Appendix

The following materials can help an institution seed a performance dialogue and assess its readiness to support a systemic effort to achieve measurable performance improvement.

An External Policy Parsing of Institutional Performance with Goals, Sample Pressures, and Sample Metrics					
Learning Accountability	Program Accountability	Expense Accountability	Affordability of Access	Convenience of Access	Capacity for Access
Goal • Measure and openly report learning outcomes in ways that permit comparisons among peer institutions Pressures • Many campuses need to improve retention and graduation rates. • Most do not measure	Goal • Respond rapidly to economic development and workforce needs with appropriate degree and certificate programs Pressures • Nonprofit higher education is not offering degree programs at the capacity	Goal • Reduce or stabilize per-student operating costs (to increase institutional productivity) Pressures • Per-student operating expenses have been increasing for years at an unsustainable average annual	Goal • Reduce or stabilize inflationary increases in net tuition (to keep higher education affordable to all qualified students) Pressures • The average annual increase in net tuition has exceeded the Consumer Price	Goal • Offer students convenient, flexible options for completing a degree or certificate Pressures • A growing number of "flex" students can't or won't participate in program and service offerings unless those offerings	Goal • Manage enrollment capacity in response to demand Pressures • Bottleneck courses • Bottleneck programs • Faculty capacity • Classroom capacity • There are more students in the

learning and benchmark the results with peer campuses, even in the high-enrollment courses taught in common at most campuses. • Policy-makers want learning assessed via independent instruments, such as the Collegiate Learning Assessment. • Credit transfer, even for courses taught in common at almost all campuses, is random in its nature. Sample Metrics • Peer average rate vs. actual rate for key indicators	required to meet local, state, and national needs for teachers, health-care professionals, engineers, scientists, mathematicians, IT professionals, and other workforce personnel. • Even public nonprofit higher education is failing the free-market test in which supply and demand tend toward equilibrium. Sample Metrics • Percentage of annual student FTE increase directly attributable to programs created to meet	rate in the 4–5% range. • While productivity has risen for years in almost all sectors of the economy, productivity in higher education has decreased. Sample Metrics • Per-enrollment direct instructional expenses • Average ratio of enrollments to instructional personnel FTEs for college-prep and college-level basic fluency courses and some of the highest-enrollment introductory courses • Percentage of change in the	Index for years, making it difficult for students in lower- and middle-income brackets to afford higher education. • Higher education tends to focus on revenues, not costs, and so focuses on replacing public revenue shortfalls rather than increasing productivity in order to hold down per-student costs and, thus, net tuition increases. Sample Metrics • Ratio of the annual rate of change in undergraduate	maximize asynchronous online self-service instruction and services while also providing real-time access to faculty and staff as needed. • Convenience is the primary reason that students, even residential students, expect "flex" programs and services. • Program accountability obligations often dictate flex programs and services. Sample Metrics • Percentage of all degree programs that can be delivered asynchronously	national pipeline today than ever before. • With more "flex" students entering the pipeline today, enrollment pressures will continue, especially at public institutions in the larger metropolitan statistical areas. Sample Metrics • Percentage of qualified applicants refused admission or admitted with delay • Annual percentage change in total credit hours and in total non-credit

such as retention, persistence, and graduation • Peer comparisons in the National Survey of Student Engagement or in the Community College Survey of Student Engagement • Peer benchmarking via the Collegiate Learning Assessment, MAPP, or other independent assessments of college-prep courses, college-level basic fluency and critical thinking skills, and some of the highest-	identified economic development or workforce needs—for teachers, nurses, biotech workers, etc. • Percentage of annual increase in non-credit enrollments directly attributable to programs created to meet identified economic development or workforce needs • Percentage of all degrees awarded that are directly attributable to programs created or redesigned to meet identified economic development or workforce needs	annual ratio of student FTEs to instructional personnel FTEs • Percentage of change in the annual ratio of student FTEs to administrative FTEs • Per-student-FTE central IT expense and IT personnel (full-time and part-time) expense • Similar unit expense metrics in other lines of service	tuition/fees to the annual Consumer Price Index • Ratio of per-student-FTE revenues from net tuition/fees to per-student-FTE direct operational expenses	except for required clinical or lab work • Percentage of all non-credit programs that can be delivered asynchronously except for required clinical or lab work • Annual inventory of services accessible asynchronously via a Web portal	enrollments • Total first-term enrollments (credit and non-credit) • Ratio of total first-term credit hours to total first-term instructional personnel FTEs and of total first-term non-credit enrollments to total first-term instructional personnel FTEs • Ratio of total annual enrollments to total seating capacity of the classroom plant

enrollment introductory-level disciplinary and professional courses				

Assessing Institutional Response to External Performance Pressures

For each of the six performance pressures described below, please indicate

- Its importance to your institution (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4, where 0 = not important, and 4 = highly important)
- Your institution's current practice of measuring performance or not
- Your estimate of your institution's current performance (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4, where 0 = poor, and 4 = excellent) (whether or not your institution actually measures performance)

