

2017 Performance Measure Results Community Colleges

Bulaing NUSSOURIA-fulme				Metropolitan		Missouri State	Moberly Area		Ozarks Technical	St. Charles	St. Louis	State Fair	-
Bulding Musiburis-Juline VY clegrees.	Crowder College	East Central College	Jefferson College	Community College	Mineral Area College	University-West Plains	Community College	North Central Missouri College	Community College	Community College	Community College	Community College	Three Rivers College
Three-Year Graduation and Tra	ansfer Rate (m	neasure was in initial r	model)										
Fall 2010-Fall 2012	35.8%	34.7%	35.4%	33.4%	37.9%	37.7%	35.2%	50.1%	39.1%	40.7%	27.6%	37.8%	32.0%
Fall 2011-Fall 2013	37.6%	35.1%	35.6%	36.3%	39.8%	34.7%	38.7%	47.0%	40.8%	39.3%	25.9%	39.8%	32.1%
Top third of peers	43.9%	43.9%	43.9%	43.9%	43.9%	43.9%	43.9%	43.9%	43.9%	43.9%	43.9%	43.9%	43.9%
In top third of peers			√	√	1			✓	1				√
Improved Did not improve, not in top third of peers	•	V	V	V	V	√	V		•	✓	✓	•	· ·
Did not improve, not in top time of peers													
Percent of Attempted Courses	Successfully	Completed (in initial model)									
Fall 2012-Fall 2014	77.3%	76.1%	74.1%	70.8%	81.3%	72.3%	72.5%	83.7%	70.9%	73.9%	66.9%	77.1%	72.6%
Fall 2013-Fall 2015	77.5%	74.9%	75.3%	70.5%	84.4%	71.2%	73.6%	83.0%	72.1%	74.2%	68.3%	77.9%	74.2%
Top third of peers	77.8%	77.8%	77.8%	77.8%	77.8%	77.8%	77.8%	77.8%	77.8%	77.8%	77.8%	77.8%	77.8%
In top third of peers Improved	<u> </u>		<u>/</u>		v		1	V	1	1	1	<u> </u>	1
Did not improve, not in top third of peers	·	✓	•	√	•	√	•		•	•	•	•	
				·									
Pass Rates on Professional Lice	ensure Exams	(measure was in init	tial model)										
Fall 2014-Fall 2016	93.1%	95.7%	92.7%	90.2%	94.9%	95.1%	93.3%	96.0%	98.6%	90.6%	94.9%	94.4%	86.5%
Fall 2015-Fall 2017	96.4%	97.4%	91.3%	90.0%	95.2%	93.4%	93.1%	96.1%	97.8%	92.4%	95.6%	94.9%	87.6%
Benchmark	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%
Meets or exceeds benchmark	∨ ✓	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	V	v	v	V	V	V	V	∀	∨	v	√
Improved Did not improve, not at benchmark	•	· ·			•			Y		•	•	<u> </u>	•
bla list improve, not at benefithark													
Non-Core Expenditures as a Pe	ercent of Tota	l Expenditur	es (new measure)										
Fall 2014-Fall 2016	9.5%	26.9%	29.0%	25.9%	18.2%	34.0%	13.7%	47.8%	12.9%	16.3%	25.7%	26.3%	20.2%
Fall 2015-Fall 2017	9.7%	24.2%	30.0%	24.1%	16.8%	32.6%	13.9%	44.1%	12.0%	16.7%	23.6%	26.2%	19.5%
Top third of peers	17.7%	17.7%	17.7%	17.7%	17.7%	17.7%	17.7%	17.7%	17.7%	17.7%	17.7%	17.7%	17.7%
In top third of peers	✓				✓		✓		✓	✓			
Improved		✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Did not improve, not in top third of peers			✓										
Tuition and Fees as a Percent of	of Median Far	mily Income	(new measure)										
Fall 2012-Fall 2014	7.2%	5.9%	4.9%	4.9%	7.1%	7.9%	5.4%	6.9%	7.7%	4.4%	5.5%	6.7%	7.6%
Fall 2013-Fall 2015	7.4%	6.1%	5.1%	5.0%	7.0%	7.8%	5.5%	7.1%	7.9%	4.6%	5.7%	7.0%	8.1%
