

Recommended measure	Selected comments from 09/16/03 and 10/1/03 SUS sector meetings	Should this be an SUS (aggregate) accountability measure?	Should this be an accountability measure for your individual university?	How should the standard for this measure be determined (e.g., against own prior performance, peers, threshold, etc.)?	If standard is set in this manner, should this measure a performance-based funding measure for your university?
Number of degrees granted at all levels.	Okay for SUS aggregate measure. Other sectors might want to consider similar measures to capture evidence of student learning.	10 Yes	10 Yes	5 (Own performance) 2 (Based on enrollment plan) 1 (5-year trend as well as performance of peer institutions taking funded enrollment into account) 1 (Own performance and goals set for evaluation period) 1 (Average over several years weighted by funded enrollment increases)	6 Yes; 2 No; 1 Maybe; 1 This can best be decided once all measures are identified
<i>Scores on the Graduate Record Examination</i>	<i>Proposed by K-20 Task Force. Not recommended by SUS Task Force. Prefer using the proportion of students who enroll in a graduate-level program within an appropriate timeframe.</i>	<i>1 Yes; 7 No; 1 Only fair if evaluated on those students who intend to go to graduate school; 1 no response</i>	<i>1 Yes; 8 No; 1 no response</i>	<i>10 (None/No response/?/NA)</i>	<i>8 No; 1 no response; 1 N/A</i>
<i>Assessments of Student Learning Outcomes</i>	<i>See memo from Mr. Uhlfelder and homework assignment from K-20 group. Institutions will report on initiatives to assess outcomes within disciplines</i>	<i>Under continued discussion</i>	<i>Under continued discussion</i>	<i>Under continued discussion</i>	<i>Under continued discussion</i>
Proportion of test takers who pass licensure tests within a time frame appropriate to the discipline.	Need to see how successful efforts are to obtain data.	9 Yes; 1 No	6 Yes; 4 No	4 (Own performance) 3 (No response) 1 (5-year trend as well as performance of peer institutions) 1 (Own performance or peers) 1 (National average or peers)	2 Yes; 1 Maybe; 5 No; 1 No, or not weighted very high, since such a small proportion of the population; 1 This can best be decided once all measures are identified
<i>Percentage of qualified HS graduates enrolled in postsecondary</i>	<i>(New access measure in response to K-20 task force) Good measure for entire system, including community colleges. Not an institutional measure.</i>	<i>Yes (with other postsecondary sectors)</i>	<i>N/A</i>		

Recommended measure	Selected comments from 09/16/03 and 10/1/03 SUS sector meetings	Should this be an SUS (aggregate) accountability measure?	Should this be an accountability measure for your individual university?	How should the standard for this measure be determined (e.g., against own prior performance, peers, threshold, etc.)?	If standard is set in this manner, should this measure a performance-based funding measure for your university?
<i>Number of students applying, admitted, enrolled--disaggregated (New access measure in response to K-20 task force)</i>	<i>(New access measure in response to K-20 task force) Good measure for entire system, including community colleges. Not an institutional measure.</i>	Yes	N/A		Limited by level of funded enrollment; universities are already accountable for meeting enrollment plans.
Proportion of underrepresented populations among graduates at all levels.	Measures access and retention at all levels needed to attain the degree. Okay for SUS aggregate measure. Good measure because it requires successful access at all levels.	9 Yes; 1 Yes informational only	7 Yes; 1 Yes informational only; 2 No	4 (Own performance) 2 (Own performance, peers, state population) 1 (Own performance and against the aggregate opportunities available for improvement) 1 (Impossible to set standards that aren't racial quotas) 2 (None/No response)	1 Yes; 8 No; 1 This can best be decided once all measures are identified
Proportion of students who enroll in a graduate-level program within an appropriate time frame.	Use an index that is as comprehensive as possible in terms of institutions participating in state and nationally. Within one year? Should be paired with employment.	8 Yes; 1 Yes informational only; 1 No,	7 Yes; 1 Yes informational only; 2 No	3 (Own performance) 2 (Own performance and peers) 2 (State average, own performance) 1 (Own performance and goals) 2 (None/No response)	2 Yes; 7 No; 1 No response
First-to-second-year retention rate for FTICs (Using IPEDS or CDS definitions).	Okay for SUS aggregate measure. More timely data than six-year graduation rate. Catch students who show up any time during the second year. DCU staff will send copies of definitions to representatives. (Do we need to break this out by race/ethnicity?)	10 Yes	10 Yes	4 (Own performance and peers) 3 (Own performance) 1 (Own performance and goals) 1 (5-year trend as well as performance of peer institutions) 1 (Peers)	8 Yes; 1 ?; 1 This can best be decided once all measures are identified

