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Purpose of Workshop

To describe an approach to defining competitive advantage and key vulnerabilities.

To identify performance indicators for identifying and monitoring key activities.

To show how to inform decisions by comparing indicators to similar institutions.

To identify key concepts and key steps through hands-on exercises in benchmarking.

To introduce use of a spreadsheet model to form comparator groups in benchmarking.
Organization

Introduction

Seven Steps (with activities)

Benchmarking your institution

Discussion

Summary
Part I

INTRODUCTION
**Definition: Benchmarking**

A *measurement* of the quality of an organization's policies, products, programs, strategies, etc., and their *comparison* with standard measurements, or similar measurements of its peers.

The **objectives** of benchmarking are to

- determine what and where improvements are needed,
- analyze how other organizations achieve high performance levels, and
- use this information to improve performance.

[http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/benchmarking.html](http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/benchmarking.html)
Why Use Benchmarking?

- Evaluate Competition
- Identify Strength and Weaknesses
- Guide Policy Development
- Provide Justification for:
  - Budget Requests
  - Salary Adjustments
  - Teaching Loads
  - Bragging
  - Setting Tuition
## Why Use Specific Groups?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>COMPARISON GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Operations</td>
<td>Reference =&gt; Aspirational Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage Enrollment</td>
<td>Competitors for Students True/Reference Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine Faculty Salaries</td>
<td>Competitors for Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Range Planning</td>
<td>Aspirational Peers National Norm Groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selecting Comparison Institutions

Requires:

An understanding of overt and hidden political agendas.

An awareness of different types of comparison groups.

Understand that at many levels the methodology used to select the comparison group will reflect the politics surrounding the issue.
Select Institutions

Select the state you would like to filter the Institution list by:
All States -OR-

Select the Carnegie 2000 Classification to filter by:
All Carnegie 2000 Classifications -OR-

Select the Selectivity to filter by:
All Selectivity Groups -OR-

Pick between 5 and 20 institutions:
Option 1) Pick your institution as one of the 5 to 20 so your data is included in the aggregates of the peer report.
Option 2) Do not include your institution in the 5 to 20. Get your individual data by clicking 'Get Your Institution's Data'.

Arcadia U (PA)
Armstrong Atlantic State U (GA)
Assumption College (MA)
Augusta State U (GA)
Aurora U (IL)
Ball State U (IN)
Barry U (FL)
Baylor U (TX)

* Institutions with partial data or non-standard definitions
See documentation before making comparisons

Your Peer Selections:
Appalachian State U (NC)
Arizona State U (AZ)
Arkansas State U (AR)
Auburn U (AL)
Avila U (MO)
Bacone College (OK)

REMEMBER: Your institution is allowed one complimentary Peer Report, which is made up of the 4 pieces below (Detailed, Summary, Characteristics, and Documentation).
Make sure your selections are correct before creating any of the pieces of your report below.
Also, make sure to save all files to your hard drive.

http://csrde.ou.edu/portal/index.cfm
Example of Downloaded Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Type</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>AvACT</th>
<th>AvSAT</th>
<th>Cont. to 2nd yr</th>
<th>Cont. to 3rd yr</th>
<th>Cont. to Grad. w/in 4 yrs</th>
<th>Cont. to Grad. w/in 5 yrs</th>
<th>Cont. to Grad. w/in 6 yrs</th>
<th>Cont. to Grad. w/in 7 yrs</th>
<th>Cont. to Grad. w/in 8 yrs</th>
<th>Cont. to Grad. w/in 9 yrs</th>
<th>Cont. to Grad. w/in 10 yrs</th>
<th>Cont. to Grad. w/in 11 yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>14535</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>80.94%</td>
<td>72.19%</td>
<td>29.80%</td>
<td>36.60%</td>
<td>52.01%</td>
<td>12.72%</td>
<td>58.99%</td>
<td>5.73%</td>
<td>62.18%</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>13687</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>83.04%</td>
<td>74.28%</td>
<td>33.06%</td>
<td>35.51%</td>
<td>55.74%</td>
<td>11.31%</td>
<td>62.61%</td>
<td>4.73%</td>
<td>65.08%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>13808</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>1091</td>
<td>83.54%</td>
<td>75.19%</td>
<td>32.25%</td>
<td>36.13%</td>
<td>55.99%</td>
<td>11.66%</td>
<td>62.81%</td>
<td>4.42%</td>
<td>65.53%</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>13793</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>83.37%</td>
<td>75.01%</td>
<td>32.69%</td>
<td>36.12%</td>
<td>55.48%</td>
<td>12.24%</td>
<td>62.68%</td>
<td>4.92%</td>
<td>65.61%</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>15839</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>83.76%</td>
<td>75.56%</td>
<td>32.73%</td>
<td>35.97%</td>
<td>55.47%</td>
<td>12.22%</td>
<td>62.67%</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
<td>65.53%</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>16003</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>84.26%</td>
<td>75.54%</td>
<td>33.14%</td>
<td>36.68%</td>
<td>56.24%</td>
<td>12.38%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
<td>65.53%</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>15726</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>1091</td>
<td>84.93%</td>
<td>75.93%</td>
<td>33.77%</td>
<td>36.88%</td>
<td>56.24%</td>
<td>12.38%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
<td>65.53%</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>16605</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>84.45%</td>
<td>77.26%</td>
<td>33.77%</td>
<td>36.88%</td>
<td>56.24%</td>
<td>12.38%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
<td>65.53%</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>15312</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>84.81%</td>
<td>78.30%</td>
<td>33.77%</td>
<td>36.88%</td>
<td>56.24%</td>
<td>12.38%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
<td>65.53%</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>16334</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>86.48%</td>
<td>78.30%</td>
<td>33.77%</td>
<td>36.88%</td>
<td>56.24%</td>
<td>12.38%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
<td>65.53%</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Female Cohorts**

