

Transforming the University

**Final Report of the
Metrics and Measurements Task Force**

Submitted on behalf of the Task Force by:

**Alfred D. Sullivan
Chair of the Task Force**

Date: May 4, 2006

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Mission

To identify the right metrics and establish processes to best support and analyze the University's progress toward its goal to become one of the top three public research universities in the world within the next decade.

Deliverables

1. Recommendations on how to answer the question "How will we know when we have become one of the top three public research universities in the world?"
2. Identification of the metrics, measurements, and monitoring processes to assess progress of the entire strategic positioning effort.
3. Recommendations for appropriate key performance indicators and reporting mechanisms to support the compact process and ensure unit planning is aligned with strategic positioning.
4. Advisement and counsel to the University's designee to the Minnesota Office of Higher Education's accountability project and Minnesota Office of Higher Education's Data Advisory Task Force.
5. Alignment of the University's Accountability Report with strategic positioning goals and metrics.
6. Recommendations on how to best deliver the University's needed metrics, measurements, and reporting work.

Working Group

Alfred Sullivan (chair), Special Assistant to the President
Susan Grotevant, Director, Information Management Systems
Richard Howard, Director, Office of Institutional Research
Lincoln Kallsen, Director of Financial Research, Office of Budget and Finance
Scott Martens, Director, Office of Service and Continuous Improvement
Elizabeth Nunnally, Associate Vice President for Academic Health Sciences
John Ziegenhagen, Director, University Accountability
Staff to Task Force: Christina Frazier

Steering Committee

Steve Cawley, Chief Information Officer
Gail Dubrow, Vice Provost and Dean, Graduate School
Bruce Gildseth, Vice Chancellor, University of Minnesota Duluth
Abu Jalal, Ph.D. Student in Finance, Carlson School
Eric Ling, Undergraduate Student, Institute of Technology
Tim Mulcahy, Vice President, Research

Peter Radcliffe, Senior Analyst, College of Liberal Arts
Jerry Rinehart, Vice Provost, Student Affairs
Terry Roe, Professor of Applied Economics, Faculty Consultative Committee Member
Craig Swan, Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education
Linda Thrane, Vice President, University Relations
Mike Volna, Associate Vice President, Finance, Controller
Staff to Task Force: Christina Frazier

II. INTRODUCTION

The Metrics and Measurements Task Force was charged to identify appropriate measures to assess the University's performance and its progress toward achieving the aspirational goal of becoming one of the top public research universities in the world within the decade. This report presents results addressing the six specific elements of the task force's charge.

The task force charge asks for metrics at several levels—identifying ways to measure progress at the operational level, and in collegiate units, coordinate campuses, and administrative units, as well as University-wide performance measures. A theme throughout this work is to align what we measure, wherever we measure it, with progress toward the University's aspirational goal. Our work will lead to many activities being measured, monitored, and evaluated at a variety of levels. This is the real key to achieving the University's goal. But only a relatively short list of measures can be reasonably used to make the University-wide assessment. These latter measures must be chosen selectively from among many competitors.

Several criteria are useful in identifying effective measures. Ideal measures should:

- Reflect the University's aspirational goal
- Provide meaningful policy direction for improvement
- Be free of manipulation
- Be easily understandable and credible
- Contain benchmarks against which progress can be measured
- Be reliable and valid
- Be able to be constructed and updated regularly at reasonable cost¹

III. RESPONSE TO DELIVERABLES

1. How will we know when we have become one of the top three public research universities in the world?

As the *2004-05 University Plan, Performance, and Accountability Report* noted:

Higher education institutions are ranked and rated by numerous sources. Most of them are commercial and purport to provide consumers with precise measures of quality and distinctions between and among individual

¹ We are indebted to the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), which cited most of these principles in its work with the Minnesota Office of Higher Education to develop performance measures for a higher education accountability system for Minnesota.

institutions. Despite numerous limitations and methodological flaws, these rankings are used by consumers and cited by colleges and universities with the highest ratings.

There is no single, consistent peer group for all of the indicators included in this report. National comparisons focus on a variety of peer groups defined in different ways depending on the topic. Each ranking system has its own inconsistencies and methodological weaknesses. However, among the better known and most reliable are the University of Florida's annual rankings of research universities and the National Research Council's periodic rankings of graduate program quality.

