

MONTHLY OUTLOOK

A Meeting Preview with Data Insights and MC 2020 Progress

June 7, 2019

June Meeting Highlights—What to Expect and Why

Your last meeting of the fiscal year occurs on Monday, June 17, 2019, and includes these major items and topics:

Montgomery College 2025 Strategic Plan. After a year of preparation and a year of plan development with broad collegewide and community involvement, the new strategic plan, *Montgomery College 2025*, will be presented for your adoption. This plan is based on the board's special project, *Envisioning the Future*; the College's 2018 Self-Study for reaccreditation; and extensive input from the community, and lays out six major goals for the College's concentration from FY21 through FY25.

PIC MC Development. This resolution marks a major milestone for the College in the development plans for the Pinkney Innovation Complex for Science and Technology at Montgomery College (PIC MC) on the Germantown Campus. This resolution asks you to recognize PIC MC's development agreement with 19710 Observation Drive, LLC—a joint venture between developers Minkoff and Scheer Partners and South Duvall—to construct a building on campus to accommodate private sector companies. It also asks you to authorize the president to execute the accompanying negotiated ground lease upon completion of the development agreement.

Final Adoption of the FY20 Budgets. The budget requests you adopted earlier this year—recall the capital budget in December and the operating budget in January—must be approved for implementation now that state and county appropriation decisions are final.

Petition for State Funding. This resolution requests that the county council petition the state for \$36,521,000 for the construction of the Takoma Park/Silver Spring Math and Science Building project.

Compensation in FY20. This resolution recommends approval of the salary wage adjustment and salary schedule for non-bargaining associate and support staff, department chairs, and administrators, as well as special recognition and outstanding service awards; full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and staff member of the year awards; degree attainment salary enhancement for associate and support staff and administrators; and non-bargaining associate and support staff shift differential for FY20. Recall that compensation for bargaining unit employees is addressed in the bargaining unit agreements.

Awards of Contracts. Ten awards of contract are slated for your consideration. Five arise through competitive solicitation processes: (1) an ADA elevator addition at the Germantown Campus, (2) a time and material on-call contract for paving services, (3) a contract for structural repairs to the West Garage at the Takoma Park/Silver Spring Campus, (4) replacement of the Rockville Campus pool filtration and heat exchange unit, and (5) a contract for pharmacy benefit management (prescription drugs) services. Five contracts are sole source and include three continuations of existing contracts—the "Wellness@Work" program with Holy Cross Health, document imaging, and interim information technology leadership services with CampusWorks. One sole source contract is for an upgrade to the current Duo Security, Inc., two-factor authentication software, and one provides for a change order to an existing sole source contract with Ex Libris to provide maintenance of the College's automated online library system.

Policy Matters. One new policy and five policy modifications are on the agenda. The new policy is required by

Maryland Senate Bill 798, "Student Concerns about Athletic Programs and Activities," passed in the 2019 General Assembly. Once approved, the policy must be submitted to the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) by October 1. Modifications are proposed for five policies: the sexual misconduct policy, the telework policy (to be renamed "flexible work arrangements"), the compensation program policy, protection against retaliation policy, and the reporting suspected acts of wrongdoing policy.

Annual Report on the Cultural Diversity Plan. This is a required annual report that reviews the College's progress in implementing our Cultural Diversity Plan approved by the board in 2013. The report is due to MHEC by September 1.

FY19 College Report. The College's annual report will be presented for your acceptance. The report contains an overview of College highlights, student outcomes, a financial report, updates from the College's support organizations, recognitions of members of the College community, and a summary of the board's activities.

Board Elections. Elections will be held for the board's officers.

The following items are on your consent calendar:

Personnel Actions Confirmation Report. This report reviews personnel actions taken in April.

Nomination to the Montgomery County Consolidated Retiree Health Benefits Trust Board. Representatives from the College are nominated by the Board of Trustees to the county's Consolidated Retiree Health Benefits Trust (CRHBT). Nominee names are submitted to the county executive for confirmation by the county council. In this action, the board will nominate a replacement for the faculty member seat recently vacated.

Forest and Tree Conservation, and Stormwater Management Easement Actions. The College and the city of Rockville have negotiated a forest and tree conservation maintenance agreement and a stormwater management inspection and maintenance agreement. These two agreements are required as part of the construction of the Soccer Field Complex on the Rockville Campus. Under state law, the city has the delegated authority to implement the forest conservation laws of the state and, in that role, to approve forest conservation plans and stormwater management concept plans for any private or public development within its jurisdiction.

Retirement Resolutions. Every June the board receives resolutions and awards of medallion for employees who retired from January through June to honor and appreciate their service. Departing trustees, Robert Hydorn and Sasini Wickramatunga, will also be honored.

Data Focus of the Month

Peer Institutions Offer Comparison Benchmarks



The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) is operated by the Institute of Education Statistics, which describes itself as the independent and non-partisan “statistics, research, and evaluation arm of the US Department of Education.” IPEDS collects institutional data on a variety of measures used by state and federal government for policy analysis and development. In addition, the data can be used for institutional peer analysis and benchmarking. Seventeen community colleges across the country are considered “peers” to Montgomery College due to similarity on factors such as enrollment, location, and budget. For example, MC’s FY17 unduplicated headcount was 32,747 and the average of our 17 peers was 33,880. This report looks at comparisons on three factors: completion, retention, and student aid.

