

INTRODUCTION

The Council of University Presidents is pleased to present to the Commission on Higher Education, the Governor, the Legislature and the citizens of New Mexico its first annual Performance Effectiveness Report. This report results from a year-long process to design a Performance Effectiveness Plan for New Mexico's six universities. Our long-range objective is to report on how well our universities are meeting statewide performance expectations. We anticipate that focusing university and public attention on the quality indicators contained in the plan will promote the improvement of higher education in New Mexico and the achievement of our performance goals. We also envision our efforts as a component of an overall statewide process for reporting on the performance effectiveness of New Mexico's institutions of higher education. An overall statewide process should include our joint performance reporting on measures common to all six universities, a more extensive mission-specific reporting from each individual university, and performance effectiveness reporting by New Mexico's public two-year colleges.

This 1998 report addresses the performance of our universities on a limited number of the identified performance expectations, since it is confined to those measures for which appropriate data already existed at the institutional level. The Council of University Presidents' Performance Effectiveness Plan is still under development. The 1999 Performance Effectiveness Report will contain a significantly wider range of performance measures as the design for new measures is completed and additional data are collected.

BACKGROUND AND PROCESS

In the spring of 1998, the Council of University Presidents pledged its commitment to a major accountability initiative, the development of an accountability or performance effectiveness plan for New Mexico's universities. The Council, consisting of the presidents of the six public universities in New Mexico, appointed a task force of representatives from the six universities to design and oversee implementation of this accountability initiative. At each stage of the development process the task force has reported back to the Council of University Presidents for suggestions and approval. The Council has approved both the Performance Effectiveness Plan and the first annual Performance Effectiveness Report included in this document.

The development of our Performance Effectiveness Plan began with a review of accountability plans in other states and university systems, their experiences with the implementation of these plans and their assessments of the feasibility and usefulness of the wide range of performance measures considered or selected. It is clear that performance reporting in higher education is both a focus of attention across the nation and a still-evolving process. Many accountability plans implemented in other states have already fallen by the wayside, often because they were too cumbersome or provided information which was detailed but not meaningful in addressing core higher education purposes or significant policy issues. As a result, efforts expended on accountability activities often did not contribute to the ultimate goal--improving higher education. Our planning for accountability has benefitted from the experiences, both good and bad, of others.

In developing our Performance Effectiveness Plan we have tried to reflect core purposes and values for higher education as well as statewide concerns regarding higher education in New Mexico. We have identified quality indicators that address both performance areas common to all six universities and additional performance areas selected by each university to recognize its unique institutional mission, clientele and institutional priorities in meeting the needs of its students and region. In doing so, our focus has been, first, on our instructional missions and then on other components of our universities' missions.

After identifying a common set of indicators of university quality and effectiveness, we considered the selection of appropriate performance measures. As the result of our review of accountability system successes and failures elsewhere, each proposed performance measure was reviewed on the basis of such criteria as whether the measure was clearly definable, measurable, obtainable, meaningful, easily understood and useful. Whether data were available for a proposed performance measure was not a criterion for inclusion but did determine whether the measure could be

reported in the 1998 report or would be delayed until available in 1999 or 2000. Over time some of the performance measures included in the plan may change as performance expectations are met in some areas and adjustments are made to reflect other state needs and issues.

This document presents a Performance Effectiveness Plan and reporting system which can benefit the state, our students and our universities. We believe this process of accounting for our universities' performance and achievement of goals can make a difference in improving higher education and its ability to respond to New Mexico's educational needs.

THE PERFORMANCE EFFECTIVENESS PLAN OF NEW MEXICO'S UNIVERSITIES

Quality Indicators. The Council of University Presidents has identified a set of commonly agreed-upon indicators of university quality and effectiveness. These indicators can be used to measure the progress of New Mexico's universities in meeting statewide performance expectations for higher education. Focusing university and public attention on these quality indicators will promote the improvement of higher education and the achievement of our performance goals. These indicators of university quality and effectiveness include:

- Accessible and affordable university education
- Student progress and success in our universities
- Academic quality and a quality learning environment
- Effective and efficient use of resources
- Discovery and sharing of knowledge, research and innovation throughout New Mexico
 - Quality of research and creative activity
 - Service to New Mexicans
 - Economic impact

Performance Measures Common to All Six Universities. For each of the first four quality indicators listed above, a common set of performance measures has been selected to provide a means by which each of our universities can demonstrate its performance level. Although we are using common performance measures, each institution's performance level will reflect its unique institutional mission, students and other stakeholders, and the program and service mix it has developed in response to state and regional needs. In future years each institution can also use these measures in setting goals for performance improvement in areas of institutional priority and concern.