With the National Research Council's 1995 rankings not scheduled to be updated until 2008, and international rankings of institutions still in the early stages of development and scrutiny, the task force turned to the University of Florida's rankings and methodology for further examination.

The "Florida report" uses nine measures of research university quality: federal research expenditures; total research expenditures; endowment assets; annual giving; faculty awards in the arts, humanities, science, engineering, and health; National Academy members, doctorates awarded; post-doctoral appointees; and SAT/ACT scores. (See Appendix D for additional detail.) Broadly, these measures are aimed at identifying the quality of the institutions' human capital and the resources available to support that capital. These measures are objective, have external validity, and provide comparative information.

The task force—and many of the groups with whom the task force consulted—acknowledged that some of these measures, e.g., doctorates awarded and SAT/ACT scores, are imperfect quality standards, but the rankings provided a reasonable picture of the comparative strengths of public research universities. Going forward, we want to be part of the national and international work aimed at developing superior metrics to evaluate university performance and standing.

In addition to the Florida report measures, it is important to include measures that reflect our own goals and values, even though comparisons may be more difficult. Our widespread consultation provided helpful advice and counsel in this regard. Our proposed list of University-wide performance measures includes several such measures, e.g., those relating to diversity, student outcomes, and public engagement.

Mission, Action Strategies, and Performance Measures: The task force placed the selected measures in the context of the University's three-part mission—research and discovery, teaching and learning, and outreach and public service (public engagement)—and the five action strategies that frame the University's strategic positioning efforts:

1. Recruit, educate, challenge, and graduate outstanding students.
2. Recruit, monitor, reward, and retain outstanding faculty and staff.
3. Enhance and effectively utilize our resources and infrastructure.
4. Communicate clearly and credibly with all our constituencies and practice public engagement responsive to the public good.
5. Promote an effective organizational culture committed to excellence and responsive to change.

The interface of University mission, action strategies, and performance measures is shown on the next page.

Proposed University-wide Performance Measures

	<u>Action Strategy</u>				
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>RESEARCH AND DISCOVERY</u>					
1—National Academy Members		X			
2—Faculty Awards		X			
3—Post-Doctoral Appointees		X			
4—Research Expenditures					
A—Total		X	X		
B—Federal		X	X		
5—Faculty and Staff Diversity	X	X			
6—Faculty Satisfaction		X		X	X
<u>TEACHING AND LEARNING</u>					
7—Student Quality	X				
8—Student Diversity	X				
9—Affordability	X				
10—Student Outcomes					
A—Retention	X				
B—Timely Graduation	X				
C—Degrees Conferred	X				
11—International Involvement					
A—Study Abroad	X				
B—International Students	X				
C—International Scholars	X	X			
12—Student Satisfaction	X			X	X
<u>PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT</u>					
13—Citizen Satisfaction				X	
14—Intellectual Property Commercialization ²				X	
15—Student participation in public engagement activities	X			X	
<u>RESOURCES AND INFRASTRUCTURE</u>					
16—Financial Strength ³					
A—Total Financial Resources			X		
B—Ratio of Unrestricted Resources to Operations			X		
C—Total Endowment Assets			X		
D—Annual Giving			X		
17—Library Quality			X		
18—Facilities Condition			X		
19—Faculty and Staff Salary and Compensation		X	X		
20—Staff Satisfaction				X	X

² A ratio of core licensing income to research expenditures is being developed by the Office of the Vice President for Research.

In addition, the task force initiated work that will continue to develop additional measures. Some of the measures may be included in the University-wide measures, while others may be more suitable as operational, compact-level measures. The measures currently under consideration include:

