Jeffrey L. Tryens, Executive Director  
Oregon Progress Board  
155 Cottage Street NE U20  
Salem, Oregon 97301-3966

Mr. Tryens:

Outcomes, accountability, and the role of higher education in the state provided the framework for changes made by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education in 2004. In the reorganization of the Chancellor’s Office, the State Board of Higher Education established a small unit dedicated to performance measurement and outcomes. During the past eight months, OUS staff have used the Oregon Progress Board reporting process as an opportunity to reexamine the various performance programs within the system and to inaugurate revitalized cooperative efforts among Chancellor’s Office departments and campus leadership and staff. These efforts have identified problematic methodologies and data sources for several measures, as well as opportunities for more closely aligning parallel, but separate, accountability movements.

It is the intention of the Oregon University System to undertake, over the next one to two years, a comprehensive review of OUS performance indicators, with a focus on better alignment of Board- and campus-generated measures with state goals. Through this systemwide review process, we expect to tie OUS performance indicators more closely to current Board initiatives, focus primarily on outcome measures, reduce the total number of indicators in order to focus on the most critical, and collaborate with the Oregon Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development on common measures for statewide assessment, as well as address data issues already identified.

Through the process established by the Progress Board, we have requested the deletion of several measures and asked for modifications to some others. I would like to draw your attention, in particular, to those measures addressing affordability, an issue of critical importance to all Oregonians. Defined as developmental in 2003, the measures remain so today. Modifications were developed and proposed, and efforts continue to refine the measures and develop reliable data. Over the last ten months, the Board’s Working Group on Access and Affordability has been addressing issues of measurement as part of the acquisition and testing of a new affordability predictive model. In addition, the
ongoing national attention given to affordability indicators in such publications as *Measuring Up* 2004 offers opportunities to align the OUS indicators more closely with those used nationally. The urgency of creating an affordable public education underlines the need for meaningful and measurable indicators in this area. OUS will have affordability data available for the 2005-07 Legislative Session and we will amend the attached materials at that time. We also are working with the legislature and executive leaders to focus on those measures most directly related to a select few key goals they have for OUS.

We appreciate the patience and assistance of the Oregon Progress Board, and respectfully submit the attached *2003-05 Annual Performance Report* and 2005-07 performance forms, updated and revised to include agency targets.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

George Pernsteiner  
Acting Chancellor

Encl: 2003-05 *Annual Performance Report*  
2005-07 performance reporting forms

CC: Henry Lorenzen, OSBHE President  
Kirby Dyess, OSBHE Vice President  
OUS Presidents’ Council  
OUS Provosts’ Council  
Susan Weeks, OUS Deputy for Planning
Oregon University System

### Performance Target Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Metric</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Key Performance Measures (KPMs)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of KPMs at target for most current reporting period</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of KPMs not at target for most current reporting period</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of KPMs with no previous targets for existing data points (new measure or data under development)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mission of the Oregon University System (OUS) is to:

- Provide affordable access to high-quality postsecondary education for all qualified Oregonians;
- Improve and enrich continuously the lives of the people of the state, the nation, and the world through the pursuit and application of ever-deeper understandings in the sciences, the social sciences, the humanities, the arts, and the professions; and
- Infuse learning with the rigorous pursuit of free and open inquiry to assure that Oregon has the capacity to respond effectively to social, economic, and environmental challenges and opportunities.

During the past year, the State Board of Higher Education has reaffirmed its commitment to the state through the refinement of agency goals to reflect the expressed priorities of the Governor and Legislature. Working groups, comprising Board members and representatives of the broader Oregon community, have focused their efforts on developing initiatives and performance goals to address:

- Access and affordability;
- Excellence in delivery and productivity;
- Academic excellence; and
- Economic development.

OUS performance measurements highlight the success of Oregon’s public universities in advancing most of these initiatives. OUS institutions continue to provide access through increased enrollment of undergraduate and graduate students and have demonstrated progress in facilitating access for Oregon community college transfers and students of color. Modest strides have been made in retaining these students and nurturing them toward graduation in a timely manner, and campus efforts continue to focus on these important measures of student progress. Rounding out the Governor’s charge of “more, better, faster,” graduates of Oregon’s public universities consistently award a high rating to their overall educational experience. However, the steadily increasing ratio of students to full-time faculty sounds a warning for the potential erosion of progress in the realm of academic quality and student support.
The Oregon Benchmarks highlight the importance of an educated populace for the economic and civic strength of the state. Oregon’s public universities represent the best opportunity for Oregon residents to obtain bachelor’s or advanced degrees. In 2003, OUS institutions significantly exceeded their targets in graduating more individuals with bachelor’s and advanced degrees, perhaps as a result of additional state resources in 1999-00 which allowed greater enrollments than had previously been possible. Targeted efforts to meet workforce needs for graduates trained in engineering and computer science fields are also showing results. The outstanding success of university faculty in generating outside research funding not only speaks to the reputation and resourcefulness of OUS faculty, but such funding contributes to the quality of student education, cost-effective operations, and economic development in the state.

Despite these performance achievements, Oregon continues to face a formidable challenge in its efforts to make higher education affordable for all qualified citizens. The importance and urgency of this issue have been underscored by the focused efforts of the Governor and the State Board of Higher Education, as well as in conversations among business and civic groups across the state. OUS has developed two performance measures, incorporating Legislative direction, designed to monitor key elements of the affordability picture. Current efforts, now underway, to develop data for these measures will provide a means of tracking progress toward these goals. Even without specific performance data, however, we know that tuition costs have skyrocketed in recent years relative to funding for federal and state financial aid and family incomes in the state. It will require the combined efforts of the executive and legislative branches, all of Oregon’s postsecondary education community, and the citizens of the state to resolve the affordability crisis.

Over the next two years, the Oregon University System will conduct a comprehensive review of its performance measures and accountability reporting. Additionally, collaborative efforts with the Oregon Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development are being undertaken to identify common indicators. The guiding principle for this review is to ensure that what is measured reflects what is valued, both within the system and throughout the state.
The development of performance measures for OUS began in 1997 with the identification of broad societal goals for public higher education, which were codified in statute with the passage of SB 919 in 1997 Legislative Assembly. These goals include: access, quality, employability, and efficiency.

The Board of Higher Education, a lay board appointed by the Governor, discussed specific measures and indicators of these goals in the subsequent seven public board meetings which were held on campuses in all Oregon regions and which included opportunities for public testimony (Klamath Falls, La Grande, Portland, Eugene, Corvallis, and Ashland).

OUS staff involved campus leaders (presidents, provosts, and vice presidents) in discussions about the development of performance indicators (PIs), data sources, and targets. The Board at a regular meeting approved 30 indicators/measures, many with data available.

A planning group was formed of representatives from each campus to develop systems for collecting and aggregating campus data into agency results. This group also participated in the design of surveys of customer satisfaction (enrolled students, recent graduates, graduates 5 to 10 years later, and employers) and the economic impact of OUS on the state. They served as liaisons to translate performance goals into tangible campus activities.

In 2000, OUS invited business leaders to review the performance measurement process, including proposed improvement targets. This feedback was valuable in clarifying public expectations for accountability reporting. This ad hoc advisory group recommended that OUS focus on a limited number of indicators most critical to success and set higher targets.

To streamline the process and focus campus efforts to improve processes and results, the Board selected 12 key performance indicators (KPIs) out of the 30 proposed in the first year. These are regarded as key drivers to improving quality and results.

