

## Working Matrix of Strategic Direction Initiative Metrics

\* indicates measure from the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) recommended dashboard list. The matrix below includes feedback from the Systemwide Academic Council (SAC) through Monday, December 3

### Metric Type

Input	Progress	Outcomes	Efficiency	Quality	Quality with strong external component	Support: Yes, Maybe, or No	Rationale	Suggested Alternatives
<b>Theme 1: Student Achievement &amp; Attainment</b>								
FTF headcount	Freshman Retention of baccalaureate and associate-level students	<b># graduates by degree</b>	3-year (associate level) and 6-year (baccalaureate level) graduation rate.	% of baccalaureate graduates entering graduate and professional programs within two years.	% of baccalaureate graduates completing graduate and professional programs			
SCH by level	% of degree-seeking undergraduate students by level and degree type with Satisfactory Academic Progress		Rate of transfers within and outside UA (in the same cohorts above, excluding classic transfer-ins)	ETS or other nationally standardized exam scores of graduates, when available.				
new transfers headcount			3-year (classic baccalaureate transfer) graduation rate					
			Total, cumulative student cohort debt per annual graduates (separate by level, i.e., associate, baccalaureate)					
		<b>Annual ratio of degrees, certificates, endorsements, or transfers out of UA, per degree-seeking enrolled</b>				YES: 3 MAYBE: 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Complex metric, difficult to interpret.</li> <li>◆ Common method for determining student success. Downside - we have a high non-traditional student load so this can look bad.</li> <li>◆ Very difficult to measure</li> <li>◆ UAS indicator per 100 degree-seeking undergraduates. See iData "Degree Attainment Rate"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Should report internal UA and out of UA transfers separately. Cert, AA and AAS, Bacc, Master's and Ph.D. must be reported separately. Mixing different types of programs will make this ratio interpretable. Increasing enrollments will penalize programs unless the enrollment in the entry year (averaged for the graduates) is used.</li> </ul>

## Working Matrix of Strategic Direction Initiative Metrics

\* indicates measure from the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) recommended dashboard list. The matrix below includes feedback from the Systemwide Academic Council (SAC) through Monday, December 3

### Metric Type

Input	Progress	Outcomes	Efficiency	Quality	Quality with strong external component	Support: Yes, Maybe, or No	Rationale	Suggested Alternatives
		Proportion of graduates who earn subsequent graduate or professional degrees, or find employment				YES: 1 MAYBE: 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Employment data may not be available.</li> <li>◆ Our students are successful and this shows it.</li> </ul> Downside - can be difficult to obtain all of the information. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Very difficult to measure</li> <li>◆ No UAS metric corresponding to continued education; efforts continue to identify effective mechanisms to do so.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Cert, AA and AAS, Bacc, Master's and Ph.D. must be reported separately. Mixing different types of programs will make this ratio uninterpretable. Who is going to define 'related area'. And it is not just the employer but the position that decides that. BBA at Walmart is good if manager of store, bad if greeter.</li> <li>◆ UAS indicator "Employment" is both</li> </ul>
		Proportion of students surveyed indicating the desired level of satisfaction with UA				YES: 1 NO: 1 MAYBE: 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Only if a consistent, standardized survey instrument is used.</li> <li>◆ Our students like us.</li> <li>◆ Who will develop and administer the survey?</li> <li>◆ UAS has not participated in surveys that produce raw data due to cost and challenge of getting effective responses. UAS working with McDowell Group to secure consistent longitudinal data on student satisfaction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Must be based on a single instrument systemwide...or at least on one group like NSSE and CCSSE. Report survey results. Don't superimpose a 'desired level of satisfaction'.</li> <li>◆ Our students are successful and this shows it. Downside - can be difficult to obtain all of the information.</li> <li>◆ Possibly UAS indicator, Student Ratings of all Faculty?</li> </ul>
<b>Theme 2: Productive Partnerships with Alaska's Schools</b>								
% of recent HS graduates (2 years) who require no remediation	% of prep students who complete next sequential course within one year.		3-year (associate level) and 6-year (baccalaureate level) graduation rate of students with no remediation					
% of recent HS graduates (2 years) who require 1 course remediation	% of prep students who complete a collegiate math (or English, if applicable) within 18 mos. of first enrollment.		3-year (associate level) and 6-year (baccalaureate level) graduation rate of students with 1 remedial course					
% of recent HS graduates (2 years) who require >1 course remediation			3-year (associate level) and 6-year (baccalaureate level) graduation rate of students with >1 remedial course					

