

#### Tab 2 Certification of Performance on Performance Measures

Coordinating Board for Higher Education January 21, 2020

#### **BACKGROUND**

The Coordinating Board certified results for five of the six performance measures at its December meeting. The graduate outcomes measure, however, is not available for the current year by December because the public universities follow a national protocol for follow-up on the past academic year's completers. The First Destination Survey is published by the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE), and NACE protocol directs that institutions be given until December 30 following the academic year to determine the status of graduates.

Complete data are now available from the public universities and community and technical colleges, and are summarized in the attachment. Priority measures for recommended funding are also summarized below.

#### **CURRENT STATUS**

Each sector reports graduate outcomes by a methodology that reflects their differentiation, accounts for effectively all undergraduate completers, and has been previously vetted by Departement of Higher Education and Workforce Development (DHEWD) staff and approved by the Coordinating Board.

- Public Universities: Administer the NACE First Destination Survey to bachelor's and associate's degree completers. Completers are marked successful if employed full-time, participating in a voluntary service program (e.g. the Peace Corps), serving in the military, or enrolled in continuing education within six months of graduation.
- Community Colleges and MSU-West Plains: Completers are marked successful if competitively employed, serving in the military, or found in state wage records within six months of graduation, or enrolled in continuing education within 12 months of graduation.
- State Technical College: Completers are marked successful if competitively employed, serving in the military, or enrolled in continuing education within six months of graduation.

Community and technical colleges report a prior academic year (2017-18) due to data methodology and timelines necessary for follow-up. All sectors are required to account for at least 60 percent of graduates and to have at least 75 percent counted as successful in order to succeed on the measure.

Of the six total performance funding measures, the DHEWD worked with sectors in 2018 to select three "priority" measures for recommended funding. These recommendations were intended to highlight workforce-related measures, and are carried forward for the FY 2021 budget.

- Public Universities: Completions per FTE student, pass rates on assessment or professional licensure exams, and graduate outcomes
- Community Colleges and MSU-West Plains: Three-year graduation and transfer rate, pass rates on professional licensure exams, and graduate outcomes
- State Technical College: Three-year graduation rate, major field assessment pass rate, and graduate outcomes

DHEWD staff continue to collect data on all measures in the event of questions from legislators or other stakeholders, and for purposes of continuity of the framework. Results on all measures are summarized in the Attachment.

#### **NEXT STEPS**

DHEWD staff will provide final results to the Office of Budget and Planning.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommend that the Coordinating Board approve and certify performance measures as reported by the institutions and summarized in the attachment.

