

**REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES AT  
SELECTED HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS**

**REPORT ON AUDIT  
FOR THE YEAR ENDED  
JUNE 30, 1999**

***AUDITOR OF  
PUBLIC  
ACCOUNTS***



***COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA***

## SUMMARY

We have reviewed the performance measures process at 10 higher education institutions to determine the reliability and accuracy of performance measures information reported to the Department of Planning and Budget (DPB). We reviewed a total of 120 performance measures. We found that the higher education institutions had reported to DPB 106 (88 percent) of the measures using reliable sources of information and accurately reported 109 (91 percent) of the measures. We also identified the following weaknesses in the performance measures reporting process:

- There are inconsistencies between the institutions in the performance measures calculations for four measures. DPB provides definitions for the measures, but the definitions do not include all factors necessary to calculate performance. As a result, the institutions have developed their own methodologies on how to calculate the measures.
- The institutions use alumni surveys to gather information for two measures. These surveys are not as reliable as other information sources due to low survey response rates, the subjective nature of surveys, and a lack of controls over the distribution and evaluation process.
- Management review is not sufficient to detect inaccurate reporting to DPB.
- The institutions have not documented the process used to gather and report performance measures information.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Pages</u>
SUMMARY	
SPECIAL REVIEW	1-2
BACKGROUND and REPORTING PROCESS	3
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	4-5
PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS	7-9
RESULTS BY HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS	11-24

May 8, 2000

The Honorable James S. Gilmore, III  
Governor of Virginia  
State Capital  
Richmond, Virginia

The Honorable Vincent F. Callahan, Jr.  
Chairman, Joint Legislative Audit  
and Review Commission  
General Assembly Building  
Richmond, Virginia

### SPECIAL REVIEW

We have reviewed the performance measures process at higher education institutions to determine the reliability and accuracy of performance measures information reported to the Department of Planning and Budget (DPB).

#### Review Objectives, Scope and Methodology

We had three objectives for our review of higher education institutions reporting of performance measures. These objectives were to evaluate the process used to accumulate and report performance measures information; to determine the reliability of the data sources used; and to verify the accuracy of performance measures information reported to DPB.

We reviewed the performance measures information submitted to DPB as of June 30, 1999, unless otherwise noted. We reviewed the following twelve performance measures.

- Graduation Rate
- Progression Rate
- Retention Rate
- Persistence Rate
- Number of transfer students
- Percent of graduates employed in Program-related work
- Percent of graduates pursuing further study
- Dollars spent on instruction, libraries, and academic computing as a percent of Educational and General expenses
- Percentage of Management Standards Met
- Classroom Utilization
- Total credit hours per full time equivalent faculty
- Research and public service expenses per full time equivalent faculty

We reviewed these measures at the following ten institutions of higher education:

Christopher Newport University  
College of William and Mary  
George Mason University  
Longwood College  
Mary Washington College  
Norfolk State University  
Old Dominion University  
Virginia Commonwealth University  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute State University  
Virginia State University

We reviewed a total of 120 individual performance measures. In performing this review, we conducted interviews with institution personnel and reviewed guidelines provided by DPB and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) to determine procedures used to report performance measures. We obtained documentation from the institution supporting performance measures results. If the institution did not maintain supporting documentation, we asked them to reproduce the data. We recalculated performance measure results to verify their accuracy and agreed them to the results reported to the DPB. We also relied on testwork performed during the institution's annual audit to help determine the reliability of the data sources.

### Results

We found that the higher education institutions had reported to DPB 106 (88 percent) of the measures using reliable sources of information and accurately reported 109 (91 percent) of the measures. We also identified weaknesses in the performance measures reporting process. We discuss these weaknesses in the section entitled "Findings and Recommendations."

### EXIT CONFERENCE

We discussed this report with representatives of the Department and Planning and Budget and the State Council of Higher Education on June 26, 2000.

