



RUSS DEATON
Interim Executive Director

STATE OF TENNESSEE
HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION
PARKWAY TOWERS, SUITE 1900
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37243-0830
(615) 741-3605
FAX: (615) 741-6230

BILL HASLAM
Governor

TO: Chancellors and Presidents of Public Tennessee Higher Education
Community Colleges and Universities

FROM: Russ Deaton

SUBJECT: Institutional Outcome Improvement Fund Grant: Call for Proposals

DATE: April 15, 2016

For nearly four decades, Tennessee higher education has made the allocation of state appropriations based on elements of performance and outcomes a central element of public policy. With the passage of the Complete College Tennessee Act of 2010, Tennessee introduced an outcomes-based funding formula model, rewarding institutions for the production of outcomes that further educational attainment and economic development across the state. Since the implementation of the formula, many outcomes have grown, however individual institutional performance has varied.

With the completion of the first five years of the model, THEC began an in-depth formula review process in 2015, which included a reexamination of all elements of the formula — ranging from the outcomes and focus populations to the underlying architecture of the calculations. A desire to assist institutions struggling with outcome growth arose as a part of this process. In response, eight hundred thousand dollars (\$800,000) in non-recurring funding was provided in the FY17 budget for a competitive grant program to encourage the increased production of deficient outcomes. THEC is pleased to provide the Institutional Outcome Improvement Fund grant Request for Proposals (RFP).

As stated in the attached RFP, grants of up to two hundred thousand dollars (\$200,000) will be available to eligible institutions for a twenty-four month period to aid in the development of action plans to increase the production of historically lagging outcomes. To be eligible for this grant, an institution must show evidence of deficiency in growth in at least one of the eleven formula outcomes or three focus populations for public community colleges or one of the ten formula outcomes or two focus populations for public universities. Proposals must be grounded in research or best practices. Grants will be awarded to institutions that identify innovative and effective ways to increase the production of formula outcomes.

Please be aware of a few important details:

- THEC will host an informational webinar on **April 22, 2016 at 10:00AM CDT** (11:00AM EDT). Webinar details will be posted on THEC's website (www.tn.gov/thec) as soon as they are available.
- A Letter of Intent to Participate is due **Friday, April 29, 2016 by 4:00PM CDT** (5:00PM EDT). Full proposals are due **Friday, May 13, 2016 by 4:00PM CDT** (5:00PM EDT). Please see the Grant timeline on page 4 of the RFP for key dates regarding the application and review process.
- Only one proposal is allowed per institution. This RFP announcement is being shared with university and community college chancellors and presidents.

THEC looks forward to receiving your completed submission.

**Tennessee Higher
Education Commission**



**Request for Proposals and
Guidelines for Submission**

***Institutional Outcome Improvement
Fund Grants***

Notice of Intent Deadline: April 29, 2016

Proposal Deadline: May 13, 2016

Request for Proposals

Overview.....3

Institutional Outcome Improvement Fund Grant Details.....3

 Eligibility3

 Timeline.....4

 Award Amount and Duration.....5

 Subject to Funds Availability.....5

 Notice of Intent.....5

 Submission of Grant Application5

 Grant Reporting.....6

 Sustainability6

Proposal Components6

Application Procedures.....10

Award Administration11

Appendices

Appendix A – Application Checklist.....12

Appendix B – Scoring Rubric.....13

Appendix C – Application Packet.....17

Appendix D – Project Budget Summary Form.....24

Appendix E – Outcomes Data.....27

I. Overview

Since 2010, Tennessee has been pursuing a higher education completion agenda focused on significantly increasing educational attainment among all Tennesseans. In order to reach its completion goals, the state must fundamentally change how it approaches higher education attainment and measures progress. To this end, Tennessee is taking decisive action to increase educational attainment among Tennesseans through reform legislation such as the Complete College Tennessee Act of 2010 (CCTA) and Governor Bill Haslam's Drive to 55 initiative. Tennessee is poised for significant education gains.

With the passage of the CCTA of 2010, Tennessee introduced an outcomes-based funding formula model, rewarding institutions for the production of outcomes that further the educational attainment and productivity goals of the state Master Plan. The outcomes chosen represent broad activities across various types of institutions from research-heavy four-year universities to community colleges filling workforce development needs. These outcomes measures are grouped into the categories of student progression, degree production, efficiency and other important institutional functions.

Since implementation of the model, many outcomes have grown significantly: overall associate degrees have increased in the community college sector from 7,500 awarded in academic year 2009-10 to nearly 9,200 in 2014-15; the overall university graduation rate has increased from 49 percent in 2009-10 to 54 percent in 2014-15. Individual institutional performances, however, have varied.

The Institutional Outcome Improvement Fund (IOIF) grant is subject to availability of State funds. IOIF grants will be awarded to institutions that develop action plans to increase outcomes where they have historically lagged in performance. Action plans that address any of the eleven formula outcomes at community colleges or nine formula outcomes at universities are eligible for consideration. Action plans that address specific focus populations are also eligible for consideration. (See Appendix E for outcomes and focus populations data.)

II. Institutional Outcome Improvement Fund Grant Details

A. Eligibility

Applicants will be considered eligible for the IOIF grant with the following conditions:

- Institutions may partner with other non-profit institutions or community organizations to implement proposed initiatives; however, a Tennessee public community college or university must serve as the lead applicant and fiscal agent.

- If the applying institution is a community college, the proposal must address one of the eleven outcomes or three focus populations recognized for that sector in the outcomes-based funding formula model. If the applying institution is a university, the proposal must address one of the nine outcomes or two focus populations recognized for that sector in the outcomes-based funding formula model. (See Appendix E for historic outcome data.)
- A proposal must focus on one outcome or a group of related outcomes. The same proposal may further focus on none, some or all of the focus populations as it relates to the identified outcome(s).
- A proposal must define how the outcome(s) and, if applicable, focus population(s) addressed are considered deficient in growth. The proposal should reference the historic outcome data to help define growth deficiency.
- A proposal must be grounded in research, or otherwise considered a best practice by a reputable professional organization, explaining how the intended intervention may lead to increases in the identified outcome(s).
- Each applying institution may submit only one proposal addressing an outcome or group of related outcomes. Related groups of outcomes can include all three progression metrics or short- and long-term certificates. (See Appendix E for reference.)

B. Timeline

To answer questions and provide further information regarding the IOIF grant goals and application, THEC will provide a webinar for institutions on **Friday, April 22, 2016, at 10:00 AM CDT (11:00 AM EDT)**. Participation in the webinar is not required to be eligible for the grant. Institutions must submit a statement of their intent to apply for an Institutional Outcome Improvement Fund grant by **Friday, April 29, 2016, by 4:00 PM CDT (5:00 PM EDT)**. Final proposals are due **Friday, May 13, 2016, by 4:00 PM CDT (5:00 PM EDT)**.

