## 2007-09 Key Performance Measures (KPMs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPM #</th>
<th>KPM Description</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>COST AS A PERCENT OF INCOME</strong> – Cost of attendance at OUS for a resident undergraduate (tuition &amp; fees, room &amp; board, other expenses) as a percent of Oregon median family income.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>COST COVERED BY AID</strong> – Percent of total cost of attendance at OUS covered by federal and state need-based aid for resident undergraduate financial aid recipients: a) Financial aid including loans, b) Financial aid excluding loans.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN</strong> – Number of entering first-time freshman</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS</strong> – Number of students who are new Oregon community college transfers</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>ENGINEERING EMPLOYER SATISFACTION</strong> – Average rating of overall quality of engineering/computer science graduates by Oregon employers (5-pt scale)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>GRADUATE SATISFACTION</strong> – Average rating of overall quality of experience by recent OUS bachelor’s graduates (5-pt scale)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>PHILANTHROPY</strong> – Total gifts from philanthropic sources ($ in millions) a) Total, b) Capital projects, c) Faculty support (including chairs), d) Scholarships, e) Other</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>STUDENT/FACULTY RATIO</strong> – Ratio of students to full-time faculty</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Persistence</strong> – Percent of full-time freshmen who demonstrate progress by returning for the second year</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>Completion</strong> – Percent of full-time freshmen starting and completing a bachelor’s degree at an OUS university (6-year graduation rate)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>Transfer Student Completion</strong> – Percent of transfer students entering with 90-134 credits who complete a bachelor’s degree at an OUS university (4-year graduation rate)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>Sponsored Research</strong> – Total sponsored research and development dollars supported by external fund sources ($ in millions) a) Total, b) Federal sources, c) Private sources</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>Research Dollars per Faculty</strong> – Sponsored research dollars per faculty at research/doctoral universities – OSU, PSU, UO ($ in thousands)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>Inventions</strong> – Number of inventions disclosed per year</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><strong>License Income</strong> – License income per $100M research expenditures per year</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>Start-up Companies</strong> – The number of start-up/spin-off companies per $100M research expenditures per year</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>Internships</strong> – Percent of bachelor’s graduates completing an OUS-approved internship</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><strong>Bachelor’s Degrees</strong> – Total number of bachelor’s degrees granted</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><strong>Advanced Degrees</strong> – Total number of advanced degrees granted (master’s, doctoral, and professional)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>Engineering and Computer Science Degrees</strong> – Total number of degrees granted in engineering and computer sciences (all levels; includes multiple majors)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRADUATE SUCCESS</strong> – Percent of graduates employed and/or continuing education</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPLOYED IN OREGON</strong> – Percent of employed graduates working in Oregon</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATEWIDE PUBLIC SERVICES EXTERNAL FUNDS</strong> – External funds generated per state dollar invested in Statewide Public Services (SWPS)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRESHMAN PARTICIPATION</strong> – Oregon freshman participation rate in OUS institutions</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIME TO DEGREE</strong> – Average time to degree for students entering as full-time freshmen (years)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSFER STUDENT TIME TO DEGREE</strong> – Average time to degree for transfer students entering with 90-134 credits (years)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWPS VOLUNTEERS</strong> – Number of volunteers associated with Statewide Public Services programs per FTE faculty in SWPS (Extension Service only)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWPS PARTICIPATION</strong> – Number of Oregon residents participating in activities sponsored through SWPS programs per FTE faculty in SWPS (Extension Service only)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CUSTOMER SERVICE</strong> – Percent of customers rating their satisfaction with the agency’s customer service as “good” or “excellent”: overall, timeliness, accuracy, helpfulness, expertise, availability of information</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BEST PRACTICES</strong> – Percent of best practices met by Board/Commission</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This page deliberately left blank.
Oregon University System  
2008-09 Annual Performance Progress Report

Charles Triplett, KPM Coordinator  
Phone: 503-725-5717  
charles_triplett@ous.edu

AGENCY MISSION
ORS 351.009 – The Legislative Assembly declares that the mission of all higher education in Oregon is to:

1. Enable students to extend prior educational experiences in order to reach their full potential as participating and contributing citizens by helping them develop scientific, professional, and technological expertise, together with heightened intellectual, cultural, and humane sensitivities and a sense of purpose;
2. Create, collect, evaluate, store, and pass on the body of knowledge necessary to educate future generations; and
3. Provide appropriate instructional, research, and public service programs to enrich the cultural life of Oregon and to support and maintain a healthy state economy.

SCOPE OF REPORT
Agency programs/services addressed by key performance measures
OUS key performance measures (KPMs) address each aspect of the higher education mission – most easily discussed in three broad categories: instruction, research, and public service. Instruction measures assess academic quality, access, student progress, degree completion, and student success and satisfaction. Research measures focus on sponsored project expenditures, faculty productivity, and commercialization. Measures examining Statewide Public Service programs (such as the Extension Service) and Oregon’s workforce needs address the public service component of higher education’s mission.

Agency programs/services, if any, not addressed by key performance measures
OUS campuses engage in performance measurement at nearly every level of operations and many of the programs/services not addressed in these KPMs represent a level of detail monitored more appropriately, and usefully, at the system and campus levels. Additional system- and campus-level data and analysis are available online (www.ous.edu) in the annual Performance Report to the Oregon State Board of Higher Education and the OUS Fact Book.
THE OREGON CONTEXT

The Oregon University System has a direct impact on Oregon Benchmarks 24 (some college completion), 26 (college completion), and 7b (R&D in academia) and an indirect impact on OBM 4 (net job growth) and 11 (per capita income). In pursuing activities toward these benchmarks, OUS works with education partners in the state through the Joint Boards; OSBHE working groups; and staff connections to the Oregon Department of Education, the Office of Community Colleges and Workforce Development, and the Oregon Student Assistance Commission. Numerous connections to Oregon’s business community, through ETIC (Engineering & Technology Industry Council), Oregon InC, the Oregon Business Council, and other cross-sector working groups, foster efforts to support and enhance Oregon’s workforce and economic strength.

As part of a long-range planning initiative, the State Board of Higher Education reaffirmed its commitment to the state through the articulation of four broad goals to produce the highest level of educational outcomes for Oregonians. An Investment in Oregonians for the Future: A Plan to 2025 for the Oregon University System describes those goals as follows:

1. Create in Oregon an educated citizenry to support responsible roles in a democratic society and provide a globally competitive workforce to drive the State’s economy, while ensuring access for all qualified Oregonians to quality postsecondary education;
2. Ensure high-quality student learning leading to subsequent student success;
3. Create original knowledge and advance innovation; and
4. Contribute positively to the economic, civic, and cultural life of communities in all regions of Oregon.

PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

Green KPMs are MAKING PROGRESS or trending positively: cost as a percent of income (#1), cost covered by aid (#2), first-time freshmen (#3), community college transfers (#4), graduate satisfaction (#6), philanthropy (#7), persistence (#9), completion (#10), transfer student completion (#11), sponsored research (#12), research per faculty (#13), disclosures (#14), license income (#15), internships (#17), graduate success (#21), freshmen time to degree (#25), and SWPS participation (#28).

Yellow KPMs are those where progress is UNCLEAR or targets were not previously established: engineering employer satisfaction (#5), customer service (#29), and Board best practices (#30).

Red KPMs are NOT MAKING PROGRESS or not trending in a positive direction: student to faculty ratio (#8), start-up companies (#16), bachelor’s degrees (#18), advanced degrees (#19), engineering and computer science degrees (#20), employed in Oregon (#22), SWPS external funds (#23), participation (#24), transfer time to degree (#26), and SWPS volunteers (#27).

Performance Summary

- Making Progress 57%
- Not Making Progress 33%
- Unclear 10%
The 2009-2011 state appropriated operating budget for the OUS decreased by 13% from the essential budget level (EBL) determined by the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) as needed to maintain current services. This reduction comes at a time of unparalleled enrollment demand at Oregon’s universities. Fall 2008 enrollment in OUS increased by 5.2%, nearly 4,300 students over 2007. Total enrollment is at an all time high for the system and at six of the seven OUS campuses.

Shrinking state investment coupled with enrollment growth and demographic changes are forcing Oregon universities to a critical point and creating pressure in areas such as class size and availability, student access, support and facilities, and the ability to recruit and retain high-quality faculty. Despite significant achievements in leveraging external financial support to help mitigate lower levels of state funding, the effects of long-term disinvestment are apparent in the key performance areas of freshman participation, the ratio of students to full-time faculty, and degree production. Short-term gains in the area of student affordability are likely to be lost with recent reductions in funding for the Oregon Opportunity Grant and the necessity of higher tuition rates to offset declining state revenues.

An additional challenge, faced by all state and national education agencies, is the evolving nature of student enrollment and transfer patterns, as well as student needs and expectations. Shifting demographics; the challenges of global economic competition; and individualized, non-traditional pathways to educational attainment create complicated challenges to providing the opportunities for postsecondary advancement that are critical for the future of the state and its citizens.

The OUS operating budget covers education and general program expenses at all seven OUS institutions, the OSU-Cascades Campus, and the Chancellor’s Office. It also includes programs initiated through OUS Industry Affairs such as the Engineering and Technology Industry Council (ETIC), the Oregon Pre-Engineering and Applied Sciences Initiative (OPAS), the Oregon Metals Initiative (OMI), and the Oregon Robotics Tournament and Outreach Programs (ORTOP). Statewide Public Services including the Agricultural Experiment Station, the Extension Service, and the Forest Research Laboratory are also included in the OUS operating budget. In FY 2008, General Fund appropriations for general operations totaled $399.9 million; funding for debt service and capital construction and repair brought the total OUS General Fund budget to $446.0 million. Individual campus and program breakouts are available online in the 2007-08 Budget Report Summary (http://www.ous.edu/dept/budget/current.php).
This page deliberately left blank.
1. OUR STRATEGY
   Ensure an appropriate balance of cost and quality at all OUS institutions.

2. ABOUT THE TARGETS
   Ideal performance on this measure is a declining ratio of cost to income.

3. HOW WE ARE DOING
   In 2007, cost of attendance relative to median family income in Oregon improved slightly. Investments by the Legislature in 2007-2009 allowed OUS to hold average undergraduate tuition increases to a maximum of 3.4% each year at all but one campus. Severe reductions in the 2009-2011 state appropriated operating budgets for OUS will inevitably increase student cost in the near future.

4. HOW WE COMPARE
   In Measuring Up 2008, the national report card on higher education produced by the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, Oregon ranks 43rd among the 50 states in the ability of families to pay the cost of public postsecondary education. Oregon has received a grade of “F” on affordability in each of the biennial Measuring Up reports since 2002 (In 2008, 49 states received an “F” in affordability).

5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS
   State investments made during the 2007-2009 legislative session allowed the student share of college costs to decrease for the first time in several biennia. Average undergraduate tuition was kept at a maximum of 3.4% each year at all but one OUS campus, maintaining the Governor’s and Board’s goal for tuition increase controls. Tuition controls are only one piece of college affordability. Non-tuition costs (room and board, supplies, etc.) and family income, which also play a critical role, are driven by the economy, employment trends, and financial markets.
6. **WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE**

The OUS 2009-2011 state appropriated operating budget was reduced 13% from the essential budget level (EBL) needed to maintain current programs and services. This reduction comes at a time of unparalleled enrollment demand, demonstrating that a record number of Oregon citizens have recognized that a higher education is critically important. Tuition increases – which had been lower than national averages for the last four years – will increase substantially during the academic year 2009-10 to offset state disinvestment. These increases coupled with an expected drop in median family income will significantly impact affordability in the near future. As state revenue forecasts begin to show improvement, state leaders should reconsider their investment in higher education and the long term impact of educational attainment on the overall strength and resiliency of Oregon’s economy.

