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This item provides an update on the dashboard, the drill-down dashboards and new measures.
BACKGROUND

The Board of Trustees adopted a report of its Ad Hoc Committee on System and Institutional Assessment in November, 2007. The report included recommendations for refinements in the Board’s Accountability Framework, including development and launch of an Accountability Dashboard. The dashboard was successfully launched in June, 2008.

The committee included five trustees, five presidents and five system executives. The committee discussed customers for accountability, reviewed other accountability systems and consulted with Dr. Peter Ewell from the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. Committee members also guided development of the accountability dashboard. Finally, system stakeholders were consulted regularly during the design and development of the dashboard.

ACCOUNTABILITY DASHBOARD

The purpose of the Accountability Dashboard is twofold: first, to promote continuous improvement and second, to provide accountability to system stakeholders by providing an ongoing strategic assessment of system and institution performance. It is designed primarily for the Board of Trustees and other policymakers and stakeholders. Once fully developed, the dashboard will report ten important outcomes that indicate whether the system is achieving the strategic directions identified in the Board’s Strategic Plan. The performance of the system and each college and university is classified into one of three categories: exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or needs attention.

EXISTING MEASURES AND DRILL-DOWNS

This update provides a progress report on the ongoing development of the Accountability Dashboard. The dashboard will ultimately report ten performance measures and include drilldown dashboards that provide detail for each measure. Data were available for six of the ten measures when the dashboard was launched.

Existing Measures: Data and comments are being updated for the six measures now reported in the dashboard.

Drill-Down Dashboards: Drill-down dashboards have been developed and deployed for four measures: persistence and completion; licensure exam pass rates; tuition and fees; and facilities condition index. The drill-down dashboard for the enrollment measure will be deployed by June,
2009 and the drill-down dashboard for the graduate related employment rate will be deployed in fall 2009.

NEW MEASURES

Work is proceeding on development of four remaining measures: student engagement, partnerships, high quality learning and innovation.

Student Engagement: Each college and university has administered one of the two national surveys of student engagement this biennium and will continue to administer it once each biennium. Eleven colleges participated in the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and one university participated in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) in fiscal year 2008. The remaining colleges and universities are participating in the surveys this fiscal year. Staff has developed the measure and performance classification process. It is anticipated that data on the student engagement measure will be reported in the dashboard in fall 2009.

Partnerships: This measure will assess the satisfaction of partners with college and university partnering efforts and activities. This approach was developed by the system’s Accountability Drafting Team and has been discussed with other constituencies within the system. Data collection will be modeled on a Rochester Community and Technical College survey of its partnering organizations.

Partners will be surveyed about the nature and extent of their activities with the college or university and about their satisfaction with those activities. Partners will include employers, elementary and secondary education organizations, units of government, non-profit organizations, community and economic development organizations and others. Staff is working with a contractor to develop and administer the partnership survey.

High Quality Learning: Two approaches for the quality measure have been discussed with the presidents, college and university academic and student affairs officers and other constituency groups. The following approaches are under consideration:

- **Standardized Assessments** – This approach would use standardized assessments of learning that are under development or implemented through national or other external agencies. All seven state universities have committed to participate in the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) sponsored by two public university associations. VSA participants must use one of three standardized learning assessments and report results publically. The recent reauthorization of the federal Carl Perkins Act requires institutions that receive funds under the act to measure technical skill attainment with standardized assessments.

  The system high quality measure would be an index of the results of these assessments. The advantage of this approach is that it would utilize existing standardized assessments. Existing instruments, however, may not be available for all fields of study and may or may not capture the knowledge and skills that the system and institutions hope to achieve.
• **Learning Assessment Process Measure** – This approach would measure the extent to which each college and university’s assessments of learning outcomes comply with a common set of process standards. The standards would be developed to reflect national best practices. While assessing process is not an ideal or robust measure of high quality learning, this method could serve as a near term option since the other options would take several years to develop and implement. A survey of the assessment practices used by U. S. colleges and universities that is currently being conducting National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment may help inform the development of this approach.

**Innovation:** This measure is the most challenging to develop because of the varied nature of innovation. Efforts have focused on reviewing the literature on innovation and studying how firms, industries and not-for-profit organizations define and measure innovation. One option being considered is the development of a qualitative measure that would characterize the varied nature and extent of innovation within the system.

Staff will continue the efforts to develop and refine these four measures and continue to consult with system constituencies to insure broad input into the process.