Recommended measure	Selected comments from 09/16/03 and 10/1/03 SUS sector meetings	Should this be an SUS (aggregate) accountability measure?	Should this be an accountability measure for your individual university?	How should the standard for this measure be determined (e.g., against own prior performance, peers, threshold, etc.)?	If standard is set in this manner, should this measure a performance-based funding measure for your university?
6-year, cohort-based graduation rate (using IPEDS definition).	National standard. Factors outside of SUS control may affect rates. Prefer this one for SUS aggregate measure. If used for individual university measure, compare against own past performance or performance of peers (e.g., identified through IPEDS database based on full-time/part-time ratios). Six years may be too long for funding. Some advocated option to choose different measures based on full-time versus part-time students (per FIU definitions).	8 Yes; 1 Yes informational only; 1 Yes, if there are separate rates for part time and full time cohorts based on overall attendance pattern, as discussed in our meetings	8 Yes; 1 Yes informational only; 1 Yes, if there are separate rates for part time and full time cohorts based on overall attendance pattern, as discussed in our meetings	5 Own performance and peers 3 Own performance 1 (Own performance and goals) 1 (None)	4 Yes; 1 Yes, however to affect change is very slow; 4 No; 1 No – timeframe for measurement is too long to be used in performance funding
Four-year graduation rates.	<i>Proposed by K-20 Task Force. Consider reporting (along with longer-term rates) per JCAR recommendations, but NOT for accountability or performance-based funding purposes. Alone, runs counter to some institutional missions. Four years does not allow for part-time students or students with 12 credits/semester.</i>	3 Yes; 2 Yes informational only; 3 No; 2 no response	3 Yes; 2 Yes informational only; 3 No; 2 no response	8 (None/No response) 2 (Own performance)	1 Yes; 1 Yes informational only; 5 No; 2 no response; 1 N/A

Recommended measure	Selected comments from 09/16/03 and 10/1/03 SUS sector meetings	Should this be an SUS (aggregate) accountability measure?	Should this be an accountability measure for your individual university?	How should the standard for this measure be determined (e.g., against own prior performance, peers, threshold, etc.)?	If standard is set in this manner, should this measure a performance-based funding measure for your university?
4-year graduation rate for AA transfers.	Use full-time in first semester (parallel to IPEDS definition for six-year rates for FTICS).	8 Yes; 1 Yes informational only; 1 Yes informational only; 1 Yes, if there are separate rates for part time and full time cohorts based on overall attendance pattern, as discussed in our meetings	7 Yes; 1 Yes informational only, 1 ?; 1 Yes informational only Yes, if there are separate rates for part time and full time cohorts based on overall attendance pattern, as discussed in our meetings	3 (Own performance) 2 (Own performance and peers) 2 (Peers) 1 (Own performance and goals) 2 (None/No response)	5 No; 3 No information only; 1 ?; 1 No – timeframe for measurement is too long to be used in performance funding
Proportions of bachelor graduates not enrolled in further education who are employed in Florida and earning above determined thresholds within one year of graduation.	Generally O.K. in concept, but need further work on threshold levels.	9 Yes; 1 Yes informational only	7 Yes; 1 Yes informational only; 1 No; 1?	2 (Own Performance) 2 (Threshold) 1 (Threshold not meaningful-does not indicate that job related to degree earned) 1 (Awaiting data for guidance) 1 (Not sure, needs to account for discipline mix of university) 1 (Information Only) 2 (None/No response)	1 Yes; 8 No; 1 This can best be decided once all measures are identified
Percent of graduates completing programs within 115% of required credit hours.	GAA Implementing Bill says 115% for universities and 120% for community colleges. Should be same for both sectors.	10 Yes	10 Yes	7 (Own performance) 2 (5-year trend as well as performance of peer institutions) 1 (Measures as a combination of own performance improvement and difference from statewide average. Need to set reasonable time frame for achieving targets (it takes time from admission to graduation))	7 Yes; 2 No; 1 This can best be decided once all measures are identified
Cost per graduate.	Need more work on formula. Look into national standards and definitions.	4 Yes; 1 Yes, as long as we can agree on definition; 5 No	3 Yes; 7 No	6 (None/No response/?) 2 (The standard cannot be determined until the measure is specified) 1 (Measured against peer institutions if IPEDS used. Alternatively, use the rate of growth of expenditures compared to the growth in E&G funding if SUS expenditure analysis used)	1 Yes; 7 No; 1 No, although it is difficult to say in the absence of a specified measure; 1 N/A

Recommended measure	Selected comments from 09/16/03 and 10/1/03 SUS sector meetings	Should this be an SUS (aggregate) accountability measure?	Should this be an accountability measure for your individual university?	How should the standard for this measure be determined (e.g., against own prior performance, peers, threshold, etc.)?	If standard is set in this manner, should this measure a performance-based funding measure for your university?
<p>“Return-on-investment” index that captures the economic impact of the SUS on Florida</p>	<p>Difficult to determine all the factors to include or not to include in such an index.</p>	<p>5 Yes; 1 No; 2 ?; 1 Yes, as long as we can agree on definition; 1 no response</p>	<p>4 Yes; 3 No; 2 ?; 1 no response</p>	<p>7 (None/No response/?) 1 (The standard cannot be determined until the measure is specified) 1 (Uncertain on how to measure) 1 (Individual institutional economic impact studies)</p>	<p>6 No; 3 ?; 1 no response</p>
<p>Research expenditures from external sources.</p>	<p>Want to keep emphasizing the critical role of research in the SUS. Okay in this category for the K-20 Accountability System. FBOG may place more direct emphasis on research.</p>	<p>10 Yes</p>	<p>10 Yes</p>	<p>3 (Own performance) 3 (Own performance, peers) 1 (Own performance, depends on mission and discipline mix) 1 (Own performance plus goals) 1 (5-year trend as well as performance of peer institutions) 1 (Institutional trend data, research per faculty FTE)</p>	<p>5 Yes; 1 Yes, but it is imperative that due to definitional issues each university be measured against itself; 1 Yes, if given context such as per ranked faculty member; 2 No; 1 This can best be decided once all measures are identified</p>