Other University-wide Performance Measures Under Consideration

<u>Research and Discovery</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Publication in scholarly journals—Under further consideration.
<u>Teaching and Learning</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment of student learning—Under development by Council for Enhancing Student Learning. ▪ Graduate education quality—The Graduate School is developing a robust set of metrics with which to measure quality in graduate education and coordinate data located in the Graduate School and in individual academic units. The complete set of qualitative metrics will be available in spring 2007 and will be added to the University of Florida's measure (number of doctoral degrees awarded per year). ▪ Undergraduate participation in intensive learning experiences— The Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education is working to define a measure of student involvement in intensive learning experiences covering activities such as undergraduate research with faculty, internships, directed study/research or other course work involving scholarly projects, and study abroad experiences . The key feature of these experiences is development of a substantive academic, creative, scholarly, and/or professional relationship between a student and their mentor, ideally connected to the mentor's own research, service, teaching, and professional interests and expertise. ▪ Career placement and advanced study enrollment— The Vice Provosts for Student Affairs and Undergraduate Education are continuing discussions about how to best measure these rates. ▪ Alumni satisfaction—Office of Vice Provost, Student Affairs is conducting a survey of graduates.
<u>Resources and Infrastructure</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adoption rates—Under development by Office of Service and Continuous Improvement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Best practice—Agreed to and <i>recommended</i> practices, processes, methodologies, tools or techniques which promote improved service, revenues, cost structures, or productivity. ○ Single enterprise—Agreed to and <i>required</i> practices, processes, methodologies, tools or techniques which promote improved service, revenues, cost structures, or productivity. ▪ Continuous improvement—The Best Practice Management Tools Task Force has proposed a set of operational measures in the areas of: service quality, productivity and efficiency, staff development, and best practice/single enterprise (see above) to the Administrative Service and Productivity Steering Committee for review and possible refinement.

Comparison Universities: The task force identified the University of Minnesota – Twin Cities campus’ primary comparison group to monitor progress toward becoming a top three public research university. These universities reflect the size and scope of top research universities as identified in the *The Top American Research Universities (2005)* report (see Appendix A). The task force acknowledges that coordinate campus and departmental comparison groups may differ based on the campus or specific discipline or function. The University’s coordinate campuses are defining appropriate comparison institutions as part of their strategic planning efforts.

³ Measures 16A and 16B are being developed by the Office of the Controller.

The task force offers the following as the University's 2006-2007 comparison institutions:

University of Minnesota – Twin Cities Campus Comparison Group

University of California – Berkeley University of California – Los Angeles University of Michigan – Ann Arbor University of Wisconsin – Madison University of Florida University of Illinois – Urbana-Champaign University of Texas – Austin University of Washington - Seattle Ohio State University – Columbus Pennsylvania State University – University Park

2. How will we track performance leading to improved outcomes?

The task force identified a limited number of performance measures, as shown below, for a standard collegiate-level scorecard for the 2006-07 compact process. The purposes of the scorecard are to help inform the discussion between central administration and collegiate units, to identify significant trends related to collegiate goals, priorities, and funding, and to align units' goals and work with the University's overall aspirational goal. The Office of Institutional Research developed the scorecards and a spreadsheet with the source data from which each individual scorecard was created, a parallel scorecard for the Twin Cities campus and source data, and a data dictionary. (The scorecards can be found at www.irr.umn.edu/compact under the title "2006 College/Campus Profiles.") An evaluation of the usefulness of these measures likely will result in the deletion of some measures that were presented this year and the addition of others.

2006-07 Compact Performance Scorecard Measures

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Undergraduate headcount enrollment2. Graduate and first-professional headcount enrollment3. Total headcount enrollment4. Total FYE (full-year equivalent) enrollment5. Undergraduate degrees granted6. Master's degrees granted7. Doctoral and first-professional degrees granted8. Total degrees granted9. Tenured/tenure-track faculty FTE (full-time equivalent)10. Total faculty and staff FTE11. State O&M (Operations and Maintenance) expenditures12. Total expenditures13. Grant and contract awards14. Voluntary support: gift production15. Carry forward: central funds16. Direct instructional expenditures per FYE student |
|---|

- | |
|---|
| 17. Grant award dollars per tenure/tenure-track faculty member |
| 18. Tenure/tenure-track faculty as a percent of total faculty and staff |

Supplemental Scorecard Measures

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Fall headcount and FYE enrollment▪ Student characteristics▪ New freshmen average ACT score and high school rank▪ Degrees granted▪ Retention and graduation rates▪ Number of FTE and headcount employees and characteristics▪ Tenured/tenure-track faculty by rank▪ Number of post-doctoral appointees▪ FTE staff by type▪ Expenditures by fund source and function▪ Direct instructional expenditures per FYE student▪ Total expenditures and non-sponsored carry-forward funds▪ Grant and contract proposals and awards |
|--|

3. How will we measure progress on the University's five action strategies?

Eleven of the 34 strategic positioning task forces submitted final reports or progress reports in December 2005. The task force worked with the Executive Strategic Positioning Team Leaders group to identify appropriate metrics for the task forces' recommendations. Other task forces' work will continue to be monitored as other reports are completed.

