce awards conferred (CT, SKC, BAS, AAS)	IR	Academics	goal - 1407 (ave); target - 1477	1473	1431	1
7.2 number of Employers sponsoring TMCC Apprenticeships (cumulative)	Barb Walden	Barb Walden	1-2 per year goal; 35 target			
7.3 number of TMCC Apprentices (cumulative)	Barb Walden	Barb Walden	845 goal; 970 target			
7.4 EPIC career certificate completions	Kathy Berry	Kathy Berry	increase 2% annually			
Highlights of work with regional employers (qualitative)	Barb Walden	Sidney Sullivan; EPIC				

- 7.1 As the economy improves, workforce education enrollments tend to go down. This is an ongoing trend we've seen and not Covid related. The CTE programs were hit hard by the Spring 2020 shutdown as they required hands-on lab. This was a national trend. Enrollment overall due to Covid-19 has gone down. As the economy recovers, federal and state funding will be put into workforce training which will help this KPI grow over time.
- 7.2 The apprenticeship program funding to serve any sector (AAI) will end in September 2021, funding for manufacturing only sectors will continue through September 2023. TMCC will work to sustain and grow the program adding 1-2 new employers per year. Increasing efforts to integrate credit and noncredit workforce training programs will further allow TMCC to adapt to fluctuating labor market demands with innovative programs that better reflect employers' shifting needs.
- 7.3 Apprentice numbers will grow proportionally with new employers while maintaining existing apprenticeship programs.
- 7.4 EPIC was greatly affected by COVID 19 but we are beginning to see growth as people are more comfortable with coming back into the classroom again. We expect to see ongoing growth of these programs as the focus is placed on them and as EPIC will be under new leadership beginning summer of 2021.

Group 8/9 - Research: KPI's 8.1 and 9.1-9.3

Names:

Modifications were made to KPI's based on suggestions from last month's Planning Council meeting and those individuals or groups responsible for providing data and establishing an initial suggestion for setting short-term (2 years) and long-term targets (5 years) were identified in the President's Cabinet. We are asking that you discuss these initial suggestions where available and either affirm or propose a new short-term goal and long-term target. if no initial suggestion has yet been made, please make one. Please document your rationale/notes of your discussion.

Research

8. Promote	student learning through undergra	duate research a	nd experiential l	earning							
	KPIs	Responsible for Providing Data	Responsible for Establishing Initial Suggestion for Goal Setting, and Documenting thought Process	Short Term Goal/Long Term Target	Prior 4	Prior 3	Prior 2	Prior 1	Data Year	Value	Tre nd
	8.1 Number of students involved in research and experiential learning projects on campus	Julie Ellsworth	Academics						2019-20	79	
9. Encourag	e research-based practices in teach	ning									
	KPIs	Responsible for Providing Data	Responsible for Establishing Initial Suggestion for Goal Setting, and Documenting thought Process	Short Term Goal/Long Term Target	Prior 4	Prior 3	Prior 2	Prior 1	Data Year	Value	Tre nd
	9.1 Number of faculty completing ACUE (running total) - Change to rate	VPAA Office	VPAA Office	9 goal	N/A	N/A	N/A	45	2019/ 20	74	
	9.2 Number of QM certified web	Brandy Scarnati	Brandy Scarnati	49 goal; 70 target	4	18	40	45	2019/	45	

sections taught (running total)				20	
9.3 foundation grant outcomes (Qualitative)	Gretchen Sawyer	Gretchen			

• 8.1

8.1: undergraduate research (Julie will provide definition - "an inquiry or investigation conducted by an undergraduate student that makes an original intellectual or creative contribution to the discipline."

(includes hypothesis, open ended definition, collect data, reflection on how that data weighed in on the hypothesis, authentic inquiry-based learning)

Change point person to VPAA, since this KPI includes all academics, and not just Julie's division.

Create an 8.2 (or keep as part of 8.1) - self reporting from faculty with a common definition of project-based learning and/or experiential-based learning (need to definition to discern 8.1 from 8.2) (Paul to define, if we decide to go with an additional 8.2 KPI) See: http://www.bu.edu/ctl/guides/experiential-learning/ and

https://experientiallearninginstitute.org/resources/what-is-experiential-learning/

We did talk about moving faculty from what they may currently be doing to a more standardized understanding of experiential learning, e.g. to have more reflection.