Relevant dates for the Institutional Outcome Improvement Fund grant are as follows:

Institutional Outcome Improvement Fund (IOIF) Grant Timeline	
Item	Date/Deadline
THEC releases IOIF Grant RFP	04/15/2016
IOIF Grant proposal technical assistance webinar	04/22/2016 at 10AM CDT
Deadline to submit Notice of Intent	04/29/2016 by 4PM CDT
Deadline for receipt of grant proposal	05/13/2016 by 4PM CDT
THEC announces grant award	06/06/2016
Mandatory project director workshop	06/15/2016
Grant activities begin	07/01/2016
Grant activities conclude	06/30/2018

C. Award Amount and Duration

The Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) anticipates awarding four to eight grants, with a minimum award amount of \$50,000 per grant award to a maximum award amount of \$200,000 per grant award. Projects will last for approximately 24 months, from July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2018.

D. Subject to Funds Availability

Any awarded grants are subject to the appropriation and availability of State funds. In the event that the funds are not appropriated or are otherwise unavailable, THEC reserves the right to terminate this initiative upon written notice to the institution.

E. Notice of Intent

THEC is requiring institutions to send letters of intent to indicate their plans to submit a grant proposal. The letter of intent should identify a campus liaison with whom THEC will communicate for the remainder of the grant application and implementation process. Each letter must include the signature of the college president. Letters are due from institutions to THEC via email to Crystal Collins at Crystal.Collins@tn.gov by **4:00 PM CDT (5:00PM EDT) on April 29, 2016**. The subject line should read 'Institutional Improvement Outcome Fund Grant' with the institution's name.

F. Submission of Grant Application

The grant proposal submission deadline is **4:00PM CDT (5:00PM EDT), May 13, 2016**. Submissions should be emailed to Crystal Collins at Crystal.Collins@tn.gov. Proposals should be no longer than 15 pages, excluding the project abstract, budget items, letters of commitment and applicable curriculum vitae. Incomplete

applications will not be considered.

THEC will award grants on **June 6, 2016**. Implementation will begin approximately one month following the award and conclude June 30, 2018. The expectation is that the program will be sustainable in nature and will continue beyond the period of the grant. Please see the rubric in Appendix B for scoring details.

G. Grant Reporting

To measure the success of the proposed interventions, THEC requires grantees to submit two performance reports containing data and narrative information detailing the project's implementation status. Performance reports will be due by June 1, 2017 and within 30 days after the project's conclusion. Final grant reimbursements will not be made until the final performance report is submitted. Additionally, grantees will be required to submit two progress reports six months into the start of grant operations and six months before the conclusion of grant operations.

The performance measures required within the performance and progress reports will be contingent upon outcomes addressed in the proposal and will be explained upon awarding of the grant.

H. Sustainability

Successful proposals will focus on sustainable practices. Projects should consider that, if successful, interventions have the potential to adapt in a feasible and cost-effective manner to continuously improve an institutional outcome after the conclusion of the grant. Proposals should describe how the institution will sustain the plan after the conclusion of the grant.

III. Proposal Components

A. Cover Page

Applicants must complete the IOIF cover page and include all required signatures (Appendix C). Applicants must designate a project manager and a primary contact (these can be the same individual) to report to THEC.

Applicants should identify the contact(s) by listing first and last name, title and contact information on the cover page.

B. Project Abstract

Applicants should include a project abstract no longer than half a page. This will be used to describe funded proposals in publications and on THEC's website.

Note: The project abstract does not count toward the 15-page proposal limit.

C. Project Proposal (45 Points)

Proposals must include a detailed description of the proposed interventions. Intervention descriptions should provide:

1. The five-year historical performance (academic year 2010-11 to 2014-15) of the outcome or related group of outcomes (and, if applicable, focus populations) addressed by the proposal. Related groups of outcomes can include all three progression metrics or short- and long-term certificates. (See Appendix E for reference.)
2. An explanation as to how and why the proposal considers the addressed outcome or related group of outcomes (and, if applicable, focus populations) to be deficient in growth. Discussion of institutional challenges that have impacted the outcomes or related group of outcomes (and, if applicable, focus populations) identified as deficient in growth. Identification of institutional strengths to be leveraged to address these challenges.
3. Description of the intervention, the associated activities and the rationale for choosing said intervention. The narrative should address how the proposed project will specifically increase the outcome or related group of outcomes (and, if applicable, focus populations) considered deficient in growth. The narrative should also include academic research (or relevant connections to best practices as identified by a reputable professional organization) that connects analogous interventions to growth in analogous outcomes.
4. Description of anticipated growth in the addressed outcome or related group of outcomes (and, if applicable, focus populations) as a result of the proposed intervention.
5. Month-by-month timeline, from July 2016 through June 2018, with grant activities and anticipated deliverables listed. Deliverables include performance reports to be submitted on July 1, 2017 and within 30 days of the completion of grant activities, as well as two additional progress reports to be completed 6 months into grant operations and 6 months before the conclusion of grant operations.

D. Organizational Capacity (10 Points)

Proposals must include an overview of the applying institution's capacity to successfully carry out the proposed project and the resources available to support implementation. Applicants should provide:

1. List of individuals responsible for managing, coordinating or carrying

out activities and their associated responsibilities. Include curriculum vitae for the project director and any key personnel responsible for project implementation.

2. If the intervention includes internal collaboration across institutional departments and offices, the proposal must provide a brief summary of the internal collaboration and signed letters of collaboration from the internal partners.
3. If the intervention includes external collaboration with another institution or organization, the proposal must provide a brief summary of the external collaboration and signed letters of collaboration from the external partners.

Note: Letters of commitment to collaboration and curriculum vitae do not count toward the 15-page limit.

E. Project Goals and Evaluation (20 Points)

Proposals must address to what extent the proposed interventions will increase the stated outcome or related group of outcomes (and, if applicable, focus populations) identified for intervention. Specifically, proposals must include the following:

1. Clearly stated measures of success for growth in the outcome or related group of outcomes (and, if applicable, focus populations) identified for intervention. Targets must be data that can and will be collected through the reporting requirement.
2. Description of how desired targets were established using baseline data. (See Appendix E for reference.)
3. Explanation of specific institutional practices that will change as a direct consequence of the proposed intervention. Adoption of these practices will be considered a project goal and identified through the reporting requirement.
4. Descriptions of how the intervention's evaluation will be implemented, including how grantees intend to collect, analyze and report required data.
5. List of institutional personnel, including title, responsible for evaluation.

F. Sustainability (15 Points)

Applicants will provide a detailed explanation of how the IOIF grant intervention will be sustained beyond the life of the grant. The sustainability plan should describe how the institution plans to continue the work initially funded by the IOIF grant and how the institution plans to adjust, in terms of institutional capacity, personnel, dedicated funding and/or other resources that will be brought to bear in order to continuously improve an outcome or related group of outcomes after the conclusion of the grant.

G. Project Budget (10 Points)

All proposed budget items should directly link to the delivery of services associated with IOIF grant interventions.

Both a Project Budget Summary Form, including the line-item detail, and a written narrative for each budget line item is required. The budget narrative explains 1) the basis for estimating the costs of each line item and, 2) how major cost items relate to the proposed project activities.

Budget forms and budget narrative must justify an effective and efficient use of funds and describe the full range of resources needed to accomplish project goals.

Both the budget and budget narrative must align with the proposed intervention and resources needed to fully and successfully implement the intervention. Funds *may not be used to supplant* existing interventions.