4. How will the Minnesota Legislature's higher education accountability project help the University achieve its aspirational goal?

The 2005 Legislature provided initial funding to establish a statewide accountability program. The University, along with other Minnesota post-secondary institutions, is assisting the Minnesota Office of Higher Education "to develop and implement a process to measure and report on the effectiveness of postsecondary institutions." The purpose of the program is to provide information to students, taxpayers, and policymakers on the effectiveness of the higher education sector in meeting state goals. The Office of Higher Education has selected the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) to help design the accountability system. Currently, a draft set of six goals is under consideration:

1. Improve success of all students, particularly students from groups under-represented in higher education.
2. Create a responsive system that produces graduates at all levels who meet the demands of the economy.
3. Increase student learning and improve skill levels of students so they can compete effectively in the global market place.
4. Increase skill levels of adult population, especially those who have not completed high school.

5. Contribute to development of a state economy that is competitive in the global market through research and other appropriate means.
6. Ensure affordability so that access and choice are provided for all students.

Members of the Metrics and Measurements Task Force, as well as the University's Government Relations Office, are participating in this project as the University's representatives. (For more information on the project, see: www.ohe.state.mn.us/mPg.cfm?pageID=1536.)

5. How will the University's accountability report be modified to reflect our aspirational goal and strategic positioning efforts?

The *2005-06 University Plan, Performance, and Accountability Report* will provide an overview of the University of Minnesota's aspiration to become one of the top three public research universities within the decade, the current measures by which it will gauge its progress toward that goal, the status of the University's strategic positioning efforts, and appropriate measures of the progress of the coordinate campuses as they establish strategic plans, priorities, and performance measures. The report will include, to the extent possible, the University-wide measures and peer group comparisons identified by the task force.

The 2005-06 edition of the report is currently under development. An outline of the report was presented to the Board of Regents' Educational Planning and Policy Committee in December 2005. A presentation on performance measures related to Teaching and Learning was made in February 2006. The final report is scheduled to be presented to the Board and to the Minnesota Legislature in May 2006. (Past editions of the accountability report are available at <http://academic.umn.edu/accountability/reports/reports.html>.)

6. How will the University gather, analyze, and report information more effectively for planning and decision-making?

The task force has not addressed this charge directly. However, there have been ongoing discussions between leaders of those offices that typically produce information in support of University planning and decision making activities. Initial conversations have focused on the support of operational or management activities vs. strategic planning and decision support.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRIORITIZING DELIVERABLES

Just as achievement of the University's aspirational goal will take multiple years of sustained effort, the development of the most ideal measures of progress toward that goal also will take additional years to develop and refine. The task force underscores the importance of future monitoring and evaluation of the initial University-wide performance measures and comparison group. Each year a review of the relevance of these measures should be conducted and recommendations made to senior leadership. With these considerations in mind, the task force recommends the following:

1. **Steering Committee:** The University's Senior Vice Presidents should appoint a standing Metrics and Measurements Steering Committee. This co-chaired Steering Committee would be responsible for oversight and improvement of metrics and measurements and be responsible for providing advice to the University's senior leaders.

2. **Comparison Group:** The Metrics and Measurements Steering Committee will monitor and review the appropriateness of the University's comparison institutions, recommending additions and deletions as warranted.

3. **University-wide Measures:** The Metrics and Measurements Steering Committee will monitor and evaluate the validity and usefulness of these measures, and provide recommendations for adjustments, deletions, and additions. The following are key attributes in the management of the University's metrics and measures:
 - a. Metric Responsibility: For each metric, a University leader will be identified that will have responsibility for validating its continuing relevancy to the Steering Committee.
 - b. Metric Review: Annual review of the reliability and validity of metrics will be conducted by the Steering Committee.
 - c. Metric Clarity, Consistency and Definition: The Steering Committee should review and modify metrics to reduce variability in reported results within the University system and across higher education. Attention should be given to ensure alignment of the University-level metrics and operational metrics, and University action strategies.
 - d. Create Measures: The Steering Committee will review the progress of working groups established to create appropriate measures that reflect the values, productivity and quality of the University's teaching and learning, research and discovery, public engagement, and resources and infrastructure. It would be expected that these groups would develop proposed measures by June 2007.
 - e. Confirm Proposed Additional Measures, and Develop Data Collection and Reporting Processes: The Steering Committee will confirm the new measures developed in item d above and identify ways to produce and utilize these by June 2008.
 - f. Alignment and Balance: Measures should be reviewed and evaluated for alignment with, and balance among, the University's mission and strategic positioning action strategies.