The Board of Higher Education’s Student Participation and Completion committee continues to address financial barriers to access, especially when considering under-represented first-generation students and populations of color. Tuition increases expected during the next several years may deter many students from pursuing higher education. Establishing effective outreach and assistance programs to help families understand the realities of college costs and financial aid will be critical to helping Oregon students achieve postsecondary education.

7. **ABOUT THE DATA**

Tuition data are reported for the academic year, with detailed annual reports available on the OUS website ([www.ous.edu](http://www.ous.edu)). Non-tuition costs are obtained from the Oregon Student Assistance Commission and also represent the academic year. Median family income data are collected from the U.S. Census Bureau and derived from the American Community Survey.
1. OUR STRATEGY

   Manage tuition policy to provide access and maintain quality while promoting and growing student aid opportunities

2. ABOUT THE TARGETS

   Ideal performance on this measure is an increase in the percent of cost covered by financial aid. Targets for this measure were not developed.

   The 2009 Legislative Assembly approved a request to merge this measure with KPM 1 into a single affordability measure. OUS will develop targets for this new measure.

3. HOW WE ARE DOING

   Despite small improvements in 2007, these data suggest that higher education in Oregon is trending in the wrong direction and becoming less affordable for average Oregonians. Increases in the federal Pell grant and a tuition tax credit will help, as will funding for the Oregon Opportunity Grant (OOG), but steep tuition increases resulting from decreases in 2009-2011 state appropriations will hamper progress on college affordability in Oregon. The 2007 investment in the OOG was implemented in 2008-09 and the effects are not evident in these figures.

4. HOW WE COMPARE

   In Measuring Up 2008, the national report card on higher education produced by the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, Oregon and 48 other states received an “F” in affordability. Oregon ranked 43rd among the 50 states in families’ ability to pay for public postsecondary education. Oregon has received a grade of “F” on affordability in each of the biennial Measuring Up reports since 2002.
5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

OUS students fund their education using myriad resources, including the OOG, college savings plans, federal student and parent loans, private loans, grants, federal or campus work study, campus or other scholarships and fee remissions, and other sources.

The Oregon Opportunity Grant Shared Responsibility Model (SRM) – adopted and funded by the 2007-09 legislature – represents the first major investment that Oregon made in college affordability in decades, but the 2009-2011 appropriated budget for the OOG was reduced by 14%. Reductions in the OOG exacerbate higher education affordability issues among low- and moderate-income students attending OUS campuses. In response to these concerns, the Board approved a policy which sets aside 30% of all 2009-10 tuition revenues realized by increases above 3.6% (the expected growth in family income and ability to pay) for need-based financial aid for undergraduate residents.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

The 2007-2009 investment in the OOG will likely have a short-term effect on college affordability given the 2009-2011 reductions. To fully realize the state’s investment in student access and affordability, OOG funding needs to be fully restored and the SRM needs to be marketed to students across the state. Educational outreach for historically underserved populations is essential to raise awareness among those communities.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

Data are reported for the academic year. Additional information on financial aid is provided in the OUS Fact Book at www.ous.edu.
1. **OUR STRATEGY**

   Strengthen collaborative efforts with the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) to enhance college preparation and alignment. Streamline matriculation process to increase participation rates.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**

   Ideal performance on this measure is a steady, manageable increase in first-time freshmen enrollment. Enrollment increases must remain in balance with university resources to maintain quality.

   Future targets reflect the anticipated number of Oregon high school graduates and projected enrollment trends at OUS institutions.

3. **HOW WE ARE DOING**

   The number of newly admitted freshmen increased by 7.7% in fall 2008 to a record high of 11,575. Enrollment increases are the result of 2007-2009 state investments in the OUS and increases in federal and state need-based aid. Enrollment of first-time freshmen from Oregon increased by 3.3% in fall 2008, up from an increase of 2.1% in fall 2007. The number of first-time freshmen enrolling in OUS from out of state also increased in fall 2008, from 2,637 in fall 2007 to 3,262.

4. **HOW WE COMPARE**

   While there are no national norms for this particular subset of student enrollment, the ten-year growth for OUS fall headcount (total enrollment including all extended enrollment) has outpaced national averages, increasing by 21,557 (or 33.2%) since 1998.
5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

Myriad factors influence college enrollment including real and perceived college costs, the availability of need-based financial aid, enrollment opportunities, state and regional economic outlooks and job markets, and the aspirations of high school graduates and adult learners.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

OUS continues to engage in cross-sector alignment initiatives with ODE including dual credit enrollment opportunities for high school students. Additionally, OUS is continuing efforts to communicate the importance of a college education for personal fulfillment, to Oregon’s workforce, and for securing a family wage job. Although decreases in 2009-2011 appropriations for OUS will make many of these efforts difficult to continue at appropriate levels, the Board’s Committee on Student Participation and Completion is continuing its statewide effort to improve access, participation, retention, and success of underserved Oregon populations. A second symposium –modeled after the successful 2007 event – is scheduled for November 19, 2009.

The reduction in state appropriations also affects student cost and OUS universities’ ability to provide student outreach, support services, and faculty. Enrollment (headcount) for fall term 2009 and 2010 are expected to increase significantly and will be difficult for some OUS campuses to manage given the reduction in resources. There is a possibility that some campuses may have to restrict enrollment.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

Data are collected in the fourth week of fall term and represent one academic year. Each university provides data along prescribed parameters to a central OUS database; following the implementation of validation programs, enrollment reports are generated for consistent reporting across the system. Additional and disaggregated enrollment data are presented in the OUS Fact Book, available online at www.ous.edu.

Note: In earlier reports, these data are mistakenly labeled as “first-time, full-time” freshman. The KPM definition includes part-time students and the correct title is “first-time freshmen.”
Key Measure Analysis | 2008-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPM 4</th>
<th>COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS – Number of students who are new Oregon community college transfers</th>
<th>Measure since: 1997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Access: Expand access to students who meet admission standards – community college transfers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Context</td>
<td>OBM24 – Some college completion, OBM26 – College completion, OBM11 – Per capita income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source</td>
<td>OUS Institutional Research Services, fall fourth-week enrollment reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Charles Triplett (503) 725-5717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **OUR STRATEGY**

   In collaboration with community colleges, develop, enhance, and streamline co-enrollment and transfer policies and procedures.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**

   Ideal performance on this measure is a steady, manageable increase in Oregon community college transfer enrollment. Enrollment increases must remain in balance with university resources to maintain quality.

   In recent years, slower growth in community college enrollment failed to meet the established targets which were based on the strong growth seen in earlier years. Future targets reflect new enrollment projections and take into account the slower growth rates experienced during the past three years.

3. **HOW WE ARE DOING**

   For a second consecutive year, the number of new Oregon community college transfer students enrolling in OUS increased. In fall 2008, Oregon community college transfers to OUS increased by 1 percentage. Newly admitted transfer students from all sources (including Oregon community colleges) increased by 8.9% over fall 2007 enrollments.

4. **HOW WE COMPARE**

   While there are no national norms for this particular subset of student enrollment, the ten-year growth for OUS fall headcount (total enrollment including all extended enrollment) has outpaced national averages, increasing by 21,557 (or 33.2%) since 1998.
5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

The number of new transfer students is growing once again after experiencing declines in 2005 and 2006. This follows the enrollment patterns at Oregon community colleges where enrollment is rising again after it peaked in 2001-02 and declined as much as 10% over the next four years. In 2007, the OOG changed to allow part-time students to receive awards. That change, coupled with increases in the amounts of grant awards helped community college enrollment grow. In addition, efforts to streamline and improve articulation among Oregon’s education agencies to smooth the transition from community college to university appear to be having an impact.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

OUS campuses strive to provide access and support for transfer students entering their institutions. OUS continues to work with educational agencies on the following cross-sector initiatives in support of transfer activities:

   a. Associate of Arts/Oregon Transfer Degree (AA/OT)—to maximize effectiveness, system leaders are re-examining the purpose and structure of this degree;

   b. Oregon Transfer Module—enables students to complete first-year general education courses at any public college or university and transfer without loss of credit;

   c. Degree Partnership Programs between OUS institutions and Oregon community colleges allow for simultaneous enrollment, flexibility, and vital student support (including tutors, financial aid, and library services);

   d. Articulated Transfer Linked Audit System (ATLAS)—allows students to monitor academic progress toward their undergraduate degree;

7. ABOUT THE DATA

Data are collected in the fourth week of fall term and represent one academic year. Each university provides data along prescribed parameters to a central OUS database; following the implementation of validation programs, enrollment reports are generated for consistent reporting across the system. Additional and disaggregated enrollment data are presented in the OUS Fact Book, available online at www.ous.edu.

Note: 2002 and 2003 data were adjusted to exclude post baccalaureate undergraduates inadvertently counted in earlier reports. The remaining data are consistent with the current OUS definition of “Oregon community college transfers.”
**OUR STRATEGY**

Improve engineering education by better aligning curriculum and research with Oregon’s workforce demands.

**ABOUT THE TARGETS**

Ideal performance on this measure is an increase in the satisfaction of Oregon employers.

The 2009 Legislative Assembly approved a request to delete this measure and future targets were not set.

**HOW WE ARE DOING**

In 2006, 84% of the employers surveyed rated OUS engineering graduates 4 or 5 in overall quality, with a mean rating of 4.0. Graduates scored high in general technical skills, science, and mathematics.

**HOW WE COMPARE**

There are no national norms to compare against.

**FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS**

Consistent and valid data collection for this measure is problematic. Though two surveys were conducted (2002 and 2006), the comparability of results are unclear because of the variability in employer samples and the range of employment positions and academic majors being evaluated. While a survey was attempted in 2008, the response rate was approximately 1%, and the few responses could not be considered a valid representative result.
6. **WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE**
   The Engineering and Technology Industry Council (ETIC) and OUS engineering programs should continue to work closely with industry partners and solicit and receive feedback on employer needs in engineering and high tech occupations, as well as their general appraisal of OUS graduates.

7. **ABOUT THE DATA**
   The 2002 data were collected through an online survey of members of the Engineering Education Roundtable (EER), a now defunct group of professionals responsible for hiring and/or managing employees in technical or engineering fields. The 2006 and 2008 surveys were administered through an online survey tool sent to Oregon employers affiliated with either the Oregon Business Association or the Associated Oregon Industries.
1. **OUR STRATEGY**
   Continue to nurture educational quality in all academic programs and strengthen student support services.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**
   Ideal performance aims for consistently high assessments by recent graduates.

3. **HOW WE ARE DOING**
   This measure reports 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 academic areas and preparation for employment and/or advanced educational opportunities. OUS bachelor’s degree recipients from the class of 2007 expressed high levels of satisfaction with the quality of their education, producing a mean rating of 4.2 on a 5-point scale in which 1 is “poor” and 5 is “excellent.” The mean rating has increased over the past two assessment periods from 4.0 among the class of 2003 to a high of 4.2 among 2007 graduates.