Salaries and Benefits– All salary and benefit expenditures must be linked to intervention services; therefore, each salary draw down must reflect the real-time contributions of personnel on the intervention. *Institutions are required to provide 50 percent of all salary and benefit expenditures.* For calculating fringe benefits, use your institution's current rate. This is only applicable to salaried employees.

Food Expenditure– Grant funds may not be used for food for attendees unless doing so is necessary to accomplish legitimate meeting or conference business. Working lunches may be allowable, provided attendance at the lunch is needed to ensure full participation in essential discussions concerning the goals and objectives of the intervention.

Tuition and fees– Grant funds may not pay for tuition and fees.

Indirect Costs– Grant proposals should use your institution's indirect cost rate. Preference will be given to proposals that propose an indirect cost rate of 8 percent or lower. Indirect cost rate cannot exceed 8 percent.

Travel– Reimbursement to the Grantee for travel, meals or lodging shall be subject

to amounts and limitations specified in the “State Comprehensive Travel Regulations,” as they are amended from time to time, and shall be contingent upon and limited by the Grant Budget funding for reimbursement.

Note: The Project Budget Summary Form (Appendix D) and corresponding budget narrative do not count toward the 15-page proposal limit.

IV. Application Procedures

A. Preparation of the Application

Listed below are the required components of an acceptable application. The narrative sections of the proposal must have one-inch margins, be 1.5-spaced and the font used must not be smaller than 11-point. This narrative portion of the application shall not exceed 15 pages. The project abstract, letters of support, curriculum vitae and budget items do not count toward the 15-page limit. The proposal sections are labeled and must be returned in order, as shown:

- Cover Page, signatures required
- Project Abstract
- Project Proposal
- Organizational Capacity
- Project Goals and Evaluation
- Sustainability and Scalability
- Project Budget

B. Submission

Applicants must submit a complete application packet electronically, with signatures, located in Appendix C, to Crystal.Collins@tn.gov. To be considered for funding, proposals must be received by THEC no later than 4:00 PM CDT on April 29, 2016. Incomplete applications will not be considered. An application checklist is included in the application packet (Appendix A).

C. Notification

Notice will be sent to the project director listed on the grant application confirming receipt by THEC within two business days. It is the sole responsibility of the applying institution to verify receipt of the proposal.

D. Review Process

Funding recommendations will be made by a grant review committee that will score proposals according to the guidelines in the scoring rubric. THEC will use the

review committee's scores and recommendations as the primary consideration for funding and to form the basis for negotiation and final selection. Proposals will be funded based upon 1) review committee recommendations; 2) extent of deficient growth in outcome or related group of outcomes (and, if applicable, focus populations) addressed by the intervention; 3) potential of the proposed intervention to increase the treated outcome or related group of outcomes (and, if applicable, focus populations); 4) feasibility of project cost relative to expected growth in the identified outcome or related group of outcomes; and, 5) program sustainability and scalability.

Following award selection, THEC will contact the project director of the selected proposals to discuss any modifications to the project plan or budget that may be required before the grant is awarded. To maximize the impact of limited funds, applicants whose proposals are recommended for funding at less than the amount requested may be asked to revise the project budget and/or scope of work.

V. Award Administration

A. Award Conditions

The amount of funding awarded to each institution may vary based on institutional size, project activities and resources needed to fully and successfully implement the interventions used to address the outcome or related group of outcomes considered deficient in growth. Awards are contingent upon THEC receiving funding from the State, availability of funds within the grant budget and upon the State's evaluation of funded programs for compliance with project requirements and effectiveness of project implementation.

B. Grant Requirements

Each eligible contracted institution must report its progress in meeting performance measures identified in the grant proposal to THEC. Further information regarding reporting requirements and forms will be provided by THEC after the grant is awarded.

Appendix A – Application Checklist

Institutional Outcome Improvement Fund Grant

Application Checklist

Status	Item	Date(s)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Potential applicants participate in webinar	10AM CDT, Friday, April 22
<input type="checkbox"/>	Applicants submit Letters of Intent to Participate	4PM CDT, Friday, April 29
<input type="checkbox"/>	Completed Proposal due to THEC from Applicants	4PM CDT, Friday, May 13
<input type="checkbox"/>	Grant Awards Announced by THEC	Monday, June 6

Institutional Outcome Improvement Fund Grant
Reviewer Scoring Rubric

Applying Institution _____
Outcomes Addressed _____
Total Project Budget _____
Funding Recommendation (yes, no, yes with modifications) _____

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Reviewer Score	Comments/Recommendations
<p>Project Proposal: <i>Project Description</i></p> <p>-Does the proposal include a detailed description of the project? Does the proposal clearly articulate how the project will affect the outcome or group of outcomes identified as deficient in growth?</p> <p>-Does the proposed project design clearly align with the outcome or group of outcomes identified as deficient in growth?</p> <p>-Does the proposal clearly articulate how the project will help meet the State goals outlined in the Complete College Tennessee Act of 2010 and the Drive to 55?</p> <p><u>Scoring Range</u> 35 – Proposal includes a detailed description of the project, proposed interventions and how the initiative will increase the identified outcome(s) in the Outcomes Based Funding formula. Project is supported by relevant research or promising best practice.</p> <p>17 – Proposal includes a description of the project and proposed interventions but may lack detail. The proposal does not clearly articulate how the intervention will lead to increased outcome(s) in the formula <u>or</u> the project is not supported by relevant research/ best practice.</p> <p>1 – The proposal is lacking key information about the proposed intervention and any relevant research/best practice. The project does not clearly identify how the intervention will affect formula outcome(s).</p>	<p align="center">35</p>		

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Reviewer Score	Comments/Recommendations
<p>Project Proposal: <i>Implementation Timeline</i></p> <p>-Does the proposal include a month-by-month timeline with deliverables (e.g. progress and performance reports) listed?</p> <p>-Is the proposed timeline feasible and likely to result in successful grant implementation and improved student outcomes?</p> <p><u>Scoring Range</u> 10 – The proposal includes a detailed implementation timeline that includes key milestones, responsible parties and anticipated outcomes.</p> <p>5 – The proposal includes a timeline but may lack sufficient detail.</p>	10		
<p>Organizational Capacity</p> <p>- Does the proposed project list the responsible individuals and how they will contribute to the project? Do the qualifications of the project director/key personnel demonstrate skills needed to be successful?</p> <p>-Does the applying institution commit the resources necessary for the project to be successful?</p> <p>-Does the proposal include a description of internal and/or external collaboration at the institution?</p> <p><u>Scoring Range</u> 10 – The institution’s resources and key personnel have the capacity to successfully implement the proposed project. The proposal demonstrates strong collaboration.</p> <p>5 – The proposal lacks sufficient detail about the institution’s resources or the project director’s capacity to carry out the project. Identified collaboration is limited.</p> <p>1 – The proposed leadership, partnerships or institutional commitment are unlikely to adequately carry out the project.</p>	10		

