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Background

- President’s initiative to promote transparency and accountability regarding overall performance
- “A Strategic Direction for the University System” outlined first cut of measures in October 2008
- Impetus: Association of Governing Boards
- University systems and performance measures
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University of Missouri Strategic Plan: Organized around Five Themes

• Teaching and Learning
• Research and Discovery
• Economic Development
• Community Service and Engagement
• Developing and Managing Human, Financial, and Physical Resources
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Principles of Identifying Measures

- Most meaningful measures under each theme
- Common data sources and definitions across campuses
- Externally-validated sources: IPEDS, AAUP, NSF, etc.
- Comparator peer data availability
- Include measures from Coordinated Plan for the Missouri Higher Education System and Voluntary System of Accountability
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Process of Developing Measures

• Task Force began August 2008
• Four campuses and UM System represented
• Meetings and video conferences during year
• Relied heavily on campus and UM System IR offices
• UM System IR maintained official report template
• Report template and core measures finished March 2009
  • Historical data, benchmarks, and comparator peer averages populated July 2009
  • Campuses given option to add campus-specific measures
  • Campus targets established August 2009
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Components of Notebook

- Guide to President’s Accountability Measures
- Campus reports: historical data, indicators, targets, benchmarks, comparator peer averages, and sources
- Campus comparator peer groups
- Operational definitions and complete data sources
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Components of Campus Reports

• Three years of historical data
• Indicator: green, yellow, red
• Campus three-year target
• Benchmark (best in class)
• Comparator peer average
• Source
• Voluntary System of Accountability/Coordinated Plan component
• Data definition/notes
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### Components of Notebook - Campus Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>Indicator (1)</th>
<th>Target (2)</th>
<th>Benchmark (3)</th>
<th>Peer Average</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>VSA/CP (5)</th>
<th>Data Definition/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TL-1</td>
<td>Headcount enrollment by student level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>21,484</td>
<td>21,586</td>
<td>22,980</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,741</td>
<td></td>
<td>IPEDS Fall / EMSAS Fall</td>
<td>IR&amp;P/RS</td>
<td>VSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>5,598</td>
<td>5,708</td>
<td>6,024</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL-2</td>
<td>FTE enrollment by student level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>19,922</td>
<td>20,074</td>
<td>21,410</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,008</td>
<td></td>
<td>IPEDS 12-month</td>
<td>IR&amp;P/RS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual credit hours divided by 30/24 credit hours.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>3,866</td>
<td>3,904</td>
<td>4,124</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,432</td>
<td></td>
<td>IPEDS 12-month / Student Census</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 credit hours=1.0 FTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td></td>
<td>IPEDS Fall / EMSAS Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MU professional programs: Law-JD, Medicine-MD, and Veterinary-DVM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL-3</td>
<td>Freshman applicant acceptance rate</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IPEDS Inst. Characteristics</td>
<td>IR&amp;P/RS</td>
<td>VSA</td>
<td>First-time, degree seeking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL-4</td>
<td>Freshman yield rate of those accepted</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td>IPEDS Inst. Characteristics</td>
<td>IR&amp;P/RS</td>
<td>VSA</td>
<td>First-time, degree seeking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL-5</td>
<td>Entering freshman GPA on high school core courses</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Census</td>
<td>IR&amp;P/RT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time, degree-seeking, first-time-college (Fall or preceding Summer Semester). Audit-only are NOT included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL-6</td>
<td>Average ACT score entering freshman</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>EMSAS Fall</td>
<td>IR&amp;P/RS</td>
<td></td>
<td>First-time degree-seeking, Educational quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL-7</td>
<td>Percent of entering students who come from the top 10% of their high school</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EMSAS Fall</td>
<td>IR&amp;P/RS</td>
<td></td>
<td>First-time degree-seeking freshmen. Educational quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL-8</td>
<td>Student diversity by gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- **Teaching & Learning**
- **VL-1** Headcount enrollment by student level
- **VL-2** FTE enrollment by student level
- **VL-3** Freshman applicant acceptance rate
- **VL-4** Freshman yield rate of those accepted
- **VL-5** Entering freshman GPA on high school core courses
- **VL-6** Average ACT score entering freshman
- **VL-7** Percent of entering students who come from the top 10% of their high school
- **VL-8** Student diversity by gender
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## Campus Report Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>Indicator (1)</th>
<th>Target (2)</th>
<th>Benchmark (3)</th>
<th>Peer Average (4)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching and Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headcount enrollment by student level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>21,484</td>
<td>21,586</td>
<td>22,980</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>24,741</td>
<td>25,658</td>
<td>IPEDS Fall / EMSAS Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>5,598</td>
<td>5,708</td>
<td>6,024</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>6,481</td>
<td>7,573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing and Managing Human, Financial, and Physical Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average ranked faculty salary</td>
<td>$74,549</td>
<td>$76,139</td>
<td>$81,604</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$112,481</td>
<td>$93,957</td>
<td>AAUP (Academe)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Indicator:
- Green = reach or exceed
- Yellow = making progress
- Red = no progress

(2) Target Indicator for most measures is for 3 full years out, FY12.

(3) Benchmark based on top performing peer institution in FY07.

(4) Peer Average based on FY07 peer institution data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| TL-1| Headcount enrollment by student level         | IPEDS Fall Enrollment survey, Part A http://www.umsystem.edu/ums/departments/fa/planning/students/compliance/ipedsef.shtml | Randy Sade, Institutional Research & Planning (UM) | * Graduate (doctorate-professional practice) is formally titled first-professional.  
  * Included are students enrolled in courses creditable toward a diploma, certificate, degree, or other formal award. Students enrolled in courses that are part of a vocational or occupational program, including those enrolled in off-campus centers. High school students taking regular college courses for credit under their classification as recorded by the institution. Full-time students taking remedial courses if the student is considered degree-seeking for the purpose of student financial aid determination. Students from overseas enrolled in U.S. courses (e.g., online). Graduate students enrolled for thesis credits, even when zero credits are awarded, as these students are still enrolled and seeking their degree.  
  * Not included are students enrolled exclusively in courses not creditable toward a formal award or the completion of a vocational program. Students taking Continuing Education Units unless they are also enrolled in courses creditable toward a degree or other formal award. Students exclusively auditing classes. Residents or interns in Doctor’s - professional practice fields, since they have already received their Doctor’s degree. Any student studying abroad (at a foreign university) if their enrollment at this institution is only an administrative record and the fee is nominal. Students in any branch campus located in a foreign country. |
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Issues

• How many measures?
• Targets for all measures?
• Benchmark: best in class
• Interrelationships among different measures/targets
• Cost-benefit consideration on some measures
  • Identifying meaningful indicators that can be measured accurately
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Strategies for setting campus targets

• Campus sets targets on selected measures
• Same for each campus
• Reviewed and discussed annually by Chancellors & President
Next Step

- Outside “audit” of measures
- Validity and reasonableness of measures, targets, benchmarks, and peer comparisons
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Annual Process

- Collaboration with campuses
- UM System IR responsible for maintaining and updating report
- Updates shared with Board of Curators in December
- Considered dynamic document
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Lessons Learned

• President lead effort
• Balancing involvement and speed
• Changes based on campus input
Developing Accountability Measures for a University System

Questions

Randy Sade, Asst. Analyst
Institutional Research & Planning
University of Missouri System
(573) 884-9201
sader@umsystem.edu

Mardy Eimers, Director
Institutional Research
University of Missouri-Columbia
(573) 882-3412
eimersm@missouri.edu