4. **Compact-level Measures:** Working with the University's Senior Vice Presidents and the Metrics and Measurements Steering Committee, the Office of Institutional Research should evaluate the 2006-07 performance scorecard measures' usefulness to the University's leadership, coordinate campus chancellors, collegiate deans, and budget officers; and make adjustments, as needed, for the next compact cycle. In addition, the coordinate campuses and collegiate units should identify goals and projected timetables for achieving results, e.g., enrollment targets, retention and graduation rates, grant expenditure dollars per tenured/tenure-track faculty, etc.
 - a. Charge the Office of Institutional Research to evaluate the usefulness of the FY07 academic performance scorecard measures, work with academic deans and chancellors to identify unique measures for each campus and collegiate unit, and modify the performance scorecard to align with University-level metrics, by December 2006.
 - b. Charge the Office of Institutional Research to work with appropriate University leaders to develop and monitor metrics designed to assess the progress and outcomes of specific unit and University-wide initiatives.
 - c. In coordination with the Administrative Services and Productivity Steering Team and the Metrics and Measurements Steering Committee, the Office of Institutional

Research should develop and modify administrative and service units' performance scorecard measures.

5. **Coordination and Alignment of University Data:** The University should identify and develop processes, definitions and optimal access to and storage of the institutional data that support University-wide accountability, planning and policy analysis. The Office of Institutional Research and Office of Information Technology should serve as co-leaders of this effort to develop recommendations to the senior vice presidents by September 2006.
6. **State and Federal Higher Education Accountability:** The University's Senior Vice Presidents, Office of Government Relations, and Office of Institutional Research should continue to participate actively in and cooperate with the Minnesota Office of Higher Education's project to develop higher education goals and performance measures. The Office of Institutional Research should continue to report and refer to federal reports (e.g., IPEDS), accreditation reports, NCAA and other key federal reporting requests and requirements. The Office of Budget and Finance should continue to actively cooperate with state financial reporting requests and requirements.

V. APPENDICES

- A. Comparison Institutions**
- B. Consultations and Communications**
- C. Task Force and Steering Committee Charge Letters**
- D. Other Reference Materials**

APPENDIX A: COMPARISON INSTITUTIONS

The task force identified ten public research universities considered as comparison institutions. These ten public universities have outcomes and measures the University of Minnesota – Twin Cities campus will measure itself against. Several of these universities frequently top the rankings in University-level metrics such as the Florida report: University of California – Berkeley, University of California – Los Angeles, University of Michigan – Ann Arbor, and University of Wisconsin – Madison. In addition, peer institutions were identified as other highly ranked universities with land grant status and similar missions, academic offerings, student size and other attributes. These include: University of Florida, University of Illinois – Urbana-Champaign, University of Texas – Austin, University of Washington – Seattle, Ohio State University – Columbus, Pennsylvania State University – University Park. The task force recognizes the importance of identifying a standard University-level comparison group of universities for continuity of communicating University progress, activity, and evaluation of results to all of our constituents and particularly to the Board of Regents. This top ten university comparison group is considered somewhat dynamic and may shift over time.

APPENDIX B: CONSULTATIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

<u>Date</u>	<u>Group</u>
July 21, 2005	Executive Committee
August 29, 2005	Twin Cities Deans Council
September 2, 2005	Faculty Consultative Committee
September 20	Office of Service and Continuous Improvement Advisory Committee
October 4, 2005	Executive Strategic Positioning Team
October 5	University of Minnesota Chancellors
October 6	Board of Regents Work Session
October 27	Faculty Consultative Committee
November 9, 2005	University of Minnesota Chancellors
November 11	CLA Departmental Chairs
November 29	Minnesota Student Association
November 29	Academic Strategic Positioning Steering Committee
December 1, 2005	Student Senate
December 6	Executive Strategic Positioning Team
December 7	Improvement Liaison Network
December 8	Education Planning and Policy Committee (Board of Regents)
December 14	Graduate and Professional Student Assembly
December 15	Council of Research Associate Deans
December 16	Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA)
December 16	Council on Public Engagement Steering Committee
January 9, 2006	Twin Cities Deans Council
January 26	Civil Service Committee
January 27	Academic Health Sciences Steering Committee
February 13	Twin Cities Deans Council
January 24-February 24	Progress Report Public Comments
March 30-April 30	Preliminary Report Public Comments