## Working Matrix of Strategic Direction Initiative Metrics

\* indicates measure from the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) recommended dashboard list. The matrix below includes feedback from the Systemwide Academic Council (SAC) through Monday, December 3

### Metric Type

Input	Progress	Outcomes	Efficiency	Quality	Quality with strong external component	Support: Yes, Maybe, or No	Rationale	Suggested Alternatives
Headcount of students in teacher education programs (separate baccalaureate, licensure, MAT, MEd)		<b>Number of newly-licensed teachers/year who are recent UA graduates.</b>	Graduation rates (time-appropriate) by program. Appropriate time for part-time students separately.		# UA teacher education program graduates 1st hire by Alaska district/year.			
					# UA teacher education program graduates (for initial licensure) employed by Alaska district/total teachers employed (a measure of retention; compare with non-UA grads/total teachers employed)			
		<b>Percent of Prep students completing collegiate course within one year</b>				NO: 2 MAYBE: 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Usually prep students are enrolled in collegiate courses <i>concurrently</i>. &gt;80 are placed in prep math but collegiate courses otherwise. At least at UAF, Cert and AAS students rarely take prep courses, rather they take courses with related instruction embedded.</li> <li>◆ What is the definition of collegiate course? Does this include Development Education courses? Why one versus two years as the metrics?</li> <li>◆ Almost all Prep students are enrolled in one or two courses concurrently.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Focus on collegiate course <i>in the area needing remediation, usually math</i>. Metric should be whether they complete the next-in-sequence collegiate math or English course. For persons placing more than 1 course below collegiate, allow 18 mos.</li> <li>◆ Regional Market Penetration</li> </ul>
		<b>Percent of Prep students completing collegiate course within two years</b>				NO: 2 MAYBE: 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Usually prep students are enrolled in collegiate courses concurrently. &gt;80 are placed in prep math but collegiate courses otherwise. At least at UAF, Cert and AAS students rarely take prep courses, rather they take courses with related instruction embedded.</li> <li>◆ What is the definition of collegiate course? Does this include Development Education courses? Why one versus two years as the metrics?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Focus on collegiate course in the area needing remediation, usually math. Metric should be whether they complete the next-in-sequence collegiate math or English course. For persons placing more than 1 course below collegiate, allow 18 mos.</li> <li>◆ You might ask how many return after the first and second year of Prep course work.</li> </ul>

## Working Matrix of Strategic Direction Initiative Metrics

\* indicates measure from the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) recommended dashboard list. The matrix below includes feedback from the Systemwide Academic Council (SAC) through Monday, December 3

### Metric Type

Input	Progress	Outcomes	Efficiency	Quality	Quality with strong external component	Support: Yes, Maybe, or No	Rationale	Suggested Alternatives
		Annual teacher education graduates per enrolled teacher education major				YES: 1 MAYBE: 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ A complex metric that will be hard to interpret.</li> <li>◆ Are we producing the teachers needed for the State? If not, what needs to be improved? Why are we losing teacher education graduates?</li> <li>◆ You would need to be more specific, undergraduate or graduate to start with and maybe lower/upper division.</li> <li>◆ No current corresponding UAS metric</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Separate MEd, Licensure, Baccalaureate. Should also report numbers of majors of each type. Should use numbers enrolled in entry year in denominator, otherwise programs will be penalized for increasing enrollment. (Entry year would need to be averaged among those graduating.)</li> <li>◆ Past UAS metric was number of teacher education awards.</li> </ul>
		Ratio of teacher graduates hired in field within three years to teacher education graduates.				YES: 1 MAYBE: 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Affected by factors outside UA control, particularly economic conditions, wages/benefits of teaching positions, availability of teaching positions in road system communities, and conditions of employment in remote communities.</li> <li>◆ Are our students competitive in the job market? If not, what needs to be improved? Who will conduct the survey to collect the data for this metric?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Separate MEd, Licensure, Baccalaureate. Should also report numbers of graduates of each type. Report out-of-state hires?</li> </ul>
<b>Theme 3: Productive Partnerships with Alaska's Public and Private Industries</b>								
Headcount of students in HDJA programs, fall of year		# of HDJA graduates, FY	Ratio of HDJA graduates/HDJA headcount, separately for cert, AAS, bacc, Master's, Ph.D. Use average enrollment for entry date to avoid	% pass (1st attempt and ever) on certification or licensing exams (state, national)	# of HDJA graduates <i>in selected fields</i> employed in related job (define) within 1 year of graduation.			
	External support for students, i.e. employer sponsored course participation (either for-credit or non-credit)							
Noncredit instruction units in workforce-related areas (e.g., mine training)								

