



## 2003-04 Accountability Report

January 2005



# H I G H E R EDUCATION

917 Lakeridge Way SW P.O. Box 43430 Olympia, WA 98504-3430 360.753.7800 www.hecb.wa.gov Bob Craves, chair *Redmond* 

Gene Colin *Seattle* 

Roberta Greene *Spokane* 

Jesús Hernández Wenatchee

Bill Marler Seattle

Anthony Rose *Seattle* 

Herb Simon *Tacoma* 

Sam Smith *Seattle* 

Michael Worthy *Vancouver* 

Joan Yoshitomi *Seattle* 

James E. Sulton, Jr., Ph.D. Executive Director

This publication is available on the HECB Web site at www.hecb.wa.gov



January 2005

# Accountability Update: 2003-04 Performance by the Public Baccalaureate Institutions

#### **Background**

The 2003-05 state operating budget requires the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to set biennial performance targets for each public baccalaureate institution and to review each institution's performance annually thereafter.

In December 2003, the board approved new targets for the 2003-05 biennium. This report compares 2003-04 academic year performance against those targets, as well as against baseline data from 1996-99 and midpoint data from 1998-01.

This report will be the final report using the framework described below. As described in House Bill 3103 (Section 11) and the HECB 2004 Strategic Master Plan, HECB staff have been working together with representatives from the two-year and four-year public institutions to design a new accountability monitoring and reporting system. Recommendations for a new system will be presented to the board in April 2005.

#### **Current Reporting Framework**

Each institution is required to report on a total of six measures:

- 1) Graduation Efficiency (Freshmen)
- 2) Graduation Efficiency (Transfers)
- 3) Undergraduate Retention
- 4) Five-Year Freshman Graduation Rate
- 5) Faculty Productivity (which can be measured differently by each institution)
- 6) A unique measure for each institution, reflective of its mission

The first four measures listed are common to all the baccalaureate institutions.

Graduation efficiency is calculated by dividing the total number of credits required for a
baccalaureate degree (minus transfer credits) by the total number of credits attempted at
that institution. For example, a student transferring 90 credits and attempting 90 credits
at a four-year institution toward a bachelor's degree requiring 180 credits is 100 percent

efficient [(180-90)/90]. A student transferring 90 credits and attempting 100 credits at a four-year institution is 90 percent efficient [(180-90)/100]. This calculation expresses "efficiency" in terms of credits completed, rather than the amount of time required for a student to earn a degree, which can be skewed by part-time attendance.

- Retention rates refer to the percentage of undergraduate students who return for consecutive years.
- The percentage of freshmen who graduate within five years is calculated as the fourth common measure.
- The last two measures are institutionally-specific and the manner in which they are calculated can vary.

#### **Key Findings**

There are two ways to evaluate performance:

- 1) Did institutions meet their targets?
- 2) Have institutions improved their performance over time?

Results for these two questions are provided below.

#### 1) 2003-05 Targets and Achievement (Yes = met target; No = did not meet target)

	CWU	EWU	TESC	UW	WSU	wwu
Graduation	86.7	95.0	94.0	95.0	91.5	88
Efficiency:	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
Freshmen						
Graduation	79.6	82.5	90	90	85	82
<b>Efficiency:</b>	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
Transfers						
Undergraduate	82.2%	90%	80%	95%	88%	86%
Retention	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
(overall)						
5-Year	44.3%	45%	50%	65%	56%	55%
Freshman	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Graduation Rate</b>						

### 2) 1998-01 Midpoints and Achievement (Yes =improved since midpoint; No = did not improve since midpoint)

	CWU	EWU	TESC	UW	WSU	WWU
Graduation	86.3	87.7	93.0	90.1	89.8	87
<b>Efficiency:</b>	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Freshmen						
Graduation	79.2	77.4	90	82.6	81.7	80.7
<b>Efficiency:</b>	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Transfers						
Undergraduate	81.8%	88%	78%	87.3%	86%	85.7%
Retention	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
(overall)						
5-Year	43.3%	37.4%	48%	64.4%	53.7%	54.1%
Freshman	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Graduation Rate</b>						