| Year | Headcount | AvACT | AvSAT | Cont. to 2nd yr | Cont. to 3rd yr | Cont. to Grad. w/in 4 yrs | Cont. to Grad. w/in 5 yrs | Cont. to Grad. w/in 6 yrs | Cont. to Grad. w/in 7 yrs | Cont. to Grad. w/in 8 yrs | Cont. to Grad. w/in 9 yrs | Cont. to Grad. w/in 10 yrs | Cont. to Grad. w/in 11 yrs |
|------|-----------|-------|-------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| 2001 | 8360      | 23.1  | 1051  | 81.79%        | 73.72%        | 34.31%                   | 33.52%                   | 55.26%                   | 11.22%                   | 61.77%                   | 4.59%                    | 64.71%                   | 2.04%                    | 65.88%                    |
| 2002 | 7783      | 23.6  | 1077  | 83.88%        | 75.39%        | 38.21%                   | 31.61%                   | 59.11%                   | 9.66%                    | 65.21%                   | 3.79%                    | 67.50%                   | 1.80%                    | 68.35%                    |
| 2003 | 7992      | 24     | 1074  | 84.89%        | 77.05%        | 38.07%                   | 32.45%                   | 59.26%                   | 10.31%                   | 65.76%                   | 3.93%                    | 68.23%                   | 1.71%                    | 69.28%                    |
| 2004 | 7908      | 24.2  | 1077  | 83.93%        | 76.47%        | 37.50%                   | 32.89%                   | 58.61%                   | 11.08%                   | 64.90%                   | 4.75%                    | 67.87%                   | 1.93%                    | 70.28%                    |
| 2005 | 8975      | 23.7  | 1080  | 84.68%        | 76.78%        | 37.45%                   | 32.28%                   | 58.63%                   | 10.26%                   | 65.21%                   | 4.21%                    | 67.87%                   | 1.93%                    | 70.28%                    |
| 2006 | 9249      | 24.1  | 1073  | 84.70%        | 75.94%        | 37.78%                   | 33.20%                   | 58.81%                   | 11.10%                   | 66.67%                   | 5.05%                    | 65.53%                   | 2.09%                     | 66.67%                    |
| 2007 | 9004      | 25.1  | 1074  | 85.54%        | 77.25%        | 38.54%                   | 34.25%                   | 58.81%                   | 11.10%                   | 66.67%                   | 5.05%                    | 65.53%                   | 2.09%                     | 66.67%                    |
| 2008 | 9440      | 25.2  | 1082  | 85.60%        | 78.70%        | 33.20%                   | 34.25%                   | 58.81%                   | 11.10%                   | 66.67%                   | 5.05%                    | 65.53%                   | 2.09%                     | 66.67%                    |
Part 2

THE SEVEN STEPS
Seven Steps

Audit Your Situation

Select Measures and a Standard

Collect Data (physically get the data)

Form Groups

Set Goals/Standards

Monitor Outcomes

Interpret and Use Results

Gaither, Nedwek, and Neal, Measuring Up, the Promises and Pitfalls of Performance Indicators in Higher Education
ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports, 1994
Step 1. Audit Your Situation

The Context

Mission and Values
- Mission Consistency

Internal Audit
- Strengths & Weaknesses

External Audit
- Opportunities & Threats
Matching the Contextual with Mission and Values

- You are 90% dependent on tuition and fees
- You are rural and regional
- You offer Bachelors with some Masters
- You heavily draw from traditional matriculates
- You have a 65% tenured, 80% TT, 90% FT faculty
- Your goal is to grow 3-5% for the next 5 years and maintain selectivity
- High School enrollment is declining for 5 years
## Identify Institutional Success Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Education</td>
<td>• Student Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Viable Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Enhancement</td>
<td>• Teaching, research, service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Effectiveness</td>
<td>• Applicants,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Sustainability</td>
<td>• Operational Effectiveness and Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cash Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Debt Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Doing the Internal Audit

Does your institution use a resource-based approach to decision-making?

What is your business model?

Does the business model lead to the desired outcomes (e.g., financial well-being)?

Are your operations consistent with mission and values?

Do they lead to the desired student outcomes?

What does the literature reveal about your approach to institutional management?
# Doing the External Audit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who are your competitors? (Task environment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What state or federal legislation and/or regulations are under discussion? (P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the broader economic trends? (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the socio-economic status of students from the recruitment areas? (S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What new types of technology are likely to impact the institution? (T)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What laws are important? (L)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summing up the Findings

From SWAT to TOWS

- Threats
- Opportunities
- Weaknesses
- Strength
Organizing to Foster Communication About Institutional Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(O) External Opportunities (from outside the institution)</th>
<th>(S) Institution's Strengths</th>
<th>(W) Institution's Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Do strengths enable the institution to take advantage of opportunities?</td>
<td>(2) Can the institution address weaknesses by taking advantage of some external opportunity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T) External Threats (from outside the institution)</td>
<td>(3) Do strengths enable the institution to neutralize threats?</td>
<td>(4) Can the institution prevent weaknesses and threats combining to destroy institutional effectiveness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exercise 1

What do you consider in audit?

Internal Factors
1. ____________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________

External Factors
1. _____________________________________________
2. _____________________________________________
3. _____________________________________________

Who are the key stakeholder groups?
1. ______________________________________________
2. ______________________________________________
3. ______________________________________________
Step 2. Select Measures

Represent key aspects of institution and institutional aspirations (Balanced Scorecard)

- Basic characteristics
- Student market
- Academic/faculty Aspects
- Financial situation

Use your purpose to help identify the measures that are selected
Quality of Measures

- Reliable
- Valid
- Available in a timely manner
- Adequately accurate
Identifying Core Competencies

Core competencies may be a function of:

- Tangible Resources
- Intangible Resources
- Institutional Capabilities

Core competencies may have their roots in qualities that are hard to quantify:

- Institutional History/Tradition
- Institutional Culture
- Institutional Location/Reputation
Capturing the Core Competencies

Valuable

• Students are willing to pay.

Rare

• A capability (or combination of capabilities) that is possessed by few of the competitors.

Costly to Imitate

• The competency may be linked, for example, to a socially complex network extending beyond graduation.
Comparing Success Factors to Identify Competence and Competitive Advantage

Performance Indicators

Favorable
Strength

CORE COMPETENCE

Can be transferred to other endeavors?

DISTINCTIVE COMPETENCE

Something college is especially good at?

COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE

Provides an Edge

INSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENT

When compared to competitors?

