

# **Results**

## **CB-116 Supplemental Follow-Up**

### **Collin College**

#### **2014 – 2015 Program Completers**

**(By Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP)  
Listed in Ascending CIP Order)**

**Nasreen Ahmad, Director**

**Institutional Research – Policy and Planning**

**November 17, 2016**

**Results**  
**CB-116 Supplemental Follow-Up**  
**Collin College**  
**2014 – 2015 Program Completers**  
**(By Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Listed in**  
**Ascending CIP Order)**

**Executive Summary**

Each year, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) tracks community college program completers in an effort to determine what proportion of the state's community college program completers were "successful" in their subsequent endeavors. The THECB defines as "successful" those community college program completers who, during the first fall (October, November, December) following program completion, either (1) transfer to another post-secondary institution to continue their education, or (2) find gainful employment. Historically, the state's placement standard used to be 85 percent. As of now there are no such state standards. However, Carl Perkins regulations designate an average student success rate of 76 percent<sup>1</sup> for any given instructional program to be deemed "successful" (Core indicator 4P1).

The THECB uses the following multi-step process, known as the Automated Student and Adult Learner Follow-up System (ASALFS), to identify "successful" program completers.

Step 1: The THECB uses its own statewide student database to track students who completed instructional programs at Texas community colleges to determine which completers continued their education during the year following their community college program completion. (For the purposes of ASALFS, instructional programs are identified by federal CIP Codes.)

Step 2: The THECB sends the Social Security Numbers of the program completers to the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC) to match against the TWC's unemployment insurance (UI) Wage Record Database to identify which completers were employed by organizations that participate in the State's UI program. An initial "success" rate is calculated for every instructional program at every community college in the State based on the first two steps.

Step 3: The THECB notifies institutions that a list is available on the THECB Internet site identifying completers who were not found as "successful" in the first

---

<sup>1</sup> The target was 80.5% for the last two years. This year the target was renegotiated with the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education (OCTAC), US Department of Education. The targets are set in consideration with other states.

two steps. The institutions, then, have the opportunity to supplement the initial success rates by undertaking their own efforts to track down their program completers who were not identified as “successful” in the first two steps. The missing students are tracked using multiple sources and strategies. When these missing completers are found, the institution administers a brief questionnaire to determine if a given completer continued her/his education or became employed/self-employed since program completion. The results of this supplemental tracking effort are entered into the THECB database by the institution via the Internet.

**Typically, THECB is unable to find students who:**

- transferred to colleges outside Texas
- worked for companies in Texas not covered by UI regulations
- were self-employed
- were incarcerated after exiting the program
- were employed outside of Texas
- were truly unemployed and not pursuing higher education

During fall 2016, the THECB notified Collin’s Institutional Research Office (IRO) that a list of 2014-2015 program completers who had not been identified as “successful” was available for supplemental follow-up. The deadline for submitting supplemental information was November 11, 2016. The list comprised of 344 completers for whom the THECB found no information. IRO undertook an extensive effort to locate and contact as many of these completers as possible using as resources the National Student Clearinghouse, Internet search engines, Collin faculty, an online survey<sup>2</sup>, and LinkedIn and other social networks. The faculty and administrators proved to be less resourceful in helping track the students this year; this was most likely because to administrative changes.

Table 1 indicates that, after completion of the first two steps in the ASALFS process, 16 of Collin’s 41 instructional programs that produced completers in 2014-15, and for whom the THECB was unable to track all completers, fell below the State’s 76 percent standard (Col.3); and 25 programs met the standard. IRO’s supplemental follow-up improved the success of all but nine programs (Col. 5). In most cases, the “unsuccessful” completers were either unemployed or stay-at-home parents during the reference period or were employed after the reference period. After IRO’s follow-up, only four of the 41 programs fell below the 76 percent target (Col. 6). All these four programs were one success shy of meeting the standard.

In column 5 of Table 1, the darker green shade indicates an improvement as a result of IRO follow-up. The nine cells with no dark green shading identify the nine programs that saw no improvement in their success rates following IRO’s efforts, though six of the nine programs met the 76 percent standard prior to IRO’s supplemental follow-up. The check

---

<sup>2</sup> As part of the Employer Satisfaction Survey, an online survey went out on 4/16/2016 to 2,707 graduates for whom personal email addresses were available. The survey asked the graduates about their employment status in fall 2015.

marks in column 6 identify the programs that met or exceeded the State standard after IRO's supplemental follow-up. Of 41 programs, 37 (90.2%) met or exceeded the State target of 76 percent (Col. 6).

In order to get a sense of success overtime, 3-year averages were computed for completers of the listed programs (Col. 7). The 3-year averages were calculated by adding the additional successes tracked by IRO to the initial outcomes from ASALFS in the last three years and dividing them by the total graduates in the program. Not all programs had completers to be tracked in each of the three years included in the average, therefore, column 8 indicates the number of years that were used in the computation of the average for each program. Only three programs did not meet the State standard.

