



**Recommendations for a Dashboard and Benchmarks
for the Board of Regents
of the Regional University System of Oklahoma**

Submitted by

Regents Dashboard Work Team

June 21, 2018

Executive Summary.....	3
Recommended Dashboard and Benchmarks.....	6
Illustrated Dashboard Table.....	9
Benchmarks Discussion.....	10
Student Access, Progress and Completion.....	10
Business Operations Benchmarks.....	10
Student Efficiency in Completion.....	10
Student Satisfaction	11
Equity in Access, Progress, and Completion	12
Student Learning.....	13
Graduate Upward Social Mobility.....	15
Conclusion.....	17
References.....	19

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Acknowledgements.....	21
Appendix 2: Dashboard Principles.....	22
Appendix 3: Student Access, Progress, and Completion.....	24
Appendix 4: Business Benchmark Definitions.....	33
Appendix 5: Business Benchmarks Data.....	35
Appendix 6: Student Access, Progress, and Completion	47
Appendix 7: Institutional General Education Evaluation Practices.....	51

This report constitutes the final recommendations of a Work Team of senior administrators and researchers across the Regional University System of Oklahoma empaneled to provide a Dashboard of Benchmarks to be employed for accountability and advocacy purposes.

Data contained in this report is a reflection of the yeoman work provided by these professionals in following the direction of the RUSO Board of Regents at its October 2017 meeting.

This has been an important and useful exercise in numerous ways. A primary benefit is the opening of a dialogue between the campuses to agree on those data sets that reflect the distinct mission of our institutions to provide upward social mobility to our students through exceptional teaching and mentoring. Further, these information exchanges have highlighted the challenging task of arriving at common definitions and data sources that enables performance comparisons in a meaningful way across a range of peers.

As a consequence of this investigation, the Work Team has generated numerous “bragging” points for the RUSO Board of Regents and RUSO institutions. Among them:

- *Social mobility.* Some 38 percent more RUSO graduates will migrate from being among the most financially insecure college students to becoming one of the wealthiest American professionals when compared to equally financially challenged students at hundreds of similar universities across the nation.
- *Student debt.* RUSO graduates find a strong rate of return on their degree. Fewer than half of graduates have accumulated debt, which averages around \$11,000.
- *Cost.* The average annual cost of attending a RUSO institution after grants and scholarships is about \$10,385 for tuition, fees, books, room and board.
- *Satisfaction.* RUSO students who complete national surveys on their experiences report around a 90 percent satisfaction rate with their college tenure.
- *Efficiency.* In the past three years, RUSO has awarded 22,791 bachelor’s, master’s, or professional degrees (bachelor’s and above), and another 562 certificates or associate’s degrees.
- *Value.* The median annual salary for RUSO graduates one year after graduation (2013-2014 graduates) was \$33,132, which was \$4,280 higher than the median for all 43 Oklahoma two- and four-year public and private institutions.
- *Workforce responsiveness.* Over that period, the leading RUSO disciplines for graduates were in the high demand areas of education, health care, public administration, wholesale and retail trade, and information technology and professional services.

- *Growing our own.* Overall, 82 percent of RUSO graduates remained in Oklahoma after graduation, as compared to 72 percent for all Oklahoma institutions.

The Work Team review began in the Fall of 2017 for potential metrics common to RUSO institutions that could provide a useful Dashboard for the Board of Regents of the Regional University System of Oklahoma and campus leaders to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of our six institutions. Further, these metrics were expected to be useful tools to the Board and the institutions to tell a positive story of the successful fulfillment of RUSO's mission to Oklahoma's decision-makers, influencers, and our own internal constituencies.

Measurable Benchmarks for this Dashboard are drawn from numerous sources. A primary document is the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation study, *Answering the Call: Institutions and States Lead the Way Toward Better Measures of Postsecondary Performance*, (Engle, J., 2016). As Board members will recall, of the 35 benchmarks offered in the supplement to the Gates study, only six were considered "easy" to acquire. The RUSO Dashboard Work Team found that to be very much the case, with many Benchmarks proving to be quite challenging to uncover meaningful data that can serve as performance accountability measures.

This final report builds on the work previously submitted to the Board of Regents at meetings in October 2017 and January 2018. This final report adds 12 Benchmarks to the Dashboard and has not altered the 15 Benchmarks previously recommended to the Board. New information is highlighted in the color green to the Index.

Although this completes the Work Team's response to the Board with information on all 27 recommended Benchmarks contained in the Dashboard, this remains very much a work in progress. There are many aspects of this report that will require a continuing dialogue between the Board, RUSO administration, and the RUSO Institutions.

As the nucleus of the Work Team extensively discussed the Benchmarks and Dashboard throughout this exercise, a series of questions arose that are yet to be answered to ensure data is easily accessible to the Board to reliably assess the efficiency and effectiveness of our institutions.

To ensure this occurs, the Work Team leaders have identified these outstanding issues to be resolved with the Board:

1. In what ways can RUSO institutions guarantee the accuracy of the data it is using for Benchmarks? Meaningful data sets can be difficult to obtain and evaluate for relevancy in a culture that is awash with data. Source documents that are supposedly using the same definitions for obtaining data sometimes have widely differing report-outs of their facts. These data differences clearly will influence the interpretation of institutional performance. Therefore, any Benchmark that is added or modified must be subjected to rigorous consideration before it is adopted as a metric.

2. How do we make the data accessible to Regents? This first report establishes a foundation for reporting. However, it is data rich in ways that require a significant investment of time by the reader to interpret the data. The Work Team nucleus recognizes the Board must be confident that data is reliable and meaningful. Therefore, continuing exploration is needed to arrive at visual representations of data through charts and graphs that are both accurate, easy to understand, and are intuitive in providing understanding of their meaning.
3. How will we know that the data reported is meaningful? There are numerous ways to frame the value of the data:
 - Institutional progress can be highly specific because of the historic culture (people, resources, policies, practices, and history of decision-making processes) and the preparedness of the students served by an institution. This complexity can provide uncontrollable “confounding factors” that may be highly influential to performance, but are extremely difficult to know, measure or assess. (See APPENDIX 2, Dashboard Principle 6). Therefore, not all Benchmarks should seek comparisons to performance to peers.
 - Peer group comparisons are important, but will be time-consuming. When appropriate to the Benchmark, a peer comparison could be relied upon for accurately measuring performance and progress. Peers may include:
 - RUSO institutions
 - RUSO & OSRHE Peer groups
 - Athletics Conference Peer Groups
 - Institutional self-identified aspirational peers
 - Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. At its broadest reach this formal classification process includes about 700 institutions considered similar to RUSO universities.

As is apparent, selecting the most likely potential peer groups for a comparative assessment could require a substantial investment of a campus’s time to gather institutional and peer group data, conduct a comparison, and analyze whether the resulting assessment and interpretation is fair, equitable, and easily understood.

Also, as the Dashboard is fine-tuned, any RUSO-institution comparisons should be evaluated for whether Benchmark should be reported for the average or the median. The latter would remove “outlier” data from institutions that are significantly skewing the RUSO average. The Work Team has found skewing caused by averaging to be the case particularly in Dashboard performance categories that particularly speak to our institutional missions of providing equity in access, progress, completion, social mobility, and measuring core curriculum education outcomes.

4. Finally, who will be responsible for collecting and interpreting future Dashboard data? The Work Team members are continuously exploring the best data sets and can respond

to the Benchmarks described in the Benchmarks & Dashboard Table presented on Page 6, and the reporting timelines described on Pages 4 and 5. However, a key question is who will have the responsibility for interpreting these raw data sets to the benefit of the Regents' oversight responsibilities. That Actor has not been identified. While the Work Team nucleus prefers this process to be the responsibility of the RUSO Office, it is undetermined if the office has staff with the campus contextual knowledge to provide interpretation for many of the Benchmarks.

The Work Team awaits the direction of the Board on these outstanding questions.

Recommended Dashboard and Benchmarks

The Work Team recommends adoption of a Dashboard of 27 Benchmarks. Data submissions will be provided on a timely basis in one of five timelines that is appropriate to the availability of the data: academic year, fiscal year, quarterly, president's evaluation, or as needed. The reporting periods reflect: 1). the utility of the data to the Board to measure institutional progress, 2). the ease of accessing the data, 3.) the optimal time for collecting and reporting the Benchmarks to the Board.

The Benchmarks and Dashboard offered to the Board of Regents in this report is supplemented by many data sources based on the expertise of those Work Team institutional leaders who continue to contribute to this conversation. Sources include:

- The *Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System* (IPEDS) from the U.S. Department of Education. This is a common data set for all 7,500 U.S. higher education institutions.
- The *Unitized Data System* (UDS) of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education that tracks 75 data elements for each enrolled student in Oklahoma.
- Customized *Institutional Data* sources provided by campus senior administrators. Some benchmarks include comparing institutional data to best practices recommended by The National Association of College & University Business Officers (NACUBO).

The Work Team recommends the Board of Regents adopt the following Benchmarks, which are delineated by their data sources as well as the reporting timeline.

October

Student Satisfaction: *RUSO institutions graduating senior survey.*

Enrollment: *OSRHE Unitized Data System.*

Retention: *OSRHE Unitized Data System.*

Credit Accumulation: *OSRHE Unitized Data System.*

Gateway Course Completion: *OSRHE Unitized Data System.*

Education Programs Offered: *Institutional data.*

Transfer Rate: *OSRHE Unitized Data System.*

Graduation Rate: *OSRHE Unitized Data System.*

Program of Study Selection: *Institutional Data Collection.*

Enrollment by Preparation, Economic Status, Age, Race/Ethnicity: *OSRHE Unitized Data System.*

Progression Performance by Preparation, Economic Status, Age, Race/Ethnicity: *OSRHE Unitized Data System.*

November

Composite Financial Index: *RUSO Business Officers.*

Restricted to unrestricted net assets ratio: *RUSO Business Officers.*

Gross tuition contribution ratio and state appropriations contribution ratio:
RUSO Business Officers.

