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1. Importance of Peer Institutions

Why select peer institutions?

• Setting consistent parameters for research

• Establishing institutional benchmarks

• Developing ambitious and attainable goals

• Measuring institutional progress towards goals
2. Selection of Peers

- Started with 192 institutions:
  - All public research universities
  - All institutions included on existing peer lists
    - 73 institutions on 19 existing peer lists
2. How Peers were Selected

- Based on South Dakota State University’s peer selection method

---

### South Dakota State University and Peer Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>UG Program</th>
<th>Graduate Program</th>
<th>Enroll Profile</th>
<th>UG Profile</th>
<th>Total HCFA 2013</th>
<th>Size &amp; Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota State University</td>
<td>Brookings</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4-yr+</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>Prof+A&amp;S/SGC</td>
<td>Doc/Prof</td>
<td>VHU</td>
<td>FT4/S/HTI</td>
<td>12,525</td>
<td>M4/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
<td>Fort Collins</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>4-yr+</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>RU/VH</td>
<td>Ball/HGC</td>
<td>Doc/STEM</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>FT4/S/HTI</td>
<td>31,186</td>
<td>L4/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>4-yr+</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>Prof+A&amp;S/HGC</td>
<td>CompDoc/ Med Vet</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>FT4/S/HTI</td>
<td>24,581</td>
<td>L4/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana State University-Bozeman</td>
<td>Bozeman</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>4-yr+</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>RU/VH</td>
<td>Prof+A&amp;S/HGC</td>
<td>Doc/STEM</td>
<td>VHU</td>
<td>FT4/S/HTI</td>
<td>14,852</td>
<td>L4/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico State University-Main Campus</td>
<td>Las Cruces</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>4-yr+</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>Prof+A&amp;S/HGC</td>
<td>CompDoc/ NMed Vet</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>FT4/I</td>
<td>16,765</td>
<td>L4/NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota State University-Main Campus</td>
<td>Fargo</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>4-yr+</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>RU/VH</td>
<td>Prof+A&amp;S/SGC</td>
<td>CompDoc/ NMed Vet</td>
<td>VHU</td>
<td>FT4/S/HTI</td>
<td>14,629</td>
<td>L4/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University-Main Campus</td>
<td>Stillwater</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>4-yr+</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>Prof+A&amp;S/HGC</td>
<td>CompDoc/ Med Vet</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>FT4/S/HTI</td>
<td>26,073</td>
<td>L4/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>4-yr+</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>Prof+A&amp;S/HGC</td>
<td>Doc/Prof</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>FT4/S/HTI</td>
<td>12,024</td>
<td>L4/HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Montana-Missoula, The</td>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>4-yr+</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>Ball/SGC</td>
<td>Doc/Prof</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>FT4/S/LTI</td>
<td>14,525</td>
<td>L4/NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Dakota Main Campus</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>4-yr+</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>Prof+A&amp;S/HGC</td>
<td>CompDoc/Med Vet</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>FT4/S/HTI</td>
<td>15,143</td>
<td>L4/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wyoming</td>
<td>Laramie</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>4-yr+</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>Prof+A&amp;S/HGC</td>
<td>Doc/Prof</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>FT4/S/HTI</td>
<td>12,778</td>
<td>L4/NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. How Peers were Selected

• Initial Statistics (11 scored metrics)

1. Land Grant
2. Carnegie Basic – 2015
3. Carnegie Characteristics
   • UG Program
   • Grad Program
   • Enrollment Profile
   • UG Profile
   • Size & Setting
4. NCES Comparison Group
6. Distance from UW
2. How Peers were Selected

- Feedback & Development – June 15\textsuperscript{th} – July 15\textsuperscript{th}

Met with and solicited feedback from:

1. Vice President Gern
2. Office of Institutional Assessment Director Koller
3. Vice President Blalock
4. Academic Deans Council
5. Student Affairs Directors Council
6. Incoming Provost Miller
7. University Executive Council
8. University Financial Crisis Advisory Council
2. How Peers were Selected

• Feedback & Development – June 15\(^{th}\) – July 15\(^{th}\)