The 29 agency performance measures reported here reflect the 30 PIs identified in November 1997 with some modifications based on both internal process reviews and review by the 2003 Legislative Assembly. During 2004, OUS staff have initiated efforts within the system and among Oregon’s educational communities to review performance measures and accountability reporting to improve clarity, facilitate cross-sector collaboration, and further integrate performance measurement into agency policy processes.
The following questions shed light on how well performance measures and performance data are leveraged within your agency for process improvement and results-based management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 How are performance measures used for management of the agency?</strong></td>
<td>The performance measures are used to compare agency performance over time and to other higher education institutions. From this process, the agency has made it a priority to align programs with desired results. For example, freshman persistence to the second year is the best predictor of bachelor’s degree completion. A task force was assembled of campus representatives to consider how current outcomes could be improved. Campuses modified policies, programs, services, and budgets according to current research on what makes students persist. This is important in producing more graduates needed to support Oregon’s economy. The agency is achieving improvements in both freshman persistence and graduation rates (as well as other measures). This will lead to higher education services that are more efficient and effective. As we collect data for most of the measures on an annual basis and there is often a lag time in producing data, we tend to use the results to set policy and budget directions for future years rather than using the results to manage on a day-to-day basis. Campuses are expected to develop systems for collecting and monitoring data at the program and activity level and align budgets and priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 What training has staff had in the use performance measurement?</strong></td>
<td>Campus-level training has occurred largely through the Inter-institutional Planning and Research Council (IPRC). Topics have included: projecting targets from current performance, benchmarking performance against peer groups, reviewing best practices, setting realistic but challenging targets, aligning targets with strategic directions, understanding the public’s demand for accountability, and developing processes for awarding incentives for improvement (funded only in the first year). We also have trained campus personnel on-site so they can train staff responsible for improving performance results. Current efforts emphasize the alignment of Oregon Benchmarks, DAS measures (29), OUS key performance indicators (12), campus measures, and Board goals, simplifying reporting conventions for clarify and working across sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 How does the agency communicate performance results and for what purpose?</strong></td>
<td>We have made formal annual reports to the Board of Higher Education, Legislature, and press (since 1998) based on agency performance and individual campus performance. The purposes are to (1) describe how well we are achieving the four broad goals, (2) identify risk factors to making improvements, (3) set budget priorities, (4) provide information to stakeholders and the public, and (5) increase accountability to Oregon taxpayers. In compliance with state directives, OUS reports performance results through the Oregon Progress Board and the biennial agency budget request. We have focused on improving communication by greater transparency in our results. The web-based component, begun in 2001, was designed to provide information in a format and language that would be understandable to all readers. We post both trend data and improvement targets for the 12 KPIs and 29 agency measures. We are in the process of revising the Accountability link on the OUS website, but performance results are still available at: <a href="http://www.ous.edu/mp_home.htm">http://www.ous.edu/mp_home.htm</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 What important performance management changes have occurred in the past year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name: Oregon University System</th>
<th>Agency No.: 580</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The following questions shed light on how well performance measures and performance data are leveraged within your agency for process improvement and results-based management.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 has been a year of change for the Oregon University System. January saw the installation of a new State Board of Higher Education, appointed by Governor Kulongoski to revitalize higher education in the state through structural changes in the Chancellor’s Office and the development of targeted strategies in the key areas of affordability, access and completion, academic excellence, and economic development. As a first step, the Board undertook a large-scale reorganization of the Chancellor’s Office resulting in new leadership, staff reductions, the establishment of a Provosts’ Council to oversee academic programs and related issues, and a restructuring of performance management within the agency. The work of the Board and the Governor on strategic initiatives for higher education has brought performance management to the fore. Outcomes and performance reporting have shaped the discussion of policy and procedures within Board working groups, the Provosts’ Council, and the Chancellor’s Office. This year, agency staff at the system and campus level became more familiar with, and more involved in, coordinated performance measurement efforts. OUS has committed to conducting, over the next two years, a comprehensive review of performance indicators, with a focus on better alignment of Board-approved measures with the DAS links to Oregon Benchmarks, development or revision of indicators that tie more closely to current Board initiatives, emphasis on outcome measures, reduction of the total number of indicators in order to focus on the most critical, and connections between campus-generated performance measures and Board and state level measures. The guiding principle of this review is to assure that what is measured reflects what is valued. Additionally, OUS staff is collaborating with staff from the Oregon Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development to identify common measures to enhance the assessment of statewide performance across postsecondary sectors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT- PART II, KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS
TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)

Agency Name: Oregon University System
Agency No.: 580

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 1a – Percent of undergraduates receiving federal Pell grant awards. (DEVELOPMENTAL)</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 1b – State and federal assistance to undergraduates as a percent of undergraduate tuition &amp; fees and total cost. (DEVELOPMENTAL)</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Developing data and sources.

Key Performance Measure Analysis

To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?
Goal 1.1 Access: Affordability

What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?
OBM 24, 26a, 26b: Data from the Oregon Population Survey indicate that, in 2002, a greater percentage of Oregonians had attended college and had completed degrees at all levels than ten years earlier. Oregon’s public universities represent the best opportunity for Oregon residents to obtain a college degree; ensuring affordable access is a critical early step.
OBM 11: Per capita income in Oregon declined from 96% of the U.S. average in 1995 to 93% in 2002. National and state studies confirm the correlation between educational attainment and higher earnings.

How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?
Measures of access for low-income Oregonians were modified in 2003 to address legislative priorities and directives. Existing data sources, however, failed to provide reliable quantitative results for the measures as written. Further discussions were held to refine the way OUS measures affordability. Emphasis was on effectively representing threats to access, availability of reliable data, and unambiguous direction for goal setting. OUS has submitted a request to replace these measures with the following:
# 1a – Cost of attendance for a resident undergraduate (tuition & fees, room & board, other expenses) as a percent of Oregon median family income, and
# 1b – Percent of need met by financial aid for resident undergraduate Pell grant recipients: a: all financial aid and b: financial aid excluding loans.
Efforts are underway to develop reliable data for these revised measures. Even without specific performance data, however, we know that tuition costs have skyrocketed in recent years relative to funding for federal (Pell Grant) and state (Oregon Opportunity Grant) aid and family incomes in the state.

Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.
Performance data and targets for modified measures as proposed are being developed.
Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.
Performance data and relevant comparators for the modified measures as proposed are being developed.

What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?
OUS administers a $12 million GEAR-UP grant to assist low-income students prepare for college.

What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?
Affordability is a critical component of access for all qualified Oregonians to higher education. Shutting out low- and middle-income students from college will have long-term consequences for the state – reducing life opportunities for a significant segment of the population, and slowing Oregon’s progress in meeting workforce needs and economic development goals. OUS is working with campus financial aid offices, the Oregon Student Assistance Commission (OSAC), and national data agencies to identify, collect, and aggregate meaningful and reliable data for measuring agency performance.
**ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT- PART II, KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS**

**TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)**

**Agency Name: Oregon University System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 2 – Number and percent of students who are students of color</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>10,750</td>
<td>11,350</td>
<td>12,377</td>
<td>13,371</td>
<td>14,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>8,441</td>
<td>8,818</td>
<td>9,446</td>
<td>10,068</td>
<td>10,543</td>
<td>Dec 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: OUS Institutional Research Services, fall fourth-week enrollment reports*

**Key Performance Measure Analysis**

**To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?**

Goal 1.2 Access: Diversity

**What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?**

OBM 24, 26a, 26b: Data from the Oregon Population Survey indicate that, in 2002, a greater percentage of Oregonians had attended college and had completed degrees at all levels than ten years earlier. Oregon’s public universities represent the best opportunity for Oregon residents to obtain a college degree; ensuring access is a critical early step.

OBM 11: Per capita income in Oregon declined from 96% of the U.S. average in 1995 to 93% in 2002. National and state studies confirm the correlation between educational attainment and higher earnings.

**How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?**

With a bachelor’s degree required for many higher-wage, entry-level jobs, it is imperative that all qualified Oregonians have access to public higher education. Enrollment and degree completion by students of color ensure future employment opportunities and a representative workforce. Additionally, racial/ethnic diversity enriches the educational experience of all students. OUS strives to enhance representation, inclusion, engagement, and success of people of color in higher education. Increasing numbers and proportional representation of students of color demonstrate access and enrollment support for these students at Oregon’s public universities.

**Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.**

OUS performance with regard to diversity enrollment has exceeded the targets established. Targets through 2007 are designed to reflect the increasing proportion of students of color among Oregon’s high school graduate and college-age populations, and to continue challenging OUS universities to provide opportunities and support.

**Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.**

In fall 2003, students of color represented 15.3% of all OUS first-time freshmen enrollment, compared to 16% of Oregon’s public high school completers in 2002-03.
What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?
Examples of initiatives in this area include: campus-wide diversity councils; enhanced participation of faculty, staff, and students of color throughout the institutions; incorporation of diversity considerations into the curriculum; and institutionally sponsored events that enhance the learning environment.

What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?
Although OUS has made clear and consistent strides in creating a diverse educational environment, there are still opportunities to improve the effort. Enhanced research relating to diversity in the campus and community environments should continue to be encouraged and supported. Current K-16 data systems fail to capture the enrollment patterns of students through the educational pipeline. As Oregon moves toward a system of enhanced K-16 data alignment, racial/ethnic diversity should be included to help guide related policy decisions. Comprehensive K-16 statewide and institutional educational initiatives should appropriately incorporate diversity considerations. As OUS looks forward to continuing to provide opportunities for representation, inclusion, engagement and successes for all OUS populations, consistent monitoring and flexibility within diversity initiatives becomes increasingly important.
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT- PART II, KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS

TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)

### Agency Name: Oregon University System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 3 - Number of entering first-time, full-time freshmen</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>10,365</td>
<td>9,847</td>
<td>10,076</td>
<td>10,517</td>
<td>11,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>8,990</td>
<td>9,211</td>
<td>10,074</td>
<td>10,365</td>
<td>9,861</td>
<td>Dec 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source:** OUS Institutional Research Services, fall fourth-week enrollment reports

### Key Performance Measure Analysis

**To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?**

Goal 1.3 Access: Entering freshmen

**What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?**

OBM 24, 26a, 26b: Data from the Oregon Population Survey indicate that, in 2002, a greater percentage of Oregonians had attended college and had completed degrees at all levels than ten years earlier. Oregon’s public universities represent the best opportunity for Oregon residents to obtain a college degree; ensuring access is a critical early step.

OBM 11: Per capita income in Oregon declined from 96% of the U.S. average in 1995 to 93% in 2002. National and state studies confirm the correlation between educational attainment and higher earnings.

**How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?**

Oregon’s public universities strive to meet the demands for access to higher education from new high school graduates. Enrollment of first-time freshmen increased 15.3% between 1999 and 2002. A coding change in 2003 resulted in a significant number of undergraduates entering with college credit being counted as transfer students rather than first-time freshmen. This change accounts for half of the drop in first-time freshmen enrollment that year. Much of the remainder is likely the result of a smaller public high school graduating class, though higher tuition rates and an unstable economy may also have contributed.

**Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.**

Enrollment rates for first-time, full-time freshmen met targets through 2002, falling slightly short in 2003 for the reasons cited above.

**Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.**

While there are no national norms for this measure, efforts are underway to identify appropriate standards or comparators.
What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?

OUS is strengthening efforts to communicate the importance of a college education for personal fulfillment, for Oregon’s workforce, and for securing a family-wage job. Grants administered by OUS through the GEAR-UP and PASS projects seek to align high school preparation and expectation with requirements for college enrollment and success. Additionally, OUS conducts a survey every other year to understand the behaviors and choices of Oregon’s high school graduates in order to monitor in-coming students’ needs and perceptions.

What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?

K-12 is increasing standards and improving outcomes for Oregon high school students, suggesting demand for postsecondary education will be greater. The increase of tuition and fees and the low levels of need-based state grant assistance will pose significant access barriers to low- and middle-income students. OUS will continue to monitor applications, acceptances, enrollment from all sources, and the participation rate of Oregon high school graduates in state public universities.
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT- PART II, KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS
TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)

Key Performance Measure (KPM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># 4 – Number of students who are new Oregon community college transfers</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>3,410</td>
<td>3,972</td>
<td>4,041</td>
<td>4,149</td>
<td>4,330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>2,667</td>
<td>2,763</td>
<td>3,119</td>
<td>3,408</td>
<td>3,727</td>
<td>Dec 2004</td>
<td>4,149</td>
<td>4,330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: OUS Institutional Research Services, fall fourth-week enrollment reports

Key Performance Measure Analysis

To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?
Goal 1.4 Access: Oregon community college transfers

What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?

OBM 24, 26a, 26b: Data from the Oregon Population Survey indicate that, in 2002, a greater percentage of Oregonians had attended college and had completed degrees at all levels than ten years earlier. Oregon’s public universities represent the best opportunity for Oregon residents to obtain a college degree; ensuring access is a critical early step.

OBM 11: Per capita income in Oregon declined from 96% of the U.S. average in 1995 to 93% in 2002. National and state studies confirm the correlation between educational attainment and higher earnings.

How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?
Transfer data reflect the responsiveness of OUS to changing patterns of college attendance and improved collaboration between higher education sectors in the state.

From the biennial survey conducted by OUS, we know that, among Oregon’s 2003 high school graduating class, 36.5% now attending an Oregon community college have definite plans to transfer to OUS, and an additional 34% believe they will probably transfer. Over the past five years, Oregon has shown considerable progress year-to-year in the number of Oregon community college students admitted into the public universities.

Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.
OUS institutions have met or exceeded targets for the enrollment of Oregon community college transfers. Future targets assume further cross-sector efforts to facilitate this transfer transition.

Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.
While there are no national norms for this measure, efforts are underway to identify appropriate standards or comparators.
What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?

The Joint Boards Articulation Commission, a partnership of the Board of Higher Education and the Board of Education, meets regularly to discuss and develop policy recommendations in the areas of articulation and transfer. The Articulation and Transfer Conference, co-sponsored this year by OUS and Oregon Community Colleges and Workforce Development (CCWD), provides a forum for 250 counselors, advisors, and administrators from community colleges and four-year institutions to resolve issues at the point of contact with students in transfer and articulation. OUS supports efforts to develop and enhance dual admission programs between OUS campuses and community colleges in their regions to streamline the transfer process for students.

The Excellence in Delivery and Productivity Working Group of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education is working to develop opportunities and program changes that will directly contribute to improvements in this area. Dual enrollment agreements between OUS and community colleges are being created to enable students to reduce higher education expenses while maintaining a successful path to graduation. The working group is also exploring a statewide common education core that is accepted for transfer by all Oregon public two- and four-year colleges and universities. This type of common core would enable more efficient student progress towards a bachelor’s degree and improve graduation rates for all post-secondary institutions.

What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?

We need to learn more about the impact of postsecondary capacity in Oregon on student attendance patterns between postsecondary sectors and further develop, as a state, our understanding of student attendance patterns.
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT- PART II, KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS
TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)

Agency Name: Oregon University System
Agency No.: 580

### # 5 – Number of undergraduates enrolled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>62,500</td>
<td>63,150</td>
<td>66,102</td>
<td>66,848</td>
<td>68,222</td>
<td>70,375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>64,516</td>
<td>Dec 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: OUS Institutional Research Services, fall fourth-week enrollment reports

### Key Performance Measure Analysis

**To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?**

Goal 1 Access

**What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?**

OMB 24, 26a, 26b: Data from the Oregon Population Survey indicate that, in 2002, a greater percentage of Oregonians had attended college and had completed degrees at all levels than ten years earlier. Oregon’s public universities represent the best opportunity for Oregon residents to obtain a college degree; ensuring access is a critical early step.

OMB 11: Per capita income in Oregon declined from 96% of the U.S. average in 1995 to 93% in 2002. National and state studies confirm the correlation between educational attainment and higher earnings.

**How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?**

Increased undergraduate enrollment reflects the importance of a bachelor’s degree for entry-level jobs in a knowledge economy. Between 1999 and 2003, the number of students enrolled as undergraduates grew almost 20%.

**Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.**

For the past four years, undergraduate enrollment at Oregon public universities has more than met established targets.

**Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.**

While there are no national norms for this measure, efforts are underway to identify appropriate standards or comparators.

**What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?**

Enrollment Watch, a link on the OUS website (http://www.ous.edu/ew_home.htm), was created to maintain a transparent monitor of student enrollment at the seven universities and at campus centers. Enrollment Watch helps to identify factors, such as rising tuition, that challenge a students’ ability to access and afford a college education in Oregon. The Legislature, campuses, and the public have access to this site.
What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?

Increasing demand for public higher education and shrinking state revenues have created serious challenges to institutional capacity. OUS reviews admission requirements annually and many institutions are raising admission standards to manage enrollment. As admission standards and tuition and fees rise, students may choose to avoid post-secondary education or attend sporadically, increasing their time to degree completion. The Oregon State Board of Higher Education is dedicated to addressing these challenges. Several Board working groups have been established to develop and implement policies to promote increased access and cost-effectiveness while capitalizing on existing strengths within OUS institutions.
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT - PART II, KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS
TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)

Agency Name: Oregon University System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 6 – Number of advanced degree students enrolled in credit courses</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>13,440</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>14,960</td>
<td>16,176</td>
<td>16,523</td>
<td>16,950</td>
<td>17,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>13,441</td>
<td>13,455</td>
<td>13,995</td>
<td>14,959</td>
<td>15,042</td>
<td>Dec 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: OUS Institutional Research Services, fall fourth-week enrollment reports

**Key Performance Measure Analysis**

**To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?**

Goal 1 Access

*What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?*

OBM 24, 26a, 26b: Data from the Oregon Population Survey indicate that, in 2002, a greater percentage of Oregonians had attended college and had completed degrees at all levels than ten years earlier. Oregon’s public universities represent the best opportunity for Oregon residents to obtain a college degree; ensuring access is a critical early step.

OBM 11: Per capita income in Oregon declined from 96% of the U.S. average in 1995 to 93% in 2002. National and state studies confirm the correlation between educational attainment and higher earnings.

**How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?**

Advanced degree enrollment reflects the importance of a graduate or professional degree for jobs in a knowledge-based economy, as well as the reputation of Oregon’s public universities. Enrollment of students in advanced degree programs increased at OUS institutions by 12% between 1999 and 2003, amply meeting targeted enrollment for this group.

**Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.**

As noted above, OUS met and slightly exceeded enrollment of advanced degree students.

**Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.**

While there are no national norms for this measure, efforts are underway to identify appropriate standards or comparators.

**What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?**

The Academic Excellence/Economic Development (AEED) Working Group of the State Board of Higher Education is focused on the intersection of areas of excellence in our higher education institutions with existing or new economic forces driving business initiatives. Several areas of excellence identified as “opportunity areas” by the AEED...
Working Group are being researched to develop initiatives that enhance research strengths and build nationally and internationally competitive programs. Creating competitive research programs is one of the best ways to recruit advanced degree students and to help support Oregon businesses’ need for a highly trained workforce.

**What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?**

Many Oregon businesses are forced to recruit new talent from outside the state due to the limitations of OUS’ research programs. Supporting existing research strengths has a direct impact on Oregon’s economy and the success of OUS students. The AEED Working Group is working to support programs that respond to Oregon’s industry demands as well as support new company creation, an important indicator of economic vitality. OUS is serving in an advisory capacity to the Governor’s Workforce Investment Board.
**ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT- PART II, KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS**

**TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name: Oregon University System</th>
<th>Agency No.: 580</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</strong></td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 7 – Letter grade awarded to Oregon based on percent of 18- to 24-year olds who are enrolled in college full-time and percent of working adults enrolled part-time.</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REQUESTING DELETION**


**Key Performance Measure Analysis**

**To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?**

Goal 1 Access

**What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?**

OBM 24, 26a, 26b: Data from the Oregon Population Survey indicate that, in 2002, a greater percentage of Oregonians had attended college and had completed degrees at all levels than ten years earlier. Oregon’s public universities represent the best opportunity for Oregon residents to obtain a college degree; ensuring access is a critical early step.