Budget impact of credit hour production: *RUSO Business Officers.*

Current ratio: *RUSO Business Officers.*

January

Expenditures Per Completion: *Institutional data.*

Net Price: *Institutional data.*

Student Share of Cost: *Institutional data.*

Cumulative Debt: *USDE Title IV data.*

Loan Repayment Rate: *USDE Title IV data.*

Cohort Default Rate: *USDE Title IV data.*

Quarterly

Days of Cash on Hand: *RUSO Business Officers.*

As Required

Per-Issuance Debt Coverage Ratio (New Capital Construction): *RUSO Business Officers.*

The President's Evaluation


Completion Performance by Preparation, Economic Status, Age, Race/Ethnicity: *OSRHE Unitized Data System.*

Student Learning Outcomes: *Individual Institutional Testing Sources.*

As Available

Social Mobility: *Oklahoma Promise or other institutional data.*

The Benchmarks and Dashboard are illustrated on the Chart below. They are delineated by *Student Access, Progression, and Completion* referenced by *Performance, Efficiency, and Equity*, which is the template offered in the Gates Foundation recommendations.

 REGIONAL UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF OKLAHOMA BENCHMARKS & DASHBOARD			
PERFORMANCE	ACCESS	PROGRESSION	COMPLETION
	Enrollment Education Programs Offered	Retention Credit Accumulation Gateway Course Completion Program of Study Selection	Transfer Rate Graduation Rate Student Satisfaction Student Learning Outcomes
EFFICIENCY		Per-Issuance Debt Coverage Ratio Composite Financial Index Days of Cash on Hand Restricted to unrestricted net assets ratio Gross tuition contribution ratio and state appropriations contribution ratio Budget impact of credit hour production Current ratio	Expenditures Per Completion Net Price Student Share of Cost Cumulative Debt Loan Repayment Rate Cohort Default Rate
EQUITY	Enrollment by Preparation, Economic Status, Age, Race/Ethnicity	Progression Performance by Preparation, Economic Status, Age, Race/Ethnicity	Completion Performance by Preparation, Economic Status, Age, Race/Ethnicity Social Mobility

Benchmarks Discussion

Student Access, Progress and Completion

These data sets are the most common metrics that are tracked by the IPEDS survey through the U.S. Department of Higher Education to 7,500 higher education institutions. They are supplemented by Benchmark recommendations drawn from the Gates Foundation. These are the most easily tracked metrics and include traditional categories of student enrollments, retention and graduation rates, programs offered, credit hour production, and remediation rates.

Data submitted to the Regents in November 2017 are contained in Appendix 3.

Business Operations Benchmarks

Seven Benchmarks were presented to the Board of Regents at its November meeting through the work of the RUSO business officers.

RUSO Business Officers conducted substantial conversations on benchmarks that they thought would be most useful to Regents as a means of assessing institutional fiscal health. All but two benchmarks will be reported each November. One will be reported on a Quarterly basis. One will be reported as construction projects occur. As recommended in the Principles, these Benchmarks will be continuously reviewed by the Business Officers for validity, and may be modified in future reports.

Definitions of the Business Benchmarks are described in Appendix 4.

Data submitted to the Regents in November 2017 are contained in Appendix 5.

Student Efficiency in Completion

Student efficiency metrics have been an item of concern for more than two decades. At its base, this conversation has focused on ensuring transparency in costs so that students and their families have an appreciation for their actual financial obligation for their education. This includes all direct costs to students after accounting for government funding, tuition, grants, loans, and scholarships. The National Governors Association was the final arbiter in establishing these Benchmarks.

However, due to the spotlight cast on this area and the public emphasis on student cost, an increasing friction has developed between the academy, public decision-makers, and critics of public higher education. The academy argues that while transparency in cost is important, a focus solely on cost efficiencies, when married to earnings outcomes, re-casts a college degree into a commodity to be bought and sold in the marketplace. In that scenario, a diploma becomes an inappropriate proxy for indicating that a graduate is fully prepared for the workforce and life. Overemphasis on efficiency and return on investment, therefore, can diminish the importance of the effectiveness of producing highly educated graduates who contribute to society in a variety of

ways. Gildersleeve, et al., (2010) provides excellent insights into the policy and social issues that have reframed the value of a college degree into a market-based commodity.

The Work Team chose six benchmarks in which it agrees with the Gates Foundation which will provide transparent, meaningful data on student cost efficiency for RUSO institutions. The RUSO institutions employed a formula from the national Delta Cost Project and IPEDS financial information as sources recommended by Gates.

Described below are the definitions for the individual Benchmarks and the RUSO institution averages for Fiscal Year 2017.

Expenditures per Completion — Education and related expenditures divided by the number of student completions in a fiscal year.
RUSO Average: \$44,283.

Student Share of Cost — Percentage of education expenditures covered by net student tuition versus all public subsidies in a fiscal year.
RUSO Average: 42.35 percent.

Net Price — Average cost of attendance less all grant aid given in a year.
RUSO Average: \$10,384.

Cumulative Debt — Median amount of debt student borrowers incur while attending an institution.
RUSO Average: \$11,085.

Loan Repayment Rate — Percentage of borrowers in a cohort.
RUSO Average: 49.26 percent.

Loan Default Rate — Percentage of borrowers who enter into repayment and default within three fiscal years.
RUSO Average: 10.84 percent.

Student Satisfaction

All institutions employ a graduation survey for Spring Semester commencing seniors. The RUSO Chief Academic Officers considered the most efficient and effective means to gather this data. The information collected on student satisfaction will be similar to that currently posed to our students through institutional participation in the National Survey of Student Experiences. RUSO institutions participation in NSSE generally varies from every year to every three years. As an alternative, the RUSO Dashboard will report this information annually.

These questions also serve as an indirect means to assess student learning as it assumes that satisfaction with a student's overall experience also indicates satisfaction with what was learned.

Institutions will pose variations of these questions:

1. Did your academic major experiences meet your expectations with respect to the knowledge and skills that you acquired?
2. Knowing what you now know, if you had to do it over again, would you still attend this institution?

Equity in Access, Progress, and Completion

Nationally, the Carnegie Classification system categorizes all 7,500 higher education institutions. RUSO institutions fall into the “selective” category that is predicated on establishing admissions criteria that are more expansive in accepting students. (“Highly” selective institutions, such as state flagship campuses and Ivy League or private institutions, set higher admissions standards that attract students who are more likely to succeed toward graduation.)

The Work Team selected data sets that effectively measure the success of RUSO institutions in fulfilling its equity obligation in providing access based on two cohorts: race and gender. The Work Team relied on the traditional benchmarks for measuring persistence and completion — first- to second-year retention, and 6-year graduation rates.

The data provides a sense of how these students performed across two frameworks: 1). persisting or completing their degree at their original institution for enrollment, or, 2). based upon them persisting or completing their degree at another state institution in Oklahoma.

The analyses from this perspective provides a much clearer understanding of the success rates of students because national (IPEDS) data that only tracks first-time, full-time high school graduates who enroll in the fall semester. The Gates Foundation, among many others, note that the IPEDS practice does not accurately reflect the reality of today’s student population.

This expanded perspective recommended by the Work Team provides a much more complete story of the success rates of students. One limitation is that those RUSO students who transfer out of state and complete their degrees are not counted. However, the number of students who are in this category are small, with a minimal impact on the analyses.

Persistence was measured by evaluating the first- to second-year graduation rates for first-time, full-time students admitted in the fall of 2016. Generally, the findings indicate that based upon gender, female students persisted almost 10 percentage points higher than male students in the “within institution” category and in the “within state” category. This is consistent with findings at the national level.

Persistence based upon race/ethnicity was analyzed across RUSO institutions. Data revealed that Caucasian and Hispanic/Latino students from the Fall 2011 first-time, full-time cohort persisted at a higher percentage than African American and Native American students. The persistence levels were higher within RUSO institutions and across state institutions as students moved from

their first to second year of college. The comparable outcomes of Hispanic/Latino students with Caucasian students were higher than the national findings, and the outcomes of African American and Native American students compared with Caucasian students parallels national trends.

Across all institutions in terms of gender, female students consistently outperformed male students in six-year graduation rates for the 2011 cohort. The difference is almost 10 percentage points higher at each institution for “within institution” and “across institutions” in the state. These numbers reflect a similar trend to national data regarding graduation rates based upon gender. Female students achieve success at higher levels consistently at the national level also.

Although the data tracks only the 2011 cohort, prior cohort outcomes are similar to these with female students consistently outperforming male students.

Regarding race and ethnicity, Caucasian students’ six-year graduation rates were consistently higher than African American, Native American, and Hispanic/Latino students. Due to small enrollment numbers, it was difficult to assess the performance of other federally designated minority categories, including Native Alaskan and Asian students.

Of those categories analyzed by the Work Team, the RUSO outcomes continue to mirror the national trends for gaps in success, with significant disparities between Caucasian students and minority students.

Student Access, Progress, and Completion data is reported in Appendix 6.

Student Learning

This is the most complex area of measurement and arguably the most important to a RUSO institution fulfilling its fundamental mission. For the past 28 years there has been a continuous meta-analysis of tens of thousands of institutional surveys that measure learning. These 28 years of studies are synthesized in, “How College Affects Students: 21st Century Evidence that Higher Education Works, Volume 3,” (Mayhew, Rockenbach, Bowman, Seifert, Wolniak, Pascarella & Terenzini, 2016).

These volumes explore numerous aspects of student growth and development, including cognitive and intellectual development, psychosocial change, attitudes and values, moral development, educational attainment and persistence, career and economic impacts of college, and the quality of life after college.

The RUSO Work Team’s report addresses the content area on the development of verbal, quantitative, and subject matter competence. (Readers of this Dashboard report to the RUSO Board are encouraged to explore Mayhew, et al. (pp. 23-104) as the analysis crisply defines the reality of the learning that occurs, debunks a number of myths on which category of institutions teach best, and provides additional insight into the performance of RUSO-category institutions as

compared to such other categories as doctoral institutions, liberal arts colleges, and community colleges.)