Statistics Added based on feedback:

1. Being sole public research university in state
2. Has medical education (MD, DDS, DMD, DO, or DVM)
4. Amount of federal, state, local and private research grants
5. # of faculty with tenure or on tenure track
6. NSF research rankings
7. Endowment value
8. Previous inclusion on UW peer lists
9. Do these institutions consider UW their peer?
10. Percent of applicants admitted
11. Faculty average salaries & non-instructional staff average salaries
12. Incoming class 2014 25\(^{th}\) percentile & 75\(^{th}\) percentile ACT scores
2. How Peers were Selected

- Final Ranking Methods (43 scored metrics)

Some scored metrics derived from multiple sources of data
Numbers in parentheses below indicate the number of metrics included in that area if more than one

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Institution</th>
<th>Distance from UW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Grant</td>
<td>Medical Education &amp; Services (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sole Public Research U. in State</td>
<td>Grants &amp; Contracts (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Classifications 2010 (6)</td>
<td>Prevalence on existing UW peer lists (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Basic Classification 2000</td>
<td>UW Considered a Peer by institution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCES Comparison Grouping</td>
<td>ACT Scores &amp; Admissions Selectivity (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment – 2013 &amp; 2008 (2)</td>
<td>Average 9 month salaries (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. How Peers were Selected

- Secondary selection:
  - Pink – Close Peers
  - Feedback received
  - Geographic considerations
    - Represent surrounding states
    - Urban/Rural
2. How Peers were selected

- Secondary selection:
  - Gold - Aspirational Peers
    - Carnegie “Very-High Research” (RU/VH)
    - Feedback received
3. Selected Peers

Pink – Close Peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utah State U.</th>
<th>U. of Maine #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State U.</td>
<td>Montana State U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Nevada Reno</td>
<td>North Dakota State U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Rhode Island #</td>
<td>South Dakota State U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico State U.</td>
<td>U. of Montana **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Idaho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Only Public Research University in State
** NOT Land Grant
### 3. Selected Peers

#### Gold - Aspirational Peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kansas State U.</th>
<th>Clemson U.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia U. #</td>
<td>Texas Tech U. **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Nebraska – Lincoln</td>
<td>Washington State U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State U.</td>
<td>U. Of Utah **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Only Public Research University in State
** NOT Land Grant

- Student Costs
- Student Body
- Graduation & Retention Rates
- Academic Programs
- Employees & Student Faculty Ratio
- Faculty & Research
- Private Giving

Student Costs Across Peers

• Median Costs
• Tuition & Fee Distribution
• Tuition & Fees compared to Room and Board
• Tuition and Fees compared to Student Loans
• Online/Outreach Charges compared to traditional offerings
Median Student Costs for AY 2016-2017
15 Credit Hours, Average Room & Board Charges

Data collected from respective institutions’ websites 7/21/2016
Estimated Room and Board is calculated in accordance with the provisions for calculating cost of attendance in Title IV, Section 472 of the Higher Education Act
Tuition and Fee Distribution AY 2016-2017
15 Credit Hours

Data collected from respective institutions’ websites 7/21/2016
Estimated Room and Board is calculated in accordance with the provisions for calculating cost of attendance in Title IV, Section 472 of the Higher Education Act.
AY 2014 Tuition and Fees & Ave. Federal Loans
Resident Undergraduate Tuition, Total Federal Loan disbursements divided among all undergraduate students

Federal Student Loan Allocations per Student AY14

FY14 Resident UG Tuition and Fees

Data collected from respective institutions’ websites 7/21/2016
Data collected from respective institutions’ websites 7/21/2016
Regular & Online Graduate Tuition & Fees Comparison

Online Programs are more expensive

Online Programs are discounted

Data collected from respective institutions’ websites 7/21/2016

Student Body Makeup Across Peers

• Percentage racial minority
• Percentage full-time/part-time
• Breakdown by level (continuing, first-time, transfers, etc.)
Percent of Student Body Identifying as a Racial Minority
(Not identifying as solely ‘White’)

