





















Pennsylvania's State System of Higher Education **University Success Task Group**

December 11, 2018 Meeting Agenda and Highlights

Context

- Operate within context of how other Task Groups define
 - o System Success
 - Student Success

Framework for Draft Recommendations

- Guiding principles.
 - Task group adopted guiding principles as reflected in Attachment 2.
- Concepts to consider when determining the draft recommendations (Attachment 1).
- Appropriateness of potential measures.
 - o Financial measures (Attachment 2, supported by Attachments 3 and 4).
 - Task Group supported the following three financial measures:
 - Primary Reserve Ratio (useable reserves to operations)
 - Net Operating Revenues Ratio (operating gain/loss)
 - Visibility Ratio (useable resources to debt)
 - Student success measures (Attachments 5 and 6)
 - Focus on affordability measures
 - o Community engagement measures based on Carnegie classification categories for community engagement (Attachment 7)
 - Focus on community support measures
 - o Alignment with System goals; collaboration
 - How can this be measured?

Framework for University Success Task Group Report

- · What's missing or needs to be changed?
 - o All measures must be named and presented in a way that is informative for nonfinancial audiences.
 - o Address inter-relationship of measures with work of other task groups
- Input needed to complete:
 - Proposed Measurement Framework
 - Finalize proposed measures at next meeting
 - Other Observations

Other Business

<u>Texas A&M</u> University System Phase II – Regional Universities Comprehensive Administrative Review, identifies potential administrative efficiencies and effectiveness to produce cost savings.

Concepts to consider:

Student Success: Achieve personal growth and economic security

- Alignment with System goals/strategy/operating principles
 - o No tolerance for 'climate change deniers'; this in not a passing storm
- Degree of collaboration (sharing university)
 - System success is the overriding priority all wear same big hat
 - o Resources are system resources, not university resources
- Use of enablers for Student Success
 - Use such tools as
 - Predictive analytics
 - Personal student advising
- Meet student and community needs with program flexibility, for example:
 - o Online classes
 - o Evening classes/degree programs
 - Weekend classes/degree programs
 - Programs tailored to provide for community workforce needs

Community engagement

- Build partnerships with private sector to create virtuous cycle of program funding and job
 placement (private sector provides funds and employment opportunities, university
 provides human talent (workforce with the right skills))
- Actively raise awareness of university programs/accessibility to optimize student applications
 - o Faculty, students and graduates should all be active in outreach

DRAFT as of December 5, 2018 Attachment 2

Proposed Financial Dashboard for Pennsylvania's State System of Higher Education

Guiding Principles:

For inclusion in a financial dashboard, indicators must be:

Impactful—presenting meaningful information about the financial health of the organization.

Valid and Reliable—consistently measuring the same thing over and over.

Comparable—among System universities and externally.

Accessible and Understandable—informative for nonfinancial audiences.

Assumptions:

- 1) Affordability measures and instructional/student success efficiency measures will be derived via the Student Success Task Group.
- 2) If System goals are established that will generate efficiencies, associated savings will be captured in addition to any other financial measures adopted.
- 3) Targets should not be established for financial measures; standards for performance may be established against which trends of the following measures may be monitored.
- 4) Although not part of the dashboard, the System will continue to monitor trends in funding and expenditures per student and by source/function/object.

				Community/External
	Composite Financial Index*	Other Financial Trends Monitored	Facility Indicators	Engagement
Option 1	Report a modified CFI with three of its four ratios: Primary Reserve Ratio. Net Operating Revenues Ratio. Viability Ratio. Calculate both with and without long-term liabilities.	Monthly Days Cash on Hand	Density: gross square feet (GSF) per user (students and employees)	
Option 2	Report the CFI and its four ratios: Primary Reserve Ratio. Net Operating Revenues Ratio. Return on Net Position Ratio. Viability Ratio. Calculate both with and without long-term liabilities and affiliated entities.	Net Tuition per Student Debt Service to Operations	and/or Facilities Composite Score	Private Support: Annual Funds Raised

^{*}If a Composite Financial Index (CFI) is used, the Prager/KPMG CFI is the most common, but it is usually modified for use in public systems. Modifications typically include: the elimination of postretirement healthcare and pension liabilities, the exclusion of the financial performance of affiliated entities (a.k.a., component units), and/or presenting the four separate components exclusive of the weighted composite result.