Median of peers	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%
Below national median	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Improved					✓	✓							✓
Did not improve, above national median													•
Graduate Outcomes (first year meas	ure is being used)												
Successful Outcomes – Spring 2015 Grads	87.2%	92.4%	93.4%	86.6%	95.5%	90.1%	89.9%	92.2%	88.8%	95.0%	85.0%	85.6%	87.7%
Successful Outcomes – Spring 2016 Grads	89.7%	94.2%	89.1%	89.9%	94.0%	97.0%	91.3%	94.0%	90.5%	95.0%	85.0%	92.2%	90.7%
Benchmark	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%
At or above benchmark	√	√	✓	√	√	√	√	√	√	✓	√	√	√
Improved	V	V		V		V	V	V	V			V	√
Did not improve, not at benchmark													
Community College Totals													
Measures Made	6/6	5/6	5/6	5/6	6/6	4/6	6/6	6/6	6/6	5/6	5/6	6/6	5/6
Performance Funding Earned	\$508,911	\$418,708	\$606,594	\$2,466,490	\$512,373	\$368,822	\$560,865	\$246,698	\$1,253,686	\$682,252	\$3,435,710	\$558,170	\$395,501
Performance Funding Not Earned	\$0	\$83,742	\$121,319	\$493,298	\$0	\$184,411	\$0	\$0	\$1,233,080	\$136,450	\$687,142	\$0	\$79,100
remormance runding Not Earned	\$0	٥٥٥,/42	\$121,319	\$435,298	\$0	\$104,411	ŞU	\$ 0	ŞU	\$150,450	\$007,142	ŞU	\$79,100



2017 Performance Measure Results

Public Universities and State Technical College

ulding Musibilitis- future VY clegrees.	Harris-Stowe State University	Lincoln University	Missouri State University	Missouri Southern State University	Missouri Western State University	Northwest Missouri State University	Southeast Missouri State University	University of Central Missouri	Truman State University	University of Missouri System		State Technical Co
ompletions Per Full-Time Equ	uivalent Stud	ent (weighted for	Pell-eligible students	and students who co	omplete STEM or health p	programs; new meas	ure)				Completions Per FTE (old)	
FY 2013-FY 2015	19.0	28.3	32.6	34.1	28.9	35.1	29.0	38.7	33.2	37.8	FY 2013-FY 2015	62.8%
FY 2014-FY 2016	18.2	25.8	32.6	35.0	30.6	36.6	29.7	42.9	33.6	38.9	FY 2014-FY 2016	67.0%
Benchmark	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	Benchmark	25.0%
Meets or exceeds benchmark		√	√	√	∀	√	√	√	√	√		√
Improved Did not improve, not at benchmark	✓			V	V	V	V	V	V	•		V
ass Rates on Learning Assess	ments or Pro	fessional Lic	ensure Exan	1S (measure was a	n option in initial model)						Graduation Rate (old)	
FY 2013-FY 2015	18.1%	55.1%	99.6%	96.9%	55.9%	70.8%	86.4%	67.4%	72.8%	94.8%	Fall 2009-Fall 2011	59.8%
FY 2014-FY 2016	18.9%	54.3%	99.8%	96.4%	54.9%	73.6%	88.2%	68.8%	73.2%	94.8%	Fall 2010-Fall 2012	60.6%
Benchmark	50.0%	50.0%	90.0%	90.0%	50.0%	60.0%	90.0%	60.0%	70.0%	90.0%	Top Third of Peers	55.8%
Meets or exceeds benchmark	30.070	√	✓	✓	✓	√ ✓	30.070	✓	√	✓	Top Time of Feets	✓
Improved	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Did not improve, not at benchmark												
rcent of Total Expenditures	on Core Miss	SION (measure was	an option in initial r	nodel)							Major Field Assessment Pass Ra	ate (old)