**APPENDIX C: TASK FORCE AND STEERING
COMMITTEE CHARGE LETTERS**

Task Force Charge Letter

September 6, 2005

TO: John Ziegenhagen, Director, University Accountability
Richard Howard, Director, Office of Institutional Research and Reporting
Lincoln Kallsen, Director, Financial Research
Scott Martens, Director, Office of Service and Continuous Improvement
Beth Nunnally, Associate Vice President, Academic Health Sciences
Susan Grotevant, Director, Information Management Systems

FROM: Alfred D. Sullivan, Executive Associate Vice President
Office of Planning and Academic Affairs

RE: Metrics and Measurements Task Force Working Group

I am writing to thank you for your willingness to serve as a member of the Metrics and Measurements Task Force Working Group as part of the implementation of the University's 2005 strategic plan titled, "*Transforming the University of Minnesota*," and endorsed by the Board of Regents on June 10, 2005.

I will be chairing this group and together, we will work to identify the right metrics and establish processes to best support and analyze progress toward the goal of becoming one of the top three public research universities in the world within ten years. My assistant, Chris Frazier, will provide staff support to the task force. Chris may be reached at 612-625-9682 or cfrazier@umn.edu.

Periodically, we will meet with a wider group of University constituents who will serve as a steering committee. Regular and ongoing consultation with members of the University community who will be impacted by this work is crucial to the strategic positioning effort, and the Metrics and Measurements Steering Committee will assist us in achieving this goal. The Steering Committee will also be available as a resource to the task force to share our thinking, and provide oversight and advice as we proceed with our work. The work of the Metrics and Measurements Task Force will need to be closely coordinated with the entire strategic positioning effort. However, we will need to pay particular attention to the related work being done by other task forces, for example, the Best Practice Management Tools Task Force led by Steve Cawley.

In his charge letter to me as team leader, President Bruininks has asked us as a task force to conduct our work in light of the five strategic action areas identified in the University's 2005 strategic plan. These strategic action areas are:

- Recruit, nurture, challenge and educate outstanding students who are bright, curious and highly motivated.

- Recruit, mentor, reward and retain world-class faculty and staff who are innovative, energetic and dedicated to the highest standards of excellence.
- Promote an effective organizational culture that is committed to excellence and responsive to change.
- Exercise responsible stewardship by setting priorities and enhancing and effectively utilizing resources and infrastructure.
- Communicate clearly and credibly with all of our constituencies and practice public engagement responsive to the public good.

During the development of the University's strategic positioning plan, certain common themes have been identified that formed the goal to become one of the top three public research institutions in the world. These themes can help us as we develop the tools that will be used to measure progress toward that goal. The themes are:

- Strong academic programs and leadership.
- Improved access to success for students demonstrating that a better education leads directly to better results.
- Excellence in research.
- Lowered economic costs through improved services and strengthened core investments.
- Greater alignment across all programs and services.

The primary role for the Metrics and Measurements Task Force is to answer the question, "How will we know when we have become one of the top three public research universities in the world?" The task force will develop appropriate metrics and measurements as the major focus of our ongoing work. It will be important for us to begin looking at this question right away, as on Thursday, October 6, I am scheduled to make a presentation to the Board of Regents on behalf of our task force on this topic. Please be prepared to put thought and effort toward this in preparation for that presentation.

The task force will also consider these related issues:

1. Identify the metrics, measurements, and monitoring processes to assess progress of the entire strategic positioning effort. Other task forces will provide assistance by suggesting appropriate metrics in their respective endeavors.
2. Develop appropriate key performance indicators and reporting mechanisms to support the compact process and ensure unit planning is aligned with strategic positioning. We need to have this work completed by November when the FY 2006-2007 Compact Instructions are finalized and distributed.
3. Provide advice and counsel to me as the University's designee to the Minnesota Office of Higher Education's accountability project, and to Rich Howard as the University's designee to the same office's Data Advisory Task Force.