DRAFT as of December 5, 2018 Attachment 3

Use of Financial Indicators by Other States/Systems

State	Composite Financial Index*	Other Financial Trends Monitored	Facility Indicators	Community/External Engagement	Comments
University of California		Revenue by source Gifts by restricted use Costs by function Costs by object of expenditure Source of funds for instructional expenditures	Capital funding Assignable square feet by use Energy Efficiency		Reports financial trends since 2000 in inflation-adjusted dollars.
Georgia		It does not appear that Georgia re	ports on any financial measures/goal	s.	
Maine	1	Total Expenditures per Fall FTE Student Net Revenue from tuition and fees Revenue from net student fees, other auxiliaries, and noncapital state appropriations Debt ratings (Standard and Poor's)	Density factor: number of users per 100,000 gross square foot (GSF) Net Asset Values (as a percent)		Of its 19 indicators, 11 are financial.
Maryland		System goals include an "Effectiveness and Efficiency initiative to enhance student success, continue innovation in teaching and learning, reengineer administrative processes, and reduce costs. Annual savings achieved are measured.	Number of buildings constructed or designed to be LEED-certified "Silver" or higher Reduce carbon emissionsin metric tons or percent reduction per GSF	Private funds raised per year	
Minnesota	Same as Maine		Reports the Facilities Condition Index (FCI)**: total value of deferred maintenance as a percent of the facility replacement value.		
New York (SUNY)				Total Sponsored Activity Alumni/philanthropic support Civic engagement Economic impact	It does not appear that SUNY has goals, targets, or reports on financial indicators.
North Carolina	Although North Carolina has an Efficiency Goal to "pursue and utilize increased operational and financial flexibility," the university/system performance agreements and institution-specific dashboards exclude financial, efficiency and affordability measures/targets.				

DRAFT as of December 5, 2018 Attachment 3

Use of Financial Indicators by Other States/Systems

State	Composite Financial Index*	Other Financial Trends Monitored	Facility Indicators	Community/External Engagement	Comments
North Dakota	Reports the CFI and its four ratios; calculates both with and without long-term liabilities and affiliated entities.	Current Ratio Working Capital Ratio Operating Income Ratio Net Income Margin Net Tuition and Fees per FTE Student Net Tuition and Fees Dependency Net Liquid Assets Less Current Liabilities Long-term Liabilities, Excluding Pension Liability and Compensated Absences; State Funding per FTE Student for Public Institutions (national comparison) Educational Revenues per FTE Student Educational Appropriations per FTE Student			
Ohio	Reports the CFI with modified weighting and three of its four ratios (excludes Return on Net Assets Ratio); calculates both with and without long-term liabilities.				
Oregon	It does not appear that Oregon reports on any financial measures/goals.				
Tennessee		Revenue per FTE Student by Source			
Texas		Budget Expenditures Budget Revenue Trends per FTE by Source Average Net Tuition and Fees		Research Expenditures Research Fund Sources	
Middle States Commission on Higher Education	CFI and its four ratios: Primary Reserve Ratio, Viability Ratio (with and without Pension liability), Return on Net Assets Ratio, Operating Revenues Ratio. Calculated with and without pensions; since uses IPEDS definitions, excludes affiliates.	Net Income Ratio (operating surplus/operating income) Debt Burden Ratio (debt service to operations) Tuition Discount Ratio (institutional aid/tuition and fees) Tuition Dependency Ratio (net tuition and fees/revenue)			

^{*}If a Composite Financial Index (CFI) is used, the Prager/KPMG CFI is the most common, but it is usually modified for use in public systems. Modifications typically include: the elimination of postretirement healthcare and pension liabilities, the exclusion of the financial performance of affiliated entities (a.k.a., component units), and/or presenting the four separate components exclusive of the weighted composite result.

^{**}The use of a Facilities Condition Index (FCI) is not uncommon, although its methodology may vary significantly. It relies on an estimate of deferred maintenance backlog.

Financial Ratios Currently Monitored by Pennsylvania's State System of Higher Education