Required Skill

KEY VULNERABILITY

Required Skill Not Present

Unfavorable
Weakness
What to Consider

Balanced Scorecard

- Customer
- Finance
- Process
- Development
Domains and Variables - Examples

**Domain**

- Tuition and Financial Aid
  - Tuition and fees / FT students
  - Financial aid (Pell) / FTE students
  - Institutional aid as % of total aid
  - External aid as a % of total aid
  - % of students on work study
  - Inst. aid as a % of tuition + fee revenue

- Students
  - Full time equivalent enrollment
  - First time applicants
  - Acceptances as a % of applicants
  - Enrolled as a % of acceptances
  - Enrollment by ethnic status
  - Ratio of full-time to part-time
Exercise 2

1. What are your institution’s Success Factors?
   __________________________________________

2. Identify related domains.______________
   ________________________________________

3. Propose measures.____________________
   ________________________________________

4. What major problems will you need to overcome.____________________
   ________________________________________
3. Obtain the data

Primary data from IPEDS

Other data sources include

- CSRDE
- ACT, College Board
- Education Trust
- NSSE
- CDS
- U-CAN, VSA, VAAS, US News,
## Basic IPEDS Data Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic/Institutional Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys (under the Data tool)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[http://www.airweb.org/EducationAndEvents/IPEDSTraining/Tutorials/DataCenter/Pages/ComparisonGroups.aspx](http://www.airweb.org/EducationAndEvents/IPEDSTraining/Tutorials/DataCenter/Pages/ComparisonGroups.aspx)
Select the comparator group

Download the file

Select the variables – code values
Select by Group or Variable

This is EZ Group
Click on a “+” and options appear
Select options and gives you a running total
If you save a group (.uid) have to login
Can save group after form it
## Data Center ExPT Tool

### ExPT and DFR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My Comparison Institution</td>
<td>- DePaul University</td>
<td>- Create a Custom Data Feedback Report</td>
<td>- You have selected 99 institution(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Report Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures selected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VIEW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Download PDF**
Description of comparison group definition (optional)

---

### Figure 1

**Percentile ACT scores of first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students: Fall 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject and percentile</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25th percentile</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite (N=56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th percentile</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite (N=56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th percentile</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (N=52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th percentile</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (N=52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th percentile</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math (N=52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th percentile</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math (N=52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Test score data are presented only for institutions that do not have an open admission policy, and apply to first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students only. Institutions report test scores only if they are required for admission. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group. 
New Tools for Benchmarking Students

Student outcomes

• Identify characteristics of the students of interest
• Use these new tools to look at the outcomes of those students
• Compare their outcomes with outcomes from your students.
More Student Characteristics

College Peer Tool

http://www.collegeresults.org/search2a.aspx
Exercise 3

1. Using EZ Groups at IPEDS Data Center, select characteristics for basically similar institutions.
2. Select some basic institutional characteristics.
3. Download group (.uid file)
4. What student benchmark studies would you like to do with this group? __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
Step 4. Form Groups

Three purposes for groups

- Peers
- Competitors
- Aspirants

Four basic types of groups

- Pre-formed
- Judgmental
- Statistical
- Hybrid
# Purposes of Comparison Groups

## Peer
- Typically similar in key aspects such as mission, size, and complexity.
- May need different peers for different aspects of your institution.

## Aspirational
- Dissimilar but reflect characteristics that the home institution desires to have.
- If presented as a peer group, risk your credibility.

## Competitor
- Organizations competing with your institution for students, faculty, and/or financial resources.
- May not be similar in mission, size, or complexity. (Similarity may or may not be an issue.)
Competition for Students

- **Price** – Cost, Opportunity
- **Time and effort** – Required to degree
- **Value added** – Social, economic, intellectual, personal
- **Convenience** – Attendance, Logistics
- **Brand loyalty** – Reputation, based on what you promise, communicate, and deliver
# Types of Groups

## Predetermined

- **Natural**
  - Belongs to a highly visible grouping
  - Specific comparable characteristic needs to be evaluated.

- **Traditional**
  - Group membership based on historical relationships
  - A familiar association and maybe widely accepted.

## Classification-based

- A grouping used for national or regional reporting – e.g. Carnegie Classification.
  - Tend to have credibility and are usually recognized.
  - Typically based on one or two characteristics (with wide variability on other institutional dimensions).
Types of Groups

Jurisdictional

- Share the same political or legal jurisdiction.
- Typically this type of comparison group is used in politically driven situations even though the institutions have little else in common.
Methodology for Forming Group

**Judgmental**
- Select predetermined group
- Make adjustments
- Set criteria
- Engage key individuals in conversation
- Ask expert(s) and users

**Statistical**

**Grouping or agglomerative**

**Depends on proximity**
Technical Issues

What size(s) and how many groups are needed?

What are the critical areas of concern and what critical indicators/windows exist?

What objective measures should be used? Magnitude, Performance ratios, or Proportional Profiles?

Should weighting be by domain area or by variable?

What is the appropriate role for reasoned review?

What is the appropriate improvement process? Success measures, refinement process, and strategic use?
Model Process

- Map data into Measures
- Set Same and Similar
- Adjust windows, screens and weights
- Workshop
  - Set weights
  - Compute Proximity
- When you get home
Reference Group Model

Steps:
1. Go to the **BSC** sheet and select an institution.
2. ( They are in alphabetic order )
3. <Copy - Paste Values> into the 2nd row of the sheet **Proximity**
4. Go to **Neighbors** and < custom sort> based on column BE labeled Proximity. Make sure you check the box “My data has headers”.
5. If you want to exclude certain groups (like schools from the west) create a copy of **Neighbors** such as **Neighbors(2)**. Sort this sheet on what you want to set as a screen and delete the ones you don’t want. Then <custom sort> on column BE. Make sure you check the box “My data has headers”.
6. **BSC** and **Proximity** should always be sorted in alphabetic order.
7. To change the importance of a measure, change the weight on row 9 of Proximity.
Exercise 4

Who is in your:

• Competitor Group__________________________________________
• Peer Group_______________________________________________
• Aspiration (Preferred Peer Group)__________________________
• Traditional Group_________________________________________
Step 5. Setting Goals

Sustainable

Competitive

Goals must be

- Sufficient
- Measurable
- Actionable
- Reachable
- Timely
Goals and KPIs

- Identify Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).
  - Internal outcome measures that are unique to the campus
- Identify those measures that are available on comparable institutions.
- Benchmark KPIs that are available.