4. **HOW WE COMPARE**
   There are no national standards against which to assess OUS performance on this measure. However, in addition to an overall quality rating, graduates also provide satisfaction ratings about key academic supports and their OUS institution’s contribution to their development of skills and competencies. For detailed information, please visit [www.ous.edu](http://www.ous.edu).
5. **FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS**

OUS institutions strive to create a stimulating and supportive educational environment. While each campus designs programs and initiatives reflective of its particular student population, all of these seek to enhance intellectual rigor and academic richness, integrate living and learning opportunities, connect students to communities and workplaces outside the campus environment, provide a multi-faceted network of student support services, and create a healthy and respectful culture of learning.

6. **WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE**

As Oregon’s public universities seek to increase access and continue to work on alignment across education sectors, monitoring graduate satisfaction remains a priority. In times of diminished resources, important academic and non-academic student support services are reduced as administrative functions are cut to preserve instruction and course availability. The challenge is quickly identifying where students are experiencing dissatisfaction and employing available resources to make adjustments.

7. **ABOUT THE DATA**

Graduate satisfaction data are obtained through a biennial survey of recent bachelor’s graduates, collected approximately one year following graduation. Budget shortfalls in 2007-2009 forced the Chancellor’s Office to eliminate the position responsible for conducting surveys. As a result, the full report on the class of 2007 survey is incomplete and data collection during the 2009-2011 biennium is unlikely. Complete reports of earlier surveys are available on the OUS website at [www.ous.edu](http://www.ous.edu).
1. OUR STRATEGY

   Establish funding priorities with university-affiliated foundations and promote strong relationships with alumni, businesses, and community supporters.

2. ABOUT THE TARGETS

   Ideal performance is a steady increase in gifts from philanthropic sources.

3. HOW WE ARE DOING

   Philanthropic donations increased 20% between FY07 and FY08. Strong growth in FY08 is primarily attributable to several successful capital construction fundraising campaigns but scholarship donations increased an impressive $3.4 million, or 18.8%.

   Total gifts in FY08 are reported in the following categories:

   Capital projects: $37.9 million
   Faculty support: $23.1 million
   Scholarships: $21.0 million
   Other (includes research, service, and management support): $55.5 million

4. HOW WE COMPARE

   While there are no national norms to suggest what performance on this measure should be, university foundations across the nation are playing a larger role in university funding by contributing to student, faculty, and facility enhancements at a time with state appropriations are declining.
5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

Targeted fundraising campaigns at individual institutions can affect the system total in any given year. Institutions engaging in capital fundraising campaigns will often experience spikes in annual giving. The overlap of these type of campaigns may account for the larger than expected increase in FY08.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

University foundations should continue to work with campus leaders to establish fundraising goals and priorities. Foundation funds enhance university operations rather than covering basic operating costs. Many private donations are restricted to specific aspects of the university (e.g. scholarships, facilities, research) and are often placed in long-term endowments. Strong communication between university administrations and their affiliated foundation is paramount.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

Data are collected annually for the previous fiscal year (July 1 through June 30) and reported in the OUS audited financial statements. In order to comply with a legislative directive to report breakouts for this measure, the definition was modified in 2007. As a result of changes to GASB reporting requirements, consistent data for this measure and its component parts are not available prior to 2004. Complete audited financial statements are available on the OUS website at www.ous.edu.
Key Measure Analysis | 2008-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPM 8</th>
<th>STUDENT/FACULTY RATIO – Ratio of students to full-time faculty</th>
<th>Measure since: 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Quality: Increase quality of undergraduate program – student success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Context</td>
<td>Academic excellence; OBM26 – College completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source</td>
<td>OUS Institutional Research Services, IPEDS Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Charles Triplett (503) 725-5717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **OUR STRATEGY**
   
   Continue to support the recruitment and retention of full-time faculty.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**
   
   Ideal performance on this measure is a declining ratio of students to full-time instructional faculty. Enrollment growth is expected to drive up student-faculty ratios as reflected in the 2010 and 2011 targets.

3. **HOW WE ARE DOING**
   
   Following three years of improvement, the ratio of students to full-time faculty increased slightly in 2008. This increase reflects the sharp growth in fall enrollments and is expected to increase further as budget constraints will prevent commensurate increases in additional faculty.

4. **HOW WE COMPARE**
   
   Most OUS institutions have a higher student to full-time faculty ratio when compared to their designated peer institutions. Peers for OUS research universities have a fall 2008 average ratio of 20.7 to 1, while comparator institutions for OUS regional universities report a fall 2008 average ratio of 22.8 to 1.
5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

The number of full-time instructional faculty and student enrollment trends affect this measure. The ratio of students to full-time faculty is an indirect indicator of instructional quality and student support, contributing to students’ ability to successfully meet their educational goals. Lower student/faculty ratios allow faculty to provide more time for mentoring and advising, more engaging learning environments, more time for student research, and ultimately, improved student completion and success.

Increasing enrollments coupled with budget constraints hampering faculty recruitment have forced OUS campuses to rely heavily on part-time instructional faculty. The percent of part-time faculty increased in 2008 to 32.4%.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

Universities are constantly challenged to maintain a balance that preserves instructional and program quality while using instructional resources in the most cost-effective way. At the campus and system levels, efforts continue to enhance faculty recruitment and retention, explore and broaden instructional methods that effectively employ technology, and monitor student satisfaction and academic achievement.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

This measure represents the ratio of fall FTE enrollment (calculated as full-time headcount plus one-third of part-time headcount) to full-time faculty headcounts, as reported in IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) to the National Center for Education Statistics. Data for 2008 represent fall term of the 2008-09 academic year.
1. **OUR STRATEGY**

   Enhance student readiness and fortify early student support programs.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**

   Ideal performance on this measure is increasing percentages of first-time freshmen students returning for a second year. Targets for the 2007-2009 biennium were deliberately ambitious given an increased focus on retention but performance proved difficult to improve. The 2010-2011 targets are more realistic given the diminished resources in the 2009-2011 biennium.

3. **HOW WE ARE DOING**

   Despite a small dip in 2008, retention rates have hovered around 80% since 2001. During that same period, the number of first-time freshmen grew by 17%, placing additional burdens on campus services and faculty and likely contributing to the failure to improve.

4. **HOW WE COMPARE**

   According to ACT, retention rates at public four-year universities are declining nationally while OUS persistence rates remain relatively stable. The fall 2008 OUS rate (79.8%) is significantly higher than the average of 72.9% reported by ACT for first-time freshman cohorts at public four-year universities.
5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

First-to-second year retention remains a strong predictor of completion. Among first-time freshmen who persist to the second year, over 72% completed their OUS degree within 6 years, compared to 59.4% of all first-time freshmen. Adequate academic preparation for college, combined with essential support services for students who enroll (freshmen orientation and engagement programs, tutoring, academic advising, early warning programs, faculty and peer mentors), are key components to enhancing persistence and completion rates. OUS institutions develop student programs tailored to their unique student populations. In general, increasing access – particularly to populations with lower historical rates of college participation and preparation – can have a negative impact on persistence and completion. The challenge is to identify and address the needs of these students before and after they enter college.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

OUS institutions continue to implement instructional and support programs tailored toward the unique needs of their student populations. Campuses implement programs that monitor student progress and provide a personal connection to peers, faculty, and student activities. Programs used by campuses include: living and learning communities, enhanced academic advising, early warning systems, mentoring relationships with upper-division students, and summer bridge programs. Successful programs focus on the specific needs of particular student groups which include underprepared first-time freshman, first-generation college students, and returning adults.

The Board’s Committee on Student Participation and Completion is continuing its statewide effort to improve access, participation, retention, and success of underserved Oregon populations. A symposium entitled “Best Practices in Retention – Day One to Degree” is scheduled for November 19, 2009.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

Performance data represent the proportion of first-time, full-time freshman entering an OUS institution one fall and returning to any OUS institution the following fall. Data are reported in the returning year (e.g., persistence rates reported in 2008 represent the fall 2007 cohort returning in fall 2008). The reporting cycle is the academic year. Disaggregated data by campus are available in the annual campus performance and target setting reports found in the Monitoring Performance section of the OUS website at www.ous.edu.
1. **OUR STRATEGY**
   Maintain and strengthen an array of programs and policies to support timely academic progress for all student populations.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**
   Ideal performance on this measure is a steady increase in the OUS graduation rate. Agency targets for the upcoming biennium seek to achieve and retain a modest improvement.

3. **HOW WE ARE DOING**
   OUS graduation rates have risen almost 11 percentage points in 15 years (48.8% in 1993). In 2008, the completion rate dropped slightly for the first time in 6 years. Rates actually increased at five campuses last year, and the system wide drop is due almost entirely to a significant decline at one campus which was facing serious financial difficulty several years ago when this cohort was in the middle of their degree programs.

4. **HOW WE COMPARE**
   Oregon public 4-yr universities rank 20th among the fifty states in six-year graduation rates where students count as completers only if they graduate from the same institution. OSU completion rates for students entering and completing from the same institution was 54.2% in 2007, above the U.S. average of 53.5%.
5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

A number of factors impact student completion, including adequate academic preparation for college, essential support services (freshmen orientation and engagement programs, tutoring, academic advising, early warning programs, faculty and peer mentors), financial issues, and personal and family events.

Reductions in 2009-2011 OUS appropriations require cuts in the numbers of classes and course selections, as well as staffing reductions, making it more difficult for students to get the classes and support services they need to graduate. This is likely to increase the time it takes students to earn a degree and could potentially lead some students to leave school without completing.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

OUS institutions continue to identify predictors of success and target programs to enhance student completion. System and campus initiatives to improve factors related to affordability, academic alignment (including support for the new Oregon public high school diploma requirements and continued enhancement of Advanced Placement and Dual Credit programs), and academic support services (such as tutoring, writing labs, peer mentoring, and early warning and intervention programs) are being employed. Student exit surveys, designed to identify reasons students are leaving, are used within some academic programs and campuses.

The Board’s Committee on Student Participation and Completion is continuing its statewide effort to improve access, participation, retention, and success of underserved Oregon populations. A symposium entitled “Best Practices in Retention – Day One to Degree” is scheduled for November 19, 2009.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

Data represent first-time, full-time freshman entering an OUS university and graduating from any OUS institution within six years (150% of normal time). A very small number (0.001) of the degree awards contributing to this measure are associate degrees; primarily in professional health disciplines. Students earning an associate’s degree within three years (150% of normal time) and not continuing on to obtain a bachelor’s degree are reflected in the graduation rate. Graduation rates for 2007-08 (reported for 2008) reflect progress of students entering OUS in fall 2002. The reporting cycle is the academic year. Disaggregated data by campus are available in the annual campus performance and target setting reports in the Monitoring Performance section of the OUS website at www.ous.edu.
1. **OUR STRATEGY**

Maintain and strengthen an array of programs and policies to support timely academic progress for transfer students.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**

Ideal performance on this measure is an increase in the percentage of transfer students completing a degree within 4 years or less. The definition of “transfer” student in KPMs 11 and 26 was administratively changed in 2008 to better align with other, internal OUS measures. This change rendered historic legislatively approved targets obsolete and they were deleted by DAS.

3. **HOW WE ARE DOING**

Completion rates among transfer students increased in 2008, but trends for this measure are fluid and complex to interpret. OUS continues to watch this rate to determine if alignment efforts are helping students to move efficiently to degree completion.

4. **HOW WE COMPARE**

There are no national norms for this measure.