## Working Matrix of Strategic Direction Initiative Metrics

\* indicates measure from the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) recommended dashboard list. The matrix below includes feedback from the Systemwide Academic Council (SAC) through Monday, December 3

### Metric Type

Input	Progress	Outcomes	Efficiency	Quality	Quality with strong external component	Support: Yes, Maybe, or No	Rationale	Suggested Alternatives
		Ratio of obtainers of High Demand Job Area employment to earners of High Demand Job Area degrees, certificates and				YES: 2 NO: 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ This is too complex; it will be uninterpretable. There are a huge variety of HDJA credentials. Will be affected by economic conditions and other factors beyond UA control.</li> <li>◆ Are we meeting the jobs needs specified by industry in the State? If not, why not? Are our High Demand Job Areas the ones needed in the State or has that evolved?</li> <li>◆ Way too bloody complex a measure! Collecting the data would be an interesting challenge.</li> <li>◆ Represents an efficiency metric</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Choose a manageable subset of HDJA. Report program by program, not (or at least not only) as a combined total.</li> <li>◆ Break it down into items we can measure.</li> <li>◆ Also include HDJ awards and employment by HDJ areas. Possible alternative: ratio of HDJ awards to High Demand Career Pathways (enrollment; see iData)</li> </ul>
		Number and \$ amount of pay for service activities delivered by UA				NO: 2 MAYBE: 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ I don't understand this one. Is the pay the amount that people or organizations pay UA for service activities? But most service is offered for free, part of UAF's Land Grant and Sea Grant Mission. Also, an aggregate number would be meaningless because the service activities are heterogeneous.</li> <li>◆ How do we determine what counts as a pay for service activity? How do company-sponsored</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Select particular service activities.</li> </ul>
		External support for students, i.e. employer sponsored course participation				YES: 1 NO: 1 MAYBE: 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Shows we are meeting continuing development needs of employers.</li> <li>◆ While it might be possible to measure, I really don't see the benefit of knowing the answer.</li> <li>◆ If it's possible to determine employer sponsorship.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Include UAF employee tuition waivers?</li> </ul>
		Percent of Alaska population utilizing noncredit courses and workshops				YES: 3 MAYBE: 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Workshop participants usually don't register, and resist doing so. Headcount is available, but may double count people who attend several workshops.</li> <li>◆ Shows we are meeting public needs and lifelong learning goals.</li> <li>◆ A nice number to report, but I think it will be more difficult to measure than you would think. Many courses/workshops/seminars do not require registration.</li> <li>◆ UAS already tracks enrollment in non-credit instructional activities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ In what period of time? Annually?</li> <li>◆ Non-credit Instructional Activity (see iData) (includes CEU and VTEC units only)</li> <li>◆ Guest lecturers and visiting scholars engaged in classes.</li> <li>◆ Number of university-sponsored public forums and lecture series that engage communities.</li> <li>◆ Number of advisory groups or partnership agreements with entities in the community.</li> <li>◆ Alumni membership.</li> <li>◆ Extent of annual external contributions.</li> </ul>

### Theme 4: Research & Development to Build and Sustain Alaska's Economic Growth and Enhance Communities

## Working Matrix of Strategic Direction Initiative Metrics

\* indicates measure from the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) recommended dashboard list. The matrix below includes feedback from the Systemwide Academic Council (SAC) through Monday, December 3

### Metric Type

Input	Progress	Outcomes	Efficiency	Quality	Quality with strong external component	Support: Yes, Maybe, or No	Rationale	Suggested Alternatives
# of external grant proposals submitted/year (segregate competitive, non-competitive)	% of competitive grant proposals funded (based on funding <i>decisions</i> in record year)							
	Research expenditures, annual	<b># of peer-reviewed publications</b>	# of peer-reviewed publications/tenure-line faculty FTE	Citations/paper, compared with peers.				
		<b># of creative and scholarly (humanities) products (categorize by local, regional, national, international)</b>	# of creative and scholarly products (categorize by local, regional, national)/FTE tenure-line faculty					
	Number of patent disclosures/year	<b>University income from intellectual property/year</b>		Number of patents awarded/year				
				Number of licensing agreements/year				
		<b>Faculty creative activity (publications, shows, presentations) per faculty full-time equivalent</b>				YES: 2 MAYBE: 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Such activities are very heterogeneous. Need to be subdivided.</li> <li>◆ We often look good compared to peers on this one, especially with researchers with joint appointments. It is also a traditional metric.</li> <li>◆ Developing a standard method of measurement and reporting will be a challenge.</li> <li>◆ Current UAS metrics include both faculty and students and are "number of" metrics (not FTE ratios)</li> <li>◆ Suggest including IP and commercialization -</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Should categorize, e.g., local, regional, national/international. Solo vs. group. Etc.</li> <li>◆ Number of faculty and student peer-reviewed publications or juried creative exhibitions.</li> </ul>