The Work Team considered many factors, including research provided by Mayhew, et al. (2016), to arrive at several recommendations and conclusions:

- General Education performance is the most appropriate means to measure student learning. Research shows that the greatest statistically significant gains in intellectual growth during a student's college career occurs during that experience (by as much as 28 points). Depending on the testing instrument, student learning may consider proficiency in cognitive learning through reading comprehension, mathematics, writing skills, science reasoning, critical thinking, and problem-solving.
- There is a wide variety of assessment instruments to choose from based on institutional culture, student population, class size, and cost. Methodology ranges from direct testing to students providing self-reported gains. These include ACT's Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP), Educational Testing Service (ETS) Proficiency Profile, College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ), and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). Some assessment performance can be obtained from graduate examinations such as graduate admissions test, including the College Basic Academics Subjects Examination (CBASE), the Graduate Record Examination (GRE), Medical College Admissions Test (MCAT), the Law School Admissions Test (LSAT), and National Teacher Examination.
- RUSO institutions historically emphasize teaching and learning. Great teaching, a shared value within the core mission of all student-centered RUSO institutions, is the most important factor in student success (Mayhew, et al., 2016). This is a consistent factor, regardless of the testing instrument employed or when that testing occurs in a student's academic career. Empirical data show that students at institutions like RUSO's perform just as well in General Education classes, online learning platforms, and end of career testing, as do those students enrolled at highly selective institutions (state flagship campuses and Ivies), whether they are research, comprehensive colleges, or liberal arts colleges. This is because RUSO faculty are closely connected to student learning through a variety of andragogy teaching and learning strategies. RUSO institutions place a special emphasis on active, inductive learning in which students take on more responsibility in their learning. This occurs through such varied forms as collaboration, cooperation, and active learning via peer discussions, problem-solving exercises, and group-based learning. Other productive techniques employed by engaged faculty include emphasizing students' writing experiences, participating in faculty research projects, engaging in simulations or virtual reality scenarios, consideration of case studies, experiential laboratories, service-learning projects to advance a community while earning credit, library work, homework, peer mentoring, and learning communities.
- RUSO institutions' core curricula is centered on ways of knowing, with the intent of equipping students with broad base knowledge and building skills that will be

foundational for success in their chosen disciplines. The goals of the Core are not only foundational but are interwoven into the fabric of institutional missions. They are based on the philosophical framework of “ways of knowing” (written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning/scientific method, critical inquiry, cultural and esthetic analysis, life skills) and institutional values. The latter are high-impact practices through which students experience transformative learning skills demanded by employers and the academy alike: discipline knowledge, leadership, health and wellness, global and cultural competencies, service learning and civic engagement, and research, creative, and scholarly activities. These broad skills are woven into the fabric our institutions.

- Assessments outcomes vary too dramatically among major disciplines, which complicates the ability to provide meaningful comparisons over time. Measurements within these areas can often be affected by confounding factors (quality of students, quality of faculty, resource availability) that can produce significant swings in performance over shorter time frames that will impact the ability to interpret performance trends.

The Work Team recommends:

1. That RUSO institutions continue to enjoy full autonomy in making institutional selections of General Education testing instruments and practices based on student populations, institutional cultures, costs, and confidence in the effectiveness of the most appropriate means of measuring learning.
2. Learning outcomes should be reported to the Board through the presidential review process, rather than as formal report or presentation. Reporting on assessment practices of student learning fits well in institutional practices and outcomes narrative the Board currently requests in that evaluation. As each RUSO institution customizes its extensive measuring to its culture, budget, and evaluation processes, this is a highly individualized accountability Benchmark that is an institutional province.

General Education survey instruments and measurement practices for evaluating student learning at RUSO institutions is reported in Appendix 7.

Graduate Upward Social Mobility

A signal objective for regional, public universities is to provide upward social mobility for its students (Chetty, R., Friedman, J.N., Saez, E., Turner, N., & Yagan, D., 2017). This outcome is a shared objective that the institutions of the Regional University System of Oklahoma shares with the more than 700 universities who serve the same profile of students with a shared emphasis on teaching and learning.

RUSO institutions consistently enroll students who are less affluent and/or are the first generation in their families to attend college. As a group, they are socially disadvantaged from wealthier, multi-generation students who populate either Ivy League, elite private, or highly

selective, public flagship universities. RUSO students are more significantly dependent on federal grants and loans, or scholarships, to afford college. During their academic careers they may require additional counseling, mentoring, or advising by both faculty and staff so they progress in a timely manner to graduation.

RUSO institutions consistently match up well to their national peers in assessments conducted by external evaluators, such as *Washington Monthly Magazine*, the Brookings Institution, and Stanford University's *Equality of Opportunity Project*.

As an example, the Brookings Institution of Washington, D.C., recently cited five RUSO institutions as national leaders by serving as "ladders" for its students to attain high upward social mobility (Halikais, D. & Reeves, R., 2017). Their study, *Ladders, labs, or laggards? Which universities contribute most*, cited Southeastern, Northeastern, Southwestern, Northwestern, and the University of Central Oklahoma based on access and success in moving into higher income quintiles after graduation.

(Although East Central was not included among the 215 RUSO-type institutions evaluated in the study, its mobility profile is in harmony with other RUSO institutions. The omission of East Central stems from a flaw in only partial data-gathering for a baseline study of thousands of institutions enrolling 30 million students conducted by Stanford University. Brookings Institution's deeper analysis was based on Stanford's data.)

The Brookings study analyzes the relationship between family income, the percentages of admitted students in the lowest and highest economic quintiles, and income mobility at graduation. The study relies on income and tax data collected by the Equality of Opportunity Project at Stanford University. As Halikais and Reeves (2017) concluded, the opportunity and performance metrics of "ladder" institutions like RUSO universities reveal that they are more disposed to favoring less influential lower income students, and not the politically powerful middle class. As a consequence, they contend: "A good case can be made for public support" of institutions found in RUSO.

An important indicator of RUSO upward social mobility is illustrated by the Stanford project that shows a significant, positive gap between RUSO and the national average. That research project (Chetty, et. al, 2017) concludes that the average upward social mobility index for all 4,000 higher education institutions in the United States is that 1.7 percent of its least affluence students after graduation will migrate into the top quintile of the wealthiest Americans. The ideal is 4 percent movement.

The RUSO average is 2.34 percent. This means that 38 percent more of RUSO's least affluent students will rise to the highest income category after graduation than is the national average for students at hundreds of similar institutions.

Philosophically, many supporters of public higher education point to its value in creating a social compact between an institution and its state. The social compact reasons that the societal gains from a fiscal investment by the state are justified by the contributions of an educated citizenry.

This outweighs the private benefit in the lifetime earnings income to the individual through a college education.

The future of Oklahoma is intertwined with the projections of future economic growth for the nation, as defined by Complete College America. Those policies are driven by economic growth and workforce needs as projected by the Center for Education and the Workforce at Georgetown University. Deeper analysis by Oklahoma Works unequivocally demonstrates the essentiality of RUSO institutions as drivers of the state's economy by providing a talented workforce. Indeed, Oklahoma Workforce notes that 40 of the 50 highest paying and highest demand occupations require at least a bachelor's degree. Oklahoma Works projects that by 2020 an estimated 562,000 jobs in Oklahoma will require a bachelor's or master's degree. That is a 23 percent increase since 2010. RUSO's college-educated professionals are the intellectual entrepreneurs who will create and expand Oklahoma's business and industry.

Based on OSRHE data, in the past three years, RUSO institutions have fueled the state's economic expansion by these measures:

- Awarded 22,791 bachelor's, master's, or professional degrees (bachelor's and above), and another 562 certificates or associate's degrees. Nearly 81 percent of those graduates are employed in the Oklahoma City and Tulsa metropolitan areas. These two metropolitan areas generate 70 percent of Oklahoma's Gross Domestic Product.
- Experienced a substantially higher median starting salary than other state four-year institutions. The median annual salary for RUSO graduates one year after graduation (2013-2014 graduates) was \$33,132, which was \$4,280 higher than the median for all 43 Oklahoma two- and four-year public and private institutions.
- Over that period, the leading RUSO disciplines for graduates were education, health care, public administration, wholesale and retail trade, and information technology and professional services.
- Overall, 82 percent of RUSO graduates remained in Oklahoma, as compared to 72 percent for all Oklahoma institutions.

Conclusion

RUSO institutions are vibrant universities that are a hallmark for public higher education in Oklahoma. They are institutions that:

- Trace their roots to the Normal School movement of the 19th Century and have a tradition of primarily focusing on great teaching and learning.

- Present opportunities for all by providing access and outreach that addresses the community capacity-building factors of economic development, social equity, and quality of life that are at the forefront of society's concerns.
- Emphasize that students will realize their dreams by obtaining a college degree that will provide them with a better professional and personal life. No other category of institution rivals the advantage of RUSO institutions for engaging students, faculty, and staff in learning environments that will span years.
- Dedicate extraordinary people capital and fiscal resources to evaluate and consider the most effective best practices of teaching, learning, assessment, and revision that will ensure students are learning.
- Focus on educating the whole student who will achieve a happy personal and professional life with the awareness that they have an obligation to be leaders in the society that contributed to their education.

Although not comprehensive in documenting all that occurs at RUSO institutions, the Benchmarks and Dashboard provide a useful lens in which to objectively assess the strengths, gaps, and opportunities that influence the performance, and accountability, of our six regional, comprehensive universities in fulfilling their social obligations to Oklahomans.

References

- Chetty, R., Friedman, J.N., Saez, E., Turner, N., & Yagan, D. (2017). Mobility report cards: The role of colleges in intergenerational Mobility. Stanford University. Retrieved from http://www.equality-of-opportunity.org/papers/coll_mrc_paper.pdf
- Complete College America (2012). Remediation: Higher education's bridge to nowhere. Retrieved from <http://www.completecollege.org/docs/CCA-Remediation-final.pdf>.
- Complete College America. (2011). Time is the enemy. Retrieved from http://www.completecollege.org/docs/Time_Is_the_Enemy.pdf.
- Engle, J. (2016). *Answering the Call: Institutions and States Lead the Way Toward Better Measures of Postsecondary Performance*/ Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. Retrieved from: <http://www.okhighered.org/complete-college-america/15-to-finish.shtml>
- Garry, P. (2015). Education as the key to opportunity and upward mobility. RenewAmerica. Retrieved from <http://www.renewamerica.com/analysis/garry/150320>
- Gildersleeve, R.E., Kuntz, A.M., Pasque, P.A., & Carducci, R. (2010). The role of critical inquiry in (re)constructing the public agenda for higher education: Confronting the conservative modernization of the academy. *The Review of Higher Education*, 34. Retrieved from <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/rhe/summary/v034/34.1.gildersleeve.html>
- Halikias, D., & Reeves, R. (2017). Ladders, labs, or laggards? Which public universities contribute most. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/research/ladders-labs-or-laggards-which-public-universities-contribute-most/>
- Janice, A. & Voight, M. (2016). *Toward Convergence: A Technical Guide for the Postsecondary Metrics Framework*. Retrieved from <http://www.ihep.org/postsecdata/resources-reports/metrics-framework-technical-guide>
- Mayhew, M.J., Rockenbach, A.N., Bowman, N.A., Seifert, T.A., Wolniak, G.C., Pascarella, E.T., & Terenzini, P.T. (2016). How College Affects Students: 21st Century Evidence that Higher Education Works, Volume 3. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Morrissey, E. (2017). Brookings Study: Public Universities Disproportionally Subsidize The Upper Middle Class. Retrieved from <https://hotair.com/archives/2017/07/20/brookings-study-public-universities-disproportionally-subsidize-upper-middle-class/>
- National Governors Association. (2013). *America Works: Education and Training for Tomorrow's Jobs*. Retrieved from <https://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/2013/CI1314AmericaWorks.pdf>

June 21, 2018

20

Oklahoma Office of Workforce Development, 2014. *Oklahoma Works, and 15 to Finish Oklahoma*. (2014). Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. (2018). Statewide Median Annual Salary by Degree Level, Field of Study and Industry. Retrieved from <http://okhighered.org/econ-dev/dashboards/dashboard-StatewideMedianAnnualSalary.html>

APPENDIX 1: Acknowledgements

This report is based on the enterprise of dozens of colleagues from across the six institutions of the Regional University System of Oklahoma. They contributed in innumerable ways to the reviewing and recommending the Benchmarks and Dashboard for RUSO.