Good things should go up and bad things should go down.
Defining KPIs

Important indicators that measure institutional performance and activities

Typical categories

• Finance
• Enrollment
• Student Success
• Faculty and Staff
Uses of KPIs

Provide a balanced view of the situation

Identify issues and establish progress

Motivate the proper actions

To interpret

• Trends over time
• External comparisons
• Internal comparisons
• Ideal standard.
KPIs and Performance Reporting

To report performance outcomes to:

- Outside agencies – e.g., Federal and State Governments
- Accreditation agencies – Regional and Professional
- Institutional users – Program Reviews, Student Learning Outcomes Assessment, Strategic Planning
Characteristics of Good KPIs

- Sufficient and relevant to key issues
- Reliable, timely, and **inexpensive**
- Ideal standard
- Strategically relevant
Steps for Developing KPIs

Start with a **critical** success factor

- Example: The college must remain financially healthy.

Identify the critical components

- Example: Financial Health
  - Composite Financial Indicator
    - Primary Reserve – Assets to expenses
    - Viability – Assets to debt
    - Return on Net Assets – Increased Assets
    - Net Income Ratio – “Percent Profit”

See Appendix for additional information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>KPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td>• State appropriations per FTE student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordability</strong></td>
<td>• Tuition minus financial aid as % median income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation</strong></td>
<td>• % HS graduates going to higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree attainment</strong></td>
<td>• Degrees awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job placements</strong></td>
<td>• Jobs obtained by college graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Articulation</strong></td>
<td>• Transfers between 2- and 4-year institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completion</strong></td>
<td>• 3 and 6 year graduation rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sponsored research</strong></td>
<td>• $ of external funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student development</strong></td>
<td>• Alumni survey on college value added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College-school collaboration</strong></td>
<td>• % Fresh with college prep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Appendix for additional information
Burke and Minassians, NDIR, 116, 2002
Exercise 5

• Create a copy of **Neighbors**. Select the 25 institutions most similar to yours. Compute the median \( \text{median}() \) on the measures.

• How does your institution compare to the 25 most similar institutions on Graduation Rates and Retention?

  ______________________________________
  ______________________________________
  ______________________________________

• What other variables would you like to have?

  ______________________________________
  ______________________________________
  ______________________________________
Step 6. Monitor the Outcomes

Understand the Red Flags

Report using some combination of words, tables, and/or graphics

• For example, when the user is a “picture” person
  • Develop a visual representation
  • Show performance of institution relative to time and relative to others
  • Include quartiles or ranges where possible
  • Use in sets based on type of data
  • Use inserts for other types of users
External Public Policy Issues

- Price of Tuition
- Student Financial Aid
- Access and Success
- Student Learning (Accountability)
- Consumer Information “Transparency”
- Board Accountability (IRS)
- Tax Policy (Related to Giving and Tuition)
- Support for Scientific Research
- Global Competitiveness
- Aligning P-20 Education

See Appendix for additional information
Public Policy Paper Series, AGB, April 2007
Watching for Red Flags

KPI outcomes that indicate to Planners that a problem might be developing or already has developed

Areas of Concern

- Financial Assets
- Student Assets
- Learning Assets
- Staff Assets
When to Be Concerned

Financial Assets: Perhaps you should be concerned if

- Current expenditures > Current revenues
- Key revenue streams decrease while expenditures increase
- Student aid as proportion of tuition & fees increases
- The ratio of reserves to operating expenses decreases
- The discount rate increases
- Major secondary revenue streams decrease
When to Be Concerned

- Decreasing applicants or yield
- Increasing difference in qualifications of accepted not-enrolled & enrolled
- Decreasing graduation rates
- Increasing number of students not returning
- Decreases in % of entering students in top 10% of HS class

Student Assets: Perhaps you should be concerned if:
When to Be Concerned

- Cost of instruction increases compared to price
- Cost per credit hour increases
- Faculty salaries increase relative to tuition revenue
- Faculty salary decrease relative to the cost-of-living
- No new academic programs
When to Be Concerned

- Faculty (academic staff) to non-academic staff ratio drops
- Tenure ratio increases with declining enrollment
- Proportion of non-faculty increases
- Non-retirement retention increases
- Benefits cost relative to salary increases.

Staff Assets: Perhaps you should be concerned if:
Display the data
### UM Student Dashboard, 2005

#### Admission Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top HS Decile</th>
<th>Average SAT</th>
<th>Accept Rate</th>
<th>Yield Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid. of Peers</td>
<td>Below Peers</td>
<td>Mid. of Peers</td>
<td>Below Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Student Body Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NF Enrollment</th>
<th>UG Enrollment</th>
<th>Grad. Enrollment</th>
<th>Prof. Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid. of Peers</td>
<td>Mid. of Peers</td>
<td>Below Peers</td>
<td>Mid. of Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,277</td>
<td>10,537</td>
<td>3,219</td>
<td>1,918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctoral Degrees</th>
<th>NF Retention Rate</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
<th>% On-campus-DUG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Peers</td>
<td>Below Peers</td>
<td>Below Peers</td>
<td>Mid. of Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Female-UG</th>
<th>% Minority-UG</th>
<th>% Int'l-UG</th>
<th>% Out-of-State-DUG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Peers</td>
<td>Above Peers</td>
<td>Above Peers</td>
<td>Mid. of Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Financial Aid Indicators*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Peers</td>
<td>Above Peers</td>
<td>Mid. of Peers</td>
<td>Mid. of Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>$15,123</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Loans**

- Above Peers: $7,015

---

*Comparisons for all Financial Aid Indicators are limited to the nine private peer institutions included in the list below.

Arrow (up/down) means UM trend is significantly higher/lower over the prior 6-year period. A flat line means no significant trend.

"Above Peers": "Below Peers" means that UM is significantly above/below the mean of 12 peer institutions listed below using last year's data (not shown). "Mid. of Peers" means UM is not significantly diff. from the mean. Green means a positive trend/comparison. Red means a negative trend/comparison. Neutral trends are shown in black.

