Florida State University System

SUPA Recommendations to the Florida Board of Governors regarding Performance Indicators and Goals for *Building World-Class Academic Programs and Research Capacity*[1]

Background:

Following discussion of the draft SUS Strategic Plan presented at the May 18, 2004 meeting of the State University Presidents' Association, Mr. John Dasburg, Chair of the Florida Board of Governors' Strategic Planning Committee invited the State University Presidents to develop a set of valid performance criteria that might be used to gauge the progress of the State University System and its institutions toward the goal of *Building World-Class Academic Programs and Research Capacity*. Concern was expressed by some institutional leaders that the proposed Association of American Universities (AAU) measures did not adequately address the breadth and diversity of research productivity at SUS institutions. Moreover, the goal of a second AAU member institution in the State of Florida by 2012-13 suggested a lack of statewide ambition in the minds of some (compared to nine in California; seven in New York; four in Pennsylvania; and three in each of Texas, Illinois and Massachusetts), while concern was expressed that the AAU's "by invitation only" membership process might, through an overemphasis on reputational ratings, effectively remove institutional and/or system-wide control over achieving the goal.

Accordingly, the SUPA recommends adoption of a hybrid set of performance criteria that will collectively yield a valid assessment of institutional and system-wide progress toward *Building World-Class Academic Programs and Research Capacity* while promoting the importance of differentiated research missions (and institutional types) across the Florida State University System. Furthermore, the university presidents recommend that, where possible, the FBOG utilize data already collected/reported by SUS institutions. The institutional/system-wide research performance categories recommended by the university presidents include measures related to:

i. Faculty quality and research productivity,
ii. Advanced training,
iii Research funding,
iv. Research outputs.

[1] There is a need to confirm that Goal I.C. has been amended to read *Building World-Class Academic [Programs and] Research Capacity.*

Proposed Research Performance Indicators:

The core measures of the proposed set of research performance criteria include indicators utilized by *TheCenter* (at the University of Florida) in compiling its annual report (2000-2004) on *The Top American Research Universities*. Furthermore, readily available data collected and/or reported are recommended for inclusion to ensure a more comprehensive assessment of *Building World-Class Academic Programs and Research Capacity*. In each case it is recommended that SUS totals be divided by the total number of FTE faculty.

1. Total Research Expenditures [i and iii]
2. Federal Research Expenditures [i and iii]
3. Doctorates Awarded [ii and iv]
4. US Patents Issued [i and iv]

Notes:

Items 1-3 are included in *The Top American Research Universities* annual report published by *TheCenter*, at the University of Florida.
Item 4 is another suggested performance indicator utilizing readily available data reports.

Definitions and Data Sources:

1. Total Research Expenditures
   Source: *The Top American Research Universities*, published by *TheCenter* at the University of Florida; NSF/SRS Survey of R&D Expenditures at Universities and Colleges.

2. Federal Research Expenditures
   Source: *The Top American Research Universities*, published by *TheCenter* at the University of Florida; NSF/SRS Survey of R&D Expenditures at Universities and Colleges.

3. Doctorates Awarded
   Source: *The Top American Research Universities*, published by *TheCenter* at the University of Florida; NCES IPEDS Completions Survey, doctoral degrees awarded between July 1 and June 30.

4. US Patents Issued
   Source: U.S. Colleges and Universities Patents and Licenses issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, and the annual *Licensing Survey* of the Association of University Technology Managers.