Special consideration is directed to the tireless and continuing efforts of the Work Team that embraced the project and provided extensive insight and deliberation to arriving at Benchmarks that are accurate and useful.

Work Team team members included:

Dr. Mark Kinders, Vice President for Public Affairs, UCO (Convener).
Dr. James South, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, SWOSU.
Dr. Bo Hannaford, Vice President for Academic Affairs, NWOSU.
Dr. Myron Pope, Vice President for Academic Affairs, UCO.
Ms. Patti Neuhold, Vice President for Finance, UCO.
Dr. Gary Steward, Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness, UCO.

Many others provided special assistance in recommending and defining selected Benchmarks, or capturing the data, and deserve additional acknowledgement for their contributions:

Dr. David Pecha, Vice President for Administration, NWOSU.
Ms. Kylea Amerlin, Institutional Research Specialist, NWOSU.
Ms. Brenda Burgess, Vice President for Administration & Finance, SWOSU.
Ms. Diane Fitzsimmons, Institutional Effectiveness Specialist, SWOSU.
Ms. Cindy Boling, Executive Director of Institutional Research, UCO.
Dr. Debby Landry, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, NSU.
Ms. Christy Landsaw, Vice President for Administration & Finance, NSU.
Dr. Julia Sawyer, Executive Director of Institutional Effectiveness, NSU.
Dr. Adrianna Lancaster, Acting Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs, ECU.
Ms. Meredith Jones, Director, Office of Institutional Effectiveness, ECU.
Mr. Dennis Westman, Vice President for Business Affairs & Chief Financial Officer, SEOSU.
Ms. Kristie Luke, Associate Dean of Academic Records/Registrar, SEOSU.

The Work Team also extends a special thank you for guidance and feedback to Regent Board Chair Mark Stansberry, Vision and Planning Committee Chair Jeff Dunn, UCO President Don Betz, and RUSO Executive Director Sheridan McCaffree.

APPENDIX 2: Dashboard Principles

As the Work Team conducted its activities, it arrived at these principles for selecting the recommended metrics:

1. The benchmarks should accurately reflect the mission of RUSO institutions as teaching enterprises whose primary role is to provide opportunities for upward social mobility for their students, many of whom are non-traditional, first-generation, part-time, or financially at risk.
2. RUSO institutions are attuned to and responsive to the national and state discussion of the past seven years that addresses the major Gates areas of Performance, Efficiency, and Equity. Previous groundwork embraced by RUSO institutions include: *Time is the Enemy*, (2011, Complete College America); *Remediation: Higher Education's Bridge to Nowhere*, (2012, Complete College America); *America Works: Education and Training for Tomorrow's Jobs*, (2013; National Governors Association); *Oklahoma Works*, (Oklahoma Office of Workforce Development, 2014); and *15 to Finish Oklahoma* (Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, 2017).
3. Benchmarks should emphasize the outcomes of the educational experience more so than outputs. There should be a demonstration that learning has occurred that will enable graduates to live happy professional and personal lives. Although outputs—such as graduation rates and cost measures—are important considerations, an overemphasis on these indicators results in commoditizing a college degree as a product to be purchased. This infers that the mere awarding of a degree is a proxy for an educated person who will be successful in life. Further, this mindset inordinately emphasizes whether the graduate had timely access to a program, and not whether they received an educational value from the experience.
4. Benchmarks should be drawn from available data that is collected annually by RUSO institutions. Many RUSO institutions are understaffed in meeting existing Institutional Research obligations. No additional data-gathering burdens should be placed on them by creating new metrics.
5. To ensure the definitions and formulas of the recommended benchmarks and Dashboard are consistent between institutions, the Work Team recommends using those prepared in a supplemental report to *Answering the Call*. The supplemental report, issued by the Institute for Higher Education Policy, is *Toward Convergence: A Technical Guide for the Postsecondary Metrics Framework*, (Janice, A. & Voight, M., 2016).
6. A Dashboard should be employed as a measurement of progress that is institution-specific. Some benchmarks may be aggregated for RUSO overall System

- performance. Due to the differences between institutional profiles, it would be problematic to draw comparisons between institutions for most benchmarks.
7. To be reliable as a measurement tool, the Dashboard should include metrics charted over a 5-year period.
 8. Because of the typical RUSO student profile, meaningful improvement in the categories of Performance, Efficiency, and Equity will require additional financial investment if there is to be significant improvement in retention and graduation rates, and student learning outcomes. Student success requires continuous interventions in advising, counseling, and tutoring. These interventions are costly Best Practices that cannot be achieved exclusively by the base reallocation of current limited resources to fund these intervention strategies.
 9. RUSO should host an annual, one-day meeting of Institutional Research directors and a designee of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs offices for each institution. The meeting should be held six months prior to the installations of the metrics. The meeting will focus on common definitions and data collection strategies. It also will be reflective to review if the definitions produced a metric that is meaningful and useful.
 10. The Dashboard should be rolled out over a two- to three-year time period. This will enable the Institutional Research staff to integrate the new metrics into their existing workload.

APPENDIX 3: RUSO ACCESS, PROGRESS, GRADUATION SUMMARY

RUSO Dashboard			
Name of School: RUSO Schools Combined			
Enrollment Information (total)	14-15	15-16	16-17
FTE	33,435	33,759	32,654
Total Headcount	48,632	48,505	47,496
Student Credit Hours	979,631	988,714	956,208
First Time Freshmen	5,555	5,886	5,831
First Time Full-time Freshmen	5,295	5,600	5,584
Retention Rates (average)	14-15	15-16	16-17
First Time Freshmen	61%	59%	55%
First Time Full-time Freshmen	63%	61%	60%
Graduation Rate/Degrees Granted	14-15	15-16	16-17
Graduation Rates (average)	30%	30%	32%
Certificates (total)	51	114	160
Associates (total)	220	215	214
Bachelors (total)	6,271	6,231	6,266
Master (total)	1,461	1,579	1,682
Doctoral (total)	104	110	102
Education Programs (Average)	14-15	15-16	16-17
Number of Degree Programs	67	68	70
Number of Accredited Programs	24	23	19
Gained or Lost Accreditation?			
Gateway Courses (Average)	14-15	15-16	16-17
Gateway Course Enrollment-MATH	847	843	899
Gateway Completion % - MATH	76%	72%	75%
Gateway Course Enrollment-ENGL	1,051	1,095	1,061
Gateway Completion % - ENGL	82%	82%	84%

APPENDIX 3: EAST CENTRAL UNIVERSITY ACCESS, PROGRESS, GRADUATION METRICS

Enrollment Information	14-15	15-16	16-17	
FTE	3827	4346	3511	OSRHE Headcount and Full-Time Equivalent for Class Divisions for ALL Semesters for Academic Year 2015-16 (www.okeys.org) or IPEDS
Total Headcount (Academic Year)	5458	5450	4962	OSRHE Headcount and Full-Time Equivalent for Class Divisions for ALL Semesters for Academic Year 2015-16 (www.okeys.org) or IPEDS
Total Headcount (Fall)	4428	4444	4160	UDS Record S Fall Semester
Student Credit Hours	111421	126916	102228	OSRHE Headcount and Full-Time Equivalent for Class Divisions for ALL Semesters for Academic Year 2015-16 (www.okeys.org)
First Time Freshmen (Fall)	605	748	596	IPEDS Fall Enrollment
First Time Full-time Freshmen (Fall)	581	741	586	IPEDS Fall Enrollment
Retention Rates	14-15	15-16	16-17	
First Time Freshmen	64%	54%	47%	OIE Calculations
First Time Full-time Freshmen	64%	52%	*	IPEDS Fall Enrollment
*won't have official IPEDS number until April 18				
Graduation Rate/Degrees Granted	14-15	15-16	16-17	
Graduation Rates %	34%	36%	34%	IPEDS GRS
Certificates # (Undg & Grad)	41	51	83	IPEDS Completions
Associates	--	--	--	
Bachelors #	724	683	688	IPEDS Completions
Master #	256	274	261	IPEDS Completions
Doctoral	--	--	--	
Education Programs	14-15	15-16	16-17	
Number of Degree Programs	54	52	57	OSRHE Degree Programs Inventory
Number of Accredited Programs	16	13	13	OSRHE Degree Program Review
Gained or Lost Accreditation?	0	3	0	OSRHE Degree Program Review
Gateway Courses (SU, FA, SP)	14-15	15-16	16-17	
Gateway Course Enrollment-MATH	204	204	138	MATH 1413 Survey of Math
Gateway Completion % - MATH	78%	67%	70%	
Gateway Course Enrollment-ENGL	680	832	604	ENG 1113 Freshman Comp
Gateway Completion % - ENGL	79%	76%	82%	
UDS Record E Unsuccessful Grade (5, 6, 7, 8, 9, W, N)				