Source: IPEDS 2014
Breakdown of Undergraduate Enrollment

Source: IPEDS 2014

Graduation and Retention Rates

- Graduation Rates & Tuition Rates
- Retention Rates & Total Cost
- Graduation Rates & Undergraduate Headcounts
- Graduation Rates & Rates of Pell Grants
- Retention Rates & Instructional Expenditures
- Retention Rates & Enrollment
- Retention Rates & Rates of Pell Grants
6 Yr. Grad. Rates and Resident Tuition & Fees

Source: IPEDS 2014

Go To Non-Resident Figures
First Year Retention and Total Price of Attendance - Resident

Total Price of Attendance Includes Tuition & Fees, Room & Board, Books & Supplies, and other Campus Expenses

First Year Full Time Retention Rate 2014

Total Price of Attendance for Resident Students - 2014

- All Public Research U.
- UW Peers
- UW
- Total Cost Ave.
- Retention Ave.
- Linear (UW Peers)

Source: IPEDS 2014

Go To Non-Resident Figures
First Year Retention and Total Full Time Enrollment

Source: IPEDS 2014

Go To 6 Yr. Grad & Enrollment Figures
First Year Retention and Total Instructional Expenditure per FTE

Instructional Expenditures is the sum of all operating expenses associated with colleges, schools, depts., etc. Includes compensation for all instruction, community education, preparatory and adult basic education, and remedial or tutorial instruction.

Source: IPEDS 2014

Degree Programs Offered

• Enrollment & CIP-4 Digit Degree Areas
• Expenses & CIP-4 Digit Degree Areas
• Research Grants & CIP-4 Digit Degree Areas
Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total UW Majors</th>
<th>Total UW 2-Digit CIP Areas</th>
<th>Total UW 4-Digit CIP Areas</th>
<th>Total UW 6-Digit CIP Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171 Degrees on Website (76 Bachelors, 60 Masters, 28 Doctorate, 7 Other)</td>
<td>27 (grad &amp; undergrad)</td>
<td>125 (grad + undergrad) (58 graduate, 67 undergraduate, 42 undergraduate areas that also have Grad. studies)</td>
<td>114 unique CIP 6-digit areas (all degrees) 158 (grad + undergrad) (91 undergraduate, 67 graduate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example UW Majors</th>
<th>CIP 2 Digit Code</th>
<th>CIP 4 Digit Code</th>
<th>CIP 6 Digit Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.S. in Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>14 – Engineering</td>
<td>14.07 – Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>14.0701 – Chemical Engineering, General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. Music</td>
<td>50 – Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td>50.09 - Music</td>
<td>50.0901 – Music, General</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IPEDS 2014
CIP-4 Areas Offering Degrees and Enrollment

Classification of Instructional Profile (CIP) 4 digit areas differentiate separate career-level academic areas. Sum of graduate and undergraduate areas offering degrees.
CIP-4 Areas Offering Degrees and Instructional Expense per Student

Classification of Instructional Profile (CIP) 4 digit areas differentiate separate career-level academic areas. Sum of graduate and undergraduate areas offering degrees.

Source: IPEDS 2014

Employees & Student Faculty Ratio
- Total FTE Employment and FTE Enrollment
- S-F Ratios and Costs
- S-F Ratios and Retention
- S-F Ratios and Graduation
Source: IPEDS 2014
Student-Faculty Ratio and Resident Undergraduate Total Cost

Total cost includes tuition & fees, books & supplies and room & board expenses.

Total Cost – Resident Undergraduates on Campus 2014-2015 AY

- All Public Research U.
- UW Peers
- UW

Source: IPEDS 2014

Go To Non-Resident Figures
Student-Faculty Ratio and Full Time Student Retention Rates

First Year Full Time Retention Rate 2014

Student:Faculty Ratio - 2014

Source: IPEDS 2014
Source: IPEDS 2014

Student-Faculty Ratio and 6 Yr. Graduation Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>6 Year Graduation Rate 2014</th>
<th>Student to Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USU</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDSU</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNL</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URI</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WVU</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMaine</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNL</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSU</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IPEDS 2014

Faculty and Research

• Total Full Time Instructional Staff and Research Grants
• NSF Rankings and CIP-4 Areas Offering Graduate Degrees (Ph.D.)
• CIP-4 Areas offering Graduate Degrees and total Ph.D. Graduates
University of Utah (not displayed) has 1,959 full-time instructional staff and $365M in grant awards.
Average NSF Research Percentile Rank and CIP-4 Areas offering Graduate Degrees

Average of NSF Percentile Rankings for Earned Doctorates, Full Time Graduate Students, Total Federal Obligations, and Total R&D Expenditures from 2014. Scores are inverted (top 1% is reflected as 99th percentile on this map).

