

# Investigating a Proposed Funding Formula Metric

Ronald D. Thompson, Ph.D.  
Senior Institutional Research Analyst  
University of Missouri System

# Abstract

This presentation describes in detail how mathematical probability is used to investigate the practicability of a proposed metric pertaining to a higher-education funding formula model.

# Outline

- Proposed Metric
- Implementation
- Example
- Discussion
- Summary
- Q&A

## Proposed Metric

Release the set-aside for next year iff the proportion of this year's graduates who are *successful* exceeds last year's proportion by more than 0.01 (= 1.0%).

A graduate is deemed “successful” iff *six months after graduation* he/she is either enrolled in grad or prof school, or employed in a position “commensurate” with his bachelor's degree.

## Proposed Metric

Release the set-aside for ~~next-year~~ year after next iff the proportion of this year's graduates who are *successful* exceeds last year's proportion by more than 0.01 (= 1.0%).

A graduate is deemed “successful” iff six months after graduation he/she is either enrolled in grad or prof school, or employed in a position “commensurate” with his bachelor's degree.

## Proposed Metric

$N_i$  No. of year  $i$  grads.

$G_i$  No. of year  $i$  grads enrolled in grad/prof school.

$W_i$  No. of year  $i$  grads working successfully.

$p_i = (G_i + W_i) / N_i$  Pop. proportion of "successful" year  $i$  grads.

$p_2 - p_1$  Change in consecutive pop. proportions.

Release the set-aside for year 4 iff  $p_2 - p_1 > 0.01$  .

## Proposed Metric

$N_i$  No. of year  $i$  grads. Know

$G_i$  No. of year  $i$  grads enrolled in grad/prof school. "Know"

$W_i$  No. of year  $i$  grads working successfully. ???

$p_i = (G_i + W_i) / N_i$  Pop. proportion of "successful" year  $i$  grads. ???

$p_2 - p_1$  Change in consecutive pop. proportions. ???

Release the set-aside for year 4 iff  $p_2 - p_1 > 0.01$  . ???

## How to Proceed?

$R_i = N_i - G_i$       No. of *year  $i$*  grads *not* accounted for.

Solution #1: Survey all  $R_i$  unknown *year  $i$*  grads, and observe  $W_i$ .

- Need ~100% response rate (to reduce reporting bias).
- Expensive approach.



## How to Proceed?

$R_i = N_i - G_i$  No. of unknown *year i* grads.

$u_i = W_i / R_i$  Corres. proportion of unknown *year i* grads.

$$W_i = u_i R_i$$

Solution #2: Survey a SRS( $n_i$ ) of the  $R_i$  unknown *year i* grads, observe the number  $x_i$  of successful grads, and *estimate*  $W_i$  by estimating  $u_i$  using  $x_i / n_i$ .

- Need ~100% response rate, but this seems more attainable here.
- Statistical approach which promises to be less expensive.
- Allows one to quantify decision uncertainty.

## Solution #2: Probability Results

$$1. \quad \hat{u} \equiv \frac{x}{n} \sim Normal \left( u \equiv \frac{W}{R} \equiv \frac{W}{N-G}, \sigma_{\hat{u}} \equiv \sqrt{\frac{u(1-u)}{n} \cdot \frac{R-n}{R-1}} \right)$$

$$2. \quad \sigma_{\hat{u}} \equiv \sqrt{\frac{u(1-u)}{n} \cdot \frac{R-n}{R-1}}$$

$$3. \quad p \equiv (G+W)/N = (G+Ru)/N$$

$$4. \quad \hat{p} \equiv (G+R\hat{u})/N$$

## Solution #2: Probability Results (cont.)

$$5. \quad \hat{p} \sim \text{Normal} \left( p \equiv \frac{G + Ru}{N} = \frac{G + W}{N}, \sigma_{\hat{u}} \cdot \left( \frac{R}{N} \right) \right)$$

$$6. \quad n = \frac{R}{1 + \frac{R-1}{u(1-u)} \left( \frac{me \cdot N}{z_{\alpha/2} R} \right)^2} \leq \frac{R}{1 + (R-1) \left( \frac{me \cdot 2N}{z_{\alpha/2} R} \right)^2}$$

$$7. \quad \hat{p} \pm z_{\alpha/2} \cdot \sigma_{\hat{u}} \cdot \left( \frac{R}{N} \right)$$