APPENDIX 3: NORTHEASTERN STATE UNIVERSITY ACCESS, PROGRESS, GRADUATION METRICS

Enrollment Information	14-15	15-16	16-17	NOTES
FTE	6722	6663	6494	From IPEDS 12-month Enrollment
Total Headcount	9882	9734	9556	From IPEDS 12-month Enrollment
Student Credit Hours	196001	194074	189317	From UDS ViStat Course Enrollment reports
First Time Freshmen	935	821	907	From IPEDS Fall Enrollment - Fall cohorts (includes summer starters)
First Time Full-time Freshmen	906	806	879	From IPEDS Fall Enrollment - Fall cohorts (includes summer starters)
Retention Rates	14-15	15-16	16-17	
First Time Freshmen	61%	65%	62%	Fall 2014 cohort returning Fall 2015 and Fall 2015 cohort returning Fall 2016 from IPEDS Fall Enrollment; Fall 2016 cohort returning Fall 2017 from internal data as of census data of 9/1/17
First Time Full-time Freshmen	62%	65%	63%	Fall 2014 cohort returning Fall 2015 and Fall 2015 cohort returning Fall 2016 from IPEDS Fall Enrollment; Fall 2016 cohort returning Fall 2017 from internal data as of census data of 9/1/17
Graduation Rate/Degrees Granted	14-15	15-16	16-17	
Graduation Rates	26%	27%	32%	From IPEDS Graduate Rate Survey for Fall 2009 and Fall 2010 first-time full-time cohorts; calculated from UDS Record D and internal data for Fall 2011 first-time full-time cohort
Certificates	10	10	17	From IPEDS Completions
Associates	0	0	0	From IPEDS Completions
Bachelors	1378	1372	1370	From IPEDS Completions
Master	319	331	416	From IPEDS Completions
Doctoral	28	28	29	From IPEDS Completions
Education Programs	14-15	15-16	16-17	
Number of Degree Programs	79	82	83	Suspended programs removed from total
Number of Accredited Programs	42	43	43	
Gained or Lost Accreditation?	1	1	0	CACREP gained SP15; ACOTE

Gateway Courses	14-15	15-16	16-17	
Gateway Course Enrollment-MATH	1074	1089	1350	From UDS Record E – Includes College Algebra & Applied Mathematics
Gateway Completion % - MATH	73%	65%	69%	From UDS Record E - Includes College Algebra & Applied Mathematics
Gateway Course Enrollment-ENGL	1872	1742	1754	From UDS Record E - Includes Freshman Composition I & Freshman Composition II
Gateway Completion % - ENGL	80%	79%	81%	From UDS Record E – Includes Freshman Composition I & Freshman Composition II

APPENDIX 3: NORTHWESTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY ACCESS, PROGRESS, GRADUATION METRICS

Enrollment: Summer - Fall - Spring (UDS Reporting Method)	14-15	15-16	16-17
FTE	1831	1788	1799
Total Headcount	2602	2590	2621
Student Credit Hours	54301	52968	53257
First Time Freshmen	452	422	465
First Time Full-time Freshmen	420	374	417
Retention Rates - Fall to Fall	14-15	15-16	16-17
First Time Freshmen	52.6%	52.2%	51.4%
First Time Full-time Freshmen	53.5%	54.3%	53.7%
Graduation Rate/Degrees Granted - full-time fall status	14-15	15-16	16-17
Graduation Rates	23.3%	26.4%	27.4%
Certificates	0	33	32
Associates	0	0	0
Bachelors	310	315	350
Master	46	44	53
Doctoral	0	0	0
Education Programs	14-15	15-16	16-17
Number of Degree Programs	41	41	41
Number of Accredited Programs	4	4	4
Gained or Lost Accreditation?	no	no	no
Gateway Courses	14-15	15-16	16-17
Gateway Course Enrollment-MATH	271	244	261
Gateway Completion % - MATH	90.8%	87.10%	91.70%
Gateway Course Enrollment-ENGL	341	344	372
Gateway Completion % - ENGL	93.3%	92.9%	95.0%

**APPENDIX 3: SOUTHEASTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
ACCESS, PROGRESS, GRADUATION METRICS**

Enrollment Information	14-15	15-16	16-17
FTE	3196	3076	3055
Total Headcount	4701	4589	4631
Total Headcount (Fall)	3878	3754	3725
Student Credit Hours	94251	90148	89261
First Time Freshmen (Fall)	500	470	516
First Time Full-time Freshmen	486	442	501
Retention Rates	14-15	15-16	16-17
First Time Freshmen	63%	60%	53%
First Time Full-time Freshmen	64%	61%	55%
	<i>F13 to F14</i>	<i>F14 to F15</i>	<i>F15 to F16</i>
Graduation Rate/Degrees Granted	14-15	15-16	16-17
Graduation Rates	29%	29%	25%
Certificates	--	--	--
Associates	--	--	--
Bachelors	655	664	638
Master	139	178	206
Doctoral	--	--	--
Education Programs	14-15	15-16	16-17
Number of Degree Programs	54	52	52
Number of Accredited Programs	28	27	26
Gained or Lost Accreditation?	No	No	No
Gateway Courses	14-15	15-16	16-17
Gateway Course Enrollment-MATH	669	597	624
Gateway Completion % - MATH	73%	73%	78%
Gateway Course Enrollment-ENGL	539	502	541
Gateway Completion % - ENGL	80%	80%	82%

APPENDIX 3: SOUTHWESTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY ACCESS, PROGRESS, GRADUATION METRICS

Enrollment Information	14-15	15-16	16-17	
FTE (Academic Year)	4,492	4,609	4,810	OSRHE Headcount and Full-Time Equivalent for Class Divisions for ALL Semesters for Academic Year 2015-16 (www.okeis.org) or IPEDS
Total Headcount (Academic Year)	5,907	6,074	6,274	OSRHE Headcount and Full-Time Equivalent for Class Divisions for ALL Semesters for Academic Year 2015-16 (www.okeis.org) or IPEDS
Total Headcount (Fall)	4,994	5,113	5,320	UDS Record S Fall Semester
Student Credit Hours (Academic Year)	130,057	133,585	139,312	OSRHE Headcount and Full-Time Equivalent for Class Divisions for ALL Semesters for Academic Year 2015-16 (www.okeis.org)
First-Time Freshmen (Fall)	914	956	990	IPEDS Fall Enrollment
First-Time, Full-time Freshmen (Fall)	896	939	971	IPEDS Fall Enrollment

Retention Rates	14-15	15-16	16-17	
First-Time Freshmen	62%	65%	62%	OIE Calculations
First-Time, Full-time Freshmen	66%	69%	66%	IPEDS Fall Enrollment To calculate the 16-17 figures, 10th-day figures were used. Methodology is to use end-of-semester.

*won't have official IPEDS number until April 18

Graduation Rate/Degrees Granted	14-15	15-16	16-17	
Graduation Rates %	33%	33%	35%	IPEDS GRS These rates are based on FTF cohorts from FA08, FA09, and FA10, bachelor-degree-seeking only. Other IPEDS graduation rates are available.
Certificates # (Undg & Grad)	0	1	4	IPEDS Completions These numbers are based on completers from SU14 through SP17.
Associates	162	169	156	IPEDS Completions
Bachelors #	626	697	745	IPEDS Completions
Master #	155	179	220	IPEDS Completions
Doctoral	76	82	73	IPEDS Completions

Education Programs	14-15	15-16	16-17
--------------------	-------	-------	-------

Number of Degree Programs	71	71	71	OSRHE Degree Programs Inventory
Number of Accredited Programs	30	30	30	OSRHE Degree Program Review
Gained or Lost Accreditation?	0	0	0	OSRHE Degree Program Review

Gateway Courses (SU, FA, SP)	14-15	15-16	16-17	
Gateway Course Enrollment-MATH	1,108	1,128	1,180	MATH 1143 MATH CONCEPTS, MATH 1153 MATH APPLICATIONS, MATH 1513 COLLEGE ALGEBRA
Gateway Completion % - MATH	67%	69%	69%	
Gateway Course Enrollment-ENGL	823	932	903	ENGL 1113 Freshman Comp
Gateway Completion % - ENGL	79%	82%	82%	

UDS Record E Unsuccessful Grade (5, 6, 7, 8, 9, W, N)

TRANSLATIONS FROM UDS

HANDBOOK:

5	F
6	W
7	AU
8	I
9	S
W	AW
N	No Grade

APPENDIX 3: UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL OKLAHOMA ACCESS, PROGRESS, GRADUATION METRICS

FTE				
Total Headcount (Academic Year)				
Total Headcount (Fall)	16,869	16,918	16,437	IPEDS numbers are preferable
Student Credit Hours				
First Time Freshmen	2,049	2,371	2,222	
First Time Full-time Freshmen	1,959	2,239	2,152	
Retention Rates	14-15	15-16	16-17	
First Time Freshmen				this has to be calculated; not tracked elsewhere
First Time Full-time Freshmen	66%	62%	61%	
Graduation Rate/Degrees Granted	14-15	15-16	16-17	
Graduation Rates	38%	39%	38%	may want to specify which cohort year is needed IPEDS Completions has degrees awarded and the number of completers (headcount) so will need to specify which is needed
Certificates	0	0	22	
Associates	81	58	59	
Bachelors	2,498	2,608	2,626	
Master	547	540	526	
Doctoral	---	---	---	
Education Programs	14-15	15-16	16-17	
Number of Degree Programs	104	104	109	
Number of Accredited Programs				
Gained or Lost Accreditation?				
Gateway Courses	14-15	15-16	16-17	
Gateway Course Enrollment-MATH	1,757	1,797	1,842	UDS Record S will take a little bit of time to consolidate
Gateway Completion % - MATH	76%	71%	71%	
Gateway Course Enrollment-ENGL	2,051	2,215	2,191	
Gateway Completion % - ENGL	78%	82%	82%	

*Considers distinct student enrollment in Gateway course (Math 1513 & English 1113) during a given Academic Year (Summer, Fall & Spring terms combined) as of Official Census. Students earning a D or better grade were considered completions. Students making multiple attempts for the course during the Academic Year, but earning a D or better were counted as a completion.

APPENDIX 4: Business Benchmark Definitions

The per-issuance debt coverage ratio is suggested to provide insight into resource management as an institution enters into new debt. This ratio illustrates an institution's ability to pay the debt service on the new issuance from the identified funding source. Each time an institution requests approval to enter additional debt it will provide the regents with this ratio in addition to the standard information such as purpose, description, amount and sources of debt service payment.

The debt burden ratio provides insight into the cost of borrowing funds. The National Association of College & University Business Officers (NACUBO) suggests the threshold for this ratio is at or below 7 percent. This means that current principal and interest expense should not represent more than 7 percent of total expenditures. It is important to note that many institutions can operate effectively at a higher ratio while others may not. This measure, like several others, is relative to each institution's plans and budget.

