

# Lessons Learned in Developing Accountability Measures for a University System

MidAIR 2009 Conference  
Kansas City, Missouri  
November 12, 2009

Randy Sade, University of Missouri System  
Mardy Eimers, University of Missouri-Columbia

# Developing Accountability Measures for a University System

## 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

# Developing Accountability Measures for a University System

## 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

# Developing Accountability Measures for a University System

## 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

# Developing Accountability Measures for a University System

## 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

# Developing Accountability Measures for a University System

## 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

# Developing Accountability Measures for a University System

## 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

# Developing Accountability Measures for a University System

## Components of Notebook - Campus Reports

No.	Measures	FY07	FY08	FY09	Indicator (1)	Target (2)	Benchmark (3)	Peer Average	Source	Responsibility	VSA/CP (5)	Data Definition/Notes
	<b>Teaching &amp; Learning</b>											
TL-1	Headcount enrollment by student level								IPEDS Fall / EMSAS Fall	IR&P/RS	VSA	
	Undergraduate	21,484	21,586	22,980	●	24,741		25,658				
	Graduate	5,598	5,708	6,024	●	6,481		7,573				
	Professional	1,102	1,111	1,126	●	1,123		1,418				MU professional programs: Law-JD, Medicine-MD, and Veterinary-DVM
TL-2	FTE enrollment by student level									IR&P/RS		Annual credit hours divided by 30/24 credit hours.
	Undergraduate	19,922	20,074	21,410	●	23,008		25,365	IPEDS 12-month			30 credit hours=1.0 FTE
	Graduate	3,866	3,904	4,124	●	4,432		6,563	IPEDS 12-month / Student Census			24 credit hours=1.0 FTE
	Professional	1,093	1,103	1,119	●	1,105		1,389	IPEDS Fall / EMSAS Fall			MU professional programs: Law-JD, Medicine-MD, and Veterinary-DVM Full-time=1.0 FTE, Part-time=0.5 FTE
TL-3	Freshman applicant acceptance rate	78%	82%	85%				57%	IPEDS Inst. Characteristics	IR&P/RS	VSA	First-time, degree seeking
TL-4	Freshman yield rate of those accepted	47%	47%	47%	●	45%		39%	IPEDS Inst. Characteristics	IR&P/RS	VSA	First-time, degree seeking
TL-5	Entering freshman GPA on high school core courses	3.35	3.34	3.32	●	3.35			Student Census	IR&P/RT		Full-time, degree-seeking, first-time-college (Fall or preceding Summer Semester). Audit-only are NOT included.
TL-6	Average ACT score entering freshman	25.3	25.4	25.5	●	25.5			EMSAS Fall	IR&P/RS		First-time degree-seeking. Educational quality
TL-7	Percent of entering students who come from the top 10% of their high school	27%	26%	25%					EMSAS Fall	IR&P/RS		First-time degree-seeking freshmen. Educational quality
TL-8	Student diversity by gender								IPEDS Fall	IR&P/RS		All students
	Men	47%	46%	46%				49%				
	Women	53%	54%	54%				51%				



# Developing Accountability Measures for a University System

## Campus Report Example

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

# Developing Accountability Measures for a University System

## Components of Notebook - Operational Definitions

### Teaching & Learning

No.	Measures	Source	Contact	Definition
TL-1	Headcount enrollment by student level	IPEDS Fall Enrollment survey, Part A <a href="http://www.umsystem.edu/ums/departments/fa/planning/students/compliance/ipedsef.shtml">http://www.umsystem.edu/ums/departments/fa/planning/students/compliance/ipedsef.shtml</a>	Randy Sade, Institutional Research & Planning (UM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graduate (doctorate-professional practice) is formally titled first-professional.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

# Developing Accountability Measures for a University System

## 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

# Developing Accountability Measures for a University System

## Strategies for setting campus targets

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

# Developing Accountability Measures for a University System

## Next Step

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

# Developing Accountability Measures for a University System

## 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

# Developing Accountability Measures for a University System

## 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](mailto:sader@umsystem.edu)

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