AUDITOR OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

LCR:aom  
aom:61

## **BACKGROUND**

A 1991 Joint Legislative Audit Review Commission (JLARC) study, entitled *Review of the Executive Budget Process*, addressed the issue of incorporating performance measures in the Commonwealth's budgeting process. The study recommended that the Department of Planning and Budget (DPB) proceed with plans to develop performance measures for certain programs on a pilot basis. Subsequently, the 1995 administration launched a comprehensive performance budgeting process for all executive branch agencies. This process required that each state agency develop and report the results of three to five performance measures. Concurrently, the General Assembly conducted its own study in 1995. This study, *The Concept of Benchmarking for Future Government Actions*, also recommended that DPB implement a planning and performance management system.

Higher education institutions used a different process because of their similar characteristics. DPB in collaboration with Virginia's higher education institutions and SCHEV developed core performance measures for all higher education institutions. The collaboration led to the selection of seven core measures to reflect how well institutions manage their academic, human (faculty and students), fiscal, and physical resources. These seven core performance measures are comprised of twelve individual performance measures. Chapter 1073 of the Appropriations Act directs SCHEV, in consultation with the public colleges and universities, to develop a report on Institutional Effectiveness, which will be made available to the public no later July 2001. These reports will include performance measures information by institution.

The Auditor of Public Accounts Office began working with the Department of Planning and Budget in 1995 to integrate the review of information and systems used to accumulate and report performance measures into our annual agency and institution audits. We review the procedures and methods of reporting performance measures information as part of our financial audits. We do not evaluate or report on the appropriateness of the performance measures.

## **REPORTING PROCESS**

The higher education institutions use guidelines provided by DPB and SCHEV when calculating the core performance measures. Annually, DPB provides "Definitions and Reporting Periods for Core Performance Measures for Higher Education" to the higher education institutions. The institutions use these guidelines as the basis for their calculations. Further, the institutions reference SCHEV guidelines for information not provided by DPB.

The institutions must establish a baseline and target for each performance measure. The baseline is the original level of performance and the target is the estimate of the expected results. Annually, the institutions review and update the targets for each performance measure and report results to DPB. When updating targets, the institution considers such factors as its mission, historical trends, enrollment and funding fluctuations, and industry conditions.

In general, institutional research and assessment personnel accumulate the information and calculate the performance measures with the assistance of budget, human resources, and admissions personnel. Upon completing the calculations, management performs a cursory review of the results before submitting them to the President of the institution and once approved the results go to DPB.

The institutions' student information system is the main source of data for the calculations. The student information systems at the institutions contain various controls surrounding access and program modifications and undergo annual review by the Auditor of Public Accounts. Institutions also obtain data from surveys, reports from other state agencies, the Commonwealth Accounting and Reporting System (CARS), internal financial reporting systems, and human resources databases.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*There were inconsistencies in reporting four of seven core measures.* DPB provides definitions for the core performance measures; however, the definitions for some measures do not include all factors necessary to calculate performance. Therefore, the institutions have developed their own interpretations of how to calculate the measures. We recommend that DPB, SCHEV, and the institutions work together to address the following inconsistencies:

### Progression rates

- DPB's definition does not indicate whether part-time students should be included. Some institutions include part-time students, and some do not when computing this rate.
- The number of credit hours a student must earn to progress vary by institution. Some institutions use 30 credit hours, while others use 24 credit hours.

### Percentage of graduates who are employed in program-related work or pursuing further study

- Eight institutions only include individuals currently pursuing further study, while two institutions include individuals who are pursuing further study **and** individuals who have completed further study (prior to the survey).
- Institutions' interpretation of the survey results varied. Some institutions used a formula as instructed by DPB, to calculate their survey results. Other institutions reported survey result based on how many graduates completed the survey or how many graduates responded to the question.

### Dollars expended on instruction, libraries, and academic computing as a percent of total Educational and General expenditures

- Three of the institutions did not include programs as defined by DPB. DPB defines these expenses as the sum of certain CARS programs which are defined on page 7.

### Faculty Productivity

- The institutions' determination of "full-time equivalent" faculty vary. Full-time equivalency used such factors as credit hours taught, research grants, an outdated SCHEV funding model, personnel contracts, etc.
- Some institutions reduce research and public service expenditures by funds received from non-state entities.