Exercise 6

• In comparing your institution to the median of the 25 most similar institutions, what do you see that might be a cause for concern?
  ____________________________________________________________
  ____________________________________________________________
  ____________________________________________________________
  ____________________________________________________________
  ____________________________________________________________

• In comparing your institution to the median of the 25 most similar institutions, what do you see that might be a cause for celebration?
  ____________________________________________________________
  ____________________________________________________________
  ____________________________________________________________
  ____________________________________________________________
  ____________________________________________________________
Step 7. Interpret & Use Results
Changes in the Top 10 IT Issues

While the rank changes there seemed to be a steady list until NOW
Best Approach for Understanding the Context

No one best approach but many resources

• **Models**
  • PEST [Political, Economic, Social, Technical]
  • Systems Models [Input, Process, End Purpose Issues]
• **White Papers and Reports**
  • Federal and State Governments
  • Association White Papers
• **Board of Trustees Resources**
  • Association of Governing Boards Analyses
• **Books on Private Higher Education**
  • Townsley, KPMG [Financing and small colleges]
  • Websites [Price, Equity, Quality, Accountability]
  • Public Agenda.org, Education Trust, etc.

See Appendix for additional information
Look at the System: College Flow

**Inputs**
- Students
- Faculty/staff
- Facilities
- Finances

**Operations**
- Mission
- Programs
- Completion
- Progress

**Outputs**
- Students
- Cognitive
- Value added
- Environment
Be Strategic: Know the Institution

- Mission
- Students
- Faculty
- Programs
- Resources

Operate

Assess

Plan

Academic Initiatives

Organizational Indicators

- Mission
- Students
- Faculty
- Programs
- Resources

Cost Benefit Capacity Capability

Key Performance Indicators

Program Portfolio

Dashboard

Initiative Implementation

Discretionary Request

Budget

Spring

Summer

Winter Year + 1

Fall
Part 3

USING THE CSRDE TOOL
Using the CSRDE Tool

Read and agree to the terms

http://csrde.ou.edu/portal/index.cfm
Read the Instructions
(One per Institution)

Peer Report Tool

Each contact person from your institution has access to this system. Since your institution is entitled to one complimentary peer report, please be sure to coordinate with them before creating your report.

This tool allows you to create your institution's peer report.

Your complimentary peer report is made up of 4 pieces: Peer Detailed Report, Peer Summary Report, Peer Characteristics, and Peer Documentation. **You will need to click each of the four buttons below in order to create all of the pieces of your complimentary report.**

Follow the steps below for creating the report:

1. Narrow down the institutions in the left box using the four category drop-down menus or you can click in the left box and start typing the name of the institution. **Only one category drop-down menu will work at a time.**
2. Select your institutions below by choosing the name in the left box and then clicking the arrow to move the selection to the right box. If you would like to take a school out of your selection list, choose the school to remove in the right box and click the left arrow to move the school to the left box. You also can press the 'Reset' button at any time to clear your peer selection list.
3. There are two options for creating your peer reports

   **Option 1:** Pick your institution as one of the 5 to 20 institutions. This will include your institution in with the aggregates.
   **Option 2:** Do not pick your institution as one of the 5 to 20 peers. Click the "Get your Institution's Data" button below and get a separate report for your institution's data only.

4. Review your selection group carefully and make any changes needed. **Once you submit your request, you cannot return and make changes.**
5. When you are satisfied with your selections, press the 'Get Peer Detailed Report' button to submit your request for the Detailed Peer Report. **Do not close the browser yet.** Also, make sure to save your excel file to your hard drive before closing it.
6. Select the 'Get Peer Summary Report' button to submit your request for the Peer Report Summary. If you leave this page before requesting the Peer Summary Report, it will not be available when you return.
7. **Optional:** To complete your peer report, you can also get characteristics data and documentation for both your peer group and your own institution. Click the "Get Peer Institutions' Characteristics" button below to get a characteristics report and click the "Get Peer Institutions' Documentation" button below to get a documentation report for your selected peer group. The "Get Your Institution's Characteristics" button and the "Get Your Institution's Documentation" button allow you to retrieve only your institution's corresponding report. **Note:** You can only get one characteristics report and one documentation report for your peer group.
8. If you would like to obtain additional peer reports, please contact CSRDE at 405-325-2158 or email us at csrde@ou.edu and let us know how many additional peer reports you would like. We will increase your available online peer reports and send you an invoice for the additional peer reports.

http://csrde.ou.edu/portal/index.cfm
Select Institutions

Select the state you would like to filter the Institution list by:

-OR-

Select the Carnegie 2000 Classification to filter by:

Select the Carnegie 2010 Classification to filter by:

Select the Selectivity to filter by:

Richard Howard
Josetta McLaughlin
Gerry McLaughlin

Pick between 5 and 20 institutions:

Option 1) Pick your institution name of the top 20 institutions data is included in the aggregates of the peer report.
Option 2) Do not include your institution data. Select B. Get your individual data by clicking "Get Your Institution's Data." 

Your Peer Selections 6:

Arcadia U (PA)
Armstrong Atlantic State U (GA)
Assumption College (MA)
Augusta State U (GA)
Aurora U (IL)
Ball State U (IN)
Barry U (FL)
Baylor U (TX)

* Institutions with partial data or non-standard definitions
See documentation before making comparisons

REMEMBER: Your institution is allowed one complimentary Peer Report, which is made up of the 4 pieces below (Detailed, Summary, Characteristics, and Documentation).
Make sure your selections are correct before creating any of the pieces of your report below.
Also, make sure to save all files to your hard drive.

http://csrde.ou.edu/portal/index.cfm
Get All The Reports

• Before you leave the page – get and save the reports – they come down in Excel

REMINDER: Your institution is allowed one complimentary Peer Report, which is made up of the 4 pieces below (Detailed, Summary, Characteristics, and Documentation). Make sure your selections are correct before creating any of the pieces of your report below. Also, make sure to save all files to your hard drive.