Ratio Name	Definition	What it measures
Selectivity (1)	Number of acceptances divided by	Measures the depth of a university's applicant
Selectivity	applications	pool
Matriculation ⁽¹⁾	Number of students enrolling divided by	Measures the preference of a student to attend a
Watifulation	number of applications accepted	particular university
	The sum of gross tuition and fees revenue	
Net Tuition per Student ⁽¹⁾	less scholarship discount and allowances	Measures tuition and fees actually received per
The Full of Student	less scholarship expense divided by Total	student, after scholarships
	FTE Enrollment from the prior year	
Annual Operating Margin ⁽¹⁾ (similar to CFI Net	Operating Revenue, less Operating	Indicates the excess margin (or deficit) by which
Operating Revenues Ratio, excluding affiliates)	Expenses, divided by Operating Revenue	annual revenues cover operating expenses
Unrestricted Financial Resources to Operations ⁽¹⁾	Unrestricted financial resources divided by	Measures coverage of annual operations by the
(similar to CFI Primary Reserve Ratio)(2)	total operating expenses	most liquid financial resources
	Monthly Liquidity times 365 divided by	Measures the number of days a university is able
Monthly Days Cash on Hand	Operating Expenses less depreciation and	to operate (cover its cash operating expenses)
	additional, unusually large non-cash	from unrestricted cash and investments that can
	expenses	be liquidated within one month
Debt Service to Operations ⁽¹⁾	Annual debt service divided by Operating	Measures burden of actual debt service payments
	Expenses	relative to overall operating budget
	Annual operating surplus (deficit) plus interest and depreciation expenses plus	Measures actual margin of protection for annual
Debt Service Coverage	additional, unusually large non-cash expenses, divided by actual principal and	debt service payments from annual operations
	interest payments	
Total Debt to Cash Flow	Total Debt divided by Operating Cash Flow	Measures the ability of a university to repay its
Total Debt to Casil Flow	, , ,	debt from the profitability of its operations
Total Financial Resources to Comprehensive Debt	Total financial resources divided by debt outstanding	Measures coverage of all debt by total financial resources including permanent endowments
Unrestricted Financial Resources to	Unrestricted financial resources divided by	Measures coverage of comprehensive debt by the
Comprehensive Debt ⁽¹⁾ (similar to CFI Viability	debt outstanding including privatized	most liquid financial resources
Ratio) ⁽²⁾	student housing by affiliates	most iiquid iiiluiiolai 1000ai 000
Unrestricted Financial Resources to Direct Debt ⁽¹⁾ (similar to CFI Viability Ratio but without affiliates) ⁽²⁾	Unrestricted financial resources divided by debt outstanding	Measures coverage of direct debt by the most liquid financial resources

Notes:

- (1) Ratios currently used in the System's annual financial risk assessment.
- (2) The Composite Financial Index (CFI), as created by Prager, Sealy, & Co., KPMG, and Attain, includes four ratios. The System does not monitor the Return on Net Assets (used both in the CFI and by Moody's) as it is most applicable to private entities.

Yellow highlighted measures are considered leading indicators of financial distress.

Financial Ratios Currently Monitored by Pennsylvania's State System of Higher Education

Other Financial Trends Monitored

Operating Efficiencies (financial and human resources)

Daily Cash Balance

Monthly Operating Cash Balance by Year

Unrestricted Net Assets without Long-Term Liabilities

Revenues by Fund (E&G, Auxiliary, Restricted, Plant)

E&G Revenues by Source

E&G Expenditures per FTE Student, Personnel and Nonpersonnel

Expenditures by Function

E&G Revenues per FTE Student by Source (appropriation, student, other)

FTE Faculty compared to FTE Enrollment; Student/Faculty Ratio

FTE Staff compared to FTE Enrollment; Student/Staff Ratio

Facility Indicators

Density: Gross Square Feet per User (students and employees); E&G and Auxiliary space

Actual E&G Plant Inventory compared to Space Guidelines Estimated Required Assignable Square Feet

Facilities Operating Costs (utilities, daily operations, preventive maintenance

E&G Capital Investment vs. Funding Target

Facilities Composite Score, Compared to External Peers (reinvestment in plant, preventative maintenance investment, energy efficiency, plant operations and service)

Performance Funding Financial Indicators (Used Prior to 2017/18)

Private Support: annual funds raised

Facilities Investment: annual facilities investment score (a composite score in comparison with national peers)

Yellow highlighted measures are considered leading indicators of financial distress. In addition, enrollment trends and academic preparedness of entering class are leading indicators; both of which will be addressed in the Student Success Task Group recommendations.

Figure 4. Availability of Key Metrics in Major Data Sets

	Metric	Federal Sources (IPEDS and NSLDS)	National Source (NSC)	State Source (CCA)
	Enrollment			
	Credit Accumulation			
	Credit Completion			
	Gateway Course Completion			
	Program of Study Selection			
	Retention Rate			
	Persistence Rate			
川川	Transfer Rate			
PERFORMANCE	Graduation Rate			
MA	Success Rate			
띪	Completers			
ĬŽ.	Net Price			
点	Unmet Need			
-	Cumulative Debt			
	Employment Rate			
	Median Earnings and Earnings			
	Threshold			
	Loan Repayment Rate			
	Cohort Default Rate			
	Graduate Education Rate			
\vdash	Learning Outcomes			
	Cost for Credits not Completed			
	Cost for Completing Gateway Courses			
_	Time to Credential Credits to Credential			
ပြွ	Cost of Excess Credits to Credential			
EFFICIENCY	Expenditures per Student			
2	Change in Revenue from Change in			
焦	Retention			
1	Completions per Student			
	Student Share of Cost			
	Expenditures per Completion			
	Enrollment Status (first-time, transfer)			
	Attendance Intensity (full-time, part-			
	time)			
	Degree-seeking Status			
_	Program of Study			
EQUITY	Academic Preparation			
l Q	Economic Status			
_	Race/Ethnicity			
	Age			
	Gender			
	First-generation Status			
	Available with minor Available with		ailable with major	Not available
	modifications needed modifications	needed mod	difications needed	- Trot available