Create an 8.3 Internships - for-credit internships have averaged 20-25 per year for the past several years- until last year when there was a drop.

• 9.1

Completion of any modules of ACUE

• 9.2

Good with the target as a measure

• 9.3

Grants that are relevant to best practices in teaching. Innovation and undergraduate research-based grants - measure the outcomes/successes of the grants awarded.

Group 10-12 - Resources: KPI's 10.1, 11.1-11.4, and 12.1-12.2

Names:

Modifications were made to KPI's based on suggestions from last month's Planning Council meeting and those individuals or groups responsible for providing data and establishing an initial suggestion for setting short-term (2 years) and long-term targets (5 years) were identified in the President's Cabinet. We are asking that you discuss these initial suggestions where available and either affirm or propose a new short-term goal and long-term target. if no initial suggestion has yet been made, please make one. Please document your rationale/notes of your discussion.

Resources

10. Optir	nize state-funded revenue										
	KPIs	Responsible for Providing Data	Responsible for Establishing Initial Suggestion for Goal Setting, and Documenting thought Process	Short Term Goal/Long Term Target	Prior 4	Prior 3	Prior 2	Prior 1	Data Year	Value	Tre nd
	10.2 Weighted student credit hours (Are these completed?)	IR	Cabinet	3% in 5 years starting Sp. 22	204,80	204,26 6	215,99 5	227,42 7	2019/20	227,510	
11. Maxi	 mize and grow non state-funded reve	nue streams									
	KPIs	Responsible for Providing Data	Responsible for Establishing Initial Suggestion for Goal Setting, and Documenting thought Process	Short Term Goal/Long Term Target	Prior 4	Prior 3	Prior 2	Prior 1	Data Year	Value	Tre nd
	11.1 Revenue from self-supporting programs	Elise - metric still needs to be defined	Finance								
	11.2 baseline amount of private donations	Gretchen Sawyer	Gretchen Sawyer						2019-20	\$2,181,427	

	11.3 dollar amount of grant-based revenues	Gretchen Sawyer	Gretchen Sawyer						2019-20	\$5,738,527	
	11.4 Percentage of FT TMCC employees who contribute to the Foundation	Gretchen Sawyer	Gretchen Sawyer	50%; 100% of leadership	38%	36%	34%	32%	2019/2 0	34%	
12. Promote er	hvironmental sustainability										
	KPIs	Responsible for Providing Data	Responsible for Establishing Initial Suggestion for Goal Setting, and Documenting thought Process	Short Term Goal/Long Term Target	Prior 4	Prior 3	Prior 2	Prior 1	Data Year	Value	Tre nd
	12.1 Maintain Second Nature Resilience Commitment Status (qualitative)	Yevonne Allen	Yevonne Allen	Maintain	Resilie nce Commi tment Signed		Resilie nce Assess ment	Climat e Action Plan Create d	FY 21	Climate Action Plan progress measuremen t cycle	
	12.2 Campus-wide environmental sustainability initiatives (qualitative)	Yevonne Allen	Yevonne Allen	Maintain	TMCC Faculty Sustai nabilit y Advoc ate additio nal assign ment create d	Sustai nabilit y Websit e, "Facutl y Stories ", RTC discou nt bus passes , and hydrati on station	(1) TMCC Green Team establi shed. (2) Sustai nable Promo tional Materi als Initativ e.	(1) U.S. Depart ment of Educat ion Green Ribbo n School design ation. (2) TMCC 100%		GREENevada Golden Pinecone Sustainability Award - Clean Energy	

		S	Renew	
			able	
			Energy	
			Power	
			ed	

- 10.1
- 11.1 profit of self supporting programs showing greater than or equal to previous years profit
- 11.2 3 and 5 year snapshot, 6% target for both 3 year and 10% increase for the 5 year snapshot
- 11.3 3 and 5 year snapshot, 6% target for both 3 year and 10% increase for the 5 year snapshot
- 11.4 define Leadership
- 12.1
- 12.2