5. **FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS**

Although *institution* variables such as course availability and credit alignment can affect completion rates, *student* variables such as financial ability to pay, personal motivation and commitment, and family and employment obligations often have a greater effect on transfer students. To minimize the effect of institution variables on transfers, OUS continues to focus on academic alignment of Oregon’s public postsecondary sectors and coordinated enrollment processes, as well as renewing their attention to student support services.
6. **WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE**

OUS and Oregon community colleges continue their work to streamline general education requirements and eliminate policy and process barriers to college completion. Statewide alignment and academic preparation efforts are underway to ease the transition for students moving between and among Oregon’s educational sectors. Examples of these efforts include the Oregon Transfer Module, ATLAS (Articulated Transfer Linked Audit System), and Degree Partnership Programs between OUS institutions and Oregon community colleges.

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 continues to work with the office of Community Colleges and Workforce Development (CCWD) to ensure accurate and complete data on transfer students.

7. **ABOUT THE DATA**

Data represent students entering OUS with 90-134 transfer credits (equivalent to junior standing) and graduating from any OUS institution within four years (150% of normal time). This measure was refined in 2008 to provide a better understanding of transfer students’ progress toward degrees. To allow comparative analysis with the traditional first-time freshman cohort, OUS tracks transfer student cohorts for four years from the point of entry to correlate to the time horizon for the corresponding first-time freshman cohorts. Graduation rates for 2007-08 (reported for 2008) reflect progress of student entering OUS in 2004-05. The reporting cycle is the academic year. Additional data on transfer students are available in the OUS Fact Book, which is available online at [www.ous.edu](http://www.ous.edu).
## Key Measure Analysis | 2008-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPM 12</th>
<th>SPONSORED RESEARCH – Total sponsored research and development dollars supported by external fund sources ($ in millions) a) Total, b) Federal sources, c) Private sources</th>
<th>Measure since: 1997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Quality: Increase quality and external resources for research and scholarship programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Context</td>
<td>OBM7b – Research and development (academia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source</td>
<td>OUS Controller’s Office, Annual Financial Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Charles Triplett (503) 725-5717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **OUR STRATEGY**
   Attract and retain internationally recognized faculty, increase graduate education, and enhance strategic research partnerships via intercampus and interdisciplinary collaborations.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**
   Ideal performance on this measure is increasing research expenditures. Targets project increasing expenditures but assume slower growth rates.

3. **HOW WE ARE DOING**
   Total research expenditures increased 3% in FY08. In the past five years, OUS research expenditures have grown 30% from $253M in FY03 to a high of $328M in FY08. Federally funded research expenditures rebounded in FY08 following a 4% drop between FY06 and FY07.
   Federal sources account for $215.7 million and private funds account for $99.5 million of the total sponsored research expenditures in FY08, 96% of total expenditures.

4. **HOW WE COMPARE**
   According to the National Science Foundation’s, *Survey of Research and Development Expenditures at Universities and Colleges, FY2007*, Oregon maintains a very competitive research enterprise even when compared to much larger states. Oregon ranked 22nd in total research expenditures at public universities and 17th in total public research funded by the federal government (rankings include OHSU).
5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

A successful research enterprise is dependent on competitive faculty and strong graduate programs. Sponsored research awards are based on a competitive process and demonstrate the expertise and entrepreneurial spirit of faculty members. OUS competes in a national market to attract and retain expert faculty and graduate students. Below average faculty salaries make it difficult to compete for the best faculty, a problem exacerbated as faculty members retire or leave for better paying positions elsewhere.

The OUS Research Council - an advisory council on research issues within Oregon – promotes interinstitutional and interdisciplinary education throughout the system and represents OUS with partners across the state. Since its inception, the Council has identified and gained support for numerous research initiatives including the signature research centers funded through Oregon InC.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

A successful research enterprise is built on high quality faculty, strong graduate programs, and cutting-edge infrastructure. The 2009 legislative assembly made a strong investment in Oregon’s research infrastructure through the 2009-2011 OUS capital construction budget, but cuts in the OUS operating budget may outweigh those investments in the immediate future. OUS faculty salaries remain well below peer averages and salary reductions are impending. Uncompetitive salaries affect the universities’ ability to attract and retain nationally competitive faculty. Similarly, OUS graduate stipends are below average and cuts in program funding will make it more difficult to recruit graduate students to OUS institutions. Increasing funding for faculty salaries and graduate stipends is essential to maintaining a competitive research agenda.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

Data represent expenditures for sponsored research and other activities using grant funds from external sources (e.g., federal, private), as reported in OUS audited financial statements. It includes funding for teaching/training grants, student services grants, library grants, and similar support. Data are reported as dollars in millions for each fiscal year. Disaggregated data for each campus can be found in the annual campus performance and target setting reports in the Monitoring Performance section of OUS website www.ous.edu.
KPM 13 | **RESEARCH DOLLARS PER FACULTY** – Sponsored research dollars per faculty at research/doctoral universities – OSU, PSU, UO ($ in thousands) | **Measure since:** 1997
---|---|---
**Goal** | Quality: Increase quality and external resources for research and scholarship programs | 
**Oregon Context** | OBM7b – Research and development (academia) | 
**Data source** | OUS Controller’s Office, Annual Financial Reports; OUS Institutional Research Services | 
**Owner** | OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Charles Triplett (503) 725-5717 |

1. **OUR STRATEGY**
   Attract and retain productive faculty and develop university capacity for successful pursuit of research funding.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**
   Ideal performance for this measure is increasing research expenditures per faculty member. Targets for 2009-2011 assume that OUS will not be able to increase faculty numbers. Any cuts affecting research faculty, programs, or facilities will have a negative impact on this measure.

3. **HOW WE ARE DOING**
   OUS faculty are successful at leveraging state investment in Oregon research universities. In FY08, 97% of OUS sponsored research expenditures were funded by sources other than state funds – over 65% were funded by federal sources. These competitively awarded federal grants are a testament to the expertise and entrepreneurism of OUS faculty. Research dollars per faculty have increased 30% since FY02.

4. **HOW WE COMPARE**
   According to the National Science Foundation’s, *Survey of Research and Development Expenditures at Universities and Colleges, FY2007*, Oregon faculty are very successful at attracting research funding. On a per faculty basis, Oregon ranks 12th in total R&D per FTE and 5th in R&D from federal sources per FTE faculty (rankings include OHSU).
5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

Sponsored research is a measure of faculty quality and productivity, as well as faculty and institutional entrepreneurship. An institution’s research enterprise reflects its competitive capacity to attract and retain respected and productive faculty with mature research programs. This measure is affected by changes in external funding for sponsored research and by growth (or decline) in the number of faculty.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

Competitive faculty are the cornerstone of a university’s research enterprise. Sponsored research awards are based on a competitive process and demonstrate the expertise and entrepreneurial spirit of faculty members. OUS competes in a national market to attract and retain expert faculty. At current salary levels OUS faculty recruitment and retention is a challenge. Increasing faculty salaries will improve OUS recruitment efforts for top research faculty.

The OUS Research Council is an advisory council on research issues within Oregon. The Council promotes inter-campus and interdisciplinary research collaborations with the goal of increasing grant funding in targeted research areas. The Council is also focused on enhancing the infrastructure within Oregon to facilitate excellence in research and technology transfer, including supporting faculty efforts in grant proposal development, scholarly communications, and entrepreneurial development.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

Data represent expenditures for sponsored research and other activities at OSU, PSU, and UO using grant funds from external sources (e.g., federal, private), as reported in OUS audited financial statements. It includes funding for teaching/training grants, student services grants, library grants, and similar support. Data are reported as dollars in thousands for each fiscal year. Faculty data represent a headcount of full-time instructional faculty at OSU, PSU, and UO. Additional information on OUS faculty is available in the Fact Book at www.ous.edu.
### Key Measure Analysis | 2008-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPM 14</th>
<th>INVENTIONS – Number of inventions disclosed per year</th>
<th>Measure since: 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>State economic development: Commercializing university research into profitable business ventures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Context</td>
<td>OBM7b – Research and development (academia), OBM4 – Net job growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source</td>
<td>Association of University Technology Managers, AUTM Licensing Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Charles Triplett (503) 725-5717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **OUR STRATEGY**
   Capitalize on existing research strengths, promote interdisciplinary and interinstitutional collaborations, and enhance commercialization capacity.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**
   Ideal performance on this measure is an increase in the number of inventions over time.
   The 2009 Legislative Assembly approved a request to delete this measure; therefore, 2010-2011 targets were not established.

3. **HOW ARE WE DOING**
   Invention disclosures increased by 13 in FY08 and have increased by 60% since FY02.

4. **HOW WE COMPARE**
   Meaningful comparisons are difficult for this measure due to the complex nature of technology transfer, the varying missions of reporting institutions, and the indirect relationship between fiscal research expenditures and commercialization activity in any given year.

5. **FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS**
   The University Venture Development Fund (UVDF), established by Senate Bill 853/582, provides a significant tax credit for donors who support university technology transfer. OUS institutions continue to build their UVDF funds and have made strategic investments that are already beginning to provide the required return. This infusion of financial resources into a part of the commercialization cycle known as “the valley of death” provides much needed capital at a critical stage.

![Inventions Disclosed](chart)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
<th>06</th>
<th>07</th>
<th>08</th>
<th>09</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE**

OUS institutions need to fully fund the UVDF and target those funds in research activities with commercialization potential.

7. **ABOUT THE DATA**

The *AUTM Licensing Survey* is published each fiscal year by the Association of University Technology Managers. To report the most recent activity available, OUS collects data directly from OSU, PSU, and UO.

This measure was deleted from the list of OUS KPMs in 2009. While technology transfer is undeniably an important component of the university research function and supportive of the economic vitality of the state, it is disproportionately represented in the full array of OUS key performance measures and represents a level of detail that is more appropriately and usefully monitored at the system level. The OUS Research Council is charged with facilitating and tracking technology transfer activity within the system and it reports regularly to the State Board of Higher Education.
Key Measure Analysis | 2008-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPM 15</th>
<th>LICENSE INCOME – License income per $100M research expenditures per year ($ in thousands)</th>
<th>Measure since: 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>State economic development: Commercializing university research into profitable business ventures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Context</td>
<td>OBM7b – Research and development (academia), OBM4 – Net job growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source</td>
<td>Association of University Technology Managers, AUTM Licensing Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Charles Triplett (503) 725-5717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **OUR STRATEGY**
   Capitalize on existing research strengths, promote interdisciplinary and interinstitutional collaborations, and enhance commercialization capacity.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**
   Ideal performance on this measure is an increase in license income per research expenditure.

   The 2009 Legislative Assembly approved a request to delete this measure; therefore, 2010-2011 targets were not established.

3. **HOW WE ARE DOING**
   License income has increased substantially since FY02 but annual growth is often volatile from year to year and the relationship between annual R&D and license income generated in a given year is indirect.

4. **HOW WE COMPARE**
   Comparisons are difficult for this measure due to the complex nature of technology transfer, the varying missions of reporting institutions, and the indirect relationship between fiscal research expenditures and annual commercialization activity.

5. **FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS**
   OUS and the Department of Justice (DOJ) recently streamlined the technology transfer review process by allowing OUS institutions to do many of the required sufficiency reviews in-house. This reduces both the cost and time of doing business with OUS tech transfer offices and provides tech transfer officers the flexibility to respond quickly to commercialization opportunities.
6. **WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE**

A collaborative database of OUS technologies available for licensing was released in 2009. The *Innovate, Collaborate Oregon* portal needs to be marketed to Oregon’s business community to build awareness of the resource.