4. Align the University's Accountability Report with strategic positioning goals and metrics. The Accountability Report completion date is February 1, 2005.
5. Assess the functions of the Offices of Institutional Research and Reporting, Measurement Services, Service and Continuous Improvement, and Information Management Systems, and perhaps others, to determine how to best deliver the University's needed metrics, measurements, and reporting work.
6. Provide better information to senior officers to support their leadership and decisions.

There are resources available to help support the work of this task force. The Resource Alignment Team (RAT) is an in-house consulting team with broad subject matter expertise, available to us to provide guidance and support. They have already begun to identify a number of process issues likely to surface, and will continue to provide knowledgeable counsel throughout the implementation of the more operational changes resulting from strategic positioning. University Relations is assigning several of their professional staff to facilitate and support effective communication between the task forces, and to the broader community. A toolkit of documents, and the Metrics and Measurements Task Force Steering Committee will also be available to support our efforts.

On September 16, 2005, there will be a task force retreat and workday, scheduled from 8:30 am – 5:00 pm. You are strongly encouraged to attend this session. Details concerning the agenda will be forthcoming.

Thank you for taking on this very important role. In the near future I will send you proposed meeting dates and provide background materials. Together, I am confident we can establish the guidelines and metrics critical for the University to achieve its goal. Thank you.

ADS:rnh

cc: Kathryn F. Brown, vice president and chief of staff
Chris Frazier, assistant to the executive associate vice president

Steering Committee Charge Letter

September 8, 2005

TO: Linda Thrane, Vice President, University Relations
Tim Mulcahy, Vice President, Research
Steve Cawley, Associate Vice President, Office of Information Technology
Craig Swan, Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education
Gail Dubrow, Vice Provost for Research and Dean, Graduate School
Jerry Rinehart, Vice Provost, Student Affairs
Michael Volna, Associate Vice President, Finance and Controller
Bruce Gildseth, Vice Chancellor for Academic Support and Student Life, UMD
Terry Roe, Professor, Applied Economics
Peter Radcliffe, Senior Analyst, College of Liberal Arts
Abu Jalal, Ph.D. Student in Finance, Carlson School of Management
Eric Ling, Undergraduate Student, Institute of Technology

FROM: Alfred D. Sullivan, Executive Associate Vice President

RE: Metrics and Measurements Task Force Steering Committee

I am writing to request that you serve as a member of the Metrics and Measurements Task Force Steering Committee as part of the implementation of the University's 2005 strategic plan titled, "*Transforming the University of Minnesota*," and endorsed by the Board of Regents on June 10, 2005.

I will be chairing this group and together, we will provide advice and counsel to the Metrics and Measurements Task Force Working Group whose members are:

John Ziegenhagen, Director, University Accountability
Richard Howard, Director, Office of Institutional Research and Reporting
Lincoln Kallsen, Director, Financial Research
Scott Martens, Director, Office of Service and Continuous Improvement
Beth Nunnally, Associate Vice President, Academic Health Sciences
Susan Grotevant, Director, Information Management Systems

The Metrics and Measurements Task Force will be working to identify the right metrics, and establish processes to best support and analyze the University's progress toward its goal to become one of the top three public research universities in the world within the next decade. The purpose of this steering committee will be to meet periodically with the Metrics and Measurements Task Force Working Group to provide oversight and advice on their work from your diverse perspectives.

September 8, 2005 Page 2

The work of the Metrics and Measurements Task Force will need to be closely coordinated with the entire strategic positioning effort. However, particular attention will need to be paid to related work being done by other task forces such as the Best Practice Management Tools Task Force led by Steve Cawley. The Steering Committee's ongoing advice as to other areas of close coordination to consider will also be helpful as we move forward. The Metrics and Measurements Task Force will focus much of its efforts on answering the question, "How will we know when we have become one of the top three public research universities in the world?"

Early on, work will proceed to develop appropriate metrics and measurements for this assessment. As a steering committee member for this task force, your understanding of what the task force is working to achieve and how that fits into the University's strategic positioning plan will be most helpful. In my charge letter to the task force working group, a copy of which is attached for your reference, I have identified this steering committee as one of the important resources available to them as they proceed with their work. We will schedule periodic joint meetings, to share thinking, provide insight and receive advice from you as we go forward.