The **Composite Financial Index (CFI)** is a tool that provides a picture of an institution's overall financial health. The four ratios within this index are reported annually and each ratio has been identified as a relevant measure of financial health. These ratios are:

- Primary reserve
- Viability
- Return on net assets
- Net operating revenue

Days of Cash On Hand is a recommended measure of liquidity that illustrates the number of days an institution is able to operate from unrestricted and short-term investment sources. A higher ratio is typically better, however a balance must be managed to ensure institutions are appropriately investing resources in long-term investments and avoiding holding large amounts of cash. Demonstrating the trend throughout the year for this ratio would allow for expected shifts in expenditures and revenues. This metric could be provided quarterly.

Restricted to unrestricted net assets ratio is suggested to provide insight into an institution's resource flexibility. This measure will inform the regents of the portion of the institution's assets that are eligible to be used to cover all types of expenditures and those assets that can only be used to cover a designated purpose. Limitations on the use of assets can impede an institution's ability to react quickly to changes in environment. Some flexibility across institutions in this ratio is expected as each will invest and spend according to its own strategic and campus master plans.

Gross tuition contribution ratio and state appropriations contribution ratio are recommended measures that provide insight into an institution's two main sources of revenue. These measures are significant factors in influencing impact on tuition rates, program expansion or contraction, tuition waiver need, and market competitiveness. As an institution becomes more dependent on tuition revenue for operations fluctuations in enrollment will have greater impact on its financial stability.

Budget impact of credit hour production is recommended as a measure of actual performance against projected performance. Institutional budgets are built on the projected revenue that comes from tuition and fees charged on each credit hour. This metric demonstrates an institution's budget planning using trend analysis and other factors. Uncontrollable external factors such as global international relations and natural disasters can have significant unplanned impact on an institution's budget.

Current ratio provides insight into an institution's short-term assets with current liabilities. Best practices suggest a 2:1 ratio to ensure that for every dollar of liability there are at least two dollars of assets to cover it. A higher ratio is typically better, however a balance must be managed to ensure institutions are appropriately investing resources in long-term investments rather than holding a significant amount of short-term assets.

APPENDIX 5: FY17 BUSINESS OPERATIONS VIABILITY SUMMARY FOR RUSO

		Metric	NACUBO Target	ECU	NSU	NWOSU	SEOSU	SWOSU	UCO	SYSTEM
Data										
Date	Report Date	Measures of Resource Sufficiency and Flexibility								
June 30	November	Primary reserve (Unrestricted + Expendable Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals/Total Expenses)	0.40	0.37	0.28	0.68	0.40	0.34	0.39	0.41
June 30	November	Days of cash on hand (Total cash+cash equivalents+short term investments/Daily Op Expense Avg (365 days))	> 80	220.17	101.31	120.82	82.84	125.22	104.20	125.76
June 30	November	Current ratio (Total Current Assets/Total Current Liabilities)	> 2	5.57	4.00	2.91	1.76	5.22	5.24	4.12
June 30	November	Unrestricted funds ratio (Unrestricted net assets/Total net assets)	none	23.27%	16%	19.18%	20.21%	21.13%	27.61%	21.23%
Measures of Resource Management, including debt										
June 30	November	CFI	> 2	2.5	1.1	2.84	3.2	2.66	2.53	2.47
June 30	November	Viability (Unrestricted + Expendable Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals/Total Long-term Debt (Bonds, Notes & Capital Leases)	none	0.58	0.59	0.90	0.30	0.78	0.49	0.61
June 30	November	Debt burden (Annual Principal and Interest Payments (debt service)/(Operating expenses +	< 7 %	4.93%	4.92%	4.33%	6.14%	6.10%	6.22%	5.44%

June 21, 2018

		Non-Operating expenses) – Depreciation expense + Principal payments made on Capital Debt and Leases			36					
Measures of Asset Performance and Management										
		Return on total net assets (Change in Total Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals (CY – PY)/Total Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals (beginning of year)								
June 30	November		3% to 4%		5.93%	-0.60%	1.03%	1.70%	8.21%	7.82% 4.02%
Measures of Operating Performance										
		Net operating revenues (Operating income (loss) + net Nonoperating revenues (expenses)/Operating revenues + Nonoperating revenues)								
June 30	November		2% to 4%		6.42%	-0.84%	0.23%	0.80%	3.80%	4.01% 2.40%
June 30	November	Gross tuition contribution ratio (LY)	< 60%		67.09%	55%	62.64%	64.1%	65.55%	62.13% 62.76%
June 30	November	State appropriations contribution ratio (LY)	none		32.86%	35%	32.72%	34.56%	29.09%	23.50% 31.29%
June 30	November	Budget impact of credit hour production	over (under)		\$(1,192,008)	\$(1,361,568)	\$254,305	\$(3,494.89)	\$454,675	\$(3,724,025) \$(5,572,115.89)

APPENDIX 5: FY17 BUSINESS METRICS EAST CENTRAL UNIVERSITY

		Metric	NACUBO Target	ECU
Data Date	Report Date	Measures of Resource Sufficiency and Flexibility		
June 30	November	Primary reserve (Unrestricted + Expendable Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals/Total Expenses)	0.40	0.37
June 30	November	Days of cash on hand (Total cash+cash equivalents+short term investments/Daily Op Expense Avg (365 days))	> 80	220.17
June 30	November	Current ratio (Total Current Assets/Total Current Liabilities)	> 2	5.57
June 30	November	Unrestricted funds ratio (Unrestricted net assets/Total net assets)	none	23.27%
Measures of Resource Management, including debt				
June 30	November	CFI	> 2	2.5
June 30	November	Viability (Unrestricted + Expendable Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals/Total Long-term Debt (Bonds, Notes & Capital Leases)	none	0.58
June 30	November	Debt burden (Annual Principal and Interest Payments (debt service)/(Operating expenses + Non-Operating expenses) – Depreciation expense + Principal payments made on Capital Debt and Leases	< 7 %	4.93%
Measures of Asset Performance and Management				
June 30	November	Return on total net assets (Change in Total Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals (CY – PY)/Total Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals (beginning of year)	3% to 4%	5.93%
Measures of Operating Performance				
June 30	November	Net operating revenues (Operating income (loss) + net Nonoperating revenues (expenses)/Operating revenues + Nonoperating revenues)	2% to 4%	6.42%
June 30	November	Gross tuition contribution ratio (LY)	< 60%	67.09%
June 30	November	State appropriations contribution ratio (LY)	none	32.86%
June 30	November	Budget impact of credit hour production	over (under)	\$(1,192,008.00)

APPENDIX 5: FY17 BUSINESS METRICS NORTHEASTERN STATE UNIVERSITY

		Metric	NACUBO Target	NSU
Data Date	Report Date	Measures of Resource Sufficiency and Flexibility		
June 30	November	Primary reserve (Unrestricted + Expendable Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals/Total Expenses)	0.40	0.28
June 30	November	Days of cash on hand (Total cash+cash equivalents+short term investments/Daily Op Expense Avg (365 days))	> 80	101.31
June 30	November	Current ratio (Total Current Assets/Total Current Liabilities)	> 2	4.00
June 30	November	Unrestricted funds ratio (Unrestricted net assets/Total net assets)	none	16%
Measures of Resource Management, including debt				
June 30	November	CFI	> 2	1.1
June 30	November	Viability (Unrestricted + Expendable Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals/Total Long-term Debt (Bonds, Notes & Capital Leases)	none	0.59
June 30	November	Debt burden (Annual Principal and Interest Payments (debt service)/(Operating expenses + Non-Operating expenses) – Depreciation expense + Principal payments made on Capital Debt and Leases	< 7 %	4.92%
Measures of Asset Performance and Management				
June 30	November	Return on total net assets (Change in Total Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals (CY – PY)/Total Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals (beginning of year)	3% to 4%	-0.60%
Measures of Operating Performance				

June 21, 2018

Measures of Operating Performance					
		Net operating revenues (Operating income (loss) + net Nonoperating revenues (expenses))/Operating revenues + Nonoperating revenues)	2% to 4%		-0.84%
June 30	November		< 60%		55%
June 30	November	Gross tuition contribution ratio (LY)	none		35%
June 30	November	State appropriations contribution ratio (LY)	over (under)		\$(1,361,568)
June 30	November	Budget impact of credit hour production			

APPENDIX 5: FY17 BUSINESS METRICS: NORTHWESTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

		Metric	NACUBO Target	NWOSU
Data Date	Report Date	Measures of Resource Sufficiency and Flexibility		
June 30	November	Primary reserve (Unrestricted + Expendable Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals/Total Expenses)	0.40	0.68
June 30	November	Days of cash on hand (Total cash+cash equivalents+short term investments/Daily Op Expense Avg (365 days))	> 80	120.82
June 30	November	Current ratio (Total Current Assets/Total Current Liabilities)	> 2	2.91
June 30	November	Unrestricted funds ratio (Unrestricted net assets/Total net assets)	none	19.18%
Measures of Resource Management, including debt				
June 30	November	CFI	> 2	2.84
June 30	November	Viability (Unrestricted + Expendable Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals/Total Long-term Debt (Bonds, Notes & Capital Leases)	none	0.90
June 30	November	Debt burden (Annual Principal and Interest Payments (debt service)/(Operating expenses + Non-Operating expenses) – Depreciation expense + Principal payments made on Capital Debt and Leases	< 7 %	4.33%
Measures of Asset Performance and Management				
June 30	November	Return on total net assets (Change in Total Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals (CY – PY)/Total Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals (beginning of year)	3% to 4%	1.03%

June 21, 2018

Measures of Operating Performance					
		Net operating revenues (Operating income (loss) + net Nonoperating revenues (expenses)/Operating revenues + Nonoperating revenues)	2% to 4%		0.23%
June 30	November				
June 30	November	Gross tuition contribution ratio (LY)	< 60%		62.64%
June 30	November	State appropriations contribution ratio (LY)	none		32.72%
June 30	November	Budget impact of credit hour production	over (under)		\$254,305

APPENDIX 5: FY17 BUSINESS METRICS: SOUTHEASTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