Source: IPEDS 2014
Number of CIP-4 Areas offering Graduate Degrees and Total Ph.D. Graduates (2014)

Does not include professional degrees (Law, Medical, Etc.)

R² = 0.7103

Source: IPEDS 2014

Foundation and Giving

- Total foundation assets
- Foundation expenditures supporting university programs
- Assets and program support expenditures compared to football programs
Total Foundation Assets  FY14 End of Year
Federal Exempt Organization Income Tax Form 990 – Line 20  FY2014

| Data for Utah State University and the University of Utah are unavailable |

Go To Endowment & Enrollment Figures
Foundation Expenditures Used to Support University Programs

Actual and as Percent of Endowment Assets. Includes funds spent on scholarships, capital items and other expenditures in line with donor agreements.

Federal Exempt Organization Income Tax Form 990 – Part III (4e) FY2014

Source: Federal Exempt Organization Income Tax Form 990 – Part III (4e) FY2014
Data for Utah State University and the University of Utah are unavailable.
Program Service Expenditure includes funds spent on scholarships, capital items and other expenditures in line with donor agreements.


Data for Utah State University and the University of Utah are unavailable.
Summary Observations

• Student Costs
  • UW is inexpensive, especially for off-campus undergrads

• Student Body
  • UW has more transfer and more part-time students.

• Graduation & Retention Rates
  • Slightly lower than peers & peer trend

• Academic Programs
  • Slightly more degrees than close peers

• Employees & Student Faculty Ratio
  • More employees than peers of our size

• Faculty & Research
  • Slightly below peer trend

• Private Giving
  • Foundation is larger than peers
Brian’s Proposal Targets

1. Balance Students and Employees at around peer levels (4.44 students/employee)
   • FTE enrollment up to around 14,000-
   -and/or-
   • Reduce total employees by around 600-700

2. Focus tuition increases on undergraduates and residents
   • Rates can rise here and still remain competitive

3. Reduce degree program offerings slightly

4. Investigate further into why our cost/student is so high
   • (low student-faculty ratio doesn’t fully explain the discrepancy)
Thank You!
Appendix and Additional Slides
Brian’s Proposal Targets

Balance Student Body, Staff and Faculty Sizes

- Boost FTE enrollment (12,000 – 15,000)
  - Specifically target transfer students
  - Student:Faculty ratio of around 19-20

-and/or-

- Slim employee ranks over time
  - Fewer employees/student in long-run
    - Instructional
    - Non-Instructional
  - May reduce research grants
    - (~188k/FT Faculty)

Source: IPEDS 2014
Brian’s Proposal Targets

Reduce Degree offerings, or increase enrollment

- Reduce degrees offered by roughly 6-12
  - Slimming employee ranks will likely reduce research grants
    - (~188k/FT Faculty)

- Increase FTE student enrollment
6 Yr. Grad. Rates and Non-Resident Tuition & Fees

6 Year Graduation Rate 2014

Published Non-Resident Tuition & Fees

Source: IPEDS 2014

Go To Resident Figures
First Year Retention and Total Price of Attendance – Non-Resident
Total Price of Attendance Includes Tuition & Fees, Room & Board, Books & Supplies, and other Campus Expenses

Source: IPEDS 2014

Go To Resident Figures
6 Yr. Grad. Rates and Total Undergraduate Enrollment

Source: IPEDS 2014

Go To Retention & Enrollment Figures
6 Yr. Grad. Rates and Pell Grant Recipients

Source: IPEDS 2014

Go To Retention & Pell Grant Figures
Go To Total Foundation Asset Figures