**How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?**

When proposed in 2003, this measure was intended to provide a standard metric for access that would allow comparisons between states. Unfortunately, the Measuring Up letter grade is indexed to the highest performing states each survey year, so changes in Oregon’s score are dependent not only on Oregon’s performance, but that of other states. Additionally, the measure reports statewide, rather than agency, performance and the letter grade is based on factors in addition to those listed in this measure. The raw data on which the letter grade is based, however, indicate that, for the state as a whole, participation of 18- to 24-year olds has increased from 25% to 35% and part-time enrollment of working adults has gone up from 3.4% to 3.7% between the 2002 and 2004 surveys. Given the numerous problems associated with this data source, OUS proposes deleting this measure.

**Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.**

Oregon’s performance as reported in Measuring Up exceeded the stated target, but, as described above, the scoring methodology is inappropriate for tracking a state’s performance. Using the raw scores, however, the state as a whole improved performance in these measures of college participation.

**Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.**

In the 2004 Measuring Up study, Oregon is one of five states scoring a B- on participation, with 21 states scoring higher and 24 scoring lower.
What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?
OUU activities to increase undergraduate and graduate enrollment are described in the previous two measures.

What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?
OUU has proposed dropping this performance measure, though the concepts represented will be included in a system-wide review of performance and accountability reporting.
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TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name: Oregon University System</th>
<th>Agency No.: 580</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 8 – Average rating of overall quality of engineering/computer science graduates by Oregon employers (5-pt scale)</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUESTING DELETION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Source: OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Survey (one-time survey: discontinued)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Performance Measure Analysis

To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?
Goal 2.1 Quality: Satisfaction

What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?
Academic excellence is one of the fundamental goals of Oregon’s public universities and is critical to the success of OUS graduates and their contribution to Oregon’s economy. Additionally, public higher education is a major supplier of Oregon’s engineering and computer science workforce. Highly trained individuals are needed for job growth and Oregon’s economic recovery.

How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?
This measure, new in 2003, was designed to reveal how employers view the quality of OUS graduates, specifically in the fields of engineering and computer science, for which public higher education is a major workforce supplier. While the data demonstrate an acceptable level of employer satisfaction with the quality of OUS graduates, shortcomings in survey design, implementation methodology, and response rate render the results inconclusive. Discussions are underway with representatives of each OUS campus to identify options, issues, and costs associated with monitoring employer satisfaction.

Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.
This measure has only one data point, produced simultaneously to this measure’s addition. As a result, there are no corresponding targets. OUS has requested permission to delete this measure; hence, no future targets have been set.

Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.
There are no national standards against which to measure OUS performance on this measure.

What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?
State and private resources were targeted to increase the quality and quantity of graduates in engineering through the efforts of the Engineering and Technology Industry Council (ETIC). With these resources, campuses revised curricula, upgraded labs, and hired outstanding new faculty.

Quality of Engineering/Computer Science Graduates
(5-pt Scale)

REQUESTING DELETION

N/A N/A N/A

Data Source: OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Survey (one-time survey: discontinued)
**What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?**

Most surveys of employer satisfaction are done at the program level at a single university. Bearing in mind the cost implications, it is important to explore the feasibility of extending this kind of analysis to a broader array of disciplines and to the entire system of OUS institutions. OUS and campus representatives are participating in with colleagues nationwide to identify a practical survey methodology and appropriate attributes for the evaluation of broad-scale employer satisfaction. As we await the completion of this national study, we are continuing conversations to assess opportunities within the system.
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**TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 9 – Average rating of overall quality of experience by recent OUS bachelor’s graduates (5-pt scale)</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Survey of OUS Bachelor’s Graduates

### Key Performance Measure Analysis

#### To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?

Goal 2.1 Quality: Satisfaction

#### What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?

Academic excellence is one of the fundamental goals of Oregon’s public universities and is critical to the success of OUS graduates and their contribution to Oregon’s economy.

#### How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?

The performance measure reflects the perceptions held by recent OUS graduates regarding the overall quality of their educational experience, including their assessment of the university’s contribution to their development in key areas and preparation for employment or further education. Recent OUS graduates continue to express satisfaction with the overall quality of their educational experience, producing a mean rating of 4.0 on a 5-point scale in which 1 is “poor” and 5 is “excellent.”

#### Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.

Mean ratings of graduate satisfaction are on target with expectations. Future targets have been set to ensure that standards of quality remain high.

#### Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.

There are no national standards against which to measure OUS performance on this measure.

#### What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?

OUS conducts a survey of bachelor’s graduates every two years. In addition, individual OUS campuses survey graduates and enrolled students, using national-norm surveys of student satisfaction such as the National Survey of Student Engagement.
OUS institutions strive to create a supportive educational environment. Programs like the “freshman interest group” and other on-campus activities help students to create support networks that include other students, professors, and campus service representatives. Accessible academic advising and departmental support are other ways that campuses help to create a supportive educational experience for every student.

**What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?**

As Oregon’s public universities feel the impact of reduced state funding on tuition rates, availability and sufficiency of financial aid, faculty recruitment and retention, and student services, we must continue to monitor graduate satisfaction. The challenge is to identify in a timely manner where students are feeling the effects most severely. Similarly, it will be important to recognize and support those factors that most significantly improve academic quality. Efforts will continue to find means to integrate student and graduate evaluations.
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TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</th>
<th>Agency No.: 580</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 10 – Percent of recent OUS graduates who would choose the same OUS institution again</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUESTING DELETION</td>
<td>Biennial 83.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Survey of OUS Bachelor’s Graduates

Key Performance Measure Analysis

To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?
Goal 2.1 Quality: Satisfaction

What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?
Academic excellence is one of the fundamental goals of Oregon’s public universities and is critical to the success of OUS graduates and their contribution to Oregon’s economy.

How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?
Like the previous measure, this indicator was designed to reflect graduate satisfaction and perceptions regarding the level of quality at a given university. It was subsequently deemed by a panel of research specialists to be too vague and ambiguous to accurately capture student satisfaction and program quality. OUS has requested permission to delete this measure. With a single data point we are unable to demonstrate any progressive change, either positive or negative.

Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.
This measure has only one data point, produced simultaneously to this measure’s addition. As a result, there are no corresponding targets. OUS has requested permission to delete this measure; hence, no future targets have been set.

Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.
There are no national standards against which to measure OUS performance on this measure.

What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?
OUS institutions are constantly looking for ways to improve students’ experiences. Streamlined degree planning and increased career services are a couple of ways that campuses help students move more efficiently through their educational requirements and into the workforce successfully.
What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?
   Investigate alternative measures of quality and student satisfaction.
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**TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name: Oregon University System</th>
<th>Agency No.: 580</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 11- Total gifts from philanthropic sources – foundation net assets ($ in millions)</td>
<td><strong>1999</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>$767.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>$640.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: OUS Annual Financial Reports, Controller’s Office*

**Key Performance Measure Analysis**

**To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?**

Goal 2.1 Quality: Satisfaction

**What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?**

Academic excellence is one of the fundamental goals of Oregon’s public universities. Philanthropic support, while subject to economic fluctuations, reflects confidence and satisfaction on the part of alumni and other supporters.

**How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?**

Although factors such as the specific nature of individual gifts, investment returns, and current projects will affect a foundation’s net assets at any given time, an increase over time is a good indicator of external support. Gifts and donations to OUS universities increased steadily between 1999 and 2001, but have leveled off during the recent economic downturn. System wide, foundation net assets increased approximately $100 million (16%) between 1999 and 2003. Adjusted for inflation, the increase is $ 47.5 million or 7.4%.

**Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.**

This measure was new in 2003 and, as a result, has no targets for earlier years. Future targets assume steady growth in foundation assets through 2007.

**Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.**

While there are no national norms for this measure, efforts are underway to identify appropriate standards or comparators.

**What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?**

University Foundations receive, invest and distribute private gifts to fund student scholarships, academic programs, building improvements, and a host of other campus efforts. Each university works with its Foundation to set goals for fundraising. Foundation funds are usually designated for specific purposes and are intended to enhance or develop specific features of a campus program, not cover basic operating costs.
Currently there are several fundraising campaigns underway at OUS institutions. OSU has a technology campaign designed to support their goal of becoming a top-25 engineering school. PSU has just recently begun a $100 million comprehensive fundraising effort called the “Building Our Future” campaign. UO is also involved in a comprehensive campaign called “Campaign Oregon: Transforming Lives.” Their fundraising goal is $600 million.

*What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?*

- Given the current economic times, universities are focusing on reducing risk to this very important source of revenue.
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**TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name: Oregon University System</th>
<th>Agency No.: 580</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 12 – Ratio of students to full-time faculty</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: OUS Institutional Research Services; IPEDS*

**Key Performance Measure Analysis**

To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?

Goal 2.2 Quality: Student Success

What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?

Academic excellence is one of the fundamental goals of Oregon’s public universities. The ratio of students to full-time faculty is an indicator of instructional quality and student support, contributing to students’ ability to successfully meet their educational goals.

How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?