## Working Matrix of Strategic Direction Initiative Metrics

\* indicates measure from the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) recommended dashboard list. The matrix below includes feedback from the Systemwide Academic Council (SAC) through Monday, December 3

### Metric Type

Input	Progress	Outcomes	Efficiency	Quality	Quality with strong external component	Support: Yes, Maybe, or No	Rationale	Suggested Alternatives
		Student creative activity (publications, shows, presentations) per student full-time equivalent				MAYBE: 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Such activities are very heterogeneous. Need to be subdivided.</li> <li>♦ This could be low and has to be defined carefully. For example, are presentations in student classes counted?</li> <li>♦ Something along these lines would be interesting although I am not sure why it should be related to FTE students.</li> <li>♦ UAS metrics do not differentiate between faculty and students, and are "number of" metrics (not FTE ratios)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Should categorize, e.g., local, regional, national/international. Solo vs. group. Etc.</li> <li>♦ Number of faculty and student research/creative expression presentations and posters.</li> <li>♦ Ratio of degree-seeking students formally participating in research and creative expression experiences to degree-seeking FTE;</li> </ul>
		Publication citation summary in comparison to peers				YES: 1 MAYBE: 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Scholarly publications in the humanities and arts are not included in Web of Science and should be enumerated along with the creative activity.</li> <li>♦ We often look good compared to peers on this one, especially with researchers with joint appointments. It is also a traditional metric.</li> <li>♦ But I can see issues trying to provide a standardized measurement methodology.</li> <li>♦ Need to identify appropriate peers for UAS in this area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Need number of publications also. Need to use one source (Web of Science or?), common time frame, consistent search parameters.</li> <li>♦ Number of submitted research proposals; Proportion of proposals submitted that were funded.</li> </ul>
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ External dollars generated per each dollar in state research funding. (This shows how much money could be pumped into the local economy.)</li> </ul>
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Number of research projects that directly address business needs in the state (for example, someone does a project for fisheries consortium to help them with overturning a bad decision based on poor</li> </ul>
<b>Theme 5: Accountability to the People of Alaska (note that all of the metrics for all themes are about accountability)</b>								
25th and 75th percentile of class size			Instructional and student related expenditures per student full-time equivalent *					
# of participants in public workshops								

## Working Matrix of Strategic Direction Initiative Metrics

\* indicates measure from the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) recommended dashboard list. The matrix below includes feedback from the Systemwide Academic Council (SAC) through Monday, December 3

### Metric Type

Input	Progress	Outcomes	Efficiency	Quality	Quality with strong external component	Support: Yes, Maybe, or No	Rationale	Suggested Alternatives
# of outreach publications distributed								
# of website visits (selected outreach websites).								
		Surveys of participants or publication users to assess satisfaction?						
		Student (or recent alum) satisfaction (standardized survey).						
		Total, cumulative student cohort debt per annual graduates				YES: 2 NO: 1 MAYBE: 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ But may vary due to factors outside UA control.</li> <li>◆ Is college affordable?</li> <li>◆ I do not see the value.</li> <li>◆ No corresponding UAS metric</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ How about predicted student debt for entering cohorts? At least that is actionable.</li> </ul>
		Instructional and student related expenditures per student full-time equivalent *				YES: 2 MAYBE: 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Include information on differences among different groups of peer institutions. Typical cost varies among Ph.D., Master's, Baccalaureate institutions.</li> <li>◆ Traditional metric.</li> <li>◆ I think this is useful information but needs to be reported for different categories of instruction, e.g. graduate vs. undergraduate, upper vs. lower division.</li> <li>◆ Existing efficiency metric for UAS OMB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Need careful background work to find out how costs are accounted at peer institutions.</li> </ul>