Proposed Goals:

While it is acknowledged that *The Top American Research Universities* annual report does not consider "world class" performance it appears reasonable to assume that American institutions are most highly represented among rankings of the world's best universities. In a *2003 Academic Ranking of World Universities* conducted by the Institute of Higher Education at Shanghai Jiao

Tong University (http://ed.sjtu.edu.cn/rank/methodology.htm), 18 American universities appeared among the Top-25 in the World; 36 among the Top-50; and 59 among the Top 100. The University of Florida was ranked 75th, while the University of Miami (Top 150), Florida State University (Top 200), University of South Florida (Top 300), Florida International University (Top 400): and the University of Central Florida (Top 450) appeared on the list of the *Top 500 World Universities.* However, the search for comparative global, empirical data (Nobel laureates, highly cited researchers; articles in *Nature* and *Science*; articles in *Science Citation Index-expanded* and *Social Science Citation Index*; and, academic performance per faculty) necessarily led to a relatively narrow assessment which, when combined with a paucity of historical reporting, suggested that this study does not yet offer a valid performance assessment of *Building World Class Academic Programs and Research Capacity.*

Accordingly, the university presidents recommend using institutional rank (and composite statewide rank) in *The Top American Research Universities* annual report as an indicator of progress toward the Florida Board of Governors' strategic goal of *Building World Class Academic Programs and Research Capacity.* In *The Center's* most recent report (November 2003), six SUS institutions were identified (University of Florida; University of South Florida; Florida State University; Florida International University; University of Central Florida; and Florida A&M – in order of Federal Research Expenditures in 2001), as having reported upward of $20 M in Federal Research Expenditures in 2001.

An analysis of cumulative performance by SUS institutions in *The Top American Research Universities* annual reports (2000-2004) reveals that only one institution, the University of Florida, appears among the Top 25 public research universities, ranked at #7. In addition, Florida State University and the University of South Florida rank in the Top 100 public research universities. Florida International University, the University of Central Florida, and Florida A&M University are also included among the Top 200 public research universities. It is interesting to note that 21 of the Top 25 public research institutions hold membership in AAU with 12 more membership institutions appearing in the Top 26-50 institutions. The University of Oregon is the only AAU member institution that did not rank among the nation's Top 50 public research universities from 2000-2004.

SUS Performance in the 2003 Annual Report of *The Top American Research Universities*:

1 SUS institution among the Top 25 American public research universities
1 SUS institutions among the Top 26-50 American public research universities
1 SUS institutions among the Top 51-75 American public research universities

Comparison with the largest states (2003 Annual Report):

California: 5 institutions among the Top 25 American public research universities
3 institutions among the Top 26-50 American public research universities
2 institutions among the Top 51-75 American public research universities

Texas: 3 institutions among the Top 25 American public research universities
0 institutions among the Top 26-50 American public research universities
4 institutions among the Top 51-75 American public research universities

New York: 0 institutions among the Top 25 American public research universities
2 institutions among the Top 26-50 American public research universities

0 institutions among the Top 51-75 American public research universities

Illinois: 1 institutions among the Top 25 American public research universities
1 institutions among the Top 26-50 American public research universities
0 institutions among the Top 51-75 American public research universities

Pennsylvania: 2 institutions among the Top 25 American public research universities
0 institutions among the Top 26-50 American public research universities
1 institutions among the Top 51-75 American public research universities

Ohio: 1 institutions among the Top 25 American public research universities
1 institutions among the Top 26-50 American public research universities
0 institutions among the Top 51-75 American public research universities

Indiana: 1 institutions among the Top 25 American public research universities
3 institutions among the Top 26-50 American public research universities
0 institutions among the Top 51-75 American public research universities

Proposed SUS Goal for 2008-2009:

1 SUS institution among the Top 25 American Public Research Universities
2 SUS institutions among the Top 26-50 American Public Research Universities
2 SUS institutions among the Top 51-100 American Public Research Universities

Proposed SUS Goal for 2012-2013:

2 SUS institutions among the Top 25 American Public Research Universities
2 SUS institutions among the Top 26-50 American Public Research Universities
3 SUS institutions among the Top 51-100 American Public Research Universities

Further considerations:

(a) Focus on system-wide performance,
(b) Where possible, tie performance to distinctive institutional missions, peer institutional comparisons, and year-to-year growth,
(c) Consider using institutional faculty headcounts for normalizing data.