***Surveys may not provide a reliable basis for performance measures reporting.*** The institutions rely on alumni surveys to compute the percent of graduates employed in program-related work and the percent of graduates pursuing further study. The surveys have a low response rate and are subjective in nature. Also, the controls surrounding the survey distribution and evaluation should be improved at some institutions. For example, we found some universities used the wrong question to evaluate results; surveyed the wrong class of graduates or had errors in accumulating the survey results.

We recommend that DPB, SCHEV, and the institutions evaluate more reliable methods of collecting this information or try to improve alumni survey response rates. If the institutions continue to use surveys, we recommend they consider reducing the number of questions in the survey, offering incentives for completing surveys, or collecting data by telephone or electronically.

***Institution management should improve their review procedures over performance measures information.*** Overall, there was 91 percent accuracy of the performance measures reported to DPB; however, we found some errors that institutional management review could have detected. We recommend that institution management improve their review and approval process.

***Institutions have not documented the performance measures information process.*** Lack of documentation could lead to inconsistent reporting between years, insufficient audit evidence, and in the event of employee turnover, difficulties in performing computations. We recommend each institution develop written procedures for computing and reporting performance measure results and target information to DPB. These procedures should include responsible parties, data sources, and detailed procedures used to extract and evaluate data.



## **PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEFINITIONS**

### **Graduation Rate**

DPB Definition	This measure reflects graduation in six years within an institution. It reflects the entering class stipulated by DPB capturing only full-time, program placed (matriculated), first-time students.
Period Measured	Fall 1993 Cohort (students graduating by 1999)
Source of Information	Student Information System

### **Progression Rates**

DPB Definition	<i>Progression Rate</i> – students returning to the same institution at a higher program placed level. <i>Retention Rate</i> – students returning to the same institution but not progressing to a higher program placed level. <i>Persistence Rate</i> – students returning to the same institution regardless of their program-placed level (sum of progression and retention rates).
Period Measured	Fall 1998 (students returning in 1999)
Source of Information	Student Information System

### **Transfer Rates**

DPB Definition	Reflects the number of full- and part-time students transferring from the Virginia community colleges and Richard Bland College.
Period Measured	Transfers in the Fall 1999
Source of Information	Student Information System

### **Percentage of graduates employed in program-related work or pursuing further study**

DPB Definition	This data reflects the results of alumni surveys conducted by institutions of higher education.
Period Measured	Conducted during July 1, 1998 through June 30, 1999 for the graduating class of 1996 (undergraduate program only)
Source of Information	Alumni Survey

**Dollars spent on instruction, libraries, and academic computing as a percent of total Educational and General expenditures**

DPB Definition	The sum of CARS programs 101, 104-10 and 104-40 divided by the sum of CARS programs 101 through 107
Period Measured	July 1, 1998 – June 30, 1999
Source of Information	Commonwealth Accounting and Reporting System or Internal Financial Reporting System

**Percentage of Management Standards Met**

DPB Definition	Successfully meeting the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The institution receives an unqualified opinion from the Auditor of Public Accounts</li><li>• The institution has no significant management comments in the Auditor of Public Accounts audit report</li><li>• The institution meets the financial reporting requirements established by the Department of Accounts Directive</li><li>• The institution's Perkins Loan default rate is less than 10 percent</li><li>• The institution's percentage of accounts receivables outstanding greater than 120 days are less than 10 percent</li><li>• The institution's prompt pay percentage is 95 percent or greater</li></ul>
Period Measured	July 1, 1997 – June 30, 1998
Source of Information	Auditor of Public Accounts, Department of Accounts, FISAP Report, Accounts Receivable Quarterly Report, and CARS

**Classroom Utilization**

Definition	The extent to which classroom and laboratory space is used
Period Measured	Fall 1998
Source of Information	Physical inventory and the Student Information System

**Faculty Productivity**

DPB Definition	<i>Total student credit hours per full-time equivalent faculty - Fall 1999 student credit hours generated divided by the number of full-time equivalent (full-time, part-time, and GTA's) state-paid teaching and research faculty.</i> <i>Research and public service expenditures per full-time faculty - Research and public service expenditures (programs 102, 103, and</i>
----------------	---

110) divided by the number of full-time state-paid teaching and research faculty for an Academic Year.