More than just a “workload” measure, the ratio of students to full-time faculty also reflects the extent to which faculty are able to provide student advising outside of the classroom, offer valuable but more time- and labor-intensive instructional formats (such as seminars, essay exams, or applied learning), and engage in research that advances important state and societal goals. While this ratio remained at 22 or 23 through the early and mid-1990s, it climbed to 24.5 in 1999-2000 and has continued to increase steadily since then (with just a slight drop in 2000-01), as enrollments grew without a commensurate increase in full-time faculty. One consequence of funding declines is that OUS institutions have tried to accommodate the growing enrollment during this period by hiring more temporary, part-time faculty. Beyond adding to the burden this places on the regular full-time faculty for student advising, having a larger share of temporary faculty may adversely affect the development of a strong community of scholars within a department and reduce opportunities for ongoing research collaborations.

Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.

This measure was new in 2003. Future targets call for a steady, but gradual, decline in the ratio of students to full-time faculty.

Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.

With the exception of the Oregon Institute of Technology, all OUS institutions have a higher ratio of students to full-time faculty than universities in other states that have been designated peer institutions. However, this metric does not take into account part-time faculty providing classroom instruction, which varies among OUS and peer institutions.
**What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?**
OUS has requested Legislative approval and funding to recruit and retain faculty. In addition, campuses are making greater use of online instruction to enhance faculty capacity.

**What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?**
Institutions are challenged to maintain a ratio that preserves instructional and program quality, while also deploying institutional resources in the most cost-effective way. The current balance signals a warning that quality may be threatened. OUS will continue monitoring student satisfaction.
**ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT- PART II, KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS**

**TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)**

### Agency Name: Oregon University System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 13 – Percent of full-time freshmen who demonstrate progress by returning for the second year</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>May 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: OUS Institutional Research Services, Retention, Attrition, and Graduation of OUS Freshmen reports, IPEDS Fall Cohorts*

### Key Performance Measure Analysis

**To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?**

Goal 2.2 Quality: Student Success

**What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?**

OBM 24, 26a, 26b: Data from the Oregon Population Survey indicate that, in 2002, a greater percentage of Oregonians had attended college and had completed degrees at all levels than ten years earlier. Oregon’s public universities represent the best opportunity for Oregon residents to obtain a college degree and freshman persistence remains one of the best predictors of degree completion.

**How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?**

Persistence to the second year is a critical first step in a student’s path to a degree. Campus efforts to support student retention and completion have shown success as the rate for second-year persistence has gradually increased since 1999 and has held steady at 80.3% for the past two years.

**Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.**

Since 2001, OUS performance has exceeded expectations. Targets through 2007 reflect an agency-wide focus on student retention and completion.

**Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.**

Oregon’s public universities demonstrate retention rates that are comparable to national averages for public universities in all states. Using data from 313 public universities, the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange reports 79.6% as the second-year retention rate for first-time freshmen cohorts entering from fall 1996 through fall 2002.

**What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?**

OUS institutions have encouraged the development of instructional programs to enhance learning outcomes and efforts to fortify student connections with peers, faculty, and campus life. Several campuses have put into place systems that monitor student progress and provide early warnings that students are not making progress (e.g., absences, completing work, earning passing grades) so that institutions can respond more quickly to student needs.
The Excellence in Delivery and Productivity (EDP) Working Group of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education has developed a series of action items designed to promote a more efficient educational delivery system and increase the number of students entering college and completing a degree. One initiative is to develop a high school accelerated curriculum menu so Oregon public high school students have the opportunity to enroll in more rigorous accelerated academic courses and earn college credits before college matriculation. This type of accelerated learning at the high school level helps student to enter college more prepared for success. This has proven to have a positive effect on freshmen retention rates.

**What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?**

Successful institutional action involves the assessment of needs and fine-tuning of programs to meet the specific needs of different student groups. Coordinated efforts with K-12 through PASS and GEAR-UP enhance student preparation for college. The EDP Working Group is currently investigating several options for increasing retention and graduation rates among OUS students. Gaining Board support for initiatives that are agreed to enhance these efforts will be important to future success.
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TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 14 – Percent of full-time freshmen starting and completing a bachelor’s degree at an OUS university (6-yr graduation rate)</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>May 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: OUS Institutional Research Services, Retention, Attrition, and Graduation of OUS Freshmen reports, IPEDS Fall Cohorts

Key Performance Measure Analysis

To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?
Goal 2.2 Quality: Student Success

What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?
OBM 24, 26a, 26b: Data from the Oregon Population Survey indicate that, in 2002, a greater percentage of Oregonians had attended college and had completed degrees at all levels than ten years earlier. Oregon’s public universities represent the best opportunity for Oregon residents to obtain a college degree, and providing opportunities for timely, successful completion is critical to that mission.

How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?
In addition to institution variables, such as course availability, degree completion is influenced by any number of student variables, such as financial ability to pay, personal and academic preparation, motivation and commitment, and family obligations. Many students choose full-time continuous enrollment while others, for personal or financial reasons, choose part-time enrollment and a slower track to graduation. After a jump in 1999, six-year graduation rates for students entering as freshmen and completing their degree at an OUS institution have remained relatively stable, hovering around 55%.

Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.
With the exception of 2002, six-year graduation rates have slightly exceeded targets. Targets through 2007 reflect an agency-wide focus on student retention and completion.

Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.
The OUS six-year graduation rate for students completing a degree at the same institution in which they enrolled (48.0% in 2002) is slightly below the national average for public four-year universities (51.8%).
**What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?**

OUS institutions are identifying predictors of success to be more efficient and effective. Student exit studies, designed to identify reasons for leaving, are implemented within some campuses or programs. A recently-established association with the National Student Clearinghouse should allow better tracking of student college enrollment and transfer patterns, providing a better understanding of the role of OUS institutions in student degree completion.

The EDP Working Group is researching several action items that are designed to help students complete their educational goals more efficiently. Dual enrollment agreements between OUS campuses and community colleges is one way that students can take advantage of more course offerings and reduced expenses as a result of lower tuition at community colleges. Another EDP initiative is a statewide common core curriculum. A common core would be accepted for transfer by all Oregon public two- and four-year colleges and universities and ease student movement between institutions without loss of credit.

**What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?**

OUS campuses will continue monitoring risk factors and identifying appropriate student support services, including assessment of different student populations. Collection and analysis of data from the National Student Clearinghouse should provide additional information on completion rates for students who have transferred to institutions outside the Oregon University System.
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT- PART II, KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS
TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)

Agency Name: Oregon University System
Agency No.: 580

Key Performance Measure (KPM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># 15 – Percent of Oregon community college transfers completing a bachelor’s degree at an OUS university</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: OUS Institutional Research Services, Transfer, Retention, and Graduation

Key Performance Measure Analysis

To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?
Goal 2.2 Quality: Student Success

What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?

OBM 24, 26a, 26b: Data from the Oregon Population Survey indicate that, in 2002, a greater percentage of Oregonians had attended college and had completed degrees at all levels than ten years earlier. Oregon’s public universities represent the best opportunity for Oregon residents to obtain a college degree, and providing opportunities for timely, successful completion for students arriving from all educational pathways is critical to that mission.

How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?
In addition to institutional and student influences on successful degree completion common to all OUS students, the graduation rate for Oregon community college transfers reflects the impact of this particular college pathway on student success. The graduation rate for students who transferred to OUS from an Oregon community college has climbed dramatically from 69.8% in 1999 to 76.1% in 2003.

Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.
OUS achievement on this measure topped the single established target. Targets through 2007 reflect an agency-wide focus on student retention and completion. Future targets assume continued improvement on this measure.

Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.
While there are no national norms for this measure, efforts are underway to identify appropriate standards or comparators.

What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?
Through the Joint Articulations Board, OUS and Oregon community colleges have worked to streamline general education requirements and eliminate policy and process barriers to college completion. The EDP Working Group is also looking closely at improving the relationship between community colleges and OUS institutions. Dual
enrollment agreements and improved core curriculums are a couple of ways that the EDP Working Group is hoping to improve the percent of Oregon community college transfers completing a bachelor’s degree.

**What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?**
As students become more mobile and attendance patterns more varied and complex, it is increasingly important to understand those enrollment patterns in order to identify and address barriers to transfer and subsequent academic achievement. In addition to participation in the National Student Clearinghouse, OUS is working with community colleges to develop more effective student data systems.
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT- PART II, KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS

TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)

Agency Name: Oregon University System
Agency No.: 580

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#16 – Total sponsored research &amp; development dollars supported by external fund sources ($ in millions)</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>201.0</td>
<td>202.0</td>
<td>235.0</td>
<td>$268.6</td>
<td>$284.0</td>
<td>$299.3</td>
<td>$314.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>$192.0</td>
<td>$203.1</td>
<td>$221.7</td>
<td>$238.4</td>
<td>$253.3</td>
<td>Dec 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: OUS Annual Financial Reports, Controller’s Office

Key Performance Measure Analysis

To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?
Goal 2 Quality

What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?

OBM 7b: Research and development expenditures in academia remained at about .3% of the Gross State Product during the 1990s, and are on a par with Washington and the U.S. average. External research funding is a measure of faculty quality and productivity, as well as faculty and institutional entrepreneurship and academic opportunities for students.