- Central Washington University and Western Washington University met or exceeded their 2003-05 targets for every measure, and have improved on every measure over time.
- Eastern Washington University has not met its 2003-05 targets; however, there is still one year left in the biennium, during which its performance could improve. Eastern has improved its performance on two measures since 1998-2001: graduation efficiency for freshmen and the five-year graduation rate.
- The Evergreen State College has improved performance and met 2003-05 targets for two measures: overall undergraduate retention and the five-year graduation rate.
- The University of Washington has set its targets the highest of all the institutions and has met its five-year graduation rate target of 65 percent. The UW has not yet achieved its targets for the rest of the common measures, but has increased performance for undergraduate retention.
- Washington State University has improved its performance on all the common measures but has yet to reach its targets for all of the measures except the five-year graduation rate.
- All of the institutions have increased their five-year graduation rates over time.
- All but one of the institutions has increased its undergraduate retention rate over time.

• Graduation efficiency for freshmen has improved for four of the six baccalaureate institutions, while graduation efficiency for transfer students remains a challenge, with only three of the baccalaureate institutions showing improved performance since 1998-2001.

#### 2003-04 ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE

**Central Washington University** 

**Eastern Washington University** 

**The Evergreen State College** 

**University of Washington** 

**Washington State University** 

**Western Washington University** 

#### CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

	1996-99 Baseline	1998-01 Midpoint	2003-04 Performance	2003-05 Target	Target met?
Common Measures					
Graduation Efficiency Index					
Freshmen	88.0	86.3	87.8	86.7	Yes
Transfers	83.8	79.2	83.6	79.6	Yes
Undergraduate Retention (overall)	80.5%	81.8%	83.5%	82.2%	Yes
5-Year Freshman Graduation Rate	39.4%	43.3%	44.5%	44.3%	Yes
Institution-Specific Measures					
Faculty Productivity					
Expected Learning Outcomes	92.6%	100%	100%	100%	Yes
% Faculty Mentoring Students	22.5%	17.7%*	26.7%	18.1%	Yes
Ratio of Student FTE to Faculty FTE	22.2	21.5	25.7	23.5	Yes
Transfer Students with Declared					
Majors	75.1%	82.2%	89.7%	86.0%	Yes
Minority Graduation Rate	22.6%	25.0%	24.0%	25.0%	No
Internship Participation	7.3%	7.6%	7.8%	7.8%	Yes

<sup>\*</sup>Two year average.

#### **Description of Institution-Specific Measures**

**Expected Learning Outcomes:** Percentage of degree programs with specifically stated, publicized learning outcomes.

**Percentage of Faculty Mentoring Students:** Percentage of full-time faculty mentoring students in established programs that incorporate a faculty-student mentoring relationship (e.g., CWU research symposium, McNair Scholars Program).

**Ratio of Student FTE to Faculty FTE:** The ratio of student FTEs to faculty full-time equivalents (FTEs). Faculty are counted using the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) definition: "Faculty are those persons identified by the institution as such and typically those whose initial assignments are made for the purpose of conducting instruction, research or public service as a principal activity (or activities)."

**Transfer Students with Declared Majors:** The percentage of undergraduate transfer students who have declared majors by the end of the third quarter at CWU.

**Minority Graduation Rate:** This percentage reflects the number of minority students who graduate each year compared with the number of minority students enrolled fall quarter (averaged over three years).