1. Learning accountability
   Measure and openly report learning outcomes in ways that permit comparisons among peer institutions

   importance (0-4)___
   measures performance: yes___   no___
   current performance (0-4)___

2. Program accountability
   Respond rapidly to economic development and workforce needs with appropriate degree and certificate programs

   importance (0-4)___
   measures performance: yes___   no___
   current performance (0-4)___

3. Expense accountability
   Reduce or stabilize per-student operating costs (to increase institutional productivity)

   importance (0-4)___
   measures performance: yes___   no___
   current performance (0-4)___

4. <u>Affordability of access</u>
   Reduce or stabilize inflationary increases in net tuition (to keep higher education affordable to all qualified students)

   importance (0-4)___
   measures performance: yes___   no___
   current performance (0-4)___

5. <u>Convenience of access</u>
   Offer students convenient, flexible options for completing a degree or certificate

   importance (0-4)___
   measures performance: yes___   no___
   current performance (0-4)___

6. <u>Capacity for access</u>
   Manage enrollment capacity in response to demand

   importance (0-4)___
   measures performance: yes___   no___
   current performance (0-4)___

Assessing Institutional Readiness for Systemic, Measurable Performance Improvement

Mark each item 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4, where 0 = serious issue(s), and 4 = no issue(s).

1. <u>Institutional performance reporting, planning, and management processes</u>
   _ Executive leadership—executive-level agreement on the need for measurable performance improvement
   _ Faculty and executive agreement on the role of IT—collaboratively aligned to meet measurable performance obligations or objectives through IT-enabled innovation (service process redesign)
   _ Performance reporting and analytics—have an institutional data warehouse with a customizable, Web-based reporting system and customizable

scorecards to permit ad hoc queries of key indicators of institutional and departmental performance for tracking progress and analyzing performance issues

_ Performance planning and management—have a "performance council" or other institutionally focused group responsible for developing and maintaining institutional performance goals and indicators used to guide daily work, track progress, and revise goals/indicators based on evidence or changing priorities

_ Performance improvements—have experience with IT-enabled service process redesign strategies for improving academic performance and other support-service performance while reducing per-student costs

2. Institutional satisfaction with institutional digital utility services

_ Infrastructure and systems—wired and wireless network, ERP, CMS, security, backup, disaster recovery, and classroom systems (feel free also to circle any particularly problematic systems)

_ Reliability—service-level guidelines and 24x365 monitoring/maintenance of the above systems

_ Access—ubiquitous access to the campus network and application systems

_ Help-desk support and responsiveness—24x365 help desk for all students and faculty/staff members

_ Training and hands-on support—technical training and hands-on help, as required, for the institutionally supported network and all desktop, lab, classroom, and central application systems

_ Ease and coherence of use—technical systems integration services to implement and manage an individually customizable self-service Web portal providing single-logon access to a unified set of application services based on the above systems (the basics of a reliable, accurate, and easily accessible information and innovation infrastructure)

_ Life-cycle updates—assessment, planning, selection, conversion, and upgrade processes for campus infrastructure and systems, managed within budget and to meet planned schedules

3. Human resource effectiveness within the institutional IT organization

_ Leadership—ability to work collaboratively with institutional leaders to help support strategic performance objectives that could benefit from the leverage of IT and also to work with academic and administrative units to help them accomplish the same objectives from their operational and strategic perspectives

_ Management—a professionally managed and governed organization

_ Service mentality—friendly and professional service interactions

_ Staffing effectiveness—recruiting, expertise, professional development, and
   retention

4. <u>Expenditures by institutional IT organization</u>
   _ Affordability/sustainability—of institutional IT expenditures from an
   institutional and student perspective
   _ Predictability—of institutional (central) IT expenditures from year to year
   _ Peer cost-competitiveness—see EDUCAUSE Core Data Service for some
   benchmarks for funding per FTE student:
   <http://www.educause.edu/coredata/index.asp>
   _ Economies of scale—from, for example, sourcing externally or being part of
   a consortium