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Reviewer Score	Comments/Recommendations
<p align="center">Project Goals and Evaluation</p>	<p align="center">20</p>		
<p>-Does the proposal include desired changes to the outcome(s) with specific reference to objectives and key performance measures?</p> <p>-Does the proposal demonstrate the capacity to collect, analyze and report the required data?</p> <p>-Does the proposal clearly identify how the targets for formula outcome growth were identified? Does the proposal include a plan to determine the success in reaching these targets?</p> <p><u>Scoring Range</u> 20 - The proposal clearly aligns with the project's desired outcome(s) and institution-specific goals. The applying organization demonstrates the intention and infrastructure necessary to collect, analyze and use data to monitor progress and determine appropriate interventions. Chosen targets for relevant performance measures are appropriate and reference baseline data.</p> <p>10 -The proposal is missing one or more of the following: plan or capacity to collect, analyze and report necessary data; clear alignment between proposed project activities, desired outcomes and chosen performance measure targets; evidence that data will be used to improve formula outcomes.</p> <p>1-The proposal is lacking sufficient detail and more than one of the following: plan or capacity to collect, analyze and report necessary data; clear alignment between proposed project activities, desired outcomes and chosen performance measure targets; evidence that data will be used to improve formula outcomes.</p>			

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Reviewer Score	Comments/Recommendations
<p align="center">Sustainability</p> <p>-Does the proposal provide a detailed explanation of how Institutional Outcome Improvement Fund grant services and activities will be sustained at the institution beyond the life of the grant?</p> <p>-Does the proposal show evidence of integration of the project and associated long-term goals into the institutional culture?</p> <p><u>Scoring Range</u> 15 – Proposal includes a detailed explanation of how Institutional Outcome Improvement Fund grant services and activities will be sustained beyond the life of the grant and integrated into the institutional culture.</p> <p>7 – Proposal includes intention for Institutional Outcome Improvement Fund grant services and activities to be sustained beyond the life of the grant and integrated into the institutional culture.</p> <p>1- Proposal does not include sustainability plan.</p>	15		
<p align="center">Budget</p> <p>-Are budget requests detailed and justified throughout the budget narrative? Does the institution adhere to the salary requirement?</p> <p>-Are resources aligned with and appropriate to the needs of the proposed project?</p> <p><u>Scoring Range</u> 10 – Budget is complete with sufficient justifications and detail listed for each line item. Funding for salaries does not exceed 50 percent of the total requested grant amount.</p> <p>5 – Budget lacks sufficient detail but expenditures seem to be reasonable given the scope of the proposal.</p> <p>1 – Budget is incomplete and/or unreasonable given the scope of the proposal.</p>	10		

Appendix C – Application Packet

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission
Institutional Outcome Improvement Fund Grant
Section A: COVER PAGE**

Applying Organization:	
Designated Fiscal Agent for this Organization:	
Institutional Outcome(s) of Focus:	
Project Title:	
Program Director:	
Contact Name:	
Title:	
Address:	
Telephone:	Fax:
E-Mail:	
Amount of funding Requested	\$
Anticipated Number of Students to Be Served	

Certification by Authorized Official of the Designated Fiscal Agent:

The designee certifies that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the information in this application is correct and that the filing of this application is duly authorized by the applicant organization specified above.

Name and Title of Authorized Official of Designated Fiscal Agent

Signature of Authorized Official of Designated Fiscal Agent

Date

Section B: Project Abstract

Supply a project summary/ abstract no longer than half a page. This will be used to describe funded proposals in publications and on THEC's website.

Note: The Project Abstract does not count toward the 15-page proposal limit.

Section C: Project Proposal

Provide a detailed description of the proposed interventions and identification of any internal and/or external collaboration related to the project.

Section D: Organizational Capacity

Provide an overview of the applying institution's capacity to successfully carry out the proposed project and the resources available to support implementation.

Note: Letters of commitment to collaboration and curriculum vitae do not count toward the 15-page limit.

Section E: Project Goals and Evaluation

Provide a narrative outlining how the Institutional Outcome Improvement Fund grant activities and deliverables support the overarching goals of the Complete College Tennessee Act of 2010 and the Drive to 55. Proposals must also provide an evaluation plan.

Additionally, include a target for each institutional outcome indicator that will be addressed through the proposed project. Reference how the desired targets were established using baseline data provided in Appendix E.

Section F: Sustainability

Applicants must provide a detailed explanation of how the Institutional Outcome Improvement Fund grant project elements will be sustained beyond the life of the grant. The sustainability plan should describe how the institution plans to continue the work initially funded by the Institutional Outcome Improvement Fund grant and how the institution plans to adjust, in terms of institutional capacity, personnel, dedicated funding and/or other resources to guarantee sustainability of the interventions.

Section G: Project Budget

Applicants must provide a completed Project Budget Summary Form (Appendix D) as well as a written narrative explaining the basis for the estimation of cost of each line item and how major cost items related to the proposed project activities.

Note: Project budget narrative and detailed line-item descriptions do not count toward the 15-page limit.

Appendix D – Project Budget Summary Form

Institutional Outcome Improvement Fund: Proposed Budget Allocation Template							
				June 1, 2016 - June 30, 2017		July 1, 2017 - June 30, 2018	
Policy 03 Object Line-Item Reference	Expenditures	(#) FT/PT	Total Funds	IOIF Grant Funds	Grantee Match*	IOIF Grant Funds	Grantee Match*
1, 2	Salaries, Benefits & Taxes						
	Director Salary		\$0.00				
	Advisor Salary		\$0.00				
	Payroll Taxes/Expenses		\$0.00				
4, 15	Professional Fees, Grants & Awards						
	Administrative Support		\$0.00				
	Intern		\$0.00				
	Outreach/Recruitment Events	NA	\$0.00				
	Evaluation	NA	\$0.00				
5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10	Supplies, Telephone, Postage & Shipping, Occupancy, Equipment Rental & Maintenance, Printing & Publications						
	Office Supplies	NA	\$0.00				
	Rent/Utilities	NA	\$0.00				
	Technology	NA	\$0.00				
	Furniture/Equipment	NA	\$0.00				
11, 12	Travel, Conferences & Meetings						
	Travel	NA	\$0.00				
	Meetings	NA	\$0.00				
18	Other Non-Personnel						
	Marketing/Advertising	NA	\$0.00				
	Membership Dues/Registrations	NA	\$0.00				
20	Capital Purchase						
	Capital Purchases	NA	\$0.00				
	Grand Total	NA	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

* Grantee Match only required on Salaries and Benefits line items.

Instructions:

Complete Columns D & F, *IOIF Grant Funds*, allocating total grant funding over the *two* fiscal years identified. These can be estimates; the purpose of this document is to understand how you plan to allocate the IOIF grant funds over the contract period. Please include a budget narrative section with your proposal.

GRANT BUDGET LINE-ITEM DETAIL

**Please provide detailed line-item descriptions for any budget items entered above in the Professional Fee, Grant and Award, Other Non-Personnel or Capital Purchases categories.*

Salaries, Benefits and Taxes

Salaries: Enter compensation, fees, salaries and wages paid to officers, directors, trustees and full-time employees. An attached schedule may be required showing client wages or other included in the aggregations.