## Solution #2: Probability Results (cont.)

$$8. \quad (\hat{p}_2 - \hat{p}_1) \sim \text{Normal} \left( p_2 - p_1, \sqrt{\sigma_{\hat{u}_2}^2 \cdot \left(\frac{R_2}{N_2}\right)^2 + \sigma_{\hat{u}_1}^2 \cdot \left(\frac{R_1}{N_1}\right)^2} \right)$$

$$9. \quad (\hat{p}_2 - \hat{p}_1) \pm z_{\alpha/2} \sqrt{\sigma_{\hat{u}_2}^2 \cdot \left(\frac{R_2}{N_2}\right)^2 + \sigma_{\hat{u}_1}^2 \cdot \left(\frac{R_1}{N_1}\right)^2}$$

$$10. \quad Z \equiv \frac{(\hat{p}_2 - \hat{p}_1) - (p_2 - p_1)}{\sqrt{\sigma_{\hat{u}_2}^2 \cdot \left(\frac{R_2}{N_2}\right)^2 + \sigma_{\hat{u}_1}^2 \cdot \left(\frac{R_1}{N_1}\right)^2}}$$

## Solution #2: Hypothesis Test

### Hypotheses:

$$H_0: p_2 - p_1 \leq 0.01$$

$$H_A: p_2 - p_1 > 0.01$$

Decision Rule: Reject the null hypothesis (*i.e.*, **release the year 4 set-aside**) at the approx.  $\alpha = 0.05$  (say) level of significance iff

$$Z \equiv \frac{(\hat{p}_2 - \hat{p}_1) - 0.01}{\sqrt{\sigma_{\hat{u}_2}^2 \cdot \left(\frac{R_2}{N_2}\right)^2 + \sigma_{\hat{u}_1}^2 \cdot \left(\frac{R_1}{N_1}\right)^2}} > z_\alpha = z_{0.05} = 1.645$$

## Solution #2: Steps

1. Learn the no. of **year 1** grads:  $N_1$
2. Learn the no. of **year 1** grads in grad/prof school:  $G_1$
3. Determine the sample size for the survey of **year 1** grads:  $n_1$
4. Survey SRS(  $n_1$ ) of the  $R_1 \equiv N_1 - G_1$  **year 1** grads, ...
5. ... follow up, *etc.*, ...
6. ... and compute the estimated proportion of **year 1** grads who are “successful”:  $\hat{p}_1$
7. Do same for **year 2** grads:  $\hat{p}_2$
8. Test  $H_0: p_2 - p_1 \leq 0.01$  against  $H_A: p_2 - p_1 > 0.01$ .

## Solution #2: Example

1. FY2011 Bachelors, MO 4-year Publics. (See Handout.)
2. FY2012 Bachelors, MO 4-year Publics. (See Handout.)
3. Example (simulated).

## Solution #2: Example (cont.)

	<b>FY2011</b>	<b>FY2012</b>	
<b><i>N</i></b> No. graduates	2,092	1,963	
<b><i>G</i></b> No. in grad/prof school	585	549	Assume 28% of <i>N</i>
<b><i>R = N - G</i></b> The rest	1,507	1,414	
<b><i>n</i></b> Sample size	1,402	1,321	Target m.e. = 0.005
<b><i>u = W / R</i></b>			
<b><i>X</i></b> No. successful grads in sample	1,000	975	For example
<b>est(<i>u</i>) = <i>x</i> / <i>n</i></b>	0.7133	0.7381	
<b>est(<i>p</i>)</b>	0.7934	0.8113	
<b>m.e. for <i>p</i></b>	0.0045	0.0044	
<b>est(<i>p</i><sub>2</sub> - <i>p</i><sub>1</sub>)</b>		0.0179	
<b>m.e. for (<i>p</i><sub>2</sub> - <i>p</i><sub>1</sub>)</b>		0.0063	
<b><i>Z</i></b>		2.465*	<b>Release \$\$\$</b>