		Metric	NACUBO Target	SEOSU
Data Date	Report Date	Measures of Resource Sufficiency and Flexibility		
June 30	November	Primary reserve (Unrestricted + Expendable Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals/Total Expenses)	0.40	0.40
June 30	November	Days of cash on hand (Total cash+cash equivalents+short term investments/Daily Op Expense Avg (365 days))	> 80	82.84
June 30	November	Current ratio (Total Current Assets/Total Current Liabilities)	> 2	1.76
June 30	November	Unrestricted funds ratio (Unrestricted net assets/Total net assets)	none	20.21%
Measures of Resource Management, including debt				
June 30	November	CFI	> 2	3.2
June 30	November	Viability (Unrestricted + Expendable Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals/Total Long-term Debt (Bonds, Notes & Capital Leases)	none	0.30
June 30	November	Debt burden (Annual Principal and Interest Payments (debt service)/(Operating expenses + Non-Operating expenses) – Depreciation expense + Principal payments made on Capital Debt and Leases	< 7 %	6.14%
Measures of Asset Performance and Management				
June 30	November	Return on total net assets (Change in Total Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals (CY – PY)/Total Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals (beginning of year)	3% to 4%	1.70%

June 21, 2018

Measures of Operating Performance					
		Net operating revenues	(Operating		
		income (loss) + net Nonoperating revenues (expenses)/Operating			
June 30	November	revenues + Nonoperating revenues)	2% to 4%		0.80%
June 30	November	Gross tuition contribution ratio (LY)	< 60%		64.1%
June 30	November	State appropriations contribution ratio (LY)	none		34.56%
June 30	November	Budget impact of credit hour production	over (under)		\$(3,494.89)

APPENDIX 5: FY17 BUSINESS METRICS: SOUTHWESTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

		Metric	NACUBO Target	SWOSU
Data Date	Report Date	Measures of Resource Sufficiency and Flexibility		
June 30	November	Primary reserve (Unrestricted + Expendable Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals/Total Expenses)	0.40	0.34
June 30	November	Days of cash on hand (Total cash+cash equivalents+short term investments/Daily Op Expense Avg (365 days))	> 80	125.22
June 30	November	Current ratio (Total Current Assets/Total Current Liabilities)	> 2	5.22
June 30	November	Unrestricted funds ratio (Unrestricted net assets/Total net assets)	none	21.13%
Measures of Resource Management, including debt				
June 30	November	CFI	> 2	2.66
June 30	November	Viability (Unrestricted + Expendable Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals/Total Long-term Debt (Bonds, Notes & Capital Leases)	none	0.78
June 30	November	Debt burden (Annual Principal and Interest Payments (debt service)/(Operating expenses + Non-Operating expenses) – Depreciation expense + Principal payments made on Capital Debt and Leases	< 7 %	6.10%
Measures of Asset Performance and Management				
June 30	November	Return on total net assets (Change in Total Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals (CY – PY)/Total Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals (beginning of year)	3% to 4%	8.21%
Measures of Operating Performance				

June 21, 2018

Measures of Operating Performance					
		Net operating revenues (Operating income (loss) + net Nonoperating revenues (expenses))/Operating revenues + Nonoperating revenues)	2% to 4%		3.80%
June 30	November		< 60%		65.55%
June 30	November	Gross tuition contribution ratio (LY)	none		29.09%
June 30	November	State appropriations contribution ratio (LY)	over (under)		\$454,675

June 21, 2018

46

APPENDIX 5: FY17 BUSINESS METRICS: UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL OKLAHOMA

		Metric	NACUBO Target	UCO
Data Date	Report Date	Measures of Resource Sufficiency and Flexibility		
June 30	November	Primary reserve (Unrestricted + Expendable Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals/Total Expenses)	0.40	0.39
June 30	November	Days of cash on hand (Total cash+cash equivalents+short term investments/Daily Op Expense Avg (365 days))	> 80	104.20
June 30	November	Current ratio (Total Current Assets/Total Current Liabilities)	> 2	5.24
June 30	November	Unrestricted funds ratio (Unrestricted net assets/Total net assets)	none	27.61%
Measures of Resource Management, including debt				
June 30	November	CFI	> 2	2.53
June 30	November	Viability (Unrestricted + Expendable Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals/Total Long-term Debt (Bonds, Notes & Capital Leases)	none	0.49
June 30	November	Debt burden (Annual Principal and Interest Payments (debt service)/(Operating expenses + Non-Operating expenses) – Depreciation expense + Principal payments made on Capital Debt and Leases	< 7 %	6.22%
Measures of Asset Performance and Management				
June 30	November	Return on total net assets (Change in Total Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals (CY – PY)/Total Net Assets + Net Pension Liability & Related Deferrals (beginning of year)	3% to 4%	7.82%
Measures of Operating Performance				
June 30	November	Net operating revenues (Operating income (loss) + net Nonoperating revenues (expenses)/Operating revenues + Nonoperating revenues)	2% to 4%	4.01%
June 30	November	Gross tuition contribution ratio (LY)	< 60%	62.13%
June 30	November	State appropriations contribution ratio (LY)	none	23.50%
June 30	November	Budget impact of credit hour production	over (under)	\$(3,724,025.00)

APPENDIX 6: Student Access, Progress, and Completion

First Year Persistence Rates for Fall 2015, First-Time, Full-Time, Degree-Seeking Freshmen

(Within States -- Students who are part of the cohort who continue at other state institutions, & Within Institution -- Students who are part of the cohort who continue at their initial institution.)

[illegible]

F'15 Cohort	4 - Hispanic/Latino				F'15 Cohort	5 - Caucasian					
	Persist-STATE	wi STATE %	Persist-INST	wi INST %		Persist-STATE	wi STATE %	Persist-INST	wi INST %		
	262	218	83.2%	188		71.8%	1205	953	79.1%	816	67.7%
	44	33	75.0%	30		68.2%	370	285	77.0%	234	63.2%
	42	32	76.2%	29		69.0%	361	273	75.6%	234	64.8%
	34	25	73.5%	21		61.8%	195	146	74.9%	132	67.7%
	33	22	66.7%	21		63.6%	213	146	68.5%	130	61.0%
	77	61	79.2%	55		71.4%	529	423	80.0%	373	70.5%
			75.6%			67.6%			75.9%		65.8%

APPENDIX 6: Student Access, Progress, and Completion

Graduation Rates for Fall, First-Time, Full-Time, Degree-Seeking Freshmen										
Within-the-State Rates and Within-the-Institution Rates										
By Race/Ethnicity										
(Within States -- Students who are part of the cohort who continue at other state institutions, & Within Institution -- Students who are part of the cohort who continue at their initial institution.)										
Six-year Graduation Rate	F'11 Cohort	1 - African American				F'11 Cohort	2 - Native American			
Institution		Grads-STATE	wi STATE %	Grads-INST	wi INST %	t	Grads-STATE	wi STATE %	Grads-INST	wi INST %
UCO	241	65	27.0%	58	24.1%	94	43	45.7%	35	37.2%
ECU	21	4	19.0%	3	14.3%	86	38	44.2%	32	37.2%
NSU	36	12	33.3%	12	33.3%	273	83	30.4%	77	28.2%
NWOSU	25	5	20.0%	5	20.0%	30	8	26.7%	8	26.7%
SEOSU	50	7	14.0%	6	12.0%	166	55	33.1%	48	28.9%
SWOSU	26	7	26.9%	7	26.9%	47	12	25.5%	11	23.4%
			23.4%		21.8%			34.3%		30.3%

F'11 Cohort	4 - Hispanic/Latino				F'11 Cohort	5 - Caucasian			
t	Grads-STATE	wi STATE %	Grads-INST	wi INST %	t	Grads-STATE	wi STATE %	Grads-INST	wi INST %
146	60	41.1%	54	37.0%	1167	549	47.0%	478	41.0%
20	9	45.0%	6	30.0%	356	158	44.4%	142	39.9%
32	9	28.1%	9	28.1%	534	205	38.4%	176	33.0%
30	5	16.7%	3	10.0%	270	102	37.8%	82	30.4%
29	6	20.7%	5	17.2%	307	105	34.2%	91	29.6%
69	17	24.6%	17	24.6%	556	232	41.7%	205	36.9%
		29.4%		24.5%			40.6%		35.1%

APPENDIX 6: Student Access, Progress, and Completion

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
First Year Persistence Rates for Fall 2011, First-Time, Full-Time, Degree-Seeking Freshmen						
(Within States -- Students who are part of the cohort who continue at other state institutions, & Within Institution -- Students who are part of the cohort who continue at their initial institution.)						
Research & Regional Univ.	F'11 Cohort					
Institution						
UCO		919	708	77.0%	612	66.6%
ECU		267	179	67.0%	143	53.6%
NSU		401	306	76.3%	253	63.1%
NWOSU		206	149	72.3%	120	58.3%
SEOSU		282	170	60.3%	156	55.3%
SWOSU		379	298	78.6%	256	67.5%
				71.9%		60.7%

Students who are part of the cohort who continue at their initial institution.)									
F'11 Cohort	2 - Female				F'11 Cohort	All Students			
	Persist-STATE	wi STATE %	Persist-INST	wi INST %		Persist-STATE	wi STATE %	Persist-INST	wi INST %
1199	989	82.5%	848	70.7%	2118	1697	80.1%	1460	68.9%
310	246	79.4%	218	70.3%	577	425	73.7%	361	62.6%
498	397	79.7%	346	69.5%	899	703	78.2%	599	66.6%
210	176	83.8%	156	74.3%	416	325	78.1%	276	66.3%
326	221	67.8%	200	61.3%	608	391	64.3%	356	58.6%
406	320	78.8%	276	68.0%	785	618	78.7%	532	67.8%
		78.7%		69.0%			75.5%		65.1%

APPENDIX 6: Student Access, Progress, and Completion

2016-17 Graduation Rates for Fall, First-Time, Full-Time, Degree-Seeking Freshmen
Within-the-State Rates and Within-the-Institution Rates
By Gender

(Within States -- Students who are part of the cohort who continue at other state institutions, & Within Institution --

Six-year Graduation Rate		Male			
Institution	F'11 Cohort	Grads-STATE	wi STATE %	Grads-INST	wi INST %
UCO	919	332	36.1%	291	31.7%
ECU	267	85	31.8%	70	26.2%
NSU	401	125	31.2%	113	28.2%
NWOSU	206	56	27.2%	45	21.8%
SEOSU	282	78	27.7%	70	24.8%
SWOSU	379	128	33.8%	110	29.0%

-- Students who are part of the cohort who continue at their initial institution.)