Employee Benefits & Payroll Taxes: Enter (a) the institution's contributions to pension plans and to employee benefit programs such as health, life and disability insurance; and (b) the institution's portion of payroll taxes such as social security and Medicare taxes and unemployment and workers' compensation insurance. An attached schedule may be required showing client benefits and taxes or other included in the aggregations.

Professional Fees, Grants and Awards

Professional Fees: Enter the institution's fees to outside professionals, consultants, personal-service contractors and part-time personal. (A detailed description is required in the Grant Budget Line-Item Detail if this line-item is funded.)

Grants and Awards: Enter the institution's awards, grants, subsidies and other pass-through expenditures to individuals and to other institutions, including travel and equipment allowances outside the institution. This classification includes items used in direct support of this initiative. (A detailed description is required in the Grant Budget Line-Item Detail if this line-item is funded.)

Supplies, Telephone, Postage & Shipping, Occupancy, Equipment Rental & Maintenance, Printing & Publications

Telephone: Enter the institution's expenses for telephone, cellular phones, beepers, telegram, FAX, E-mail, telephone equipment maintenance and other related expenses.

Postage and Shipping: Enter the institution's expenses for postage, messenger services, overnight delivery, outside mailing service fees, freight and trucking and maintenance of delivery and shipping vehicles.

Occupancy: Enter institution's expenses for use of office space and other facilities, heat, light, power, other utilities, outside janitorial services, mortgage interest, real estate taxes and similar expenses. Include property insurance here.

Equipment Rental and Maintenance: Enter the institution's expenses for renting and maintaining

computers, copiers, postage meters and other office equipment used exclusively for this grant initiative.

Printing and Publications: Enter the institution's expenses for producing printed materials (not including posters, advertising and other marketing materials), purchasing books and publications and buying subscriptions to publications.

Travel, Conferences & Meetings

Travel: Enter the institution's expenses for travel, including transportation, meals and lodging and per diem payments.

Conference and Meetings: Enter the institution's expenses for conducting or attending meetings, conferences and conventions. Include rental of facilities, speakers' fees and expenses, printed materials and registration fees (but not travel).

Other Non-Personnel

Enter the institution's allowable expenses for advertising, the institution's and employees' membership dues in associations and professional societies and licenses, permits, registrations and testing fees. (A detailed description is required in the Grant Budget Line-Item Detail if this line-item is funded.)

Reimbursable Capital Purchases

Enter the institution's purchases of fixed assets and purchases exceeding \$5,000 for an individual item or \$5,000 for a group of items. (A detailed description is required in the Grant Budget Line-Item Detail if this line-item is funded.)

Appendix E - Outcomes Data

Funding Formula Historic Data Universities - Raw Outcomes

	30 CH	60 CH	90 CH	Bach & Assoc	Masters/ Ed Spec	Doctoral	Research & Service	Degrees per FTE	Grad Rate	
APSU										
2014-15	1,495	1,349	1,539	1,767	313	-	\$ 1,742,724	23.3	44.5%	
2013-14	1,422	1,432	1,477	1,804	316	-	\$ 2,393,772	22.2	47.6%	
2012-13	1,453	1,463	1,504	1,725	304	-	\$ 2,614,188	20.7	44.9%	
2011-12	1,480	1,358	1,357	1,553	326	-	\$ 3,601,246	18.4	47.0%	
2010-11	1,482	1,273	1,292	1,468	296	-	\$ 3,489,372	18.1	44.1%	
ETSU										
2014-15	1,807	1,702	2,021	2,229	585	122	\$ 18,039,143	21.7	51.8%	
2013-14	1,609	1,657	2,014	2,321	647	114	\$ 20,608,903	22.4	54.3%	
2012-13	1,745	1,676	2,075	2,314	576	86	\$ 22,836,711	21.4	52.6%	
2011-12	1,755	1,805	2,196	2,146	609	83	\$ 23,159,718	19.3	51.9%	
2010-11	1,774	1,750	1,942	2,028	630	79	\$ 24,085,480	18.6	52.1%	
MTSU										
2014-15	2,928	3,228	3,601	4,051	847	30	\$ 9,789,671	22.7	50.2%	
2013-14	3,001	3,135	3,904	4,012	861	32	\$ 11,740,917	21.9	53.2%	
2012-13	2,871	3,437	3,845	4,159	1,010	23	\$ 13,498,343	21.3	55.8%	
2011-12	3,334	3,485	3,980	3,911	925	20	\$ 30,655,961	19.0	54.6%	
2010-11	3,415	3,422	3,895	3,868	923	20	\$ 28,349,988	18.5	54.5%	
TSU										
2014-15	1,120	918	928	988	416	54	\$ 30,072,867	15.8	33.2%	
2013-14	1,018	833	985	916	486	85	\$ 33,195,422	15.4	41.0%	
2012-13	914	854	918	1,066	417	66	\$ 31,582,168	18.3	40.2%	
2011-12	946	895	929	1,098	434	72	\$ 31,029,229	17.8	43.1%	
2010-11	932	791	918	1,081	377	67	\$ 33,644,726	17.9	43.1%	
TTU										
2014-15	1,944	1,845	1,907	1,857	341	19	\$ 7,910,306	19.7	61.1%	
2013-14	1,858	1,722	1,753	1,804	352	23	\$ 8,348,063	19.6	59.9%	
2012-13	1,749	1,534	1,706	1,830	376	12	\$ 8,873,329	20.5	60.2%	
2011-12	1,612	1,524	1,809	1,696	444	18	\$ 9,586,009	19.2	57.9%	
2010-11	1,504	1,550	1,639	1,603	644	21	\$ 10,396,768	19.0	56.5%	

*Data reflects individual year outcomes, not three-year averages

**Funding Formula Historic Data
Universities - Raw Outcomes**

	30 CH	60 CH	90 CH	Bach & Assoc	Masters/ Ed Spec	Doctoral	Research & Service	Degrees per FTE	Grad Rate
UM									
2014-15	2,180	2,414	2,824	2,898	929	247	\$ 53,715,900	21.0	48.6%
2013-14	2,084	2,492	2,773	2,991	1,071	260	\$ 57,947,913	21.6	49.2%
2012-13	2,297	2,459	2,785	2,887	1,064	259	\$ 51,992,967	20.0	51.1%
2011-12	2,220	2,377	2,624	2,724	1,009	271	\$ 55,561,194	18.3	47.5%
2010-11	2,197	2,304	2,652	2,678	1,042	256	\$ 62,442,725	18.3	47.1%
UTC									
2014-15	1,728	1,764	1,815	1,825	428	64	\$ 8,607,946	19.8	58.8%
2013-14	1,863	1,636	1,702	1,756	433	70	\$ 9,186,021	18.8	54.2%
2012-13	1,745	1,561	1,619	1,638	446	68	\$ 10,409,340	18.1	53.4%
2011-12	1,647	1,523	1,661	1,514	490	54	\$ 11,444,947	17.0	54.2%
2010-11	1,793	1,664	1,621	1,320	432	60	\$ 10,350,479	15.5	54.8%
UTK									
2014-15	3,881	4,075	4,305	4,445	1,552	572	\$ 138,314,792	22.5	78.4%
2013-14	3,543	4,090	4,193	4,372	1,579	549	\$ 145,602,228	22.5	79.3%
2012-13	3,552	4,019	4,175	4,407	1,607	565	\$ 154,378,165	23.0	77.2%
2011-12	3,571	4,003	4,078	4,539	1,583	571	\$ 149,350,434	23.6	75.7%
2010-11	3,858	4,041	4,478	4,332	1,515	481	\$ 151,215,597	22.1	73.9%
UTM									
2014-15	1,083	1,093	1,244	1,199	119	-	\$ 2,270,725	19.6	57.2%
2013-14	1,074	1,133	1,212	1,223	104	-	\$ 2,233,932	19.4	58.4%
2012-13	1,217	1,111	1,199	1,247	122	-	\$ 2,001,804	19.0	57.1%
2011-12	1,189	1,192	1,206	1,116	132	-	\$ 3,036,994	16.8	59.6%
2010-11	1,385	1,254	854	1,038	131	-	\$ 3,646,780	15.7	59.3%