7. **ABOUT THE DATA**

The *AUTM Licensing Survey* is published each fiscal year by the Association of University Technology Managers. To report the most recent activity available, OUS collects data directly from OSU, PSU, and UO.

This measure was deleted from the list of OUS KPMs in 2009. While technology transfer is undeniably an important component of the university research function and supportive of the economic vitality of the state, it is disproportionately represented in the full array of OUS key performance measures and represents a level of detail that is more appropriately and usefully monitored at the system level. The OUS Research Council is charged with facilitating and tracking technology transfer activity within the system and it reports regularly to the State Board of Higher Education.
### OUR STRATEGY

Capitalizing on existing research strengths, promote interdisciplinary and interinstitutional collaborations, and enhance commercialization capacity.

### ABOUT THE TARGETS

Ideal performance on this measure is an increase in the number of start-up companies per research expenditure.

The 2009 Legislative Assembly approved a request to delete this measure; therefore, 2010-2011 targets were not established.

### HOW WE ARE DOING

Report timing causes the FY07 data to appear high and FY08 data to appear low. Combined figures for these two years compare favorably to the aggregate of FY05 and FY06. Start-up companies per research expenditures vary greatly from year to year. The variable nature of research and discovery makes year-to-year tracking, with an assumption of a regular pattern of growth, problematic.

### HOW WE COMPARE

Comparisons are difficult for this measure due to the complex nature of technology transfer, the varying missions of reporting institutions, and the indirect relationship between fiscal research expenditures and annual commercialization activity.
5. **FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS**

OUS and the Department of Justice (DOJ) recently streamlined the technology transfer review process by allowing OUS institutions to do many of the required sufficiency reviews in-house. This reduces both the cost and time of doing business with OUS tech transfer offices and provides tech transfer officers the flexibility to respond quickly to commercialization opportunities.

Limited funding to secure and license intellectual property is also a challenge to this measure. The UVDF helps to address this particular issue. OUS institutions should fully fund the UVDF and target research that shows potential for commercialization.

6. **WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE**

A collaborative database of OUS technologies available for licensing was released in 2009. The Innovate, Collaborate Oregon portal needs to marketing to Oregon’s business community to build awareness of the resource. OUS institutions also need to continue funding the UVDF and targeting research activities with commercialization potential.

7. **ABOUT THE DATA**

The AUTM Licensing Survey is published each fiscal year by the Association of University Technology Managers. To report the most recent activity available, OUS collects data directly from OSU, PSU, and UO.

This measure was deleted from the list of OUS KPMs in 2009. While technology transfer is undeniably an important component of the university research function and supportive of the economic vitality of the state, it is disproportionately represented in the full array of OUS key performance measures and represents a level of detail that is more appropriately and usefully monitored at the system level. The OUS Research Council is charged with facilitating and tracking technology transfer activity within the system and it reports regularly to the State Board of Higher Education.
1. OUR STRATEGY
   Through employer contacts and student mentoring, continue to develop, support, and encourage experiential learning opportunities and participation.

2. ABOUT THE TARGETS
   Ideal performance on this measure is an increasing number of OUS students engaging in experiential learning.
   In 2005, a revised survey question for collecting data regarding internships and applied learning was implemented and has resulted in data that are more reliable. This adjustment to the data collection methodology is responsible for the dramatic increase in targets beginning in 2007.

3. HOW WE ARE DOING
   Among graduates of the class of 2007, 90% reported participating in at least one form of experiential learning.
   Students also experienced hands-on learning through participation in study abroad programs (16% of graduates) and the National Student Exchange (completed by 2% of graduates). Approximately 34% of OUS graduates indicated that participation in an experiential learning program led directly to their current employment.
   Figures in 2005 and 2007 are higher than those reported among previous graduating classes but comparisons are invalidated by changes to the survey instrument.

4. HOW WE COMPARE
   There are no national norms for this measure.
5. **FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS**

Hands-on learning opportunities have become increasingly popular as faculty recognize their impact on student learning and students see their relevance to future goals. However, these programs require additional time and support on the part of faculty and staff, and are undermined by cuts to administrative and student support services.

6. **WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE**

OUS works 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 a traditional internship, international experience, or community service event, students are challenged to put their classroom experience to work in a real world context. OUS is continuing efforts to accurately identify and tabulate student participation in this important contributor to student learning and graduate employability.

7. **ABOUT THE DATA**

Data for this measure are derived from a biennial survey of recent OUS bachelor’s graduates. Graduates were queried on their participation in a variety of experiential learning exercises including internships, clinical or student teaching experience, fieldwork, practica, capstone projects, and community service learning opportunities. Budget shortfalls in 2007-2009 forced the Chancellor’s Office to eliminate the position responsible for conducting surveys. As a result, the full report on the class of 2007 survey is incomplete and data collection during the 2009-2011 biennium is unlikely. Complete reports of earlier surveys are available on the OUS website at [www.ous.edu](http://www.ous.edu).
1. OUR STRATEGY
Promote policies and programs that increase student access, facilitate student progress, and ensure academic quality at the undergraduate level.

2. ABOUT THE TARGETS
Ideal performance on this measure is an increase in the number of bachelor’s degree awards. Performance on this measure continues to fall short of targets due primarily to enrollment trends in earlier years. New targets reflect the modest enrollment growth experienced during the middle of this decade.

3. HOW WE ARE DOING
The number of bachelor’s degrees awarded dropped slightly in 2008, but overall has remained flat for the last several years. In fall 2003, OUS experienced a drop in the number of first-time freshmen (FTF) which is showing up now – 4 to 5 years later. A drop in community college transfer enrollment, which began a couple of years later, is also contributing to this stagnation. Enrollment patterns during the middle of this decade suggest that the flat numbers of bachelor’s degree awards may continue for a couple more years.

4. HOW WE COMPARE
While there are no national norms to suggest what performance on this measure should be, in 2006-07, Oregon awarded 34 bachelor’s degrees at its public 4-year universities per 10,000 population, slightly higher than the U.S. average of 32.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPM 18</th>
<th>BACHELOR’S DEGREES – Total number of bachelor’s degrees granted</th>
<th>Measure since: 1997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>State economic development: Employability of graduates; Student success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Context</td>
<td>OBM26 – College completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source</td>
<td>OUS Institutional Research Services, IPEDS Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Charles Triplett (503) 725-5717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bachelor's Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>10,107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>11,225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>11,880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>12,187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>12,630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>12,668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>12,651</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>13,075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13,228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>13,289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>10,107</td>
<td>9,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>11,225</td>
<td>11,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12,187</td>
<td>12,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12,630</td>
<td>12,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12,668</td>
<td>12,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12,651</td>
<td>13,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13,075</td>
<td>13,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13,228</td>
<td>13,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13,289</td>
<td>13,647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS**

   Enrollment trends in earlier years and timely student progress greatly affect bachelor’s degree production. Slow enrollment growth reported in KPMs #3 and #4 during the middle of this decade, as well as increases in graduation rates, will influence this measure in the near future.

6. **WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE**

   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. Reductions in the 2009-2011 operating budget will likely require eliminating programs, classes, and course sections, making it more difficult for student to graduate on time, and making it more costly for them. OUS must monitor access and affordability, persistence and completion rates, and class and faculty capacity, including the ratio of students to full-time faculty (KPM 8), to maximize degree production.

7. **ABOUT THE DATA**

   Bachelor’s degrees counted for an academic year are those awarded summer term through the following spring term, which approximates the fiscal year. Students who earn a single degree with more than one major are counted only once. Data are reported to IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) in an annual Completions Survey report. Additional information on degrees awarded within OUS, including breakouts by institution, degree level, and major are reported in the OUS Fact Book, available online at [www.ous.edu](http://www.ous.edu).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPM 19</th>
<th>ADVANCED DEGREES – Total number of advanced degrees granted (master’s, doctoral, and professional)</th>
<th>Measure since: 1997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>State economic development: Employability of graduates; Student success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Context</td>
<td>OBM26 – College completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source</td>
<td>OUS Institutional Research Services, IPEDS Reports.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Charles Triplett (503) 725-5717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **OUR STRATEGY**
   Increase the number of graduate students entering and completing advanced degrees at OUS institutions through internationally-respected programs and faculty, facility development, and strong support for graduate students.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**
   Ideal performance on this measure is an increase in the number of graduate students earning advanced degrees. OUS continues to perform well below target due in large part to very high targets established on the steep enrollment growth seen earlier in the decade. Targets for 2010 and 2011 are calibrated to align with current enrollment projections and recent award trends.

3. **HOW WE ARE DOING**
   Graduate enrollments and subsequent degree awards vary greatly from year-to-year. Higher numbers of advanced degrees in 2004 and 2005 correspond roughly to higher graduate enrollment two years earlier. Master’s degrees make up the largest proportion of the significant decline in 2008, but enrollments at that level are up, presaging future improvements. Flat enrollments and degree awards at the doctoral level are likely to continue for the foreseeable future.

4. **HOW WE COMPARE**
   While there are no national norms to suggest what performance on this measure should be, in 2006-07 Oregon awarded 13 advanced degrees at 4-year public universities per 10,000 population, ranking just above the national average of 12.
5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

As with bachelor’s degrees, advanced degree production relates to enrollment in earlier years and timely student progress. The state’s job market often affects graduate program enrollment and some of the 2008 drop in degree awards may be the result of graduate students delaying completion due to a weak job market.

Faculty research and its support funding also strongly influence this measure. Reductions in state appropriation challenge OUS’s ability to recruit and retain the high caliber faculty necessary for strong graduate programs. Doctoral students – an integral part of a university’s reputation and research capacity – are also difficult to attract and retain in times of constrained resources. Nationally, the number of doctoral degrees increased over 10% in the last ten years, while OUS doctoral degrees declined by 1%.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

Oregon’s ability to compete globally, from a solid foundation of strong graduate programs and advanced degree production, has eroded over the past decade by diminished state resources. OUS needs to reinvest in its graduate programs to remain competitive in the academic marketplace. Investments in faculty recruitment and retention coupled with investment in graduate programs and students are essential. To increase advanced degree awards, OUS must increase the competitiveness of its graduate programs.

OUS has approved new advanced degree programs in response to Oregon’s workforce needs. Advanced degree programs in selected fields like healthcare and engineering build research and development capacity for Oregon’s industries and universities. Through the Engineering and Technology Industry Council (ETIC) and the OUS Research Council, OUS is working with Oregon communities and private industries to identify state needs for professionals with advanced skills and credentials to provide talent for existing and emerging industry clusters.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

Advanced degrees include master’s, doctoral, and first professional degrees, counted for an academic year and awarded summer term through the following spring term, which approximates the fiscal year. Data are reported to IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) in an annual Completions Survey report. Additional information on degrees awarded within OUS, including breakouts by institution, degree level, and major are reported in the OUS Fact Book, available online at www.ous.edu.
Engineering and Computer Science Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPM 20</th>
<th>ENGINEERING AND COMPUTER SCIENCE DEGREES – Total number of degrees granted in engineering and computer sciences (all levels; includes multiple majors)</th>
<th>Measure since: 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>State economic development: Employability of graduates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Context</td>
<td>OBM26 – College completion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source</td>
<td>OUS Institutional Research Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Charles Triplett (503) 725-5717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **OUR STRATEGY**
   Build on ETIC achievements by further enhancing program quality and capacity, strengthening industry connections, and pursuing private investment.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**
   Ideal performance on this measure is an increase in the number of degree awards. In 2008, performance fell far short of the target due not only to reduced degree production in these fields, but very ambitious targets based on 2004 and 2005 degrees, which were unusually high with respect to the overall trend over the course of the decade. Targets for 2010 and 2011 are calibrated to align with current enrollment projections and recent award trends.