**Table 1**  
**CB116 Supplemental Follow-up Summary by Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) for 2014-2015**  
**Graduates and 3-Year Averages for Successful Outcomes by CIP**  
**Collin College**

CIP	Program	ASALAFS Initial Matching Outcomes		IRO Supplemental Follow-up Outcomes			3-Year Averages		
		Successful Outcomes	Additional Success	Successful Revised Outcomes	Meet or exceed 76% target	Successful Revised Outcomes	Yrs. in Avg.		
		Graduates (Col. 1)	N (Col. 2)	% (Col. 3)	N (Col. 4)	% Final Success (Col. 5)	(Col. 6)	% Final Success (Col. 5)	
09010100	Speech Communication and Rhetoric	14	11	79%	2	93%	✓	95%	2
11010100	Computer and Information Sciences, General	22	18	82%	2	91%	✓	93%	3
11070100	Computer Science	11	10	91%	*0	91%	✓	87%	3
11080100	Web Page, Digital/Multimedia and Information Resources Design	8	6	75%	0	75%		86%	2
11100100	Network and System Administration/Administrator	19	16	84%	*1	89%	✓	94%	3
11100200	System, Networking, and LAN/WAN Management/Manager	6	4	67%	*1	83%	✓	85%	3
11100300	Computer and Information Systems Security/Information Assurance	33	25	76%	3	85%	✓	87%	3
12050100	Baking and Pastry Arts/Baker/Pastry Chef	12	10	83%	*1	92%	✓	91%	3
12050300	Culinary Arts/Chef Training	39	33	85%	3	92%	✓	88%	3
13121000	Early Childhood Education and Teaching	16	13	81%	0	81%	✓	90%	3
15030300	Electrical, Electronic and Communications Engineering Technology/Technician	5	4	80%	*0	80%	✓	90%	3
15130100	Drafting and Design Technology/Technician, General	9	6	67%	*2	89%	✓	96%	3
16160300	Sign Language Interpretation and Translation	9	6	67%	*1	78%	✓	84%	2
19070600	Child Development	15	12	80%	1	87%	✓	81%	3
19070900	Child Care Provider/Assistant	5	3	60%	*2	100%	✓	100%	1

CIP	Program	ASALAFS Initial Matching Outcomes		IRO Supplemental Follow-up Outcomes			3-Year Averages		
		Graduates	N	%	Additional Success	% Final Success	Successful Revised Outcomes	Successful Revised Outcomes	
							Meet or exceed 76% target	Yrs. in Avg.	
(Col. 1)	(Col. 2)	(Col. 3)	(Col. 4)	(Col. 5)	(Col. 6)	(Col. 5)			
22030200	Legal Assistant/Paralegal	47	39	83%	0	83%	✓	88%	3
24010200	General Studies	1604	1421	89%	77	93%	✓	92%	3
41010100	Biology Technician/Biotechnology Laboratory Technician	5	3	60%	0	60%		60%	1
43010400	Criminal Justice/Safety Studies	30	27	90%	1	93%	✓	93%	1
43010700	Criminal Justice/Police Science	43	41	95%	*0	95%	✓	96%	3
43020300	Fire Science/Firefighting	55	49	89%	3	95%	✓	97%	3
45070200	Geographic Information Science and Cartography	21	20	95%	*1	100%	✓	100%	1
50040200	Commercial and Advertising Art	10	6	60%	2	80%	✓	90%	3
50040800	Interior Design	9	3	33%	*4	78%	✓	70%	3
50040900	Graphic Design	4	3	75%	*1	100%	✓	100%	1
50041000	Illustration	1	0	0%	*0	0%		0%	1
50041100	Game and Interactive Media Design	12	9	75%	*1	83%	✓	88%	3
50090100	Music, General	10	7	70%	1	80%	✓	92%	3
50100300	Music Management	20	14	70%	*5	95%	✓	94%	3
51070700	Health Information/Medical Records Technology/Technician	38	26	68%	2	74%		82%	3
51071300	Medical Insurance Coding Specialist/Coder	16	13	81%	1	88%	✓	86%	3
51080800	Veterinary/Animal Health Technology/Technician and Veterinary Assistant	23	21	91%	0	91%	✓	91%	1
51090400	Emergency Medical Technology/Technician (EMT Paramedic)	39	37	95%	*2	100%	✓	100%	3
51090900	Surgical Technology/Technologist	24	23	96%	*1	100%	✓	94%	3
51380100	Registered Nursing/Registered Nurse	106	99	93%	*6	99%	✓	95%	3

CIP	Program	Graduates (Col. 1)	ASALAFS Initial Matching Outcomes		IRO Supplemental Follow-up Outcomes			3-Year Averages	
			N (Col. 2)	% (Col. 3)	Additional Success (Col. 4)	Successful Revised Outcomes (Col. 5)	Meet or exceed 76% target (Col. 6)	Successful Revised Outcomes (Col. 5)	Yrs. in Avg. (Col. 5)
52010100	Business/Commerce, General	126	108	86%	8	92%	✓	93%	3
52020100	Business Administration and Management, General	47	42	89%	1	91%	✓	91%	3
52021200	Retail Management	7	6	86%	1	100%	✓	94%	3
52040100	Administrative Assistant and Secretarial Science, General	11	7	64%	2	82%	✓	82%	3
52090100	Hospitality Administration/Management, General	22	19	86%	*1	91%	✓	97%	3
52150100	Real Estate	32	21	66%	*7	88%	✓	90%	3
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,585</b>	<b>2,241</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>✓</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>3</b>

Data Source: Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Automated Adult Student Learner Follow-up System data.

**Successful outcomes/Student success is defined as students having obtained employment during the months of October, November and December 2015 or having transferred to a college or university in the fall 2015 semester or being self-employed in fall 2015.**

**Note 1:** The light green cells indicate that the programs either meet or exceed the State's standard of 76% average as stated in the Carl Perkins data resources for measure 4P1.

**Note 2:** The dark green cells indicate that the program showed an improvement in success following IRO's tracking.

**Note 3:** The pink cells indicate that the program did not meet the standard of 76%.

**Note 4:** The cells without any fill in col. 5 indicate programs where no improvement could be made despite IRO efforts.

**Note 5:** The check marks indicate that the program either meets or exceeds the standard.

**Note 6:** The asterisks (\*) in col. 4 indicates that all graduates were tracked. However, they were either, unemployed and searching for work, voluntarily out of the workforce or they were employed outside the reference period. A few were either retired, disabled, stay-at-home parents, or had left the country.