#### **ATTACHMENT**

• 2020 Performance Measure Results



# 2019 Performance Measure Results Community Colleges

	Crowder College	East Central College	Jefferson College	Metropolitan Community College	Mineral Area College	Missouri State University-West Plains	Moberly Area Community College	North Central Missouri College	Ozarks Technical Community College	St. Charles Community College	St. Louis Community College	State Fair Community College	Three Rivers College
Three-Year Graduation and Tra	nsfer Rate												
Fall 2012-Fall 2014	39.5%	36.6%	39.6%	38.6%	41.4%	30.1%	41.5%	50.1%	41.1%	39.1%	27.5%	43.4%	33.4%
Fall 2013-Fall 2015	40.6%	39.5%	39.8%	38.1%	46.0%	33.9%	42.8%	53.4%	42.8%	40.7%	30.1%	44.3%	35.0%
Top third of peers	46.3%	46.3%	46.3%	46.3%	46.3%	46.3%	46.3%	46.3%	46.3%	46.3%	46.3%	46.3%	46.3%
In top third of peers	40.570	40.570	40.570	40.570	40.570	40.570	40.570	40.570	40.570	40.570	40.570	40.570	40.570
Improved	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>		<b>√</b>	✓ (Y2Y)	<b>√</b>	<b>→</b>	✓	✓	✓	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>
Did not improve, not in top third of peers				1	,	V (121)		·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· ·	<u> </u>	•
Did not improve, not in top third or peers				•									
Percent of Attempted Courses	Successfully												
Fall 2014-Fall 2016	77.4%	75.3%	76.0%	70.6%	85.3%	72.2%	74.8%	83.4%	71.4%	74.0%	69.5%	78.0%	75.6%
Fall 2015-Fall 2017	79.4%	75.8%	77.5%	71.0%	85.8%	73.7%	76.1%	83.1%	70.5%	73.7%	70.5%	78.9%	76.9%
Top third of peers	78.8%	78.8%	78.8%	78.8%	78.8%	78.8%	78.8%	78.8%	78.8%	78.8%	78.8%	78.8%	78.8%
In top third of peers					✓			✓				✓	
Improved	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓
Did not improve, not in top third of peers									✓	✓			
Pass Rates on Professional Lice	ncure Evame												
Fall 2016-Fall 2018	99.2%	98.3%	91.8%	91.8%	95.1%	95.2%	93.6%	96.4%	97.2%	94.0%	95.6%	95.2%	86.8%
Fall 2017-Fall 2019	98.9%	98.0%	93.0%	95.9%	96.0%	96.9%	92.3%	96.6%	97.8%	97.8%	94.6%	97.0%	87.8%
Benchmark	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%
Meets or exceeds benchmark	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Improved			✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Did not improve, not at benchmark													
Non-Core Expenditures as a Pe	rcent of Tota	l Expenditur	es										
Fall 2014-Fall 2016	10.7%	23.1%	32.8%	23.6%	15.7%	32.0%	13.8%	42.2%	11.7%	17.4%	24.5%	26.1%	19.2%
Fall 2015-Fall 2017	11.8%	24.8%	35.8%	24.2%	16.1%	30.8%	14.1%	37.4%	12.9%	18.3%	23.7%	27.6%	19.1%
Top third of peers	18.1%	18.1%	18.1%	18.1%	18.1%	18.1%	18.1%	18.1%	18.1%	18.1%	18.1%	18.1%	18.1%
In top third of peers	<b>1</b> 0.17,0	1011/0	10.170	10,170	<b>√</b>	151170	✓ ×	10.170	✓	101170	2012/0	20,270	101170
Improved						✓		<b>√</b>			✓		✓
Did not improve, not in top third of peers		✓	✓	✓						✓		<b>√</b>	
bid not improve, not in top third or peers										•		·	
Tuition and Fees as a Percent of	of Median Far	mily Income											
Fall 2014-Fall 2016	7.3%	6.3%	5.2%	5.0%	7.1%	7.4%	6.8%	7.3%	8.1%	4.6%	5.8%	7.1%	8.6%
Fall 2015-Fall 2017	7.3%	6.4%	5.3%	5.0%	7.1%	7.5%	6.8%	7.6%	8.5%	4.6%	5.8%	7.3%	9.3%
Median of peers	7.3%	7.3%	7.3%	7.3%	7.3%	7.3%	7.3%	7.3%	7.3%	7.3%	7.3%	7.3%	7.3%
Below national median		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓		
Improved													
Did not improve, above national median	✓					✓		✓	✓			✓	✓
Graduate Outcomes													
	00.504	02.52/	00.007	00.507	0.4.70/	02.00/	01.107	02.22/	00.007	0.4.407	0F 22/	00.227	00.50/
2014-2015 to 2016-2017	88.6%	93.6%	88.8%	88.5%	94.7%	92.0%	91.1%	93.2%	90.0%	94.4%	85.3%	88.2%	88.6%
2015-2016 to 2017-2018	91.3%	93.7%	88.3%	89.6%	94.1%	92.3%	92.6%	94.5%	90.3%	92.8%	86.1%	89.9%	89.7%
Benchmark	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%
At or above benchmark	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>	✓	<b>√</b>	✓	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>	✓	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>	<b>✓</b>
Improved	✓	<b>√</b>		✓		<b>√</b>	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	<b>√</b>
Did not improve, not at benchmark													
Community College Totals													
Measures Made	3/3 priority 5/6 overall	3/3 priority 5/6 overall	3/3 priority 5/6 overall	2/3 priority 4/6 overall	3/3 priority 6/6 overall	3/3 priority 5/6 overall	3/3 priority 6/6 overall	3/3 priority 5/6 overall	3/3 priority 4/6 overall	3/3 priority 4/6 overall	3/3 priority 6/6 overall	3/3 priority 4/6 overall	3/3 priority 5/6 overall