3. **HOW WE ARE DOING**
   Earlier this decade, computer science and engineering programs (particularly those related to computer technologies) experienced sharp declines in enrollment following the dot-com bust. Decreased enrollments in those programs are now affecting degree production. After dropping for 4 years, enrollment in these areas rose in fall 2007 and again in 2008.

4. **HOW WE COMPARE**
   While there are no national norms to suggest what performance on this measure should be, computer science enrollments and degrees awards are declining nationwide.
5. **FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS**

Increasing the degrees granted in engineering and computer science is a key goal of the Engineering and Technology Industry Council (ETIC). Factors leading to increases include investments in hiring additional faculty in engineering and computer science that allow more diverse and more frequent course offerings. Competing factors include cyclical downturns in engineering employment that may temporarily discourage students from choosing these undergraduate degrees. During periods of peak employment some students may leave programs before completing their degrees to pursue job opportunities.

6. **WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE**

Recruitment efforts should focus on students earlier in their educational careers to promote college readiness. Once students enroll, retention programs focused on first-year students help to support student success during the crucial first year. ETIC supports recruitment and retention programs at OUS campuses as well as promoting investments in research and teaching faculty and facilities.

7. **ABOUT THE DATA**

The measure reports bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral degrees awarded in CIP codes 11, 14, and 15. The Classification of Instructional Programs code system was developed by the National Center for Education Statistics to facilitate program comparisons among institutions. Degrees are counted for an academic year and awarded summer term through the following spring term, which approximates the fiscal year. Students who earn a single degree with a double major are counted twice if both majors are within the appropriate CIP codes. Data are reported to IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) in an annual Completions Survey report. Additional information on degrees awarded within OUS, including breakouts by institution, degree level, and major are reported in the OUS Fact Book, available online at [www.ous.edu](http://www.ous.edu).
## Key Measure Analysis

### Table: Graduate Success – Percent of graduates employed and/or continuing education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPM 21</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Measure since: 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE SUCCESS</td>
<td>State economic development: Employability of graduates</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Context</td>
<td>OBM26 – College completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source</td>
<td>OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Survey of OUS Bachelor’s Graduates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Charles Triplett (503) 725-5717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1. OUR STRATEGY

Maintain academic standards for critical learning outcomes and foster alignment with workforce and civic needs and expectations.

#### 2. ABOUT THE TARGETS

Ideal performance on this measure maintains a high level of graduates who are employed and/or enrolled. A realistic assessment of economic projections in the state suggests lower performance in the near future. The 2011 target is equal to performance in 2003 during another, albeit less severe, economic downturn.

#### 3. HOW WE ARE DOING

This measure reports the percentage of OUS bachelor’s degree recipients who are employed and/or continuing their education approximately one year following their graduation. This percentage dropped with the class of 2007 to 92%, down 1% from the class of 2005. Although the proportion of graduates employed remained the same between the two classes, the number of 2007 graduates continuing their education dropped. This percentage is notably higher than the 88% reported in 2003 following the economic downturn early in the decade.

#### 4. HOW WE COMPARE

The proportion of graduates who were actively but unsuccessfully seeking work was 3.4% for the class of 2007, lower than the state unemployment rate of 5.3% in July and August, the months directly following graduation for most students. While administering the survey in April and May 2008, the statewide unemployment rate was 5.4% and 5.6%, respectively.
5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

The employment success of graduates is dependent on the vitality of the economy and the availability of jobs for recent degree recipients, as well as the alignment of workforce needs and expectations, curricula, faculty mentoring, research and internship opportunities, and students' personal goals. Each OUS institution strives to prepare graduates with the skills and knowledge needed for successful job placement, advanced educational programs, and responsible engagement with their local and global communities.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

OUS must maintain academic quality and support rigorous standards of student learning to ensure that graduates are competitive in their preparation for graduate programs and the job market. Students' engagement in applied learning experiences (KPM 17) and other high impact practices contributes to their academic and intellectual development. OUS institutions should strive to maintain the effectiveness of student career services despite recent cuts in state appropriations. Career service centers offer many programs for students to gain an effective edge in their job searches. 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 transition from campus to the workforce.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

This measure reports the percentage of recent OUS bachelor’s degree recipients who are employed and/or continuing their education approximately one year following graduation. Data on graduate success are obtained through a biennial survey of recent bachelor’s graduates, collected approximately one year following graduation. Budget shortfalls in 2007-2009 forced the Chancellor’s Office to eliminate the position responsible for conducting surveys. As a result, the full report on the class of 2007 survey is incomplete and data collection during the 2009-2011 biennium is unlikely. Complete reports of earlier surveys are available on the OUS website at www.ous.edu. Disaggregated data by campus are also available online in the annual campus performance and target setting reports in the Monitoring Performance section of the website.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPM 22</th>
<th>EMPLOYED IN OREGON – Percent of employed graduates working in Oregon</th>
<th>Measure since: 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>State economic development: Employability of graduates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Context</td>
<td>OBM26 – College completion; OBM4 – Net job growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source</td>
<td>OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Survey of OUS Bachelor’s Graduates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Charles Triplett (503) 725-5717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **OUR STRATEGY**
   
   Maintain academic standards for critical learning outcomes and foster alignment with workforce needs in Oregon.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**
   
   Ideal performance on this measure shows high percentages of OUS bachelor’s graduates employed in Oregon. A realistic assessment of economic projections in the state suggests lower percentages of graduates finding employment in Oregon in the near future. The 2011 target may be ambitious, but seeks to retain performance at 2007 levels.

3. **HOW WE ARE DOING**
   
   In 2005 and 2007, the percentage of employed graduates working in Oregon fell below the target of 80%. While the percentage of graduates employed and/or enrolled following graduation (Graduate Success KPM 21) strengthened mid-decade, greater proportions of those motivated and successful graduates are leaving the state for employment.

4. **HOW WE COMPARE**
   
   There are no standards or comparisons available for this measure.

5. **FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS**
   
   The migration of recent college graduates is impacted by a number of factors including job opportunities in particular fields, unemployment rates, and salary options. In 2007, job growth in Oregon (excluding farm labor) dropped to 1.7% from 3.0% in each of the two previous years. Among 2007 graduates who are employed outside Oregon, the most common reasons for seeking employment outside of Oregon were: more job opportunities, moving closer to family, and better salary options. Other reasons include quality of life, relocation by an employer, moving to home state or country, military service, and weather.
6. **WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE**

OUS campuses work directly with Oregon companies to help ensure that the curricula are in line with industry practices and future needs. This type of responsive degree planning helps to produce OUS graduates who transition effectively between their educational and professional careers. Campus career centers also represent a valuable link between OUS graduates and Oregon industry. Additional analyses could explore whether OUS graduates are finding employment in the existing and emerging industry clusters identified as critical to Oregon’s workforce development strategy.

7. **ABOUT THE DATA**

Data on graduate success and employment in Oregon are obtained through a biennial survey of recent bachelor’s graduates, collected approximately one year following graduation. Budget shortfalls in 2007-2009 forced the Chancellor’s Office to eliminate the position responsible for conducting surveys. As a result, the full report on the class of 2007 survey is incomplete and data collection during the 2009-2011 biennium is unlikely. Complete reports of earlier surveys are available on the OUS website at [www.ous.edu](http://www.ous.edu).
1. **OUR STRATEGY**
   Continue to invest in and leverage SWPS programs by aggressively seeking outside grants and contracts that add value to current programs.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**
   Ideal performance on this measure is an increasing ratio of external funds generated per state dollar. Although the ratio declined in 2008, increased state investment was the primary driver, not the slight decline in external funds generated. Targets for 2010 and 2011 assume that 2007-09 investments will result in additional grants in the future.

3. **HOW WE ARE DOING**
   Statewide Public Service programs (SWPS) saw dollars from external funds decline slightly in 2008 but the performance result for this year – reported as a ratio – was driven primarily by an increase in state funding. 2007-09 investments in SWPS should pay off in additional grants in the future but there has been, historically, a lag between changes in state appropriations and the leverage ratio. New grants for the current fiscal year are running higher than last year and the performance figure for 2009 is expected to approximate that of 2007.

4. **HOW WE COMPARE**
   There are no national standards or benchmark comparisons available.

5. **FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS**
   State support is essential to the ability of SWPS programs to hire faculty who conduct research and engage in research-based outreach work. Reductions in SWPS funding in the 2009-2011 operating budget will result in reduced service levels and require a reduction in staffing support and services across the state.
6. **WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE**

Continue to invest state funds in areas that promote positive results for external funding, such as bio-based energy production; preservation of water, watersheds, and water quality; and ecological services. Support initiatives related to foods and wood products, agriculture and forest productivity, viticulture and enology, and coastal and forest-based tourism. Receive more gifts, grants, and other revenues that are generated by research-based outreach work delivered through Extension education. Additional external funding strengthens local capacity to improve the economy, the environment, and social systems.

7. **ABOUT THE DATA**

Performance ratios are derived from state resource expenditures and expenditures from all other sources for all OSU Statewide Public Services, including the Extension Service, the Agricultural Experiment Station, and the Forest Research Laboratory.
1. **OUR STRATEGY**

   Strengthen collaborative efforts with ODE to enhance college preparation and alignment and to streamline the process.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**

   Ideal performance on this measure is an increasing percentage of Oregon high school graduates who enroll in OUS. Future targets are based on projections of Oregon high school graduates and trends in OUS first-time freshman enrollment.

3. **HOW WE ARE DOING**

   The freshman participation rate—representing Oregon high school graduates enrolling in an Oregon public university—spiked at 24.1 in 2001, responding to an increase in state funding during the 1999 session. The rate has fallen steadily since then, with the exception of two small blips in 2005 and 2007.

   The number of first-time freshmen graduating from an Oregon high school and enrolling in OUS increased 3.3% in fall 2008 but the increase was outweighed by the even larger increase (4.5%) in the 2008 Oregon high school graduating class.

4. **HOW WE COMPARE**

   National participation rates vary greatly depending on sources and methodology making good comparators difficult to find. The National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) reports that in 2006, Oregon’s participation rate ranked near the bottom of the fifty states. OUS data suggests that NCHEMS severely underreports “the number of first-time freshmen who graduated in the previous 12 months” skewing actual participation rates; however, Oregon remains well below national averages.
5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

Participation in postsecondary education is influenced by several factors including real and perceived college costs, the availability of need-based financial aid, state and regional economic outlook and job markets, the aspiration of high school graduates, and family and cultural values and perceptions. Additionally, it is possible that statewide access and alignment efforts could produce greater enrollment of Oregon high school graduates in postsecondary education, but lower OUS participation rates if more students choose to attend community colleges directly out of high school, entering OUS later as transfer students.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

In addition to cross-sector alignment initiatives, 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. As the demographic character of Oregon’s population shifts, the Board’s Committee on Student Participation and Completion is continuing its statewide effort to improve access, participation, retention, and success of underserved Oregon populations. During a 2007 symposium, committee members heard public and practitioner testimony about particular challenges faced by rural Oregonians, racial and ethnic minorities, students with disabilities, and low-income and first-generation college students. A second symposium entitled “Best Practices in Retention – Day One to Degree” is scheduled for November 19, 2009.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

The freshman participation rate is the ratio of OUS first-time freshmen from Oregon high schools (regardless of year of graduation) to Oregon high school graduates of the previous school year. The high school graduate population includes an estimate of graduates who were home schooled. Data for high school graduates is managed by the Oregon Department of Education. Additional data on freshman participation is available in the OUS Fact Book at www.ous.edu.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPM 25</th>
<th>TIME TO DEGREE – Average time to degree for students entering as full-time freshmen (years)</th>
<th>Measure since: 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Quality: Increase quality of undergraduate program – student success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Context</td>
<td>OBM26 – College completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source</td>
<td>OUS Institutional Research Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Charles Triplett (503) 725-5717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **OUR STRATEGY**
   Maintain and strengthen an array of programs and policies to support timely academic progress for all student populations.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**
   Ideal performance is a reduction in the average time to complete a bachelor’s degree.