How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?

Knowledge creation, translation, and application are important components of faculty work that distinguish it from teaching in K-12 or community colleges. These dollars are awarded based on a competitive process and are related to the entrepreneurial capacity of an institution. This activity is critical to bringing new jobs to Oregon, developing marketable products and services, and enhancing Oregon’s competitiveness. Oregon’s public universities have in recent years been successful in attracting sponsored research dollars. Between FY 1999 and 2003, total sponsored research and development expenditures increased by $61 million – more than 32%. Adjusted for inflation, the increase is $43 million or 22%.

Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.

Actual performance on this measure has far outstripped agency targets in each successive year. Strong activity in this area is reflected in OUS targets through 2007.

Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.

While there are no national norms for this measure, efforts are underway to identify appropriate standards or comparators.

What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?
OUS is partnering with private and public entities under Oregon Council for Knowledge and Economic Development (OCKED) to increase research activity leading to technology transfer and product development.
One of the largest research efforts currently underway at OUS institutions is a “signature research center” called the Oregon Nanoscience and Microtechnologies Institute (ONAMI). ONAMI is a unique and exciting research effort not only because of the technology being explored but also because of the collaborative nature of the project. ONAMI is a partnership between OSU, PSU, UO and PNNL (Pacific Northwest National Laboratory). This type of collaborative research effort is a relatively new phenomenon in university research and is being rewarded with better access to federal and private funding.

What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?

Faculty quality is critical to success in the competitive grant arena. Universities attract productive researchers through competitive salary and lab start-up packages. “Raiding” of highly talented and respected senior faculty with funded research programs puts critical OUS programs at risk.
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TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)

Agency Name: Oregon University System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 17 – Sponsored research dollars per faculty at research/doctoral universities ($ in thousands)</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>$133.4</td>
<td>$139.0</td>
<td>$144.3</td>
<td>$149.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>$97.9</td>
<td>$105.0</td>
<td>$106.8</td>
<td>$113.4</td>
<td>$117.2</td>
<td>Dec 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: OUS Annual Financial Reports, Controller’s Office; OUS Institutional Research Services

Key Performance Measure Analysis

To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?
   Goal 2 Quality

What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?
   OBM 7b: Research and development expenditures in academia remained at about .3% of the Gross State Product during the 1990s, and is on a par with Washington and the U.S. average. External research funding is a measure of faculty quality and productivity, as well as faculty and institutional entrepreneurship and academic opportunities for students.

How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?
   This measure reflects the competitiveness of OUS faculty in attracting research grants from federal, private, and other sources. Average research dollars per faculty have increased steadily since 1999. On average, faculty members at OSU, PSU, and UO produce in research grants and contracts almost 200% of their annual salaries.

Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.
   Research dollars per faculty exceeded the single target previously established. Strong activity in this area is reflected in OUS targets through 2007. The large jump in 2004 results from a 7% drop in faculty between FY 2003 and 2004.

Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.
   While there are no national standards, OUS research institutions compare favorably to many larger public universities in other states when research funding is related to the number of faculty.

What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?
   OUS is partnering with private and public entities under the Oregon Council for Knowledge and Economic Development (OCKED) to increase research activity leading to technology transfer and product development. The AEED Working Group is in the process of inventorying OUS research strengths and researching opportunities to improve the universities’ contribution to Oregon’s economy. Identifying OUS research strengths is the first step to increasing opportunities for faculty members to gain critical funding.
support for research efforts. The AEED Working Group is also looking for opportunities to remove policy barriers that inhibit faculty’s ability to build research programs and compete for federal funding.

What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?

Faculty quality is critical to success in the competitive grant arena. Universities attract productive researchers through competitive salary and lab start-up packages. “Raiding” of highly talented and respected senior faculty with funded research programs puts critical OUS programs at risk.
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT—PART II, KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS
TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)

Key Performance Measure Analysis

To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?
Goal 3.1 State Economic Development: Technology Transfer

What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?

OBM 7b: Research and development expenditures in academia remained at about .3% of the Gross State Product during the 1990s, and is on a par with Washington and the U.S. average.
OBM 4: Oregon lost over 32,000 jobs between 2000 and 2002, falling from 1st to 49th among the states in employment growth. Technology transfer activity creates new products, services, and businesses leading to high paying jobs and sustained economic growth for Oregon.

How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?
Oregon’s public research universities have made remarkable progress in the area of inventions. Between 1999 and 2002, the number of inventions disclosed increased by 50%.

Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.
This measure was new in 2003 and, as a result, has no targets for earlier years. Future targets assume continued, incremental advancements.

Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.
While there are no national norms for this measure, efforts are underway to identify appropriate standards or comparators.

What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?
OUS campuses have successfully developed and nurtured research and discovery activities among faculty, establishing research centers and providing support for entrepreneurial activities. Capitalizing on existing research strengths and looking for opportunities to build new research programs is critical to success in this arena. The AEED Working Group is currently inventorying OUS research strengths and researching opportunities to support those programs through increased funding and/or removing policy barriers that inhibit a program’s ability to compete nationally.
What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?

For OUS to contribute, it needs to hire world-class researchers with commercialization expertise, provide competitive recruitment packages, and collaborate across institutions and with the private sector. The variable nature of research and discovery makes year-to-year tracking, with an assumption of a regular pattern of growth, problematic; conversations are underway to refine the metrics for this measure.
**ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT- PART II, KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS**

**TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name: Oregon University System</th>
<th>Agency No.: 580</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 19 – Number of U.S. patent applications per year</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUESTING DELETION</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: Association of University Technology Managers, Inc., AUTM Licensing Survey*

**Key Performance Measure Analysis**

**To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?**

Goal 3.1 State Economic Development: Technology Transfer

**What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?**

OBM 7b: Research and development expenditures in academia remained at about .3% of the Gross State Product during the 1990s, and is on a par with Washington and the U.S. average.

OBM 4: Oregon lost over 32,000 jobs between 2000 and 2002, falling from 1st to 49th among the states in employment growth. Technology transfer activity creates new products, services, and businesses leading to high paying jobs and sustained economic growth for Oregon.

**How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?**

OUS patent applications have fluctuated from year to year, ranging between 43 in 2000 and 35 in 2002. The variable nature of this activity makes year-to-year tracking problematic.

•

**Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.**

This measure was new in 2003 and, as a result, has no targets for earlier years.

**Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.**

There are no national standards against which to measure OUS performance on this measure.

**What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?**

The Higher Education Technology Transfer (HETT) fund was established in 2001 to support institutional patent activity. Although the fund remains underfunded, it was initially seeded with $75,000 from the Oregon Economic and Community Development Department. The Oregon Council for Knowledge and Economic Development (OCKED) 2003-2005 Biennium Plan addresses the need to fully fund the HETT fund and increase the ability to commercialize campus research. OCKED is currently conducting an inventory of the angel and venture investment and capital formation tools and policies in Oregon. This inventory, which includes the HETT fund, will help to identify strengths, weaknesses, and gaps in resources available to universities for patent activity.
What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?

To build competitive research programs, OUS needs to hire world-class researchers with commercialization expertise, provide competitive recruitment packages, and collaborate across institutions and with the private sector. Federal research funding often restricts universities from using grant funds for patent activities. This restriction forces universities to seek additional funding sources to take research inventions through the patent process. Creating a sustainable technology transfer fund is crucial to supporting campus research from concept to patent.
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TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name: Oregon University System</th>
<th>Agency No.: 580</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 20 – Number of U.S. patents granted per year</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUESTING DELETION</td>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Association of University Technology Managers, Inc., AUTM Licensing Survey

Key Performance Measure Analysis

To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?
  Goal 3.1 State Economic Development: Technology Transfer

What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?
  OBM 7b: Research and development expenditures in academia remained at about .3% of the Gross State Product during the 1990s, and is on a par with Washington and the U.S. average. OBM 4: Oregon lost over 32,000 jobs between 2000 and 2002, falling from 1st to 49th among the states in employment growth. Technology transfer activity creates new products, services, and businesses leading to high paying jobs and sustained economic growth for Oregon.

How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?
  Patent approvals granted to OUS institutions have ranged between 13 in 2000 and 7 in 2003. The patent approval process, already subject to the variable nature of patent applications described in the previous measure, is conducted and directed by the U.S. Patent Office. OUS and its institutions have no control over this process or schedule. The Oregon University System has submitted a request to drop this measure.

Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.
  This measure was new in 2003 and, as a result, has no targets for earlier years.

Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.
  There are no national standards against which to measure OUS performance on this measure.

What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?
  The Higher Education Technology Transfer (HETT) fund was established in 2001 to support institutional patent activity. Although the fund remains under funded, it was initially seeded with $75,000 from the Oregon Economic and Community Development Department. The Oregon Council for Knowledge and Economic Development (OCKED) 2003-2005 Biennium Plan addresses the need to fully fund the HETT fund and increase the ability to commercialize campus research. OCKED is currently...
conducting an inventory of the angel and venture investment and capital formation tools and policies in Oregon. This inventory, which includes the HETT fund, will help to identify strengths, weaknesses, and gaps in resources available to universities for patent activity.

What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?