**Internship Participation:** Percentage of students participating in education internships (averaged over three years).

#### EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

	1996-99 Baseline	1998-01 Midpoint	2003-04 Performance	2003-05 Target	Target met?
Common Measures					
Graduation Efficiency Index					
Freshmen	87.9	87.7	90.8	95	No
Transfers	77.9	77.4	75.8	82.5	No
Undergraduate Retention (overall)	88.5%	88.0%	86.7%	90%	No
5-Year Freshman Graduation Rate	41.7%	37.4%	39%	45%	No
Institution-Specific Measures					
Faculty Productivity					
Student Credit Hours/FTE Faculty	305.9	336.4	375.8	Long-term target met	n/a
Experiential Learning	2,422	2,971	5,558	Long-term target met	n/a
Courses Using Distance Learning Technology	6.4	23.7	30	37.0	No
Freshman Academic Involvement Index	33.7	Not available	At or above national norms on 10 of 13 subscales	All subscales exceed national norms	No

Note: Beginning in 2003-04, EWU is using the standard methodology for calculating GEI used by the other baccalaureate institutions

#### **Description of Institution-Specific Measures**

**Student Credit Hours/FTE Faculty**: A ratio of student credit hours to IPEDS-defined faculty full-time equivalents (FTE) for fall quarter. Faculty are counted using the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) definition: "Faculty are those persons identified by the institution as such and typically those whose initial assignments are made for the purpose of conducting instruction, research or public service as a principal activity (or activities)."

Experiential Learning (previously entitled Internship/Service Learning Experience): Total number of students taking experientially-based courses, including research-directed studies, internship, cooperative education and/or service learning credits.

**Courses Using Distance Learning Technology:** The annual number of courses offered by faculty who use the worldwide Web.

**Freshman Academic Involvement Index**: The sample averages for the major subscales on the College Student Experience Questionnaire (CSEQ), a survey administered annually to students. For more information about the CSEQ, see: <a href="http://www.indiana.edu/~cseq/index.html">http://www.indiana.edu/~cseq/index.html</a>.

#### THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE

	1996-99 Baseline	1998-01 Midpoint	2003-04 Performance	2003-05 Target	Target met?
Common Measures		•			
Graduation Efficiency Index					
Freshmen	93.0	93.0	90.2	94.0	No
Transfers	90.0	90.0	88.1	90.0	No
Undergraduate Retention (Overall)	76.0%	78.0%	80.0%	80.0%	Yes
5-Year Freshman Graduation Rate	45.0%	48.0%	51.0%	50.0%	Yes
Institution-Specific Measures					
Undergraduate Retention (Freshmen)	65.0%	70.0%	71.0%	75.0%	No
Faculty Productivity Freshmen – Growth in "Using Technology to Present Work, Find Information, or Solve Problems"	*	*	2.07	2.12	No
Freshmen – Growth in "Understanding and Applying Quantitative Principles and Methods"	*	*	1.52	1.57	No
<u>Diversity</u> Retention, Students of Color (Olympia)	77.0%	78.0%	80.0%	80.0%	Yes
All Students – Growth in "Understanding Different Philosophies and Cultures"	*	*	2.63	2.68	No
All Students – Growth in "Functioning as a Responsible Member of a Diverse Community"	*	*	2.54	2.59	No

<sup>\*</sup>New indicators added in 2003-04.

#### **Description of Institution-Specific Measures**

**Undergraduate Retention (Freshmen):** The percentage of new first-time, first-year students enrolled fall quarter who are enrolled the subsequent fall quarter.

**Faculty Productivity:** Average rating by freshmen of the extent to which their experience at Evergreen contributed to their academic and personal growth in "using technology to present work, find information, or solve problems," and "understanding and applying quantitative principles and methods" (from the Evergreen Student Experience Survey). Growth is rated on a 5-point scale: 0=Not at all; 1=Very little; 2=Some; 3=Quite a bit; 4=A lot).

#### **Diversity**

**Retention of students of color, Olympia campus:** The percentage of degree-seeking, undergraduate African-American, Hispanic/Latino, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Native American/Alaskan Native students enrolled on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of fall quarter who are enrolled on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of the subsequent fall quarter. This measure tracks the subset of students who are enrolled at the main Olympia campus. The measure does not include undergraduate minority students who are enrolled at Tacoma, tribal reservations, and Grays Harbor. The students include part-time and full-time students, but they must be degree-seeking students.