Retrieve your own institution's data by clicking each button below. This will not count towards the number of peer reports you are allowed.

http://csrde.ou.edu/portal/index.cfm
## CSRDE Custom Summary Peer Report

*created on 10/03/2012*

**Copyright University of Oklahoma, Center for Institutional Data Exchange And Analysis**

*Created for Internal use of CSRDE member institution only. May not be redistributed in any format without written permission.*

| Cohort Type | Year | Headcount | AvACT | AvSAAT | Cont. to 2nd yr | Cont. to 3rd yr | Cont. to 4 yrs | Grad. w/in 4 yrs | Cont. to 5th yr | Grad. w/in 5 yrs | Cont. to 6th yr | Grad. w/in 6 yrs | Cont. to 7th yr | Grad. w/in 7 yrs | Cont. to 8th yr | Grad. w/in 8 yrs | Cont. to 9th yr | Grad. w/in 9 yrs | Cont. to 10th yr | Grad. w/in 10 yrs | Cont. to 11th yr |
|-------------|------|-----------|-------|--------|----------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Total       | 2001 | 14535     | 23.6  | 1069   | 80.94%         | 72.19%         | 29.80%       | 36.60%         | 52.01%         | 12.72%         | 58.99%         | 5.73%          | 62.18%         | 2.67%          | 63.59%         | 1.43%          | 64.42%         | 0.80%          | 64.94%         | 0.49%          |                |
| Total       | 2002 | 13867     | 23.8  | 1093   | 83.04%         | 74.28%         | 33.06%       | 35.51%         | 55.74%         | 11.31%         | 62.31%         | 4.73%          | 65.08%         | 2.50%          | 66.30%         | 1.39%          | 67.01%         | 0.89%          |                |
| Total       | 2003 | 13808     | 24.3  | 1091   | 83.54%         | 75.19%         | 32.25%       | 36.13%         | 55.59%         | 11.66%         | 62.81%         | 4.42%          | 65.53%         | 2.00%          | 66.67%         | 1.09%          |                |
| Total       | 2004 | 13793     | 24.3  | 1095   | 83.37%         | 75.01%         | 32.69%       | 36.12%         | 55.48%         | 12.24%         | 62.68%         | 4.92%          | 65.61%         | 2.15%          |                |
| Total       | 2005 | 15389     | 24.1  | 1099   | 83.76%         | 75.56%         | 32.73%       | 35.97%         | 55.47%         | 12.22%         | 62.67%         | 5.05%          |                |
| Total       | 2006 | 16003     | 24.3  | 1090   | 84.26%         | 75.54%         | 33.14%       | 36.68%         | 56.24%         | 12.38%         |                |
| Total       | 2007 | 15726     | 24.7  | 1091   | 84.93%         | 75.93%         | 33.77%       | 36.88%         |                |
| Total       | 2008 | 16605     | 23.5  | 1101   | 84.45%         | 77.26%         |                |
| Total       | 2009 | 15312     | 25.8  | 1106   | 84.81%         | 78.30%         |                |
| Total       | 2010 | 16334     | 26.5  | 1106   | 86.48%         |                |                |

### Female Cohorts

| Year | Headcount | AvACT | AvSAAT | Cont. to 2nd yr | Cont. to 3rd yr | Cont. to 4 yrs | Grad. w/in 4 yrs | Cont. to 5th yr | Grad. w/in 5 yrs | Cont. to 6th yr | Grad. w/in 6 yrs | Cont. to 7th yr | Grad. w/in 7 yrs | Cont. to 8th yr | Grad. w/in 8 yrs | Cont. to 9th yr | Grad. w/in 9 yrs | Cont. to 10th yr | Grad. w/in 10 yrs | Cont. to 11th yr |
|------|-----------|-------|--------|----------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 2001 | 8360      | 23.1  | 1051   | 81.79%         | 73.72%         | 34.31%       | 33.52%         | 55.26%         | 11.22%         | 61.77%         | 4.59%          | 64.71%         | 2.04%          | 65.80%         | 1.05%          | 66.46%         | 0.55%          | 66.83%         | 0.34%          |
| 2002 | 8783      | 23.6  | 1077   | 83.88%         | 75.39%         | 38.21%       | 31.61%         | 59.11%         | 9.66%          | 65.21%         | 3.79%          | 67.50%         | 1.80%          | 68.35%         | 1.03%          | 68.91%         | 0.76%          |                |
| 2003 | 7992      | 24.1  | 1074   | 84.89%         | 77.65%         | 38.07%       | 32.45%         | 59.26%         | 10.31%         | 65.76%         | 3.93%          | 68.23%         | 1.71%          | 69.28%         | 0.82%          |                |
| 2004 | 7908      | 24.2  | 1077   | 83.93%         | 76.47%         | 37.50%       | 32.89%         | 58.61%         | 11.08%         | 64.90%         | 4.75%          | 67.87%         | 1.93%          |                |
| 2005 | 8975      | 23.7  | 1080   | 84.68%         | 76.78%         | 37.45%       | 32.28%         | 58.63%         | 10.26%         | 65.21%         | 4.21%          |                |
| 2006 | 9249      | 24.1  | 1073   | 84.70%         | 75.94%         | 37.78%       | 33.20%         | 58.81%         | 11.10%         |                |
| 2007 | 9004      | 25.1  | 1074   | 85.54%         | 77.25%         | 38.54%       | 34.25%         |                |
| 2008 | 9440      | 25.2  | 1082   | 85.60%         | 78.70%         |                |                |                |

*Example of Downloaded Report*
Standard Reports (STEM)

Summary STEM Report Tool - Select by Categories

Select a summary report by using one of the 10 forms below that are grouped by category. Click on the category header to bring up the form. You may create as many of these reports as you like.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First-Time Full-Time Freshman Cohorts of Fall 2000-Fall 2009 By Control, Selectivity, and Carnegie 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Control (choose one):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Selectivity (choose one or more):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Highly Selective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Selective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Moderately Selective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less Selective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Classification 2000 (choose one or more):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Doctoral Research Extensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Doctoral Research Intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Masters I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Masters II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Baccalaureate-General</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://csrde.ou.edu/portal/index.cfm
Ad hoc Summary STEM Report

Adhoc Summary STEM Report Tool - Self-Selected Peers

This tool allows you to create a summary report with the peers that you select below. Follow the steps below for creating the report. You may create as many of these reports as you like.