Period Measured

July 1, 1998 – June 30, 1999 expenditures  
Academic Year 1998-99 teaching and research faculty

Source of Information

Commonwealth Accounting and Reporting System and Human Resources System

## **RESULTS BY HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS**

*Christopher Newport University*

<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Data Source Reliable</b>	<b>Results Reported to DPB</b>
Graduation Rate	33%	34%	28%	Yes	Accurate
Progression Rate	35%	41%	47%	Yes	Accurate
Retention Rate	29%	27%	24%	Yes	Accurate
Persistence Rate	64%	68%	71%	Yes	Accurate
Number of Transfer Students	238	235	245	Yes	Accurate
Percent of graduates employed in program-related work	51%	51%	51%	No (Note A)	Accurate
Percent of graduates pursuing further study	17%	18%	26%	No (Note A)	Accurate
Dollars expended on instruction, libraries, & academic computing as a percent of Educational and General Expenditures	63%	60%	60%	Yes	Accurate
Percentage of Management Standards met	100%	100%	100%	Yes	Accurate
Classroom Utilization	54%	59%	63%	Yes	Accurate
Total credit hours per FTE faculty	225	275	283	Yes	Accurate
Research & public service expenditures per full-time faculty ( <i>in thousands</i> )	\$8.4	\$6.9	\$8.1	Yes	Accurate

Note A – Low Response Rate (35%)

*College of William and Mary*

<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Data Source Reliable</b>	<b>Results Reported to DPB</b>
Graduation Rate	91%	88%	88%	Yes	Accurate
Progression Rate	91%	93%	93%	Yes	Accurate
Retention Rate	3%	2%	2%	Yes	Accurate
Persistence Rate	94%	95%	95%	Yes	Accurate
Number of Transfer Students	32	46	51	Yes	Accurate
Percent of graduates employed in program-related work	42%	42%	39%	Yes	Accurate
Percent of graduates pursuing further study	39%	39%	38%	Yes	Accurate
Dollars expended on instruction, libraries, & academic computing as a percent of Educational and General Expenditures	71%	73%	73%	Yes	Accurate
Percentage of Management Standards met	100%	100%	100%	Yes	Accurate
Classroom Utilization	60%	61%	58%	Yes	Accurate
Total credit hours per FTE faculty	170	172	168	Yes	Accurate
Research & public service expenditures per full-time faculty ( <i>in thousands</i> )	\$55.4	\$52.0	\$55.3	Yes	Accurate

*George Mason University*

<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Data Source Reliable</b>	<b>Amount Reported to DPB</b>
Graduation Rate	50%	50%	48%	Yes	Accurate
Progression Rate	34%	37%	37%	Yes	Accurate
Retention Rate	40%	36%	39%	Yes	Accurate
Persistence Rate	74%	73%	76%	Yes	Accurate
Number of Transfer Students	1213	1225	1251	Yes	Accurate
Percent of graduates employed in program-related work	39%	42%	47%	No (Note B)	Accurate
Percent of graduates pursuing further study	23%	23%	42%	No (Note B)	Inaccurate (Note C)
Dollars expended on instruction, libraries, & academic computing as a percent of Educational and General Expenditures	62%	67%	67%	Yes	Accurate
Percentage of Management Standards met	100%	100%	100%	Yes	Accurate
Classroom Utilization	65%	65%	60%	Yes	Accurate
Total credit hours per FTE faculty	250	233	228	Yes	Accurate
Research & public service expenditures per full-time faculty ( <i>in thousands</i> )	\$40.9	\$45.0	\$45.2	Yes	Accurate

Note B – Low Response Rate (56% of a 27% sample)

Note C – George Mason University reported results of alumni who “pursued” further study instead of alumni who are currently “pursuing” further study.