*Data reflects individual year outcomes, not three-year averages

Funding Formula Historic Data Universities - Focus Populations

	Adults				Low-Income			
	30 CH	60 CH	90 CH	Bach & Assoc	30 CH	60 CH	90 CH	Bach & Assoc
APSU								
2014-15	211	306	533	920	767	732	875	1,055
2013-14	236	348	546	943	797	857	913	1,096
2012-13	237	404	578	991	887	896	931	983
2011-12	277	390	516	865	939	884	811	866
2010-11	297	382	509	861	933	797	760	809
ETSU								
2014-15	120	208	359	850	741	767	963	1,163
2013-14	111	177	380	874	735	784	1,071	1,206
2012-13	139	206	487	886	824	888	1,150	1,192
2011-12	173	261	451	860	962	959	1,216	1,047
2010-11	163	222	399	762	961	931	1,008	953
MTSU								
2014-15	140	360	717	1,551	1,430	1,678	1,990	2,399
2013-14	165	345	819	1,554	1,609	1,732	2,315	2,264
2012-13	204	402	868	1,616	1,615	1,988	2,278	2,276
2011-12	241	484	872	1,488	1,932	2,048	2,315	2,037
2010-11	291	416	857	1,452	1,962	1,956	2,139	1,838
TSU								
2014-15	128	173	252	492	513	488	557	639
2013-14	91	131	258	451	548	507	638	588
2012-13	95	152	250	583	563	553	605	720
2011-12	104	153	287	546	628	598	616	713
2010-11	93	158	229	510	616	505	606	634
TTU								
2014-15	39	104	248	489	652	782	875	980
2013-14	65	121	247	424	754	755	930	1,002
2012-13	54	101	236	550	724	790	928	954
2011-12	68	126	273	469	780	785	959	890
2010-11	48	129	252	423	803	805	877	798

*Data reflects individual year outcomes, not three-year averages

Funding Formula Historic Data Universities - Focus Populations

	Adults				Low-Income			
	30 CH	60 CH	90 CH	Bach & Assoc	30 CH	60 CH	90 CH	Bach & Assoc
UM								
2014-15	128	313	672	1,310	1,029	1,279	1,603	1,733
2013-14	132	354	696	1,374	1,083	1,420	1,664	1,697
2012-13	168	366	761	1,376	1,301	1,464	1,648	1,603
2011-12	181	394	758	1,281	1,326	1,438	1,561	1,539
2010-11	180	409	799	1,258	1,280	1,355	1,575	1,385
UTC								
2014-15	28	73	226	497	614	699	791	837
2013-14	24	59	177	482	718	678	788	857
2012-13	31	85	199	486	729	697	811	791
2011-12	25	73	239	490	732	714	841	714
2010-11	43	99	247	406	854	814	801	583
UTK								
2014-15	56	125	319	733	1,097	1,316	1,586	1,747
2013-14	48	117	313	729	1,158	1,429	1,658	1,712
2012-13	26	127	301	733	1,283	1,506	1,642	1,654
2011-12	35	133	282	743	1,321	1,501	1,573	1,608
2010-11	41	128	308	679	1,393	1,477	1,700	1,372
UTM								
2014-15	49	111	195	338	515	600	718	701
2013-14	75	128	232	390	583	635	724	752
2012-13	101	142	208	407	691	658	732	739
2011-12	129	156	230	358	729	743	730	606
2010-11	143	171	212	300	848	773	517	543

*Data reflects individual year outcomes, not three-year averages

**Funding Formula Historic Data
Community Colleges - Raw Outcomes**

	12 CH	24 CH	36 CH	Dual Enroll	Assoc	1-2 Year Certs	<1 Year Certs	Job Place	Transfers Out	Contact Hours	Awards Per FTE
CHSCC											
2014-15	2,159	1,611	1,364	1,434	935	162	167	630	534	105,892	20.7
2013-14	2,339	1,708	1,446	1,373	1,046	179	262	609	499	133,554	21.3
2012-13	2,318	1,801	1,591	1,253	1,002	229	232	NA	568	149,621	19.7
2011-12	2,351	1,872	1,646	1,155	896	146	268	558	531	241,977	16.1
2010-11	2,716	1,969	1,647	1,095	842	123	203	429	440	163,770	14.5
CLSCC											
2014-15	979	645	520	1,072	365	7	258	231	206	3,882	18.2
2013-14	987	752	627	945	447	27	330	161	195	10,132	21.7
2012-13	1,060	716	605	615	372	29	196	190	209	7,596	17.2
2011-12	1,164	817	659	627	370	49	331	216	236	4,014	17.1
2010-11	1,141	897	744	626	354	39	186	200	201	7,276	15.7
COSCC											
2014-15	1,330	1,104	955	1,121	687	57	98	242	436	48,595	24.6
2013-14	1,489	1,202	1,037	959	626	51	78	209	391	60,894	21.7
2012-13	1,538	1,284	1,012	843	599	52	0	212	415	63,095	20.5
2011-12	1,558	1,304	1,050	791	611	47	0	234	449	54,072	19.7
2010-11	1,620	1,412	1,140	674	540	51	2	240	410	67,122	16.3
DSCC											
2014-15	768	489	440	982	308	20	46	169	183	12,239	23.7
2013-14	834	539	459	1,025	326	33	19	133	209	18,945	22.4
2012-13	959	625	542	887	300	26	21	121	243	7,114	16.8
2011-12	1,039	780	542	803	280	32	20	101	218	6,027	15.1
2010-11	1,122	707	530	765	260	15	0	98	190	5,909	12.7
JSCC											
2014-15	1,318	831	704	1,993	416	14	83	301	266	28,337	18.5
2013-14	1,179	763	721	1,324	470	37	35	240	341	20,571	21.2
2012-13	1,127	899	691	800	509	34	27	357	299	17,853	20.2
2011-12	1,194	921	782	815	554	34	17	284	280	14,019	19.0
2010-11	1,351	1,010	847	971	576	0	27	279	288	17,182	17.4
MSCC											
2014-15	1,485	1,184	941	987	597	0	111	118	439	3,273	21.7
2013-14	1,495	1,104	854	1,061	602	0	59	78	456	3,289	22.3
2012-13	1,363	1,044	901	859	568	1	69	73	499	5,493	20.6
2011-12	1,410	1,133	962	854	627	0	20	105	540	8,803	20.7
2010-11	1,457	1,139	993	787	526	0	58	70	508	5,513	16.4
NASCC											
2014-15	2,477	1,878	1,540	1,390	669	135	84	310	581	23,562	14.0
2013-14	2,438	1,853	1,510	1,126	646	95	50	310	617	35,107	13.0
2012-13	2,338	1,824	1,611	1,119	624	99	54	363	640	35,965	12.7
2011-12	2,305	1,937	1,717	997	718	113	58	335	675	39,563	14.2
2010-11	2,375	2,048	1,671	1,092	531	38	147	263	552	32,948	10.2