MC is slightly lower on graduation, but significantly higher on transfer. Recall that IPEDS graduation looks at new, full-time, degree-seeking students and measures how they do in three years. For MC, 23 percent of new full-time students who entered the College in fall 2014 graduated within three years compared to an average of 25 percent at peer institutions. However, the transfer rate for MC students was 10 points higher than that at peer institutions: 23 percent at MC and 13 percent at peers. Data disaggregated by race/ethnicity show comparable rates to peers for Black, White, and multi-race students; higher graduation rates for American Indian and international students; and lower graduation rates for Asian and Hispanic students (see *Figure 1*).

	American Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Multi Race	International	Overall
MC	33%	27%	15%	18%	27%	17%	37%	23%
Peers	17%	38%	15%	22%	28%	18%	33%	25%

Figure 1. Graduation rates at MC and IPEDS peer institutions for students entering in fall 2014.

MC excels in student retention. As you have heard in our Constituent Conversations this year, MC’s new, full-time, degree-seeking students returned to College at a higher rate than students from peer institutions. The MC fall 2014 IPEDS cohort returned the following fall at 75 percent compared to peers’ average of 67 percent.

Student aid is similar, though MC provides much more in institutional grants. A combination of financial aid resources is key to financing a college education. During the 2016–2017 reporting period, the “any grant aid” and state or local grant categories awarded aid to a smaller percentage of MC students than to students from peer institutions. In contrast, notably higher percentages of MC students than students at peer colleges were awarded institutional grants—including Montgomery College Foundation scholarships—and loans (see *Figure 2*). With the exception of institutional grants, MC students received lower award dollars in grants, but higher award dollars in “any grant aid” and “any loan” compared to students at peer institutions (see *Figure 3*).

	Any Grant Aid	Federal Grants	Pell Grants	State/Local Grants	Institutional Grants	Any Loans	Federal Loans
MC	57%	45%	45%	19%	33%	14%	13%
Peers	61%	44%	44%	28%	3%	9%	9%

Figure 2. Percentages of students receiving aid at MC and IPEDS peer institutions in 2016-2017.

	Any Grant Aid	Federal Grants	Pell Grants	State/Local Grants	Institutional Grants	Any Loans	Federal Loans
MC	\$5,017	\$4,437	\$4,351	\$1,513	\$1,810	\$4,969	\$4,901
Peers	\$4,704	\$4,631	\$4,543	\$1,803	\$1,510	\$4,357	\$4,357

Figure 3. Average amount of aid provided to students at MC and IPEDS peer institutions in 2016-2017.

Montgomery College 2020 Update of the Month



Since 2012, the Montgomery College 2020 strategic plan has driven significant changes in support of student success. The Performance Canvas within the plan contains three broad levels of indicators that the College is using to track its progress in realizing the themes of *Montgomery College 2020*—objective indicators, subjective indicators, and cognitive indicators. This month's update takes a look at the cognitive indicators on the canvas. The canvas concept for institutional assessment is based on *Performance: The Dynamic Results in Postsecondary Organizations*, by Richard Alfred, Kathryn Thirolf, Nathan Harris, and James Webb. The goals in the canvas are intended to be reached by the beginning of FY20.

What are 'cognitive indicators'? These consist of 10 indicators that reflect the feelings and beliefs about the College. These indicators reflect the value that individuals assign to the College based on the impressions they form through their interactions with the College and their interpretations of information about the College. Awards and Recognition indicators include granting agency selection, transfer scholarships, recognitions received by faculty and staff, employee philanthropy, number of businesses provided contract training services and their satisfaction. Valuation indices include student satisfaction, student goal attainment, and employee engagement.

How are we doing? Over the duration of the plan, our goal for the number of businesses provided contract training services is 80 annually. Our latest observation indicates that the College provided 68 businesses with training in FY18, a slight increase over the previous year's observation. Another indicator, granting agency selection, which measures the number of unique grants awarded to the College, has a target of 40 by 2020 and our last observation put this number at 40 for FY19 reflecting an increase over the previous observation and hitting the target goal.

What do the Awards and Recognitions indicators measure? These indicators focus on how well the College is performing in relation to external validation or honors. As an example of our achievement, 98 percent of employers reported satisfaction with contract training services provided, exceeding our target of 95 percent. Over the life of *Montgomery College 2020*, we challenged ourselves to increase the number of employees and retirees who donate to the Montgomery College Foundation during a fiscal year from 240 in FY12 to 325 annually by 2020. In FY19, we surpassed that target with 346 employees and retirees contributing.

What do Valuation indicators measure? These indicators focus on how the College is performing relative to internal and external perceptions. For example, we challenged ourselves to reach 6,000 annual course enrollments in contract training. Our last observation indicates that there were over 8,000 course enrollments, far exceeding our target goal. Another indicator is the percentage of employees who believe that their work supports the College's mission. Currently, over 90 percent of employees share this belief, close to our target of 100 percent.

What are the other types of indicators in the canvas? In addition to the cognitive indicators, there are also objective and subjective indicators. Objective indicators, featured in the April edition of *Monthly Outlook*, represent number-based or value-added activities. Subjective indicators, featured in the May *Monthly Outlook* represent rankings and ratings and reflect the College's standing or position on a scale, where the College strives for a favorable outcome.

Be well,



DeRionne P. Pollard, PhD

We empower our students to change their lives, and we enrich the life of our community. We are accountable for our results.