FY 2013-FY 2015	50.6%	63.1%	67.8%	56.7%	63.1%	63.7%	61.8%	64.1%	69.0%	75.3%	FY 2014-FY 2016	86.9%
FY 2014-FY 2016	49.5%	62.1%	68.4%	57.6%	63.2%	63.5%	61.8%	64.7%	69.0%	74.6%	FY 2014-FY 2016	88.0%
Top third of peers	59.8%	55.5%	58.5%	60.0%	65.0%	60.0%	61.3%	61.6%	58.3%	71.6%	Benchmark	60.0%
At or above top third	051070	✓	✓	23.273	001070	✓	✓	√ ×	✓	√ 1.0,0	Delia ilina il	✓
Improved			✓	✓	✓			✓				✓
Did not improve, not in top third of peers	✓											
ange in Salary Expenditures	Compared to	o Median Ho	usehold Inc	ome – FYI O	nly This Year (new measure)					Core as a Percent of Total Expe	nditures (new)
Change in salaries exp., FY 2013-FY 2016	-2.6%	-2.3%	1.2%	0.2%	6.7%	4.4%	4.6%	0.0%	1.5%	1.0%	FY 2013-FY 2015	69.4%
Change in Median Household Income (MHI)	3.3%	3.3%	3.3%	3.3%	3.3%	3.3%	3.3%	3.3%	3.3%	3.3%	FY 2014-FY 2016	70.3%
Salary expenditures did not increase	✓	✓						✓			Top third of peers	60.0%
Salary expenditures grew more slowly than MHI	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓		✓
Salary expenditures increased and faster than MHI					✓	✓	✓					✓
et Tuition Revenue per Full-1	Time Equivale	ant Student (`ompared to	Median Ho	usehold Incon		fore modules devices	kitu uti anal aab alaushiu			Tuition & Fees as a Percent of Media	an Family Income (n
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			· ·							¢6.613		
Net Tuition Revenue/FTE, FY 2013-FY 2015	\$2,200	\$6,196	\$6,434	\$5,667	\$6,506	\$5,575	\$5,948	\$7,382	\$4,739	\$6,812	FY 2012-FY 2014	12.4%
Net Tuition Revenue/FTE, FY 2014-FY 2016	\$2,210	\$6,243	\$6,575 2.2%	\$5,708 0.7%	\$6,679 2.7%	\$5,643 1.2%	\$6,026	\$7,455 1.0%	\$4,721	\$6,957 2.1%	FY 2013-FY 2015	12.0%
Change in Net Tuition Revenue/FTE Change in MHI	0.4% 3.3%	0.8% 3.3%	2.2% 3.3%	3.3%	2.7% 3.3%	1.2% 3.3%	1.3% 3.3%	1.0% 3.3%	-0.4% 3.3%	2.1% 3.3%	Median of peers	9.3%
Net tuition revenue decreased	5.5%	5.570	3.3%	3.370	5.5%	3.370	3.3%	3.370	5.5%	3.3%	Below national median	
New tuition grew more slowly than MHI	√	√	√	✓	√	✓ ·	✓	√	<u> </u>	✓	Improved or maintained	<i>J</i>
New tultion grew more slowly than with	· ·	·		·						,	Did not improve, above national median	
Net tuition increased and faster than MHI												
	ents who are employed	full-time, participatin	g in a volunteer or se	ervice pr <u>ogram, servir</u>	ng in the military, or purs	uing ad <u>ditional educ</u>	ation; fi <u>rst vear mea</u>	sure is b <u>eing used)</u>			Graduate Outcomes (old)	
aduate Outcomes (includes stude									70 6%	67.6%	Graduate Outcomes (old)	02.70/
aduate Outcomes (includes stude FY 2013-FY 2015 – PILOT DATA COLLECTION	77.1%	53.3%	55.3%	69.0%	78.3%	87.7%	74.5%	90.5%	79.6% 77.5%	67.6% 82.4%	FY 2013-FY 2015	93.7%
aduate Outcomes (includes stude FY 2013-FY 2015 – PILOT DATA COLLECTION FY 2014-FY 2016	77.1% 75.2%	<i>53.3%</i> 76.6%	55.3% 81.4%	69.0% 72.1%	<i>78.3%</i> 85.2%	<i>87.7%</i> 88.5%	<i>74.5%</i> 74.6%	<i>90.5%</i> 84.6%	77.5%	82.4%	FY 2013-FY 2015 FY 2014-FY 2016	95.6%