*Data reflects individual year outcomes, not three-year averages

**Funding Formula Historic Data
Community Colleges - Raw Outcomes**

	12 CH	24 CH	36 CH	Dual Enroll	Assoc	1-2 Year Certs	<1 Year Certs	Job Place	Transfers Out	Contact Hours	Awards Per FTE
NESCC											
2014-15	1,545	1,157	993	927	777	123	158	391	350	14,143	24.9
2013-14	1,475	1,200	1,126	791	781	139	176	569	397	9,778	24.7
2012-13	1,664	1,348	1,125	723	720	104	362	275	380	6,434	19.7
2011-12	1,485	1,326	1,217	585	764	110	84	261	404	6,558	19.7
2010-11	1,744	1,480	1,262	566	696	132	31	249	366	5,556	17.4
PSCC											
2014-15	2,549	2,297	1,915	1,620	1,290	4	583	366	830	49,799	21.1
2013-14	2,798	2,316	1,870	1,577	1,286	0	421	366	861	48,273	19.9
2012-13	2,823	2,346	1,947	1,213	1,258	0	524	310	850	45,598	18.7
2011-12	3,001	2,350	2,012	1,525	1,101	0	493	395	736	46,118	15.4
2010-11	2,943	2,490	2,092	1,245	932	0	435	189	614	62,867	13.2
RSCC											
2014-15	1,518	1,184	987	1,750	787	95	66	402	446	79,517	25.8
2013-14	1,509	1,248	1,054	1,691	798	99	29	402	394	102,286	24.7
2012-13	1,642	1,256	1,111	1,632	787	77	19	389	451	116,535	22.4
2011-12	1,687	1,269	1,107	1,655	804	91	17	391	486	82,250	21.9
2010-11	1,784	1,414	1,189	1,372	771	60	73	427	413	94,910	19.1
STCC											
2014-15	3,124	2,321	1,694	692	690	33	337	445	699	66,743	11.4
2013-14	3,289	2,430	1,700	582	839	32	383	445	728	84,906	12.8
2012-13	2,976	2,446	1,911	407	897	63	377	434	773	75,009	12.5
2011-12	3,898	3,072	2,360	409	808	49	432	487	778	74,172	9.4
2010-11	4,127	3,186	2,348	367	841	63	374	366	675	53,211	10.0
VSCC											
2014-15	2,033	1,498	1,280	1,767	824	79	325	411	573	97,151	20.7
2013-14	2,037	1,467	1,329	1,961	766	79	294	403	569	95,794	18.6
2012-13	2,037	1,597	1,365	1,792	787	73	343	448	595	74,639	18.1
2011-12	2,132	1,684	1,446	1,566	763	88	508	387	627	95,564	16.2
2010-11	2,469	1,781	1,490	1,519	723	82	228	278	536	71,174	14.4
WSCC											
2014-15	1,749	1,182	1,036	1,593	812	15	451	467	386	90,554	24.0
2013-14	1,779	1,260	1,095	1,612	868	28	331	467	459	66,428	24.7
2012-13	1,927	1,311	1,112	1,407	838	14	290	473	393	194,026	21.5
2011-12	1,976	1,393	1,173	1,261	791	18	295	544	479	197,866	18.9
2010-11	1,988	1,474	1,329	1,011	720	16	325	501	409	129,099	16.0

*Data reflects individual year outcomes, not three-year averages

Funding Formula Historic Data
Community Colleges - Focus Populations: Adults & Low-Income

	Adults						Low-Income					
	12 CH	24 CH	36 CH	Assoc	1-2 Year	<1 Year	12 CH	24 CH	36 CH	Assoc	1-2 Year	<1 Year
					Certs	Certs					Certs	Certs
CHSCC												
2014-15	463	473	497	553	93	90	939	868	699	520	91	97
2013-14	552	566	558	674	104	157	1,276	943	839	639	94	150
2012-13	644	679	702	652	149	155	1,345	1,115	1,022	638	128	137
2011-12	723	765	783	552	94	174	1,478	1,247	1,116	570	64	146
2010-11	877	837	724	512	72	100	1,787	1,381	1,123	519	60	136
CLSCC												
2014-15	200	139	148	169	5	141	450	375	331	246	6	159
2013-14	228	211	192	249	19	208	597	498	417	318	22	218
2012-13	277	245	240	210	25	119	698	499	430	277	24	134
2011-12	371	328	315	214	34	216	812	590	472	269	34	230
2010-11	438	386	342	202	29	112	799	660	559	235	23	120
COSCC												
2014-15	191	232	251	303	27	46	578	576	537	431	26	35
2013-14	229	303	322	285	27	34	751	685	613	406	23	38
2012-13	289	351	329	288	35	-	880	811	657	388	25	-
2011-12	350	380	355	286	28	-	957	809	670	393	25	-
2010-11	386	422	390	269	34	2	995	893	701	330	18	2
DSCC												
2014-15	93	98	119	183	15	22	359	339	318	230	17	31
2013-14	152	162	170	193	24	13	513	396	356	256	23	16
2012-13	253	253	232	176	18	12	657	483	430	224	18	19
2011-12	327	277	252	173	22	15	756	598	429	209	22	16
2010-11	331	277	228	164	11	-	841	565	422	194	11	-
JSCC												
2014-15	175	177	211	209	10	37	615	540	505	303	10	67
2013-14	189	212	256	236	20	12	796	540	543	354	29	31
2012-13	263	274	243	282	17	8	794	695	544	374	23	23
2011-12	292	313	279	322	16	7	906	741	607	411	25	11
2010-11	397	383	349	312	-	16	1,036	808	677	393	-	19
MSCC												
2014-15	197	194	205	224	-	49	671	622	512	351	-	49
2013-14	210	232	224	247	-	23	796	668	504	390	-	28
2012-13	262	242	267	275	1	49	785	654	591	371	-	29
2011-12	284	338	331	284	-	14	886	758	662	409	-	13
2010-11	377	323	285	240	-	47	935	751	652	349	-	25
NASCC												
2014-15	772	775	778	485	96	75	1,496	1,306	1,084	490	82	59
2013-14	1,014	877	798	483	73	42	1,702	1,355	1,131	471	60	32
2012-13	969	881	845	456	85	42	1,678	1,344	1,202	456	53	37
2011-12	1,028	925	905	503	82	52	1,758	1,452	1,302	507	62	34
2010-11	1,093	979	860	371	26	127	1,747	1,473	1,214	343	25	66