**Average rating by freshmen** of the extent to which their experience at Evergreen contributed to their academic and personal growth in "understanding different philosophies and cultures" and "functioning as a responsible member of a diverse community" (from the Evergreen Student Experience Survey). Growth is rated on a 5-point scale: 0=Not at all; 1=Very little; 2=Some; 3=Quite a bit; 4=A lot).

#### UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

	1996-99 Baseline	1997-00 Midpoint*	2003-04 Performance	2003-05 Target	Target met?
Common Measures					
Graduation Efficiency Index					
Freshmen	89.6	90.1	90.0	95.0	No
Transfers	81.7	82.6	81.7	90.0	No
Undergraduate Retention (Overall)	87.2%	87.3%	90.0%	95.0%	No
5-Year Freshman Graduation Rate	63.8%	64.4%	67.0%	65.0%	Yes
<b>Institution Specific Measures</b>					
Faculty Productivity					
<b>Enrollment Demand Satisfied</b>	84.8%	85.5%	82.6%	92.0%	No
Quality of Instruction	93.7%	93.2%	91.4%	98.0%	No
Research Funding/Faculty Member	\$216,774	\$236,137	\$328,500	\$320,000**	Yes
Student Credit Hours/Faculty FTE	202.90	202.3	211.5	212.6	No
Instruction # Undergrads w/Intense Research					
Involvement	1,122	1,968	3,777	3,650**	Yes
Individualized Instruction	4.0%	4.3%	3.9%	4.4% Long-term	No
Public Service Internships	842	1,721	3,982	target met Long-term	n/a
% Undergrads in Faculty Research	22.4%	23.5%	24.2%	target met	n/a

<sup>\*</sup>UW used 1997-00 to calculate midpoint.

#### **Description of Institution-Specific Measures**

**Enrollment Demand Satisfied:** The proportion of student demand for courses to enrollment space (course openings).

**Quality of Instruction:** The percentage of students who evaluate the "amount learned in the course" as "good or better" (3.0 or above on 5-point scale) on standard course evaluations.

**Funding for Research per Faculty FTE:** Grants and contracts per faculty FTE (in nominal dollars).

**Student Credit Hours Instructed Per Faculty FTE:** State-reported Student Credit Hours divided by Instructional Faculty FTE.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Depends on availability of federal research funds.

**Individualized Instruction:** Numbers of hours taken as individualized instruction divided by all undergraduate hours. ("Individualized instruction" refers to intensive faculty supervision of individual student projects beyond what is required in regular coursework.)

**Number of Undergraduates Intensively Involved in Research:** Number of students who work with faculty on research for 10 or more hours per week for at least one quarter.

**Percent Undergraduate Credits Taken as Individualized Instruction:** This measures one-on-one intensive academic experiences for undergraduates offered by university faculty. ("Individualized instruction" refers to intensive faculty supervision of student projects beyond what is required in regular coursework.)

Number of Undergraduates Involved with Public Service Internships: Number of students who are involved in public service connected with their studies for 10+ hours per week; data provided by Carlson Center for Public Service.

**Percent of Undergraduates Reporting a Research Experience with Faculty:** Derived from an annual survey of graduating senior students; provides a measure of the cumulative experience over all undergraduate years.

#### WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

	1996-99 Baseline	1998-01 Midpoint	2003-04 Performance	2003-05 Target	Target met?
Common Measures					
Graduation Efficiency Index					
Freshmen	90.0	89.8	90.3	91.5	No
Transfers	81.0	81.7	83.5	85.0	No
Undergraduate Retention (Overall)	84.4%	86.0%	86.9%	88.0%	No
5-Year Freshmen Graduation Rate	53.8%	53.7%	57.8%	56.0%	Yes
Institution Specific Measures					
Freshman Retention	83.7%	83.6%	84.3%	85.0%	No
Faculty Productivity					
Student Credit Hours/Faculty FTE	198.5	199.8	223.8	215.0	Yes
Individualized Enrollment/Faculty	3.7	3.5	3.8	4.0	No
Research and Scholarship	80.3%	85.0%	87.5%	Long-term target met	n/a
<u>Technology for Learning</u>					
Distance Student Credit Hours	24,204	40,930	49,216	Long-term target met	n/a
Degree Programs via Distance	6	10	11	12	No
Re-engineered Courses	131	586	792	Long-term target met	n/a
Classrooms with Technology	51.4%	67.6%	83.7%	80.0%	Yes

#### **Description of Institution-Specific Measures**

**Freshman Retention:** WSU has set a target for freshman retention, while continuing to report overall undergraduate retention as a measure common to all institutions.