University Success - Meeting Student Needs

In-Program Success

Do our students achieve what they set out to achieve?		
Retention (persistence) rate	% of students in a cohort enrolled at their initial (or subsequent) institution, or earning credential, up to 200% of program length	
Graduation (success) rate % of students completing credential sought from initial (or subsequent) institution, up to 200% of program length		
How efficiently do our students achieve what they set out to achieve?		
Time to credential	Average time accumulated from first date of entry to date of completion	
Completions per student	Number of completions divided by number of FTE students	
Can our students demonstrate achievement?		
Learning outcomes	Transparent display of learning goals, assessments and outcomes	

- IHEP framework distinguishes cohorts by the type of credential sought (non-credential, certificate, associate or bachelor).
- Unintended consequences may include increasing selectivity of admissions criteria, which limits access, or reducing academic quality and expectations (Li 2018)

Post-Program Success

How much economic value do our universities provide for our students?			
Employment rate (earnings threshold)	% of former students with any earnings (earnings more than median high school graduate) at one, five and ten years after exit		
Median earnings	Median annual earnings of former students at one, five and ten years after exit		
Graduate education rate	% of bachelor's recipients enrolling in post-baccalaureate or graduate programs within one, five and ten years after exit		
How do students perceive the value added from our universities?			
Student survey	% favorable response to survey (not currently in IHEP framework)		

 Our current ability to measure these, especially over long time horizons, is seriously limited by data availability. The committee may consider a recommendation that our universities invest in improving long-term data collection from alumni.

Access / Affordability

What does it cost students to attend our universities?			
Net price	Average cost of attendance less all grant aid		
How much debt do students incur to attend our universities?			
Unmet need Average net price minus average expected family contribute			
Cumulative debt	Median debt incurred		
How well do our students manage their debt after graduation?			
Loan repayment rate	% of borrowers who make at least \$1 of progress on loan principal at one, three, five and ten years into repayment		
Cohort default rate	% of cohort who enter repayment and default within three fiscal years		

• IHEP framework recommends disaggregating: (1) all undergrads from full-time cohort, (2) in-state and out-of-state students, and (3) by family income quintiles

Efficiency

How much does it cost to serve our students?		
Expenditures per student	Expenditures per FTE, based on 12-month enrollment	
Expenditures per completion	Expenditures divided by number of completions in a given year	
How efficiently are student dollars allocated?		
Cost for credits not completed	Per-student expenditures for credits attempted, but not completed, for first-year students	
Cost of excess credits to credential	Per-student expenditures for excess credits to credential (all completers in a given year)	
How is retention affecting our revenues?		
Change in revenue from change in retention	The impact on tuition revenue of changes in first-year retention rates from one cohort to another	

• Should be disaggregated by credential type

Equity

Are our universities accessible to a broad range of students?		
Economic status	% Pell Grant recipients	
Race / ethnicity	Use current IPEDS categories	
Age	By date of birth or in categories (<20, 20-24, 25+)	
Gender	Male, female or other	
First-generation	% whose parents' highest education is some college but no degree or below	

The University as an Integral Community Partner Zimmerman & Pehrsson

Framework for Measuring Community Engagement

Economic Engagement: The University as a partner in developing work related opportunities

Measure #1 Student enrollment in for credit community-based learning courses such as internships, field placements, student teaching, clinical placements, service-learning courses, etc.

Measure #2 Employment Measure – Number of graduates employed or placed in a graduate or professional program at the regional, state, and national levels. This measure could include employment in target areas such as STEM, medical professions, etc.

Measure #3 Degree application measure - Number of students who acquire gainful employment in the area of their degree or a closely related area.

Community Engagement: The University as a partner that promotes, fosters and invests in community service

Measure #3 Student/Faculty/Administration/Staff participation in local and regional government, non-profit boards, industry consultants, etc. Ideally should be related to individual's area of professional expertise. Can be paid or unpaid.

Measure #4 Student/Faculty/Administration/Staff volunteerism in community service projects, alternative break service or other co-curricular service activity. Limited to volunteerism associated with registered student or official university organization, student club, sorority, fraternity, etc.

Outreach and Partnerships: The University as a Regional Cultural and Economic Resource

Measure #5 Participation (attendance) in public lectures (including panel discussions, planetarium shows, etc.), continuing education courses, business Incubators, cultural events, athletic events, hosted k-12 academic events (science fairs, model UN, etc.).

Community Support for the University

Measure #6 Fundraising Measure – amount raised per student FTE

Measure #7 Foundation and Grant Support –amount raised per student FTE

Measure #8 Collaborative Business and Community Fundraising Projects – amount of partnerships and the amount raised per partnership