1. Narrow down the institutions in the left box using the four category drop-down menus or you can click in the left box and start typing the name of the institution. Only one category drop-down menu will work at a time.
2. Select your institutions below by choosing the name in the left box and then clicking the arrow to move the selection to the right box. If you would like to take a school out of your selection list, choose the school to remove in the right box and click the left arrow to move the school to the left box. You also can press the 'Reset' button at any time to clear your peer selection list.
3. Make any changes needed to your peer selections.
4. When you are satisfied with your selections, press the 'Get Peer Summary Report' button to create your report.
5. Optional: You can now get characteristics data and documentation for your peer group. Click the "Get Peer Institutions' Characteristics" button below to get the characteristics report and click the "Get Peer Institutions' Documentation" button below to get the documentation report.

Select the state you would like to filter the Institution list by:
-OR-

Select the Carnegie 2000 Classification to filter by:
-OR-

Select the Selectivity to filter by:
-OR-

Pick between 5 and 20 institutions:
- Albany State U (GA)
- Alverno College (WI)
- Arkansas State U (AR)
- Armstrong Atlantic State U (GA)
- Augusta State U (GA)
- Azusa Pacific U (CA)
- Baylor U (TX)
- Bloomsburg U of Pennsylvania (PA)

* Institutions with partial data or non-standard definitions
See documentation before making comparisons

Peer Selections

http://csrde.ou.edu/portal/index.cfm
Discussion

• What did you learn?

• What does it mean?

• So what?
Summary

BENCHMARKING RETENTION DATA STRATEGICALLY
Major Institutional Challenges

- Significant decline in endowments and endowment draws.
- Wealthy donors stressed financially - cutting gifts.
- Parents hit hard by loss of savings or investments.
- Financial aid takes more of each new dollar.
- Sicker price continues to grow faster than inflation. Twenty years took 57% of disposable income; now takes 82% of disposable income.
- Net price - from 59% of disposable income to 72%.
Major Institutional Challenges

- Lack of access to the public debt market.
- Reliance on local financial agencies as the main source of debt financing.
- Tendency to be tuition dependent, thus reliant on enrollment growth to finance debt. [Enrollment declines can push them over the brink!]
- Risky use of gifts or endowments to finance debt.
Major Institutional Challenges

COMPETITION

• Lack of the discounting power to snag high-end students.
• Market share going to new for-profit colleges and convenience colleges.
• Colleges may lose their cash cow (e.g., continuing education, business) to for-profits and convenience colleges (on-line, MOOC’s).
Data become strategic when they are used to support decision making and actions that support future success and well-being of the institution.

Data must be combined, analyzed, or restructured to create information.

Data and information must then be combined with knowledge of the user to create the type of intelligence required for good decision making.
What Does This Really Mean?

Benchmarking and comparative data provide the opportunity to use data to be strategic.

Retention data needs to provide the basis for creating information that can be used to better understand the context and for planning.

Judgment is required to make the retention data and information effective in strategic processes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Mistakes Made when Trying to Be Strategic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Overload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to Use Data in Appropriate Manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate Level of Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Governance Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Strategic Relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Information Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inattention-to-Time Constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance on Anecdote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Benchmarking and Comparative Retention Data Help Improve Planning

Identify, calculate, monitor and utilize RETENTION DATA and performance indicators to help the institution:

- Achieve mission effectiveness,
- Maintain financial vitality,
- Develop a competitive advantage; and,
- Neutralize key vulnerabilities.
Thank you

Richard Howard rdhoward@umn.edu
Josetta McLaughlin jmclaugh@roosevelt.edu
Gerry McLaughlin gmclaugh@depaul.edu
CSRDE Video

CSRDE Quick Query instruction video. About 13 minutes.

http://csrde.ou.edu/web/qqsinfo.html

Quick Query System Information

The Quick Query System is the new online application developed by the CSRDI of institutional membership determines which tools are accessible. The tools are described below.

1. Peer Report Tool (available to all participating members).

This tool is available to institutions that provide data for our reports. With this tool, you are able created in previous years, but now instead of faxing in a form and waiting 2 to 3 weeks for us

The Peer Report Tool can also help you in selecting institutions with similar characteristics: down to schools matched on that option. Each filter works separately on the list of institutions toward the school you are looking for since the list is in alphabetical order.

Important note: Remember that each institution is only allowed one complimentary peer reg "Get Peer Details" button.

Click here for a video of how to use the Quick Query System

2. Summary Report Tool - Select by Category (available to Level 2 and 3 members).

Quick Query System Login

Username:
Password:
Submit

*you must register to receive the login information. Click here to register.
These are instructions on how to use the CSRDE website.

http://csrde.ou.edu/web/qqsinfo.html
Step 1

Auditing the Situation

External: Anticipate Key Future Events

Political
- Financial Aid
- Future Support of K-12
- Higher Education Reauthorization Act

Economic
- Interest Rates
- Economy for industries

Social
- Demographics
- Career Demand

Technical
- Distance Learning
- Knowledge Management

Legal
- New Laws
- Technology and the law interact
### Standards for Data and Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accurate</td>
<td>Are the data free from error and do they conform to the truth?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Are observations available for the necessary points (i.e., not missing)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documented</td>
<td>Is there an explanation of where the data came from and the recoding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined</td>
<td>Is there an understandable description of the data elements?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from McLaughlin, Pavelka & McLaughlin (2005): Assessing the Integrity of Web Sites
Standards for Data and Information (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Do the data have an allowable value for the situation that is reasonable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>Are the data stable, consistent, and produce the same conclusion by various users?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Do the data do what they are intended to do? Are they properly interpreted, generalized and explain the constructs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Do the data contain all variables needed for the stated purpose?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Standards for Data and Information (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Do the data include only important measures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely</td>
<td>Are the data current for the purpose?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>Can the data be accessed easily and efficiently with sufficient documentation to determine data usability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>Are the data from a source that is recognized as “expert” in the field?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Domains and Variables - Examples

### Domain

**Academic Program**
- Level of Degrees
- Presence of professional programs
- Importance of STEM Fields
- Medical school/ Hospital
- Education disciplines
- Research funding in discipline

### Staffing and Faculty

**Full time Faculty**
- Tenure-Tenure Track
- Adjuncts as a % of instructional FTE
- Race/Ethnicity of personnel
- Administrators as % Staff
- Average Salary of faculty
Domains and Variables - Examples

**Domain**

Demographics

- Size
- Control
- Carnegie Category
- Urbanicity
- Medical school/Hospital
- Education disciplines
- Research funding in discipline

Finance

- %Full time Faculty
- %Tenure/Tenure Track
- Adjuncts as a % of instructional FTE
- Race/Ethnicity of personnel
- Administrators as % Staff
- Average Salary of faculty
Newer IPEDS Tool

INTEGRATED POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION DATA SYSTEM

INTRODUCTION TO IPEDS ANALYTICS: DELTA COST PROJECT DATABASE

Welcome to the IPEDS Analytics: Delta Cost Project Database. Here you will find a longitudinal database derived from IPEDS finance, enrollment, staffing, completions and student aid data for academic years 1986-87 through 2009-10. These data have been translated into analytical formats to allow for longitudinal analyses of trends in postsecondary education with a focus on revenues and expenditures.