To build competitive research programs, OUS needs to hire world-class researchers with commercialization expertise, provide competitive recruitment packages, and collaborate across institutions and with the private sector. Federal research funding often comes with stipulations that prevent universities from using grant funds for patent activities. This restriction forces universities to seek additional funding sources to take research inventions through the patent process. Creating a sustainable technology transfer fund is crucial to supporting campus research from concept to production.
Key Performance Measure Analysis

To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?

Goal 3.1 State Economic Development: Technology Transfer

What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?

OBM 7b: Research and development expenditures in academia remained at about .3% of the Gross State Product during the 1990s, and is on a par with Washington and the U.S. average.

OBM 4: Oregon lost over 32,000 jobs between 2000 and 2002, falling from 1st to 49th among the states in employment growth. Technology transfer activity creates new products, services, and businesses leading to high paying jobs and sustained economic growth for Oregon.

How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?

License income, like invention disclosures and patent applications, is expected to fluctuate from year-to-year. Overall, income from licenses compared to research expenditures increased 21% between 1999 and 2002, peaking in 2001. OUS research offices are expecting significant growth to be reported for FY 2003, with continued, steady progress thereafter.

Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.

This measure was new in 2003 and, as a result, has no targets for earlier years. Future targets assume continued, incremental advancements following the growth of FY 2003.

Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.

While there are no national norms for this measure, efforts are underway to identify appropriate standards or comparators.

What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?

License income from university inventions is one of the best ways to create sustainable research programs. Income earned by universities can be reinvested through distributions to faculty inventors, academic programs, and equipment.
What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?

To move an idea from concept to a licensable technology, university researchers are faced with a variety of challenges, both financial and procedural. The AEED Working Group is working with OUS campuses to identify and understand the potential barriers to a researcher's success. Understanding the challenges that university researchers face will help the Board to create policies that support their efforts and, where applicable, remove those that inhibit their progress.

The variable nature of research and discovery makes year-to-year tracking, with an assumption of a regular pattern of growth, problematic; conversations are underway to refine the metrics for this measure.
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT- PART II, KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS
TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)

Agency Name: Oregon University System
Agency No.: 580

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 22 – Number of start-up/ spin-off companies per year</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUESTING DELETION</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Requested Deletion**

**Key Performance Measure Analysis**

**To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?**

Goal 3.1 State Economic Development: Technology Transfer

**What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?**

OBM 7b: Research and development expenditures in academia remained at about .3% of the Gross State Product during the 1990s, and is on a par with Washington and the U.S. average.

OBM 4: Oregon lost over 32,000 jobs between 2000 and 2002, falling from 1st to 49th among the states in employment growth. Technology transfer activity creates new products, services, and businesses leading to high paying jobs and sustained economic growth for Oregon.

**How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?**

Based on AUTM survey data, OUS research universities were responsible for one or two start-up companies each year between 1999 and 2002. While the emergence of new companies springing from university research efforts is important to Oregon’s economic development, this measure, as written, fails to accurately describe this contribution. Apart from the likelihood of an inaccurate count in the first place, this measure fails to take into account the longevity of these entrepreneurial activities and, hence, their sustained economic impact. The Oregon University System has submitted a request to delete this measure.

**Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.**

This measure was new in 2003 and, as a result, has no targets for earlier years.

**Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.**

There are no national standards against which to measure OUS performance on this measure.

**What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?**

Technology transfer programs help to create start-up companies by licensing or selling university inventions to entrepreneurs willing to take that intellectual property to the next step. In Oregon, start-up companies are often viewed as an untapped economic engine that is difficult to capitalize on because of the competition represented by existing, more...
established companies from outside the state. In 2002, Oregonians voted, via Measure 10, to allow universities to hold and dispose of stock in technologies developed through their research activities. This measure allows often cash-strapped start-up companies to trade stock in their company for access to university technology.

**What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?**

OUS research offices will continue to explore opportunities for translating university research and development into commercially viable entrepreneurial enterprises.
**ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT- PART II, KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS**

**TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name: Oregon University System</th>
<th>Agency No.: 580</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</strong></td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 23 – Percent of bachelor’s graduates completing an OUS-approved internship</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>50.0% Biennial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Survey of OUS Bachelor’s Graduates*

**Key Performance Measure Analysis**

**To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?**

Goal 3.2 State Economic Development: Employability of Graduates

**What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?**

Employability of graduates, as a mark of academic excellence and a contribution to the state’s workforce, has long been a primary goal of higher education in Oregon. Formal internship experiences add value for the graduate and employer through increased workplace readiness.

**How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?**

About half of 2003 OUS bachelor’s degree recipients participated in internships or related experiential learning, approximately the same proportion we saw in 1999. The unusually high figure reported in 2001 is likely a result of a slightly different question format in that year’s survey.

**Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.**

Expectations for the Class of 2003 were based on survey data from 2001, which was inconsistent with previous and subsequent studies. As a result, internship participation for this most recently surveyed class fell short of the target.

**Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.**

While there are no national norms for this measure, efforts are underway to identify appropriate standards or comparators.

**What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?**

OUS has worked with university and business leaders in the state to identify the attributes that make an internship experience valuable to both the student and future employer. Experiential learning is practiced in all OUS institutions. Whether it’s a traditional internship, international experience, or community service events, students are challenged to put their classroom experiences to work in a real world context.
What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?

The very success of OUS institutions in conveying the importance of experiential learning and encouraging integration into instructional programs also contributes to the difficulty experienced in trying to collect reliable data. Attempts to collect and tabulate internship participation in electronic student records have shown variable success as academic programs develop multiple avenues for such opportunities, many of which are embedded into existing classroom curricula. As each university and major program tailors their experiential learning programs to the needs of their students, common definitions and titles cease to reflect the full scope of opportunities and participation. Conversations will continue among campus leaders and records management on ways to accurately identify and tabulate this important contributor to student learning and graduate employability.
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TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)

Agency Name: Oregon University System
Agency No.: 580

Key Performance Measure (KPM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># 24 – Total number of bachelor’s degrees granted</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,571</td>
<td>9,972</td>
<td>9,590</td>
<td>9,929</td>
<td>11,063</td>
<td>Nov 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: OUS Institutional Research Services; IPEDS

Key Performance Measure Analysis

To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?
Goal 2.2 Quality: Student Success
Goal 3.2 State Economic Development: Employability of Graduates

What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?

OBM 24, 26a, 26b: Data from the Oregon Population Survey indicate that, in 2002, a greater percentage of Oregonians had attended college and had completed degrees at all levels than ten years earlier. Oregon’s public universities represent the best opportunity for Oregon residents to obtain a college degree.

OBM 11: Per capita income in Oregon declined from 96% of the U.S. average in 1995 to 93% in 2002. National and state studies confirm the correlation between educational attainment and higher earnings.

How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?
Following several years of relatively steady production of bachelor’s degrees, performance on this measure grew by over 1,100 in 2003, an 11% increase over the previous year. This dramatic increase may reflect the infusion of state resources in 1999-00 that permitted greater access and enrollment than had been possible before.

Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.
Bachelor’s degree production was on-target until 2003 when it significantly exceeded established goals. Future targets for degree production are founded on continuing efforts to improve student retention and timely completion.

Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.
While there are no national norms for this measure, efforts are underway to identify appropriate standards or comparators.
What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?

OUS universities are focusing on increasing the proportion of students who complete their degree program in a timely fashion. Partnerships with Oregon’s community colleges and high schools emphasize setting standards for college admissions, providing opportunities for students to co-enroll, and awarding credit for required courses based on demonstrated proficiencies.

What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?

Degree production depends on qualified students entering the university, obtaining the classes they need to complete their degrees, and successfully progressing through their academic programs. To achieve degree completion, OUS must monitor access and affordability, persistence and completion rates, and class and faculty capacity, including the ratio of students to full-time faculty.
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT- PART II, KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS
TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)

Agency Name: Oregon University System
Agency No.: 580

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 25 – Total number of advanced degrees granted (master’s, doctoral, and professional)</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>3,560</td>
<td>3,560</td>
<td>3,625</td>
<td>4,143</td>
<td>4,384</td>
<td>4,529</td>
<td>4,674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>3,269</td>
<td>3,620</td>
<td>3,560</td>
<td>3,622</td>
<td>4,049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: OUS Institutional Research Services; IPEDS

Key Performance Measure Analysis

To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?
Goal 2.2 Quality: Student Success
Goal 3.2 State Economic Development: Employability of Graduates

What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?
OBM 24, 26a, 26b: Data from the Oregon Population Survey indicate that, in 2002, a greater percentage of Oregonians had attended college and had completed degrees at all levels than ten years earlier. Oregon’s public universities represent the best opportunity for Oregon residents to obtain a college degree.
OBM 11: Per capita income in Oregon declined from 96% of the U.S. average in 1995 to 93% in 2002. National and state studies confirm the correlation between educational attainment and higher earnings.

How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?
As with bachelor’s degrees, production of advanced degrees showed a significant increase in 2003 (427 degrees or almost 12%). Again, this may be the result of additional state resources allocated in 1999-00. Advanced degrees represent approximately 27% of total degree production.

Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.
Advanced degree production was on-target until 2003 when it significantly exceeded established goals. Future targets for degree production are founded on continuing efforts to improve student retention and timely completion.

Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.
While there are no national norms for this measure, efforts are underway to identify appropriate standards or comparators.
What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?
OUS has approved new advanced degree programs in response to Oregon’s workforce needs. Advanced degree programs in selected fields like healthcare, engineering, and computer science are essential to build research and development capacity for Oregon’s industries and universities. The State Board of Higher Education’s Academic Excellence/Economic Development (AEED) Working Group is working with OUS institutions, Oregon communities, and private industries to identify state needs for professionals with advanced skills and credentials.

What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?
Through AEED and other university-industry partnerships, we will identify means to provide talent for existing and emerging industry clusters to increase Oregon’s competitiveness.
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT- PART II, KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS
TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)

Agency Name: Oregon University System
Agency No.: 580

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 26 – Total number of degrees granted in engineering and computer sciences</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>Nov 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: OUS Institutional Research Services; IPEDS

Key Performance Measure Analysis

To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?
Goal 3.2 State Economic Development: Employability of Graduates

What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?
OBM 24, 26a, 26b: Data from the Oregon Population Survey indicate that, in 2002, a greater percentage of Oregonians had attended college and had completed degrees at all levels than ten years earlier. Oregon’s public universities represent the best opportunity for Oregon residents to obtain a college degree. Graduates with degrees in high demand or shortage areas enhance Oregon’s ability to meet the workforce demands of the 21st century.

OBM 11: Per capita income in Oregon declined from 96% of the U.S. average in 1995 to 93% in 2002. National and state studies confirm the correlation between educational attainment and higher earnings.

How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?
The number of engineering and computer science degrees granted by OUS institutions increased 23% between 1999 and 2003. Enrollments are also up during this period, promising more degree production in the next few years. It is unclear at this point what effect recent news and activities in Oregon’s high technology job market will have on enrollments.

Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.
Degree production in engineering and computer science has consistently exceeded targets.

Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.
While there are no national norms for this measure, efforts are underway to identify appropriate standards or comparators.
What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?

Oregon’s investment strategy included the creation of a new advisory group, the Engineering and Technology Industry Council (ETIC), to administer the engineering investments to build Oregon’s capacity to educate and train engineers. A 1997 initiative was based on a public-private partnership designed to significantly improve engineering and computer science education in Oregon. Over the past five years, the commitment of $60 million from public resources has attracted additional investments from private sources to invest in this direction.

What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?

Building on these achievements, the Oregon University System is submitting to the 2005-07 Legislative Assembly a proposal to support the Governor’s initiatives for engineering and technology investment to enhance quality academic programs, provide access, and manage for cost effectiveness.
## ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT- PART II, KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS

**TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)**

### Key Performance Measure Analysis

#### To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?
- Goal 2.2 Quality: Student Success
- Goal 3.2 State Economic Development: Employability of Graduates

#### What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?

Academic excellence and preparation of graduates for future goals are fundamental missions of Oregon’s universities.

#### How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?

While OUS graduates have been generally successful in obtaining employment or acceptance to graduate degree programs, the recent economic downturn in Oregon has had a negative impact. It should be noted that this measure represents only OUS graduates who are employed, continuing their education, or both. The balance includes not only graduates who are unemployed and seeking work, but individuals who are not participating in the workforce by choice – because they are retired, disabled, traveling, volunteering, working in the home, or pursuing other interests. The proportion of graduates who were actively, but unsuccessfully, seeking work rose from 4% of the Class of 2001 to 6% for the Class of 2003, lower than the state unemployment rate in both cases, demonstrating the value of a college degree during a depressed job market. Between January and December of 2001, Oregon’s unemployment rate soared from 4.8% to 7.9% and has remained high, peaking at 8.7% in June and July of 2003, just as the majority of 2003 graduates were leaving college.

#### Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.

This measure was new in 2003 and, as a result, has no targets for earlier years. As the unemployment rate remains high at 7.3% in September 2004 and the job market depressed, future targets assume that graduates of the class of 2005 will also feel the effects of the extended recession.

#### Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.

While there are no national norms for this measure, efforts are underway to identify appropriate standards or comparators.
What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?

OUS institutions continuously invest in the development and effectiveness of student career services. Drawing on university/industry relationships, campuses strive to develop programs that train graduates to meet the needs of their respective industries. Career Service Centers offer many programs for students to gain an effective edge in their job search. Writing workshops designed to help students create an effective resume and on-campus job fairs are a couple of ways that Career Centers support university students in their transfer from campus to the workforce.

What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?

OUS will continue to evaluate success across the full spectrum of student experience – from access to timely progress to graduate placement. Further analysis may be needed to refine our understanding of student success in areas such as occupation type, preparation, and graduate success by region or other demographic factors.
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT - PART II, KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS
TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)

Agency Name: Oregon University System
Agency No.: 580

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 27b – Percent of employed graduates working in Oregon</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Survey of OUS Bachelor’s Graduates

Key Performance Measure Analysis

To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?
Goal 3.2 State Economic Development: Employability of Graduates

What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)?
What is the impact of your agency?
Academic excellence and preparation of graduates for future goals are fundamental missions of Oregon’s universities. OUS graduates fuel Oregon’s economic growth.

OBM 4: Oregon lost over 32,000 jobs between 2000 and 2002, falling from 1st to 49th among the states in employment growth.

OBM 11: Per capita income as a percent of U.S. per capita income: Overall, per capita income in Oregon dropped from 96% of the U.S. average in 1995 to 93% in 2002.

How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?
While approximately eight in ten graduates who are employed are working in Oregon, the Class of 2003 felt the effects of the recent economic downturn, with slightly more finding employment outside the state.

Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.
This measure was new in 2003 and, as a result, has no targets for earlier years.

Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.
While there are no national norms for this measure, efforts are underway to identify appropriate standards or comparators.

What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?
OUS campuses work directly with Oregon companies to help ensure that the curriculum is in line with industry practices and future needs. This type of responsive degree planning helps to produce OUS graduates that transition effectively between their educational and professional careers. Campus Career Centers also represent a valuable link between OUS graduates and Oregon industry. Promoting recruiting efforts by Oregon industries on OUS campuses, Career Centers strive to increase the number of graduates that find work in Oregon.

Agency Name: Oregon University System
**What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?**

Additional analysis should explore whether OUS graduates are finding employment in the existing and emerging industry clusters identified as critical to Oregon’s workforce development strategy.
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Agency Name: Oregon University System     Page 64

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Measure (KPM)</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 28 – External funds generated per state dollar invested in Statewide Public Services (DEVELOPMENTAL)</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Developmental

Key Performance Measure Analysis

To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?

Goal 3 State Economic Development

What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?

Along with instruction, public service and research have long been the cornerstones of public higher education. Citizens across the state rely on extension and research services for assistance in addressing local needs related to natural and cultivated resources and family and community development.

How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?

Efforts are underway to develop meaningful and reliable data for this measure. Currently, none are reported, pending further analysis. This report will be amended as data become available.

Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.

This measure, including performance data and targets, remains developmental at this time

Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.

Performance data and relevant comparators are being developed.

What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?

The Agricultural Experiment Station (AES) and Forest Research Laboratory (FRL) include a significant component of faculty research activities that are integrated with outreach activities. The Extension Service faculty provides outreach and social service to the citizens of Oregon. An example is the 4-H program that encourages learning, social awareness, work ethics, responsibility, and a desire to pursue further educational opportunities. OUS statewide programs serve over one million Oregon citizens annually.

What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?

As this measure is refined and performance data assessed, future activities will be identified.
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**TIME PERIOD: FISCAL YEAR 2003 – 2004 (Previously reported as 2004-2005)**

**Agency Name: Oregon University System**

### Key Performance Measure (KPM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># 29 – Revenues per FTE student as a percent of average revenues per FTE student at peer universities (100% = peer average revenues per FTE student)</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: OUS Office of the Budget; OUS Institutional Research Services*

### Key Performance Measure Analysis

**To what goal(s) is this performance measure linked?**

Goal 4 Cost Effectiveness

**What do benchmark (or other high-level outcome) data say about Oregon relative to the goal(s)? What is the impact of your agency?**

The Oregon University System strives for effective and efficient stewardship of public resources.

**How does the performance measure demonstrate agency progress toward the goal?**

Proposed in 2003, this measure was intended to monitor the cost-effective use of resources throughout the system. As a revenue metric, however, it fails to address the distribution and use of this income, and, as such, does not reflect the goal of cost effectiveness. OUS is requesting permission to retain the goal, but develop an alternative metric for performance assessment.

**Compare actual performance to target and explain any variance.**

While the measure does not address the stated goal, we can comment on the measure itself. Performance data for this measure indicate that Oregon’s total revenues per FTE student have declined in relation to peer universities in other states as a result of a significant drop in state revenues compared to enrollment. Any progress toward the targets would come at the expense of affordable access as tuition revenues are used to close the gap.

**Summarize how actual performance compares to any relevant public or private industry standards.**

This measure has a comparative component built into the metric.

**What is an example of a department activity related to the measure?**

OUS is managing enrollment to fiscal capacity.
What needs to be done as a result of this analysis?
As OUS undertakes a comprehensive review of its accountability and performance management efforts, the goal of cost effectiveness will be evaluated and alternative measures proposed.