3. **HOW WE ARE DOING**
   Average time to degree for 2008 graduates who began as first-time freshmen improved slightly from 2007 graduates but remains approximately 4 years and two terms (4.57 years). Performance on this measure continues to improve incrementally.

4. **HOW WE COMPARE**
   OUS is consistent with the 2007 U.S. average of graduates earning their degree in 4 years or less (53%).

5. **FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS**
   Similar to completion rates, student time to degree is influenced by a variety of academic and personal factors, including academic preparation, availability of required courses, financial issues, and personal and family events. As students explore academic offerings through multiple colleges and online venues, the impact on time to degree becomes more difficult to predict. Significant changes in this aggregate statistic will occur gradually.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

OUS institutions continue to identify impediments to student progress and implement strategies to become more efficient and effective. Continued cross-sector efforts to align academic requirements resulted in expanded course offerings, streamlined degree completion, and flexibility among students to progress toward completion at an individual pace.

Reductions in 2009-2011 appropriations may force some campuses to make cuts in the number of classes and course sections they offer. These types of cuts make it harder for students to get the classes they need at the time they need to take them and often extend their time in college. As OUS campuses implement the reductions forced by state funding cuts, it is essential to keep student progress a priority consideration.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

The average time to degree is an estimate of the length of time that students take to complete an undergraduate degree, either an associate or bachelor’s degree, from the point at which they began their OUS career. Data reported for 2008 reflect the progress of students entering OUS in 2002-03, consistent with the completion rate cohort reported in KPM 10.
1. **OUR STRATEGY**
   Maintain and strengthen an array of programs and policies to support timely academic progress for all student populations.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**
   Ideal performance on this measure is a reduction in the average time to degree. The definition of “transfer” student in KPMs 11 and 26 was administratively changed in 2008 to better align with other, internal OUS measures. This change rendered historic legislatively approved targets obsolete and they were deleted by DAS.

3. **HOW WE ARE DOING**
   Although transfer student completion rates (KPM 11) improved this year, time to degree for students enrolling in OUS with 90-134 credits increased slightly. Transfer students took approximately two years and two terms (2.65 years) on average, to complete their degrees in 2008.

   Transfer student trends are fluid and complex to interpret. OUS continues to watch this statistic to determine if alignment efforts are helping students to move efficiently to degree completion.

4. **HOW WE COMPARE**
   There are no national norms for this measure.
5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

Although institution variables such as course availability and credit alignment can affect time to degree, student variables such as financial ability to pay, personal motivation and commitment, and family and employment obligations often have a greater effect on transfer students. To minimize the effect of institution variables on transfers, OUS continues to focus on academic alignment of Oregon’s public postsecondary sectors and coordinated enrollment processes, as well as renewing their attention to student support services.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

OUS and Oregon community colleges continue their work to streamline general education requirements and eliminate policy and process barriers to college completion. Alignment and academic preparation efforts like the Associate of Arts/Oregon Transfer Degree (AA/OT), the Oregon Transfer Module, and ATLAS (Articulated Transfer Linked Audit System) aim to ease transition for students moving between and among Oregon’s educational sectors. In addition, all OUS campuses have various degree partnership programs with Oregon community colleges to allow for simultaneous enrollment, flexibility, and student support (including tutors, financial aid, and library services).

As student attendance patterns become more varied and complex, it is increasingly important to understand 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 continues to work with CCWD to ensure accurate and complete data on transfer students.

Reductions in 2009-2011 appropriations may force some campuses to make cuts in the number of classes and course sections they offer. These types of cuts make it harder for students to get the classes they need at the time they need to take them and often extend their time in college. As OUS campuses implement the reductions forced by state funding cuts, it is essential to keep student progress a priority consideration.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

The average time to degree for transfer students is an estimate of the length of time that college transfer students take to complete an undergraduate degree among students entering with 90-134 transfer credit and completing their degree within four years. This measure was administratively refined in 2008 to allow comparative analysis with the traditional first-time freshman cohort. Transfer students in this measure are defined as students transferring to OUS with the equivalent of junior standing. Data reported for 2008 reflect the progress of transfer students entering OUS in 2004-05, consistent with the cohort reported in KPM 11.
### Key Measure Analysis | 2008-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPM 27</th>
<th>SWPS VOLUNTEERS – Number of volunteers associated with Statewide Public Services programs per FTE faculty in SWPS (Extension Service only)</th>
<th>Measure since: 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>State economic development: rural Oregon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Context</td>
<td>Support to Oregon’s communities and industries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source</td>
<td>Oregon State University, Office of Budget and Fiscal Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Charles Triplett (503) 725-5717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **OUR STRATEGY**
   
   Encourage continued investment in the Extension Service and grow the volunteer network, especially in new and underserved areas.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**
   
   Ideal performance on this measure is an increase in the ratio of volunteers to FTE faculty.

   The 2009 Legislative Assembly approved a request to delete this measure; therefore, 2010-2011 targets were not established.

3. **HOW WE ARE DOING**
   
   The number of volunteers per FTE faculty in the Extension Service fell in 2007, following a spike in 2006. The dramatic performance increase in 2006 is attributed to a steep influx in volunteers coupled with a decrease in FTE faculty. The 2007 ratio appears to have fallen into a more “normal” range, though lower than in earlier years.

4. **HOW WE COMPARE**
   
   There are no national standards or benchmark comparisons available.

5. **FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS**
   
   FTE faculty increased from 204 in 2006 to 225 in 2007. During the same period of time, the number of volunteers decreased from 25,290 to 19,854. This reduction in volunteers coupled with the increase in faculty resulted in the dramatic decrease in the 2007 volunteer to FTE ratio. The addition of FTE faculty increases the outreach capacity of the Extension Service and should result in increased numbers of volunteers in the coming years.
6. **WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE**

Continue training of additional volunteers and provide leadership to the existing statewide population. Enhance on-line training opportunities and expand into new communities and new subjects.

7. **ABOUT THE DATA**

Data represent the ratio of Extension Service faculty FTE to the number of Extension Service volunteers throughout the state. Preliminary data reported in 2005 were derived from a beta test which revealed a need for further refinement of the volunteer data. Figures for 2005 were collected with the revised data collection procedure; historical data for 2003 and 2004 were adjusted to conform to the revised methodology. Data are reported for a calendar year.

This measure was deleted from the list of OUS KPMs in 2009 as it reports on only a subset of all SWPS activities (Extension Service). The detailed nature of the measure makes it more appropriately monitored at the program level. All SWPS departments currently employ a series of metrics used to monitor performance and OSU leadership receives regular reports.
Key Measure Analysis | 2008-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPM 28</th>
<th>SWPS PARTICIPATION – Number of Oregon residents participating in activities sponsored through SWPS programs per FTE faculty in SWPS (Extension Service only)</th>
<th>Measure since: 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>State economic development: rural Oregon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Context</td>
<td>Support to Oregon’s communities and industries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source</td>
<td>Oregon State University, Office of Budget and Fiscal Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Charles Triplett (503) 725-5717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **OUR STRATEGY**
   Continue to invest in a variety of Extension Service programs, including new programs in metropolitan and underserved areas.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**
   Ideal performance on the measure is an increase in the ratio of participants to FTE faculty.

   The 2009 Legislative Assembly approved a request to delete this measure; therefore, 2010-2011 targets were not established.

3. **HOW WE ARE DOING**
   The number of Oregon residents participating in Extension Service activities for every faculty FTE increased significantly in FY07. Both participant and FTE faculty numbers increased in 2007 and the increases in faculty should allow even further gains in participation in the near future.

   Participation figures for 2005 through 2007 suggest that the extraordinarily high numbers in 2004 were an anomaly.

4. **HOW WE COMPARE**
   There are no national standards or benchmark comparisons available.
5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

FTE faculty increased from 204 in 2006 to 225 in 2007. During the same period, the number of SWPS participants increased by approximately 144,000. Increases in FTE faculty allow greater outreach capacity of the Extension Service and should result in increased participation in the coming years.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

Continue to encourage participation in Statewide Public Services through greater emphasis in urban markets and the adoption of innovative ways to reach Oregonians with information relevant to their needs.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

Data represent the ratio of Extension Service faculty FTE to the number of Oregon residents throughout the state participating in Extension-sponsored activities. Data are reported for a calendar year.

This measure was deleted from the list of OUS KPMs in 2009 as it reports on only a subset of all SWPS activities (Extension Service). The detailed nature of the measure makes it more appropriately monitored at the program level. All SWPS departments currently employ a series of metrics used to monitor performance and OSU leadership receives regular reports.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPM 29</th>
<th>CUSTOMER SERVICE: Percent of customers rating their satisfaction with the agency's customer service as “good” or “excellent”: overall, timeliness, accuracy, helpfulness, expertise, availability of information</th>
<th>Measure since: 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Quality: increase quality of existing programs – customer’s views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Context</td>
<td>OBM26 – College completion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source</td>
<td>OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, customer surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Charles Triplett (503) 725-5717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **OUR STRATEGY**

   Ensure high quality and responsiveness in meeting the needs of students and other constituents throughout all OUS activities.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**

   Ideal performance on this measure is a high level of student satisfaction.

3. **HOW WE ARE DOING**

   In 2008, almost 87% of OUS students expressed satisfaction with the overall quality of service provided by their institution.

   Respondents were most satisfied with the knowledge and expertise of OUS faculty and staff, with 90.4% providing a rating of "excellent" or "average." Students also expressed satisfaction with the helpfulness of OUS faculty and staff and timeliness of services, rated 86.4% and 86.1% respectively.

   These results are based on a response rate of approximately 16% but the findings are consistent with those obtained through a long-standing survey of OUS graduates reported in KPM 6. In this survey, 87.6% of graduates from the class of 2007 rated the overall quality of their educational experience as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale in which 1 is “poor” and 5 is “excellent.”

   ![Graph showing percent rating their "overall" service good or excellent]
4. **HOW WE COMPARE**

   There are no national standards on which to compare OUS performance on this measure with other public universities or systems. Every Oregon state agency is required to implement a standard customer satisfaction survey of a constituent population, but survey populations and implementation methodologies vary widely, undermining any meaningful comparison.

5. **FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS**

   OUS institutions strive to provide excellent service to all students and meet the needs of their unique student populations. All institutions seek to use the expertise and knowledge of faculty and staff to provide services and information that is accurate, timely, and helpful.

6. **WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE**

   As Oregon’s public universities seek to increase access and continue to work on alignment across education sectors, monitoring graduate satisfaction remains a priority. In times of diminished resources, important academic and non-academic student support services are reduced as administrative functions are cut to preserve instruction and course availability. The challenge is quickly identifying where students are experiencing dissatisfaction and employing available resources to make adjustments. On an ongoing basis, each university and individual departments monitor student satisfaction through course evaluations and alumni surveys.