*Longwood College*

<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Data Source Reliable</b>	<b>Amount Reported to DPB</b>
Graduation Rate	52%	60%	61%	Yes	Accurate
Progression Rate	68%	70%	68%	Yes	Accurate
Retention Rate	10%	12%	10%	Yes	Accurate
Persistence Rate	79%	81%	79%	Yes	Accurate
Number of Transfer Students	118	180	141	Yes	Accurate
Percent of graduates employed in program-related work	47%	49%	52%	Yes	Accurate
Percent of graduates pursuing further study	23%	24%	21%	Yes	Accurate
Dollars expended on instruction, libraries, & academic computing as a percent of Educational and General Expenditures	62%	63%	62%	Yes	Accurate
Percentage of Management Standards met	100%	100%	100%	Yes	Accurate
Classroom Utilization	55%	60%	60%	Yes	Accurate
Total credit hours per FTE faculty	251	271	271	Yes	Accurate
Research & public service expenditures per full-time faculty ( <i>in thousands</i> )	\$7.8	\$6.6	\$6.7	Yes	Accurate

*Mary Washington College*

<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Data Source Reliable</b>	<b>Amount Reported to DPB</b>
Graduation Rate	70%	74%	73%	Yes	Accurate
Progression Rate	72%	66%	71%	Yes	Accurate
Retention Rate	12%	16%	13%	Yes	Accurate
Persistence Rate	84%	82%	84%	Yes	Accurate
Number of Transfer Students	125	100	136	Yes	Accurate
Percent of graduates employed in program-related work	35%	35%	34%	Yes	Accurate
Percent of graduates pursuing further study	31%	31%	27%	Yes	Accurate
Dollars expended on instruction, libraries, & academic computing as a percent of Educational and General Expenditures	60%	61%	61%	Yes	Accurate
Percentage of Management Standards met	100%	100%	100%	Yes	Accurate
Classroom Utilization	67%	65%	66%	Yes	Accurate
Credit Hours per FTE Faculty	257	258	258	Yes	Accurate
Research & Public Service expenditures per FTE faculty ( <i>in thousands</i> )	\$4.8	\$5.9	\$6.2	Yes	Accurate

*Norfolk State University*

<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Data Source Reliable</b>	<b>Amount Reported to DPB</b>
Graduation Rate	18%	24%	20%	Yes	Inaccurate (Note D )
Progression Rate	19%	22%	19%	Yes	Accurate
Retention Rate	45%	48%	47%	Yes	Accurate
Persistence Rate	63%	67%	66%	Yes	Accurate
Transfer Rate	170	132	132	Yes	Accurate
Percent of graduates employed in program-related work	51%	51%	N/A (Note E)	No (Note E)	Inaccurate (Note E)
Percent of graduates pursuing further study	26%	26%	N/A (Note E)	No (Note E)	Inaccurate (Note E)
Dollars expended on instruction, libraries, & academic computing as a percent of Educational and General Expenditures	59%	58%	53%	Yes	Inaccurate (Note F)
Percentage of Management Standards met	80%	100%	80%	Yes	Accurate
Classroom Utilization	60%	59%	58%	Yes	Accurate
Credit Hours per FTE Faculty	259	246	259	Yes	Accurate
Research & Public Service expenditures per FTE faculty ( <i>in thousands</i> )	\$17.0	\$22.0	\$28.0	Yes	Accurate

Note D – Norfolk State University (NSU) could not provide support for this figure