Female					Total				
F'11 Cohort	Grads-STATE	wi STATE %	Grads-INST	wi INST %	F'11 Cohort	Grads-STATE	wi STATE %	Grads-INST	wi INST %
1199	565	47.1%	500	41.7%	2118	897	42.4%	791	37.3%
310	156	50.3%	141	45.5%	577	241	41.8%	211	36.6%
498	190	38.2%	167	33.5%	899	315	35.0%	280	31.1%
210	81	38.6%	66	31.4%	416	137	32.9%	111	26.7%
326	111	34.0%	94	28.8%	608	189	31.1%	164	27.0%
406	167	41.1%	150	36.9%	785	295	37.6%	260	33.1%

APPENDIX 7: Institutional General Education Testing Practices

EAST CENTRAL UNIVERSITY

• What test(s) do you use to measure accomplishments of GE learning outcomes?

East Central University uses four rubrics, which have been modified from the AAC&U Value Rubrics, to assess student course artifacts from selected courses. These rubrics were developed by the General Education Committee in 2013-2014 and 2014-2015, were piloted in 2016-2017 with a single section of each selected GE course, and were finally used on all sections of each identified course 2017-2018.

• Who gets tested and when?

Currently, East Central University has selected 21 high-population GE courses to assess. Each course has an identified artifact assignment/essay test item that is used in all sections. All sections of each course are assessed and from each section, artifacts are gathered from a random selection of students to assess (25% of students assessed if the section has 35 or less students and 15% if the section has more than 35 students).

These 21 GE courses normally account for over 50% of the student population, and include: Composition I and II, General Psychology, Choices in Wellness, General Biology, US History to 1877, US History since 1877, and many others. As such, students assessed are mostly freshmen and sophomores, but also includes juniors and seniors as some program course rotations have their students taking GE classes throughout their program.

• What is measured?

The rubrics measure the following Learning Outcomes:

- LO1: Communication,
- LO2: Intellectual Skills (combined problem solving and critical thinking),
- LO3: Information Literacy,
- LO4: Intercultural Knowledge.

Each rubric has 5 criteria upon which students are assessed. Learning Outcomes 1 and 3 are assessed in the Fall and Learning Outcomes 2 and 4 are assessed in the Spring.

• What do you do with the results?

Aggregated results (overall rubric score and individual criterion scores) are reported back to Deans/Chairs/Course Instructors. Results are used at the course level and program level to identify areas in need of improvement. As this is a relatively new way to assess GE at East Central University, results are also currently being used to identify shortcomings of the current assessment process/product in order to improve both.

NORTHEASTERN STATE UNIVERSITY**• What test(s) you use to measure accomplishments of GE learning outcomes?**

NSU does not use a single test. Instead, faculty designate course-embedded assessments as key course assignments, using a common assignment across multiple sections of the same course to facilitate data aggregation. Course embedded assessments are administered to all students enrolled in the general education course.

• Who gets tested and when?

Course embedded assessments are administered to all students enrolled in the general education course. Faculty administer the assessment every time the course is taught. One faculty member per course is responsible for gathering the assessment data from the multiple sections and submitting an annual report.

• What is measured?

The general education outcomes are embedded within the courses by general education category: Written and Oral Communication; Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences; Global Perspectives; Natural Sciences; Quantitative Reasoning; Life Skills; and University Studies.

1. GE Outcome 1: Communicate effectively through writing, listening, speaking, and reading
2. GE Outcome 2: Recognize and analyze works in the humanities (literature, art, music, philosophy, and religion) as expressions used to communicate perspectives on the human condition
3. GE Outcome 3: Identify and evaluate political, historical, and social forces that shape the past, present, and future
4. GE Outcome 4: Become globally-aware citizens through an understanding and appreciation of human and cultural diversity
5. GE Outcome 5: Understand physical and biological phenomena and their importance for the welfare of society
6. GE Outcome 6: Apply methods of scientific inquiry
7. GE Outcome 7: Use quantitative symbolic systems to solve problems and interpret data
8. GE Outcome 8: Understand and apply concepts and activities that promote good health and life skills
9. GE Outcome 9: Use critical thinking to analyze and solve problems

• What do you do with the results?

Results are reviewed by the General Education committee as well as by the specific department for curriculum improvement.

NORTHWESTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

- **What test(s) do you use to measure accomplishments of GE learning outcomes?**

NWOSU uses the ETS Mid-level test.

NWOSU also uses course embedded assessments for general education throughout the program.

Third, we use NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement).

- **Who gets tested and when?**

All students who have a minimum of 40 hours to 75 hours are asked to participate in the ETS Mid-level test. We are studying ways to get participation rate up.

NSSE is administered to first time freshman and seniors.

- **What is measured?**

- **What do you do with the results?**

All data is compiled and reviewed, then recommendations for changes come from the General Education committee.

SOUTHEASTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

- **What test(s) do you use to measure accomplishments of GE learning outcomes?**

SOSU uses the ETS Proficiency Profile (standard form) and may choose the optional essay (General Education Council currently is working on the new assessment protocols)

- **Who gets tested and when?**

Approximately 100 students from each class (Freshmen-Senior)

- **What is measured?**

Student proficiency skills in critical thinking, reading, writing, and mathematics. The option essay will be used to assess writing ability.

- **What do you do with the results?**

Results are analyzed by the Director of General Education and Director of Assessment and then shared with the General Education Council. Based on the results, the General Education Council may recommend changes to the general education program. The results and recommendations, if any, are then shared with academic departments.

Departments offering the general education courses review the results and consider the recommendations of the General Education Council and make modifications as warranted.

SOUTHWESTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY**• What test(s) do you use to measure accomplishments of GE learning outcomes?**

Southwestern assesses the institutionally recognized general education competencies using the following tools:

1. Curriculum-embedded assessments including exams, reports, essays, lab assignments, and standardized tests.
2. The standardized ETS Proficiency Profile, which measures the areas of reading, writing, critical thinking, and math.

• Who gets tested and when?

Faculty employ many methods for course-embedded assessment of student achievement within their general education courses as a part of the curriculum to all students enrolled. Freshmen are asked to complete the ETS Proficiency Profile as a pre-test during a Freshman Orientation course class period. Seniors are then asked to complete it as a post-test during a class period of a capstone course or other senior course that was scheduled by their instructor.

• What is measured?

Tests and curriculum-embedded assessments measure the general education competencies of reading, writing, mathematics, critical thinking, and computer literacy supporting five overall purposes of the General Education program:

1. GOAL 1, Demonstrate competency in communication and computer literacy.
2. GOAL 2, Demonstrate competency in scientific and quantitative reasoning.
3. GOAL 3, Demonstrate competency in aesthetic, technical, symbolic, and historic effects of the fine arts, history, and humanities.
4. GOAL 4, Demonstrate social and cultural competency in the study of social groups, social issues, cultures, institutions, and globalization.
5. GOAL 5, Demonstrate achievement of intellectual and professional aptitudes: a) Critical Thinking, b) Creativity, c) Collaboration, d) Connection, and e) Communication

• What do you do with the results?

Results are reviewed annually by the Assessment/General Education committee including a Continuous Improvement sub-committee of peer-reviewers by the following newly employed process:

1. Select General Education courses for more focused analysis.
2. Describe strengths and weaknesses.
3. Describe recommendations for improvement.
4. Suggest a timeline for implementation of recommended changes.
5. Monitor by way of a year to year comparison.

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL OKLAHOMA

The University Core Curriculum (Core) at UCO is centered on ways of knowing, with the intent of equipping students with broad base knowledge and building skills that will be foundational for success in their chosen disciplines. The goals of the Core are not only foundational but are interwoven into the fabric of UCO's Mission and Vision.

The Core curriculum is based on the philosophical framework of “ways of knowing” (written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning/scientific method, critical inquiry, cultural and esthetic analysis, life skills) and the Central Six. The latter are high-impact practices through which students experience transformative learning (discipline knowledge, leadership, health and wellness, global and cultural competencies, service learning and civic engagement, and research, creative, and scholarly activities). These broad skills are woven into the fabric of the campus and reflect UCO’s mission.

The current academic assessment plan includes several complementary strands through which the institution examines student learning, from entry-level assessment through the capstone experience.

- **Who gets tested, and when?**

- **Entry-level assessment** – Conducted by Testing Services, these assessments are used primarily to determine appropriate placement of students into UCO courses. The data is also used to help in retention, persistence, and completion efforts by identifying critical indicators of student success or struggle.
- **Mid-level assessment** – This general education assessment is focused on several areas of the Core Curriculum. Papers are scored from three required Core courses English Composition, American History, and Healthy Life Skills and aggregate data are collected from a fourth course, Fundamentals of Speech.
- **All required courses** within degree programs are aligned with degree program SLOs and assessment data on some or all of those outcomes is collected annually from each program. As examples, there are alignments matrices for several departments: Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Funeral Services, French, Political Science, Humanities, History, Dance, Child Development, Dietetics, Community and Public Health, Industrial Safety.
- Through capstone projects students demonstrate their mastery of the degree program Student Learning Outcomes and two essential general education SLOs: written communication and critical thinking, assessed using the AAC&U VALUE Rubrics for Written Communication and Critical Thinking.

- **What gets measured?**

Entry-Level

These efforts are used to determine whether students applying to the university have the skills to

succeed in college-level English, mathematics, and science courses, as well as courses with heavy reading requirements.

General Education

The University Core Curriculum outcomes for several Core courses are assessed by the departments/schools, and colleges that offer those courses. The College of Liberal Arts (CLA), has employed a very detailed approach to its course-level assessments for several years in the departments of English, History & Geography, Humanities & Philosophy, Mass Communication, Modern Languages, and Political Science.

Mid-Level General Education

These efforts are focused on three common areas of student learning in general education, written and oral communication, critical thinking, and from a focus area at UCO, health and wellness. Papers are scored from three required Core courses (English Composition, American History, and Healthy Life Skills). Aggregate data are collected from a fourth course, Fundamentals of Speech.

- **What do you do with the results?**

UCO's Core meets the requirements that are appropriate for the degree level of the institution. The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) require the completion of a basic general education core of a minimum of 40 semester credit hours, which must include content in specific areas. This basic general education core is also required by OSRHE for the Arts and Science Associate degrees. For a detailed explanation of OSRHE requirements for general education, see Chapter 3 of the OSRHE Procedure Manual.

The Core area descriptions have been aligned with the general education outcome statements from the 2007 Core Curriculum report and with the OSRHE general education requirements. Courses in the Core are reviewed every five years to see that they still address the applicable Core area. The University Core requirements sheet shows that UCO's Core meets the OSRHE requirements for number of hours as well as content requirements.