7. **ABOUT THE DATA**

   Improvements to the survey methodology in 2008, including an expansion of the survey population, do not allow for direct comparisons to 2006 results. Beginning in 2008, the satisfaction survey was implemented on-line. Invitations to participate in the survey were sent via email to all juniors and seniors (over 36,000) enrolled at all seven OUS institutions in late May. Students had approximately two weeks to respond to the survey. The response rate was just under 16%. Individual results were weighted by the likelihood of being selected (a weight derived by the population of juniors and seniors at the specific institutions and the number of responses from that institution). Results are compiled and reported in aggregate. Budget shortfalls in 2007-2009 forced the Chancellor’s Office to eliminate the position responsible for conducting surveys. As a result, data collection for this measure during the 2009-2011 biennium is unlikely.
### Key Measure Analysis | 2008-09

**BEST PRACTICES: Percent of best practices met by Board/Commission.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure since: 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Goal**  
Effective governance oversight

**Oregon Context**  
The 2006 Joint Legislative Audit Committee (JLAC) instructed DAS and LFO to develop best management practices performance measures with respect to governance oversight for applicable boards and commissions.

**Data source**  
Board Best Practices Assessment and Discussion

**Owner**  
OUS Strategic Programs and Planning, Charles Triplett (503) 725-5717

1. **OUR STRATEGY**  
Provide appropriate Board oversight and management practices to fulfill the mission and goals of OUS.

2. **ABOUT THE TARGETS**  
Ideal performance is full adherence to sound management practices.

3. **HOW WE ARE DOING**  
Through a two-phase process, culminating in a facilitated discussion, members of the State Board of Higher Education reached agreement that current practices conform to best practice standards on 14 of 15, or 93%, of criteria.

4. **HOW WE COMPARE**  
There are no national norms for this measure. State agencies meeting established criteria have been required to conduct this assessment.

5. **FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS**  
While the results on this measure are clearly affected by the perspectives and experiences of individual Board members, there has been insufficient work with this measure to fully identify the impact of other factors.
6. **WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE**

   The Board agreed that it was successfully adhering to 14 of the 15 best practices criteria. Within the past year, the Board established a working group to review governance standards and procedures and provide appropriate recommendations.

7. **ABOUT THE DATA**

   OUS staff researched the established best practices criteria, outlining an assessment form and methodology and collecting information on relevant current practices. Members of the Board were given the assessment form during spring of 2008, and asked to indicate which of the best practices criteria were being met by current practices. Individual results and comments were compiled, and the Board engaged in a facilitated discussion at the July 2008 Board meeting.
INCLUSIVITY

Describe the involvement of the following groups in the development of the agency’s performance measures: staff, elected officials, stakeholders, and citizens.

The development of a performance measurement program for OUS began in 1997 with the identification of broad societal goals for public higher education and was codified in statute with the passage of SB 919 by the 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, held on campuses in all regions of Oregon (Klamath Falls, La Grande, Portland, Eugene, Corvallis, and Ashland). These meetings included opportunities for public testimony and OUS staff involved campus leaders (presidents, provosts, and vice presidents) in discussions about the development of performance indicators, data sources, and targets. Following this open and engaging process, the Board approved 30 performance indicators.

A planning group of representatives from each campus developed 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 and propose improvements. Their 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 performance targets. In response to their feedback, the Board elevated 12 key performance indicators (KPIs) out of the 30 proposed in the first year. This change streamlined data collection and analysis, and focused campus efforts on improving processes and results in critical areas of educational quality and student success.

The 30 agency performance measures reported here reflect a majority of the indicators initially identified in November 1997. Modifications based on both internal process reviews and review by the Legislative Assemblies in 2003, 2005, and 2007 sessions have resulted in some changes. OUS regularly reviews performance measures and accountability reporting to improve clarity, facilitate cross-sector collaboration, and integrate performance measurement into agency policy and management processes.
An OUS performance measurement framework – developed in conjunction with the Board’s long-range planning initiatives – guides our tiered system of evidence-based management. It details a limited number of high-level key outcome measures, a broader array of indicators reported at the Board and System level, and a wide range of detailed metrics monitored at the campus level. A copy of the OUS performance framework is attached.

MANAGING FOR RESULTS

How are performance measures used for management of the agency? What changes have been made in the past year?

The OUS uses performance measures to evaluate performance over time and to compare to other higher education systems and institutions. During the past biennium, OUS has worked to promote performance measurement as an effective management and policy tool. Performance measures are now a requisite component of all policy option packages evaluated by the Board, and Board working groups and committees are exploring performance measurement as a means of communicating priorities and results. Campus-level data are reported annually to the Board and are a component of the formal evaluation of university presidents. In 2007, the Board engaged in a performance funding exercise aimed at rewarding campuses meeting performance targets in the areas of student retention, completion, and time-to-degree. Budget reductions in 2007-2009 and 2009-2011 will likely slow performance funding initiatives in the near term.

The OUS performance framework provides a model for connecting performance measurement to strategic planning and policy initiatives. In addition, the OUS is undertaking a comprehensive review of its performance measures and accountability reporting. The guiding principle for this review is to ensure that measures reflect values within the system and throughout the state.

STAFF TRAINING

What training has staff had in the past year on the practical value and use of performance measures?

System and campus staff have opportunities to learn more about performance measurement through dedicated training sessions and as part of broader professional development conferences. Within OUS, performance measurement discussions occur largely within the Office of Strategic Programs and Planning but interdepartmental projects such as Agency Budget Requests and performance funding initiatives fuel performance-related discussion throughout the Chancellor’s Office. The annual OUS Performance Report to the Oregon State Board of Higher Education also affords staff the opportunity to discuss system- and campus-level performance reporting each spring during the production and presentation of the Board report.

OUS staff benefit from membership in local and regional associations like the Pacific Northwest Association for Institutional Research and Planning (PNAIRP) and the Oregon Public Performance Measurement Association (OPPMA). These associations and the professional development opportunities afforded to members, help to broaden performance discussions to include national and international trends and provide a forum for discussing best practices in performance measurement.
COMMUNICATING RESULTS

How does the agency communicate performance results to staff, elected officials, stakeholders, and citizens and for what purpose?

The State Board of Higher Education and the Oregon Legislature receive formal annual performance reports based on the OUS KPMs discussed in this report and the 12 Board-level KPIs elevated in 2000. These reports are posted on the OUS website (www.ous.edu) and available in hardcopy format upon request. Performance results related to specific initiatives (e.g., research, degrees, participation, etc.) are also communicated through agency press releases and various system reports such as the OUS Fact Book. The purposes of these publications are to (1) describe progress towards achieving agency 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.

As a testament to the success of OUS in the area of “communicating results,” Oregon was one of 10 states given a “best practice” rating—the highest grade awarded— for a well developed higher education accountability system. Education Sector, a think tank promoting education reform, analyzed accountability systems across the nation and identified varied results in its report, Ready to Assemble: Grading State Higher Education Accountability Systems. Researchers measured states in 21 categories of accountability, including affordability, degree production, and research, taking into account not only the collection of information, but effective use and reporting of the data.

The report identified Oregon’s strengths as “gathering information on a wide breadth of performance measures, collecting and reporting data in a timely fashion, comparing data across time and/or against peers, aligning state priorities with concrete goals for achievement, and formally linking budgetary decisions to the performance of state postsecondary institutions.” Opportunities for improvement included “proactively informing prospective students, parents, and the general public about the performance of state colleges and universities.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access &amp; Participation</th>
<th>Student Progress &amp; Completion</th>
<th>Academic Quality &amp; Student Success</th>
<th>Knowledge Creation &amp; Innovation</th>
<th>Educated Citizenry &amp; Workforce</th>
<th>Economic, Civic, &amp; Cultural Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Total enrollment</td>
<td>• Completion rate for first-time freshmen</td>
<td>• Recent graduates employed/enrolled</td>
<td>• Research &amp; sponsored dollars</td>
<td>• Degrees awarded, by level</td>
<td>• Recent graduates working in Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others measures reported at the State &amp; Board level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New UG enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Completion rate for transfer students</td>
<td>• Graduate satisfaction</td>
<td>• Degrees in priority areas of labor force development, including engineering/computer science and education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• First-time freshmen</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Freshman-to-sophomore retention rates</td>
<td>• Ratio of students to full-time faculty</td>
<td>• Invention disclosures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community college transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Time to degree (FTF and transfer students)</td>
<td>• Internship participation</td>
<td>• License income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Freshman participation rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessment of student learning outcomes (under development)</td>
<td>• Research dollars per faculty at OSU, PSU, and UO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cost as a percent of income*</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sources of research dollars</td>
<td>• Start-up companies (requested deletions)</td>
<td>• Engineering employer satisfaction (requested deletion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cost covered by financial aid*</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Technology transfer activity (including inventions, licenses, and start-ups)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional data monitored at the System level</strong></td>
<td>• Academic source of OUS students</td>
<td>• Graduation satisfaction with specific aspects of educational experience</td>
<td>• Graduation student enrollment &amp; support</td>
<td>• Degrees detail by discipline and level</td>
<td>• Economic, environmental, and other impacts of capital construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic source of OUS students</td>
<td>• Term-to-term retention data by selected student characteristics</td>
<td>• Faculty compensation</td>
<td>• Graduate student enrollment &amp; support</td>
<td>• Degree awards by level in workforce shortage or priority areas</td>
<td>• Graduate employment by region and industry sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student profiles to monitor participation (race/ethnicity, Oregon county, high-GPA, Pell Grant recipients)</td>
<td>• Completion data by student source and transfer credit</td>
<td>• Faculty by rank, full/part-time status, gender, race/ethnicity</td>
<td>• Degree recipients by demographic detail</td>
<td>• Alumni volunteerism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participation and course enrollment trends</td>
<td>• Tuition, fees, and cost</td>
<td>• Sources of research dollars</td>
<td>• Metrics on existing workforce partnerships</td>
<td>• Economic, environmental, and other impacts of capital construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional data monitored at the Campus level</strong></td>
<td>• Credit and non-credit enrollment details</td>
<td>• Transfer and alignment activities</td>
<td>• Metrics on priority focus areas, such as sustainability, nanoscience, and biomedical research</td>
<td>• Program-specific employment and employer data</td>
<td>• Contributions to community cultural vitality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applications</td>
<td>• Accreditations</td>
<td>• Teaching load</td>
<td>• Facilities required by granting agencies</td>
<td>• Statewide Public Services metrics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Admission requirements</td>
<td>• Classroom profiles</td>
<td>• Instructional support (facilities, libraries, technology, etc.)</td>
<td>• Metrics on priority focus areas, such as sustainability, nanoscience, and biomedical research</td>
<td>• Employment &amp; other local economic impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student costs and financial aid</td>
<td>• Instructional support</td>
<td>• Faculty, student, and program awards &amp; recognition</td>
<td>• Research facilities</td>
<td>• Continuing education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Remediation</td>
<td>• Graduate school entrance exams</td>
<td>• Graduate student enrollment &amp; support</td>
<td>• Collaborative research activity</td>
<td>• Graduate student costs, recruitment, and support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educational delivery modes</td>
<td>• License &amp; certification pass rate</td>
<td>• Detailed metrics required by granting agencies</td>
<td>• Graduate student enrollment &amp; support</td>
<td>• Metrics on existing workforce partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*requested mergers*