On September 16, 2005, there will be a task force retreat and workday, scheduled from 8:30-5:00 pm. You are strongly encouraged to attend the morning session that is especially tailored for steering committees. Details concerning the agenda will be forthcoming.

Thank you for considering taking on this very important role. Unless you contact my assistant, Chris Frazier, at 612-625-9682 or cfrazier@umn.edu, that you are unwilling to be a member, I will assume that you accept this invitation. Shortly thereafter, I will send you proposed meeting dates and provide background materials. Together, I am confident we can establish the guidelines and metrics critical for the University to achieve its goal. Thank you.

ADS:rnh
Enclosure

cc: Kathryn F. Brown, vice president and chief of staff
Chris Frazier, assistant to the executive associate vice president

APPENDIX D: OTHER REFERENCE MATERIALS

“Accountable to U: University Plan, Performance, and Accountability Report” Web site:
<http://academic.umn.edu/accountability/index.html>

Brooks, Rachelle L., “Measuring University Quality” (*The Review of Higher Education* 29.1 (2005) 1-21)
http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/review_of_higher_education/v029/29.1brooks.html

National Research Council, Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs:
<http://www8.nationalacademies.org/cp/projectview.aspx?key=203>

U.S. News & World Report rankings: www.usnews.com/usnews/rankguide/rghome.htm

_____, *Academic Ranking of World Universities* (Shanghai University) Web site:
<http://ed.sjtu.edu.cn/ranking.htm>

_____, “Measuring and Improving Research Universities” (TheCenter, University of Florida, 2004) <http://thecenter.ufl.edu/MeasuringAndImprovingResearchUniversities.pdf>

_____, *The Top American Research Universities*, (TheCenter, University of Florida) Web site: http://thecenter.ufl.edu/research_data.html

_____, *World University Rankings* (London Times) Web site:
www.thes.co.uk/worldrankings

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA RANKING
From *TheCenter*: The Top American Research Universities

MEASURE	DEFINITION AND SOURCE
Federal Research Expenditures	The University's competitiveness and research productivity related to other institutions seeking funds distributed on a peer-reviewed, merit basis. <i>Source:</i> NSF/SRS Survey of R&D Expenditures at Universities and Colleges
Total Research Expenditures	Expenditures from state, corporate and entitlement programs, such as public land grant institutions in addition to federal research funding. <i>Source:</i> NSF/SRS Survey of R&D Expenditures at Universities and Colleges
Endowment Assets	The accumulated savings of the permanent gifts to the university by its alumni and friends over the lifetime of the institution. <i>Source:</i> NACUBO Endowment Student as reported in the Chronicle of Higher Education
Annual Giving	Contributions received during the fiscal year in the form of cash, securities, and other property from alumni, non-alumni, individuals, corporations, foundations and other groups. This total measures the University's current success in seeking private support to permit greater competitiveness for quality students and faculty and increased national presence. <i>Source:</i> Council for Aid to Education's Voluntary Support to Education
Faculty Awards in Arts, Humanities, Science, Engineering & Health	Nobel and Pulitzer Prize winners, election to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Law Institute, the American Academy of Nursing, the American Association for Advancement of Science Fellows, the American Council of Learned Societies Fellows, Fulbright American Scholars, Guggenheim Fellows, NSF CAREER awards and NIH MERIT awards. This provides another way to measure the quality and competitiveness of individual faculty members who are not in the sciences or other federally funded areas of research. <i>Source:</i> Directories or web-based listings for multiple agencies or organizations
National Academy Members	The number of faculty who have membership in the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine at the institution. <i>Source:</i> The National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine directories
Doctorates Awarded	The number of Doctor of Education, Doctor of Juridical Science, Doctor of Public Health, and Doctor of Philosophy awarded. <i>Source:</i> NCES IPEDS Completions Survey, doctoral degrees awarded
Post-Doctoral Appointees	The number of individuals with science and engineering PhD's, MD's, DD's or DVM's and foreign degrees equivalent to US doctorates who devote their primary effort to their own research training through research activities or study in the department under temporary appointments carrying no academic rank. <i>Source:</i> NSF/Division of Science Resource Statistics (SRS) Survey of Graduate Students and Post doctorates in Science and Engineering
SAT Scores	The mean SAT score of that range calculated. <i>Source:</i> Annual Survey of Colleges of the College Board and Data Base