*Data reflects individual year outcomes, not three-year averages

Funding Formula Historic Data
Community Colleges - Focus Populations: Adults & Low-Income

	Adults						Low-Income					
	12 CH	24 CH	36 CH	Assoc	1-2 Year Certs	<1 Year Certs	12 CH	24 CH	36 CH	Assoc	1-2 Year Certs	<1 Year Certs
NESCC												
2014-15	337	352	301	430	79	121	804	722	649	530	95	64
2013-14	356	414	425	423	77	147	917	831	771	554	88	57
2012-13	487	448	453	417	62	353	1,087	943	829	525	66	52
2011-12	488	537	561	434	68	56	1,054	980	908	549	83	51
2010-11	619	647	554	367	79	22	1,298	1,114	935	472	77	17
PSCC												
2014-15	378	473	478	588	2	351	1,170	1,101	989	800	1	330
2013-14	506	541	545	644	-	233	1,459	1,289	1,118	856	-	257
2012-13	596	610	640	620	-	304	1,567	1,413	1,254	852	-	337
2011-12	697	700	727	580	-	313	1,765	1,524	1,326	778	-	275
2010-11	791	819	787	464	-	290	1,786	1,561	1,387	602	-	246
RSCC												
2014-15	235	268	247	372	57	44	767	729	628	528	73	37
2013-14	264	302	284	401	71	28	935	822	720	582	67	13
2012-13	341	362	367	422	56	14	1,078	911	820	577	55	13
2011-12	429	395	392	438	59	10	1,190	941	823	556	57	9
2010-11	531	441	402	417	51	56	1,260	1,043	888	496	36	36
STCC												
2014-15	765	769	683	449	18	235	2,026	1,565	1,177	474	19	192
2013-14	925	922	731	579	21	251	2,310	1,665	1,206	600	22	267
2012-13	884	922	897	630	39	265	1,993	1,724	1,442	654	40	241
2011-12	1,347	1,346	1,204	586	32	309	2,926	2,330	1,818	593	28	296
2010-11	1,497	1,362	1,152	607	52	238	3,133	2,365	1,750	607	26	226
VSCC												
2014-15	340	354	357	402	52	167	875	802	744	509	52	186
2013-14	376	379	402	392	60	149	1,059	859	758	474	48	148
2012-13	414	473	454	455	55	183	1,154	1,019	894	537	42	195
2011-12	543	576	569	426	61	303	1,309	1,156	1,011	507	48	281
2010-11	724	633	555	406	54	155	1,599	1,213	1,030	460	45	124
WSCC												
2014-15	189	185	217	321	12	242	830	714	664	547	11	300
2013-14	269	227	222	371	22	189	1,065	822	718	607	16	195
2012-13	354	310	336	384	11	174	1,278	908	790	610	4	197
2011-12	525	395	414	390	13	196	1,355	1,014	894	570	13	172
2010-11	546	478	449	341	10	210	1,415	1,110	1,000	479	10	179

*Data reflects individual year outcomes, not three-year averages

Funding Formula Historic Data
Community Colleges - Focus Populations: Academically Underprepared

		Academically Underprepared					
		12 CH	24 CH	36 CH	Assoc	1-2 Year Certs	<1 Year Certs
CHSCC							
	2014-15	1,283	1,032	865	516	83	80
	2013-14	1,477	1,108	905	617	97	137
	2012-13	1,551	1,228	1,052	613	98	104
	2011-12	1,607	1,385	1,192	554	77	138
	2010-11	1,989	1,507	1,190	504	66	123
CLSCC							
	2014-15	545	420	344	230	7	139
	2013-14	602	525	429	291	16	181
	2012-13	677	528	439	256	22	95
	2011-12	767	613	480	253	27	200
	2010-11	783	651	528	245	12	87
COSCC							
	2014-15	730	638	559	419	33	41
	2013-14	845	741	610	390	27	41
	2012-13	959	838	642	360	30	-
	2011-12	1,002	870	655	369	30	-
	2010-11	1,095	952	741	359	24	2
DSCC							
	2014-15	406	335	295	200	18	31
	2013-14	509	380	329	232	26	16
	2012-13	599	475	406	200	18	16
	2011-12	724	587	425	200	19	16
	2010-11	808	539	408	169	8	-
JSCC							
	2014-15	758	557	480	278	10	59
	2013-14	732	545	516	302	23	31
	2012-13	792	672	512	303	27	21
	2011-12	880	706	566	369	24	11
	2010-11	1,003	782	617	352	-	18
MSCC							
	2014-15	904	759	631	378	-	45
	2013-14	911	766	567	393	-	28
	2012-13	906	747	621	406	1	26
	2011-12	983	829	698	420	-	11
	2010-11	1,057	869	736	347	-	31
NASCC							
	2014-15	1,563	1,273	1,030	472	76	39
	2013-14	1,613	1,281	1,101	444	48	29
	2012-13	1,596	1,344	1,144	434	57	28
	2011-12	1,700	1,425	1,265	497	66	31
	2010-11	1,787	1,536	1,198	378	19	80

*Data reflects individual year outcomes, not three-year averages

Funding Formula Historic Data
Community Colleges - Focus Populations: Academically Underprepared

		Academically Underprepared					
		12 CH	24 CH	36 CH	Assoc	1-2 Year Certs	<1 Year Certs
NESCC							
2014-15		921	750	649	515	84	77
2013-14		955	855	776	529	101	85
2012-13		1,126	983	778	504	84	115
2011-12		1,063	985	905	501	76	58
2010-11		1,364	1,120	908	473	84	21
PSCC							
2014-15		1,508	1,291	1,070	756	1	351
2013-14		1,620	1,307	1,095	718	-	233
2012-13		1,556	1,367	1,207	740	-	315
2011-12		1,783	1,500	1,294	671	-	251
2010-11		1,901	1,597	1,291	528	-	218
RSCC							
2014-15		929	765	649	472	46	29
2013-14		955	847	687	486	51	10
2012-13		1,057	863	767	483	39	13
2011-12		1,133	905	764	514	47	16
2010-11		1,230	1,004	821	472	28	35
STCC							
2014-15		2,123	1,614	1,192	492	21	159
2013-14		2,299	1,657	1,207	625	21	238
2012-13		2,021	1,739	1,472	646	45	206
2011-12		2,974	2,368	1,868	589	25	242
2010-11		3,259	2,460	1,849	626	27	216
VSCC							
2014-15		1,138	925	761	490	40	178
2013-14		1,151	919	783	488	52	157
2012-13		1,249	1,057	920	516	41	203
2011-12		1,371	1,178	995	501	55	275
2010-11		1,681	1,305	1,068	486	52	109
WSCC							
2014-15		979	710	647	524	9	259
2013-14		1,035	818	722	545	16	172
2012-13		1,192	892	753	536	5	141
2011-12		1,269	993	863	514	12	126
2010-11		1,357	1,116	988	464	11	150

*Data reflects individual year outcomes, not three-year averages