aduate Outcomes (includes stude FY 2013-FY 2015 – PILOT DATA COLLECTION FY 2014-FY 2016 Benchmark	77.1% 75.2% 75.0%	53.3% 76.6% 75.0%	<i>55.3%</i> 81.4% 75.0%	69.0%	<i>78.3%</i> 85.2% 75.0%	87.7%	74.5%	90.5%	77.5% 75.0%	82.4% 75.0%	FY 2013-FY 2015	95.6% 75.0%
aduate Outcomes (includes stude FY 2013-FY 2015 – PILOT DATA COLLECTION FY 2014-FY 2016 Benchmark At or above benchmark	77.1% 75.2%	<i>53.3%</i> 76.6%	55.3% 81.4%	69.0% 72.1%	78.3% 85.2% 75.0% ✓	<i>87.7%</i> 88.5%	<i>74.5%</i> 74.6%	<i>90.5%</i> 84.6%	77.5%	82.4% 75.0% ✓	FY 2013-FY 2015 FY 2014-FY 2016	95.6%
Net tuition increased and faster than MHI aduate Outcomes (includes stude) FY 2013-FY 2015 – PILOT DATA COLLECTION FY 2014-FY 2016 Benchmark At or above benchmark Improved Did not improve, not at benchmark	77.1% 75.2% 75.0%	53.3% 76.6% 75.0%	<i>55.3%</i> 81.4% 75.0%	69.0% 72.1%	<i>78.3%</i> 85.2% 75.0%	<i>87.7%</i> 88.5%	<i>74.5%</i> 74.6%	<i>90.5%</i> 84.6%	77.5% 75.0%	82.4% 75.0%	FY 2013-FY 2015 FY 2014-FY 2016	95.6% 75.0%
aduate Outcomes (includes stude FY 2013-FY 2015 – PILOT DATA COLLECTION FY 2014-FY 2016 Benchmark At or above benchmark Improved Did not improve, not at benchmark	77.1% 75.2% 75.0%	53.3% 76.6% 75.0% ~	55.3% 81.4% 75.0% ✓	69.0% 72.1% 75.0% ✓	78.3% 85.2% 75.0% ✓	87.7% 88.5% 75.0% ✓	<i>74.5%</i> 74.6%	<i>90.5%</i> 84.6%	77.5% 75.0%	82.4% 75.0% ✓	FY 2013-FY 2015 FY 2014-FY 2016	95.6% 75.0%
aduate Outcomes (includes stude FY 2013-FY 2015 – PILOT DATA COLLECTION FY 2014-FY 2016 Benchmark At or above benchmark Improved Did not improve, not at benchmark	77.1% 75.2% 75.0% ✓	53.3% 76.6% 75.0% • • ge Totals (wit	55.3% 81.4% 75.0%	69.0% 72.1% 75.0% • in operatir	78.3% 85.2% 75.0% •• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• ••	87.7% 88.5% 75.0% ✓	74.5% 74.6% 75.0% ✓	90.5% 84.6% 75.0% ✓	77.5% 75.0% ✓	82.4% 75.0% •	FY 2013-FY 2015 FY 2014-FY 2016	95.6% 75.0% ✓
raduate Outcomes (includes stude FY 2013-FY 2015 – PILOT DATA COLLECTION FY 2014-FY 2016 Benchmark At or above benchmark Improved Did not improve, not at benchmark blic University and State Tea Measures Made	77.1% 75.2% 75.0% ✓ chnical Colleg 3/5	53.3% 76.6% 75.0% • • • ge Totals (wit	55.3% 81.4% 75.0% / :hout chang 5/5	69.0% 72.1% 75.0% v e in operatir 5/5	78.3% 85.2% 75.0% • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	87.7% 88.5% 75.0% ✓ Asure)	74.5% 74.6% 75.0% ✓	90.5% 84.6% 75.0% ✓	77.5% 75.0% ✓	82.4% 75.0% ✓ ✓	FY 2013-FY 2015 FY 2014-FY 2016	95.6% 75.0% ✓ ✓
aduate Outcomes (includes stude FY 2013-FY 2015 – PILOT DATA COLLECTION FY 2014-FY 2016 Benchmark At or above benchmark Improved Did not improve, not at benchmark blic University and State Tec	77.1% 75.2% 75.0% ✓	53.3% 76.6% 75.0% • • ge Totals (wit	55.3% 81.4% 75.0%	69.0% 72.1% 75.0% • in operatir	78.3% 85.2% 75.0% •• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• •• ••	87.7% 88.5% 75.0% ✓ Asure)	74.5% 74.6% 75.0% ✓	90.5% 84.6% 75.0% ✓	77.5% 75.0% ✓	82.4% 75.0% •	FY 2013-FY 2015 FY 2014-FY 2016	95.6% 75.0% ✓