The performance measures on which all universities will report have been identified below as either "fast-track" or "to be developed." The fast-track measures are those which the six universities are reporting in this first December 1998 report. The measures for which data do not currently exist will require definition and data collection during the coming year. Reporting on these measures will begin as soon as data are available, either in December 1999 or 2000.

I. Accessible and Affordable University Education

Fast-track

- ◆ Tuition/required fee rates; comparative data on regional peers and per capita income
- ◆ Financial aid awarded and unmet student financial need
- ◆ Enrollment by race/ethnicity; comparative data on HS graduates, ACT takers

To Be Developed

- ◆ Transfer students from NM 2-yr colleges, including branches – in cooperation with Commission on Higher Education

II. Student Progress and Student Success

Fast-track

- ◆ Freshman persistence rates — fall to fall terms
- ◆ Graduation rates at X years, together with those still enrolled (to include graduation rates for students in certificate and associate degree programs if an integral part of the institutional mission)

To Be Developed

- ◆ Transfer student completers
- ◆ Placement rates of graduates – employment and continuation of education

III. Academic Quality and a Quality Learning Environment

Fast-track

- ◆ Faculty/staff profile – race/ethnicity, percent faculty with terminal degrees, comparative data on faculty salaries
- ◆ Percent student credit hours taught by tenured/tenure-track faculty
- ◆ External accreditation

To Be Developed

- ◆ Faculty role/contributions
- ◆ Student satisfaction with undergraduate experience
- ◆ Alumni assessment of institutional quality
- ◆ Employers' satisfaction with NM university graduates

IV. Effective and Efficient Use of Resources

Fast-track

- ◆ Primary mission (instruction, research, public service) as percent of Educational and General expenditures; comparative data on peers
- ◆ Institutional support (administrative costs) as percent of Educational and General expenditures; comparative data on peers

To Be Developed

- ◆ Flagging of all low enrollment/low degree programs – in cooperation with Commission on Higher Education
- ◆ Space utilization – in cooperation with Commission on Higher Education

Mission-Specific Institutional Reporting. For three of the indicators of university quality and effectiveness, university priorities and performance are dependent on the mission of each institution, the populations it serves and the resulting undergraduate and graduate programs and services it provides. Thus, for these indicators the performance measures

will be unique to each institution. The development of these mission-specific measures and related university reporting on performance will begin with the December 1999 report. The mission-specific quality indicators are:

V. Quality of Research and Creative Activity

Research collaboration in areas such as the environment; natural resources; high-technology materials; teaching excellence; cultural, performing and studio arts.

VI. Service to New Mexicans

Mission-specific programs and special projects in areas such as cooperative extension, distance education, extractive industries, health care, K-16 partnerships and business development.

VII. Economic Impact

Universities' economic impact in areas such as graduates' earning power, research grants and research support to the public and private sectors.

In addition, each university will develop an institutional "profile" on its mission, students and other stakeholders. An abbreviated institutional profile has been prepared by each university for this first performance report.

In future years universities also may develop additional mission-specific measures to demonstrate institutional performance goals and priorities not adequately covered in the common reporting measures on indicators of access, student success, quality and efficiency.

Implementation Schedule.

I. Overall Performance Effectiveness Plan

<i>August, 1998</i>	Complete design, process and implementation schedule
---------------------	--

II. Reporting on Performance Measures Common to All Universities

A. Fast-track: data already available

<i>September, 1998</i>	Agree on definitions, sources and reporting formats
<i>December, 1998</i>	Report on performance measures if data available

B. Development of new performance measures

<i>May, 1999</i>	Design and initiate to-be-developed performance measures
<i>December, 1999-2000</i>	Begin reporting as data become available
<i>December, 1999-2000</i>	Identify individual institutional performance goals
<i>1999 and beyond</i>	Report annually on performance measures and institutions' progress in achieving goals

III. Mission-specific Institutional Reporting

<i>1999 and beyond</i>	Provide institutional report annually on progress toward goals based on institutional mission, clientele, program/service mix and priorities
------------------------	--