Note E – NSU did not survey 1996 graduates

Note F – NSU did not compute the amount according to DPB Definition

*Old Dominion University*

<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Data Source Reliable</b>	<b>Amount Reported to DPB</b>
Graduation Rate	41%	38%	38%	Yes	Accurate
Progression Rate	33%	39%	41%	Yes	Accurate
Retention Rate	31%	32%	35%	Yes	Accurate
Persistence Rate	64%	71%	76%	Yes	Accurate
Number of Transfer Students	703	810	815	Yes	Accurate
Percent of graduates employed in program-related work	50%	50%	54%	No (Note G)	Accurate
Percent of graduates pursuing further study	22%	22%	21%	No (Note G)	Accurate
Dollars expended on instruction, libraries, & academic computing as a percent of Educational and General Expenditures	65%	62%	63%	Yes	Accurate
Percentage of Management Standards met	100%	100%	100%	Yes	Accurate
Classroom Utilization	62%	60%	66%	Yes	Accurate
Total credit hours per FTE faculty	227	240	245	Yes	Accurate
Research & public service expenditures per full-time faculty ( <i>in thousands</i> )	\$35.4	\$45.0	\$45.2	Yes	Accurate

Note G – Low Response Rate (31%)

*Virginia Commonwealth University*

<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Data Source Reliable</b>	<b>Amount Reported to DPB</b>
Graduation Rate	43%	42%	42%	Yes	Accurate
Progression Rate	48%	54%	51%	Yes	Accurate
Retention Rate	27%	24%	23%	Yes	Accurate
Persistence Rate	75%	78%	74%	Yes	Accurate
Number of Transfer Students	756	845	744	Yes	Accurate
Percent of graduates employed in program-related work	51%	51%	54 %	No (Note H)	Accurate
Percent of graduates pursuing further study	17%	17%	42%	No (Note H)	Inaccurate (Note I)
Dollars expended on instruction, libraries, & academic computing as a percent of Educational and General Expenditures	66%	66%	65%	Yes	Accurate
Percentage of Management Standards met	100%	100%	100 %	Yes	Accurate
Classroom Utilization	59%	60%	63%	Yes	Accurate
Total credit hours per FTE faculty	193	201	194	Yes	Accurate
Research & public service expenditures per full-time faculty ( <i>in thousands</i> )	\$89.9	\$95.0	\$100.2	Yes	Accurate

Note H – Low Response Rate (28% of a 42% sample)

Note I – The actual rate of graduates pursuing further study is 15%. Virginia Commonwealth University made a clerical error when reporting the results to DPB.

*Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University*

<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Data Source Reliable</b>	<b>Amount Reported to DPB</b>
Graduation Rate	71%	71%	71%	Yes	Accurate
Progression Rate	69%	67%	66%	Yes	Accurate
Retention Rate	18%	19%	23%	Yes	Accurate
Persistence Rate	86%	86%	88%	Yes	Accurate
Number of Transfer Students	496	500	538	Yes	Accurate
Percent of graduates employed in program-related work	44%	44%	53%	No (Note J)	Inaccurate (Note J)
Percent of graduates pursuing further study	20%	20%	26%	No (Note J)	Inaccurate (Note J)
Dollars expended on instruction, libraries, & academic computing as a percent of Educational and General Expenditures	64%	62%	64%	Yes	Accurate
Percentage of Management Standards met	100%	100%	100%	Yes	Accurate
Classroom Utilization	68%	73%	77%	Yes	Accurate
Total credit hours per FTE faculty	226	234	235	Yes	Accurate
Research & public service expenditures per full-time faculty ( <i>in thousands</i> )	\$66.0	\$72.0	\$73.1	Yes	Accurate

Note J – Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University surveyed 1997 graduates instead of 1996 graduates as directed by SCHEV.

*Virginia State University*

<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Data Source Reliable</b>	<b>Amount Reported to DPB</b>
Graduation Rate	23%	30%	31%	Yes	Accurate
Progression Rate	20%	30%	27%	Yes	Accurate
Retention Rate	45%	44%	47%	Yes	Accurate
Persistence Rate	65%	74%	73%	Yes	Accurate
Number of Transfer Students	47	65	58	Yes	Accurate
Percent of graduates employed in program-related work	31%	34%	19%	No (Note K)	Inaccurate (Note L)
Percent of graduates pursuing further study	18%	20%	21%	No (Note K)	Inaccurate (Note M )
Dollars expended on instruction, libraries, & academic computing as a percent of Educational and General Expenditures	50%	51%	51%	Yes	Inaccurate (Note N)
Percentage of Management Standards met	60%	60%	60%	Yes	Accurate
Classroom Utilization	77%	80%	75%	Yes	Accurate
Total credit hours per FTE faculty	240	269	251	Yes	Accurate
Research & public service expenditures per full-time faculty ( <i>in thousands</i> )	\$50.0	\$75.0	\$68.1	Yes	Accurate

Note K – Low Response Rate (12%)

Note L – Virginia State University (VSU) evaluated results based on the number of surveys returned as opposed to the number of responses to the question.