DATA DOWNLOAD

You can download the database files using the links below. Each zipped file includes the updated 1987-1999 and 2000-2010 database files along with the data dictionary, data mapping file, and program code to create value labels.

- IPEDS Analytics: Delta Cost Project Database 1987-2010 (SAS) (125 MB)
- IPEDS Analytics: Delta Cost Project Database 1987-2010 (SPSS) (106 MB)
- IPEDS Analytics: Delta Cost Project Database 1987-2010 (STATA) (115 MB)
- IPEDS Analytics: Delta Cost Project Database 1987-2010 (GSV) (105 MB)

DOCUMENTATION FILES

Please refer to the following documentation files to learn more about the variables and improvements to the database:

- IPEDS Analytics: Delta Cost Project Database 1987-2010 Data File Documentation (69 KB)
- Data Dictionary (730 KB)
- Data Mapping File (262 KB)
- SAS code to create and organize finance variables per FTE student and adjusted for CPI-U (35 KB)
- Delta Cost Project IPEDS Database History, 1987-2009 (571 KB)

If you have questions or comments about the IPEDS Analytics: Delta Cost Project Database please contact Colleen Lenihan at DeltaData@ed.gov.

http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/deltacostproject/
Step 3

Surveys of Similar Students

Compare Libraries

Compare Academic Libraries allows users to compare one library (the library of interest) with similar libraries (the comparison group). For example, a user may wish to compare one library’s total circulation with the total circulation of a group of libraries with similar total expenditures.

The steps involved in using Compare Academic Libraries are:

1. Select the library of interest for which you want to find a comparison group.
2. Choose the basis for identifying similar libraries (the “Comparison Group”): e.g. size of staff.
3. Choose the information you would like displayed in the report.
4. View the report, which compares your library of interest with its comparison group.

Start Search

Fiscal Year 2010 data from the Academic Libraries Survey (ALS) are used in Compare Public Libraries.

**Missing Data:**
These data have been reviewed and edited at the state and national levels, and verified as correct by each state’s data coordinator. There have been no imputations for non-response, so some data may be missing, indicated as “N/A.” This can result in some libraries not being selected for comparison groups. Imputation is a statistical means for providing a valid value for missing data.

**Note about confidentiality and removal of data:**
Because public use data must protect the confidentiality of respondents, changes have been made in the public use file used by this tool. For libraries where **Librarians and Other Professional Staff** is less than or equal to 2.00 FTE, **expenditures data** for Librarians and Other Professional Staff for those academic libraries have been removed.

Similarly, the **expenditures data** for All Other Paid Staff and Student **Assistants** have been removed for those libraries where **All Other Paid Staff** and **Student Assistants** respectively are less than or equal to 2.00 FTE. Other Operating Expenditures have been removed to prevent inferring these data. In addition, expenditures data for **Employee Fringe Benefits Paid by Library** have been removed if any salaries data were suppressed.

[http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/libraries/compare/]
Step 3

Cost Tool

Aspiration Groups

Relative Importance of Aspiration: Colleges of Business

Step 4

Labianca and Fairbank, Comparison Groups: Applications to Benchmarking and Accreditation, 2003
www.aacsb.edu/handouts/ADC03/Fairbank,%20Labianca.ppt
NCES Basic Categories

Community Colleges

**Public (Enrollment size)**
- Community Development & Career Institutions (<2k)
- Community Connector Institutions (2k – 10k)
- Community Mega-Connector Institutions (>10k)

**Private Not-For-Profit Institutions**
- Allied Health Institutions (100% Allied Health)
- Connector Institutions

**Private For-Profit Institutions**
- Career Connector Institutions
- Certificate Institutions (100% Certificate)
NCES Categories
4 - Year Colleges

Basic
- Doctoral (3 based on Research)
- Masters (3 based on size of program)
- Bachelors (3 based on curriculum)

Undergraduate Program

Graduate Profile

Undergraduate Profile

Size and Selectivity

Enrollment Profile
Using Reference Group Model

Purpose:

• Develop from the IPEDS data.
• Consider major components of college.
• Include students, faculty, revenues, academic programs, and expenditures.
• Allow varying importance of factors.
• Produce a list of most similar colleges.
Step 4

IPEDS Data

Obtain & Enter Basic College Characteristics for large group

Do data need to be modified or updated?

- NO
  - Run the Model

- YES
  - Modify data and institutions
    - Run the Model
    - Do outcomes need adjusting?
      - YES
        - Adjust variable weights, screens and windows
      - NO
        - Report Outcomes

Reference Group Model
IBHE Performance Report Common Institutional Indicators

- % graduates employed or in graduate school one year after graduation
- Students completing requirements
- Students receiving aid by type of aid
- Average amount of aid by type of student
- Completions by race/ethnicity, gender, and disability
- Surveys on alumni satisfaction with faculty accessibility and institution quality
- Pass rates for lawyers
- Graduation rates
- Results of program review and assessment of learning
Example: U.S. News & World Report

If there is one measure and a large number of institutions, a box-whiskers can be used for comparisons.

The bolded line is the institution. Boxes are US News Tiers.
Example 2: Comparing Institutions that Are Important for Understanding a Multiple Outcome Category

Stacked Bar Chart

Where Freshmen actually enrolled when they applied to three institutions.
Example 3: Comparing Over Time

Trend Lines
Yield from Acceptances

Year
2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007

College A
College B
College C
Example 4: Comparing a Limited Number of Institutions

The Bar Chart

The cross-hatched bar is the institution