## Working Matrix of Strategic Direction Initiative Metrics

\* indicates measure from the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) recommended dashboard list. The matrix below includes feedback from the Systemwide Academic Council (SAC) through Monday, December 3

**Metric Type**

Input	Progress	Outcomes	Efficiency	Quality	Quality with strong external component	Support: Yes, Maybe, or No	Rationale	Suggested Alternatives
		Proportion of General Education coursework taught by adjuncts or graduate students				YES: 1 NO: 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Need to decide whether this is good or bad. Low is often regarded as good=quality. But, Low=high cost. Useless to have a metric unless we know what we want. Also, at many public universities the proportion would be 100%, or at least 90%.</li> <li>◆ Are our students getting the value of the best-</li> <li>◆ Issue may be one of instructional quality--</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Faculty tenure: percentage of faculty members who are tenured or are in tenure-track positions.</li> </ul>
		Proportion of course sections with >= 100 students				NO: 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ 100 students is arbitrary</li> <li>◆ This does not show that there may be one-on-one or small group portions of the class that diffuse the large lecture stigma and the students get personal attention even though they are in a large class.</li> <li>◆ This is an arbitrary number. Also, there are few classrooms that can accommodate &gt;100 students.</li> <li>◆ As a function of the size of the student body, it</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ 25th, 50th and 75th percentile of class size.</li> <li>◆ Completers-to-faculty ratio: ratio of the number of degree completers to the number of faculty.</li> </ul>
		Average time for admission process to complete				NO: 3 MAYBE: 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ At what level...admission is nearly immediate for open admission programs. It takes much longer for selective graduate programs...more than a month in most cases. Neither time is "bad".</li> <li>◆ What has this got to do with accountability to the State?</li> <li>◆ No corresponding UAS metric</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Focus on baccalaureate programs, only. Define starting point (application received?) and end point.</li> <li>◆ Use as a component in internal CAS assessment, not as a dashboard metric. Possible dashboard metric might be number and type of service assessments completed.</li> </ul>
		Average time for transfer credit application to be processed				NO: 3 MAYBE: 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ This needs to be divided by type of transfer. Too heterogeneous otherwise.</li> <li>◆ What has this got to do with accountability to the State?</li> <li>◆ Need to define a starting point. Evaluation is triggered in a workflow upon admission to a degree program, by which time all transcripts have been received. Some evaluations are done prior to admission, as time allows. Evaluation time is correlated to cycles in the academic year and is a function of the number of students being</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Separate by internal UA transfer; GER; degree program requirement; elective credit. Also need % of total credits presented in each category.</li> <li>◆ Use as a component in internal CAS assessment, not as a dashboard metric. Possible dashboard metric might be number and type of service assessments completed.</li> </ul>

## Working Matrix of Strategic Direction Initiative Metrics

\* indicates measure from the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) recommended dashboard list. The matrix below includes feedback from the Systemwide Academic Council (SAC) through Monday, December 3

### Metric Type

Input	Progress	Outcomes	Efficiency	Quality	Quality with strong external component	Support: Yes, Maybe, or No	Rationale	Suggested Alternatives
		Proportion of transfer credits applied for that were awarded toward student's program or toward electives				NO: 2 MAYBE: 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Not primarily within UA control; there perhaps are areas (GERs) where flexibility could increase, but accreditation (and normal academic) standards place limits on what we can accept.</li> <li>◆ What has this got to do with accountability to the State?</li> <li>◆ Difficult to codify. Electives are often themselves a program requirement. Program requirements may include equivalencies in content, or number of credits in residence (which dictates how many transfer credits can be used), or number of upper division credits (which a transfer elective can satisfy).</li> </ul> <p>Wouldn't speak to SS effectiveness even if you could codify. Variables outside UA control: number of transfer credits and degrees previously earned, what program student pursues, whether student changes major. A student with a high proportion of electives might just be an indication of a student who has earned a prior bachelor's and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Separate by internal UA transfer; GER; degree program requirement; elective credit. Also need % of total credits presented in each category.</li> <li>◆ I would suggest that if you are going to report such a measure that you have two, the proportion applied toward the degree program requirements and the proportion accepted as free electives.</li> <li>◆ Possibly MAU course alignment. Would need to be defined, perhaps in terms of course numbering, GER alignment.</li> </ul>
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Graduation efficiency: ratio of the number of credits completed to the number required for a degree program. (Excludes transfer credits)</li> </ul>