## Solution #2: Remarks

1. Straightforward application of basic mathematical statistics and probability theory.
  - Straightforward implementation of the proposed funding formula metric.
  - Provides, additionally, a statement of uncertainty.
2. Show me success!
3. Practical (*c.f.*, practicable)?
4. Can be altered to address *known* grads *vs.* *unknown* grads (rather than grads in prof/grad school *vs.* grads not in prof/grad school).

## Solution #2: Remarks (cont.)

5. The *real* metric: Release the set-aside for **year after next** iff this year's **3-year weighted proportion** of graduates who are *successful* exceeds last year's **3-year weighted proportion** by more than 0.001 (= 0.10%).

$$p_3 \equiv \frac{(G_1 + W_1) + (G_2 + W_2) + (G_3 + W_3)}{N_1 + N_2 + N_3}$$

$$p_4 \equiv \frac{(G_2 + W_2) + (G_3 + W_3) + (G_4 + W_4)}{N_2 + N_3 + N_4}$$

Release the set-aside for **year 6** iff  $p_4 - p_3 > 0.001$  .

# Summary

- Described a (distilled version of a) funding formula metric.
- Motivated and described a solution for implementing this metric, developed from mathematical probability.
- Presented examples.
- Critiqued this solution.

# Questions

Ronald D. Thompson, Ph.D.  
Sr. Institutional Research Analyst  
Institutional Research & Planning  
University of Missouri System

thompsonrd@umsystem.edu  
(573) 884-6674



.960 for 95% confidence (Usually used when reporting a "margin of error.")										
.645 for 90% confidence										
.283 for 80% confidence										
Best prior guess for u (use 0.5 to be maximally conservative)	Optimal Sample Size (n)	Sampling Fraction	Cost Initial Survey (\$)	Total Cost Initial Data Gathering	Response Rate Initial Survey	Size of 1st Follow-up Survey	Cost of 1st Follow-up (\$)	Total Cost After 1st Follow-up (\$)	Response Rate of 1st Follow-up	Size of 2nd Follow-up
0.50			6		45%		6		60%	
0.50	102	1.0000	612	629	0.45	57	342	971	0.60	23
0.50	227	0.9913	1,362	1,400	0.45	125	750	2,150	0.60	50
0.50	602	0.9710	3,612	3,715	0.45	332	1,992	5,707	0.60	133
0.50	1,954	0.9021	11,724	12,085	0.45	1,075	6,450	18,535	0.60	430
0.50	694	0.9666	4,164	4,284	0.45	382	2,292	6,576	0.60	153
0.50	464	0.9789	2,784	2,863	0.45	256	1,536	4,399	0.60	103
0.50	671	0.9669	4,026	4,142	0.45	370	2,220	6,362	0.60	148
0.50	1,006	0.9500	6,036	6,212	0.45	554	3,324	9,536	0.60	222
0.50	809	0.9597	4,854	4,994	0.45	445	2,670	7,664	0.60	178
0.50	1,160	0.9423	6,960	7,165	0.45	638	3,828	10,993	0.60	256
0.50	3,095	0.8449	18,570	19,180	0.45	1,703	10,218	29,398	0.60	682
0.50	1,040	0.9480	6,240	6,423	0.45	572	3,432	9,855	0.60	229
0.50	1,402	0.9303	8,412	8,663	0.45	772	4,632	13,295	0.60	309