Note M – Same as Note L. In addition, VSU included alumni who completed further studies.

Note N – VSU did not compute the amount according to DPB Definition

The performance measures information provided on the following pages is for information purposes. The performance measures information for these institutions was not tested as part of our review.

*James Madison University*

<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
Graduation Rate	80%	80%	78.6%
Progression Rate	72.5%	73%	75.8%
Retention Rate	19%	17%	14.6%
Persistence Rate	91.5%	90%	90.4%
Number of Transfer Students	226	230	210
Percent of graduates employed in program-related work	43.7%	43%	88%
Percent of graduates pursuing further study	23.7%	23%	35%
Dollars expended on instruction, libraries, & academic computing as a percent of Educational and General Expenditures	67.9%	66%	64.2%
Percentage of Management Standards met	100%	100%	100%
Classroom Utilization	75%	60%	72%
Total credit hours per FTE faculty	269	268	272.3
Research & public service expenditures per full-time faculty (in thousands)	\$3.6	\$8	\$8.8



**Radford University**

Performance Measure	Baseline	Target	Actual
Graduation Rate	52.7%	52%	46%
Progression Rate	51.8%	58%	58.2%
Retention Rate	15.8%	17%	17.3%
Persistence Rate	67.6%	75%	75.5%
Number of Transfer Students	439	500	432
Percent of graduates employed in program-related work	41.5%	41.5%	51.8%
Percent of graduates pursuing further study	16.6%	16.6%	14.3%
Dollars expended on instruction, libraries, & academic computing as a percent of Educational and General Expenditures	65.6%	66.7%	61.91%
Percentage of Management Standards met	100%	100%	100%
Classroom Utilization	69%	58%	61%
Total credit hours per FTE faculty	247	291	289
Research & public service expenditures per full-time faculty ( <i>in thousands</i> )	\$3.3	\$5.9	\$7.5

*University of Virginia*

Performance Measure	Baseline	Target	Actual
Graduation Rate	91.5%	91%	91%
Progression Rate	80%	83.5%	87.6%
Retention Rate	16.5%	14%	9%
Persistence Rate	96.6%	96%	96.6%
Number of Transfer Students	194	175	168
Percent of graduates employed in program-related work	37%	37%	64%
Percent of graduates pursuing further study	31%	32%	33.9%
Dollars expended on instruction, libraries, & academic computing as a percent of Educational and General Expenditures	63.4%	62%	63.2%
Percentage of Management Standards met	100%	100%	100%
Classroom Utilization	51.7%	57%	58.4%
Total credit hours per FTE faculty	196	193	191
Research & public service expenditures per full-time faculty <i>(in thousands)</i>	\$99.3	\$103	\$115.5

**Virginia Military Institute**

Performance Measure	Baseline	Target	Actual
Graduation Rate	65%	65%	58.4%
Progression Rate	75.5%	80%	82%
Retention Rate	.9%	.9%	.9%
Persistence Rate	76.4%	80.9%	82.9%
Number of Transfer Students	22	30	30
Percent of graduates employed in program-related work	29.1%	30%	15.4%
Percent of graduates pursuing further study	24%	24%	10%
Dollars expended on instruction, libraries, & academic computing as a percent of Educational and General Expenditures	62.1%	60%	58.5%
Percentage of Management Standards met	100%	100%	100%
Classroom Utilization	56%	60%	52.5%
Total credit hours per FTE faculty	186	174	170
Research & public service expenditures per full-time faculty ( <i>in thousands</i> )	\$6.7	\$5	\$4.6