### 2019 Performance Measure Results

## Public Universities and State Technical College

	Harris-Stowe State University	Lincoln University	Missouri State University	Missouri Southern State University	Missouri Western State University	Northwest Missouri State University	Southeast Missouri State University	University of Central Missouri	Truman State University	University of Missouri System		State Technical Colleg
Completions Per Full-Time Equ	ivalent Stude	ent									Completions Per FTE	
FY 2015-FY 2017	18.2	24.0	33.0	35.8	31.0	37.7	29.8	50.5	33.4	40.4	FY 2015-FY 2017	66.2
FY 2016-FY 2018	19.3	25.4	33.9	37.9	31.4	37.4	31.0	52.1	33.4	42.0	FY 2016-FY 2018	67.3
Benchmark	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	Benchmark	25.0
Meets or exceeds benchmark		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Meets or exceeds benchmark	✓
Improved	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	Improved	✓
Did not improve, not at benchmark											Did not improve, not at benchmark	
ass Rates on Learning Assessr	nents or Pro	fessional Lice	<mark>ensure Exar</mark>	ns							Graduation Rate	
FY 2016-FY 2018	19.3%	25.3%	100.0%	96.2%	55.5%	74.5%	89.4%	68.5%	75.3%	94.6%	Fall 2011-Fall 2013	62.6%
FY 2017-FY 2019	16.8%	34.7%	100.0%	95.3%	54.5%	71.2%	92.9%	68.8%	76.3%	94.4%	Fall 2012-Fall 2014	66.4%
Benchmark	50.0%	50.0%	90.0%	90.0%	50.0%	60.0%	90.0%	60.0%	70.0%	90.0%	Top Third of Peers	
Meets or exceeds benchmark			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	At or above top third	
Improved		✓ (Y2Y / W)					✓	✓	✓		Improved	✓
Did not improve, not at benchmark	✓										Did not improve, not at benchmark	
rcent of Total Expenditures of	on Core Miss	sion									Major Field Assessment Pass Rate	
FY 2014-FY 2016	48.3%	60.0%	68.3%	58.7%	64.2%	62.8%	61.9%	65.5%	68.9%	73.4%	FY 2016-FY 2018	88.1%
FY 2015-FY 2017	48.5%	58.4%	68.2%	59.2%	65.3%	62.5%	62.0%	64.7%	68.6%	72.7%	FY 2017-FY 2019	87.8%
Top third of peers	58.0%	56.4%	62.6%	61.2%	60.1%	60.1%	60.4%	62.8%	61.5%	70.6%	Benchmark	60.0%
At or above top third		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Meets or exceeds benchmark	✓
Improved	✓			✓	✓		✓				Improved	
Did not improve, not in top third of peers											Did not improve, not at benchmark	
ange in Salary Expenditures	Compared to	o Median Ho	ousehold Inc	come							Core as a Percent of Total Expenditu	res
Change in salaries exp. per FTE, FY15-17 to 16-18	3%	3.3%	-1.0%	-2.3%	5.0%	3.1%	2.6%	4.2%	-1.5%	1.4%	FY 2014-FY 2016	70.6%
Change in Median Household Income (MHI)	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	FY 2015-FY 2017	70.6%
Salary expenditures did not increase	<b>∠</b> .//₀	21770	✓ ·	<b>∠</b> 1770	21770	21770	217,75	21770	✓ ·	217 /0	Benchmark	60.8%
Salary expenditures grew more slowly than MHI	✓		✓	✓			✓		✓	✓	At or above top third	✓
Salary expenditures increased and faster than MHI		✓			✓	✓		✓			Improved	
MINI											Did not improve, not at benchmark	
et Tuition Revenue per Full-T	ime Fauivale	ent Student (	`ompared to	o Median Ho	usehold Incor	ne					Tuition & Fees as a Percent of Median Fam	nilv Income
Net Tuition Revenue/FTE, FY 2015-FY 2017		\$6,544	•				\$6.100	¢7 1 4 7	¢4.014	¢0.453	FY 2015-FY 2017	
Net Tuition Revenue/FTE, FY 2015-FY 2017  Net Tuition Revenue/FTE, FY 2016-FY 2018	\$4,619		\$6,967	\$5,719 \$5,770	\$6,737 \$6,754	\$5,853	\$6,106 \$6,214	\$7,147	\$4,914	\$9,452	FY 2015-FY 2017 FY 2016-FY 2018	11.3%
Change in Net Tuition Revenue/FTE	\$4,678 1.3%	\$6,727 2.8%	\$7,084 1.7%	\$5,770 0.9%	\$6,754 0.2%	\$6,330 8.1%	\$6,214 1.8%	\$7,235 1.2%	\$4,807 -2.2%	\$9,668 2.3%	FY 2016-FY 2018 Median of peers	11.1%
Change in MHI	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	iviculari of pecis	
Net tuition revenue decreased	2.770	∠.//0	2.770	2.7/0	2.7/0	Z.//0	2.770	2.7/0	∠.//0	Z.//0	Meets or exceeds benchmark	
New tuition grew more slowly than MHI	<b>√</b>		✓	<b>√</b>	✓		<b>√</b>	<b>✓</b>	•	✓	Improved	<b>√</b>
Net tuition increased and faster than MHI		✓				✓					Did not improve, not at benchmark	
aduate Outcomes											Graduate Outcomes	
	76 10/	74.20/	77.40/	7.5.20/	90.30/	96.394	77.70/	9.6 40/	77.00/	90.70/		00.40/
2015-2016 to 2017-2018 2016-2017 to 2018-2019	76.1% 76.1%	74.2% 78.1%	77.4% 83.0%	76.3% 80.8%	80.2% 79.0%	86.3% 88.4%	77.7% 80.0%	86.4% 85.9%	77.9% 78.1%	80.7% 84.9%	FY 2015-FY 2017 FY 2016-FY 2018	96.4% 97.3%
Benchmark	75.0%	78.1% 75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	78.1% 75.0%	75.0%	Benchmark	75.0%
At or above benchmark	75.070 ✓	/3.U/0	/J.U/0	/5.0% ✓	/J.U/0	75.0%	/5.U% ✓	/J.U/0	/5.0%	73.070 ✓	Meets or exceeds benchmark	/3.0/0
Improved		· ✓	· ✓	· /		<i>✓</i>	· /		· ✓	<i>✓</i>	Improved	<b>√</b>
Did not improve, not at benchmark											Did not improve, not at benchmark	
blic University and State Tec	hnical Collec	e Totals										
Measures Made	2/3 priority	3/3 priority	3/3 priority	3/3 priority	3/3 priority	3/3 priority	3/3 priority	3/3 priority	3/3 priority	3/3 priority		3/3 priority
	5/6 overall	4/6 overall	6/6 overall	6/6 overall	5/6 overall	4/6 overall	6/6 overall	5/6 overall	6/6 overall	6/6 overall		6/6 overall 0 TBD