										NOTE: Use z = 1
	BACHELOR'S									NOTE: Use z = 1
										NOTE: Use z = 1
<u>PUBLIC BACCALAUREATE AND HIGHER DEGREE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS</u>	<u>FY12 Total (N)</u>	<u>NSC per-student cost (\$/student)</u>	<u>NSC Total Cost (\$)</u>	<u>% Going on to Grad or Prof School</u>	<u>No. Going On to Post Bacc (G)</u>	<u>No. Potentially Employed (R = N - G)</u>	<u>Required increase in p to satisfy Alumni Success Funding Measure</u>	<u>Target Margin of Error for p (m.e.)</u>	<u>z (corres. to a specified confidence level)</u>	
		0.12		28%			0.0100		1.960	
Harris-Stowe State University	160	0.12	19	0.28	44	116	0.0100	0.0050	1.960	
Lincoln University	302	0.12	36	0.28	84	218	0.0100	0.0050	1.960	
Missouri Southern State University	865	0.12	104	0.28	242	623	0.0100	0.0050	1.960	
Missouri State University-Springfield	3,226	0.12	387	0.28	903	2,323	0.0100	0.0050	1.960	
Missouri University of S&T	1,077	0.12	129	0.28	301	776	0.0100	0.0050	1.960	
Missouri Western State University	708	0.12	85	0.28	198	510	0.0100	0.0050	1.960	
Northwest Missouri State University	1,148	0.12	138	0.28	321	827	0.0100	0.0050	1.960	
Southeast Missouri State University	1,652	0.12	198	0.28	462	1,190	0.0100	0.0050	1.960	
Truman State University	1,286	0.12	154	0.28	360	926	0.0100	0.0050	1.960	
University of Central Missouri	1,874	0.12	225	0.28	524	1,350	0.0100	0.0050	1.960	
University of Missouri-Columbia	5,528	0.12	663	0.28	1,547	3,981	0.0100	0.0050	1.960	
University of Missouri-Kansas City	1,749	0.12	210	0.28	489	1,260	0.0100	0.0050	1.960	
University of Missouri-St Louis	1,963	0.12	236	0.28	549	1,414	0.0100	0.0050	1.960	

.960 for 95% confidence (Usually used when reporting a "margin of error.")										
.645 for 90% confidence										
.283 for 80% confidence										
Best prior guess for u (use 0.5 to be maximally conservative)	Optimal Sample Size (n)	Sampling Fraction	Cost Initial Survey (\$)	Total Cost Initial Data Gathering	Response Rate Initial Survey	Size of 1st Follow-up Survey	Cost of 1st Follow-up (\$)	Total Cost After 1st Follow-up (\$)	Response Rate of 1st Follow-up	Size of 2nd Follow-up
0.50			6		45%		6		60%	
0.50	116	1.0000	696	715	0.45	64	384	1,099	0.60	26
0.50	216	0.9908	1,296	1,332	0.45	119	714	2,046	0.60	48
0.50	605	0.9711	3,630	3,734	0.45	333	1,998	5,732	0.60	134
0.50	2,081	0.8958	12,486	12,873	0.45	1,145	6,870	19,743	0.60	458
0.50	747	0.9626	4,482	4,611	0.45	411	2,466	7,077	0.60	165
0.50	498	0.9765	2,988	3,073	0.45	274	1,644	4,717	0.60	110
0.50	795	0.9613	4,770	4,908	0.45	438	2,628	7,536	0.60	176
0.50	1,124	0.9445	6,744	6,942	0.45	619	3,714	10,656	0.60	248
0.50	885	0.9557	5,310	5,464	0.45	487	2,922	8,386	0.60	195
0.50	1,265	0.9370	7,590	7,815	0.45	696	4,176	11,991	0.60	279
0.50	3,319	0.8337	19,914	20,577	0.45	1,826	10,956	31,533	0.60	731
0.50	1,186	0.9413	7,116	7,326	0.45	653	3,918	11,244	0.60	262
0.50	1,321	0.9342	7,926	8,162	0.45	727	4,362	12,524	0.60	291