**Individualized Enrollment/Faculty:** Measures the amount of work faculty do with students in the form of supervising undergraduate research, internships, senior theses, private lessons, and independent studies.

**Student Credit Hours per Faculty FTE:** Number of credit hours generated per instructional faculty FTE.

**Research and Scholarship:** The percentage of faculty who completed the expected amount and type of scholarship during the past year, based on each college's definition of what constitutes scholarly work in that field.

**Distance Student Credit Hours:** Credit hours earned through interactive video courses, videotaped courses, online courses and multiple mode courses.

**Degree Programs via Distance:** The number of different degree programs offered away from any WSU campus, and primarily through electronic media such as interactive video and online courses.

**Re-engineered Courses:** The number of courses taught "primarily" by electronic means, including WHETS, online, e-mail and video conference.

**Classrooms with Technology:** The percentage of university classrooms equipped to support technology-intensive teaching.

#### WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

	1996-99 Baseline	1998-01 Midpoint	2003-04 Performance	2003-05 Target	Target met?
Common Measures				g	
Graduation Efficiency Index					
Freshmen	86.6	87.0	90.2	88.0	Yes
Transfers	80.5	80.7	84.2	82.0	Yes
Undergraduate Retention (overall)	85.5%	85.7%	87.9%	86.0%	Yes
5-Year Freshman Graduation Rate	54.0%	54.1%	55.7%	55.0%	Yes
Institution-Specific Measures					
Undergraduate Retention (freshman to sophomore)	80.3%	79.7%	83.0%	82.0%	Yes
5-Year Minority Graduation Rate	38.4%	41.3%	47.7%	42.0%	Yes
Transfers graduating with a B.S. in science (graduation efficiency)	71.3	71.8	77.5%	74.0%	Yes
Faculty Productivity Individualized Credits/FTE Student	1.43	1.56	1.74	1.52	Yes
Student Credit Hours/Undergraduate FTE Writing Courses	2.10	2.17	2.20	2.30	No
Hours Scheduled in Computer Labs	22.4	24.0	25.2	25.0	Yes
Departments Adopting Advising Model	0.0%	44.2%	98.0%	98.0%	Yes

#### **Description of Institution-Specific Measures**

**Undergraduate Retention (freshman to sophomore year):** The percentage of freshmen who return for their second year.

**Five-Year Minority Graduation Rate:** The percentage of minority students who graduate within five years.

**Transfers Graduating with a B.S. in Science:** Graduation efficiency for transfer students who earn a bachelor's degree in science.

**Individualized Credit/FTE Student:** Measures the number of credits generated per FTE student through individual instructional activities, including internships, work on faculty research projects, and other one-on-one activities.

**Student Credit Hours/Undergraduate FTE in Writing Courses:** Student credit hours per undergraduate FTE in courses designated as principally or specifically writing-based.

**Hours Scheduled in Computer Labs:** The number of student hours scheduled in university or departmental computer labs per FTE undergraduate.

**Departments Adopting Advising Model:** The percentage of WWU academic departments that have fully implemented all elements of Western's departmental advising model, which has the following components: (a) a clearly defined departmental advising program, with the advisor, location, hours, and other information easily accessible and known; (b) a fully operational department Web page, based on established template and criteria; (c) provision of an individualized, written plan of study to each student upon his or her declaration of major; (d) sponsorship of at least one event annually to help pre-majors decide on a major; and (e) sponsorship of at least one event annually to help advanced majors in the department explore career and graduate school options.