



FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

FIU, Modesto A. Maidique Campus, Graham Center Ballrooms

Livestream: <http://webcast.fiu.edu/>

Wednesday, December 8, 2021
11:15 AM

or

Upon Adjournment of Previous Meeting

Chair: Marc D. Sarnoff

Vice Chair: Cesar L. Alvarez

Members: Donna J. Hrinak, Gene Prescott, Joerg Reinhold, Alexander Rubido, Carlos Trujillo

AGENDA

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Call to Order and Chair's Remarks | Marc D. Sarnoff |
| 2. Approval of Minutes | Marc D. Sarnoff |
| 3. Information and Discussion Items | Kenneth G. Furton |
| 3.1 Statement of Purpose | |
| 3.2 Rankings and Hiring Update | |
| 3.3 Updates on University Locations | |
| 4. New Business <i>(If Any)</i> | Marc D. Sarnoff |
| 5. Concluding Remarks and Adjournment | Marc D. Sarnoff |

This page intentionally left blank

FIU Board of Trustees Strategic Planning Committee Meeting

Time: December 08, 2021 11:15 AM - 12:00 PM EST

Location: FIU, Modesto A. Maidique Campus, Graham Center Ballrooms | Livestream:
<http://webcast.fiu.edu/>

| Section | Agenda Item | Presenter | Page |
|---------|--|--------------------------|----------|
| 1. | Call to Order and Chair's Remarks | Marc D. Sarnoff | |
| 2. | Approval of Minutes | Marc D. Sarnoff | 1 |
| | <i>Minutes: Strategic Planning Committee meeting, September 14, 2021</i> | | 2 |
| 3. | Information and Discussion Items | Kenneth G. Furton | |
| 3.1 | Statement of Purpose | | |
| 3.2 | Rankings and Hiring Update | | 6 |
| 3.3 | Updates on University Locations | | |
| 4. | New Business (If Any) | Marc D. Sarnoff | |
| 5. | Concluding Remarks and Adjournment | Marc D. Sarnoff | |

This page intentionally left blank

THE FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Strategic Planning Committee
December 8, 2021

Subject: Approval of Minutes of Meeting held September 14, 2021

Proposed Committee Action:

Approval of Minutes of the Strategic Planning Committee meeting held on September 14, 2021, at the FIU, Modesto A. Maidique Campus, Graham Center Ballrooms and via Zoom.

Background Information:

Committee members will review and approve the Minutes of the Strategic Planning Committee meeting held on September 14, 2021, at the FIU, Modesto A. Maidique Campus, Graham Center Ballrooms and via Zoom.

Supporting Documentation: Minutes: Strategic Planning Committee Meeting, September 14, 2021

Facilitator/Presenter: Marc D. Sarnoff, *Strategic Planning Committee Chair*

This page intentionally left blank



Strategic Planning Committee
September 14, 2021

FIU, Modesto A. Maidique Campus, Graham Center Ballrooms and via Zoom

MINUTES

1. Call to Order and Chair's Remarks

The Florida International University Board of Trustees' Strategic Planning Committee meeting was called to order by Committee Chair Roger Tovar at 12:50 p.m. on Tuesday, September 14, 2021.

General Counsel Carlos B. Castillo conducted roll call of the Strategic Planning Committee members and verified a quorum. Present were Trustees Roger Tovar, *Committee Chair and Board Vice Chair*; Cesar L. Alvarez, *Committee Vice Chair*; Donna J. Hrinak; Gene Prescott; Joerg Reinhold; and Alexander Rubido.

Trustee Carlos Trujillo was excused.

Board Chair Dean C. Colson, Trustees Natasha Lowell and Marc D. Sarnoff and University President Mark B. Rosenberg also were in attendance.

Committee Chair Tovar welcomed all Trustees and members of the University administration. He also welcomed Trustees, University administrators, and staff attending via the virtual environment and the University community and general public accessing the meeting via the University's webcast.

2. Approval of Minutes

Committee Chair Tovar asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes of the Strategic Planning Committee meeting held on April 21, 2021. A motion was made and unanimously passed to approve the minutes of the Strategic Planning Committee meeting held on April 21, 2021.

3. Information Discussion Items

3.1 Rankings Update and Florida Board of Governors (BOG) Metric Changes

Provost and Executive Vice President Kenneth G. Furton commented on the University's record year. He indicated that the University climbed 17 spots and is now ranked No. 78 among public universities in the nation in the latest *U.S. News & World Report* rankings, adding that FIU is most improved among the State University System (SUS) and third most improved in the nation. Provost Furton pointed out that the University is one of only 40 Association of Professional Schools of International Affairs (APSIA) schools in the world. He explained that there are only 25 APSIA schools in the US and added that FIU is the youngest in the U.S. to be elected membership and the only Florida school.

Provost Furton commented on the University's strategic plan goal of achieving 100 points as it relates to BOG critical performance indicator goals. He remarked on the BOG's proposed changes

to the Performance Based Funding metrics, specifically metrics related to Percent of Bachelors Graduates Employed or Enrolled One Year after Graduation, Four-Year Graduation Rate, and the Board of Trustees Choice Metric. He pointed out that new metrics are also being proposed, stating that these pertain to the two-year graduation rate for transfer students and six-year graduation rates for Pell Grant students. Provost Furton highlighted each proposed metric change in relation to its potential impact to FIU. He provided an overview of revised Next Horizon 2025 Strategic Plan goals, noting that said goals have been updated to reflect goals approved as part of the University's Accountability Plan. He summarized the University's historical performance in terms of Performance Based Funding metrics, stating that FIU's increase in excellence points has doubled. He remarked on research innovation trends since 2014, indicating that FIU has doubled its research expenditures, increased patents by 30-fold, increased licenses by 13-fold, and increased licensing income by 12-fold. Provost Furton pointed out that the University is on track in terms of its strategic plan goals, explaining that two (2) metrics related to auxiliary income and percent of annual alumni giving are lagging.

Trustee Donna J. Hrinak commended the University on the APSIA membership. Committee Chair Tovar remarked on the need for a collaborative marketing and advertising effort in order to ensure that the University's many successes are shared, particularly with those responsible for completing peer assessment surveys.

3.2 Operational Support and Strategic Hiring Update

Provost Furton presented a prioritized listing of *U.S. News & World Report* ranking metrics. In terms of the \$32M Legislative Budget Request, he presented an overview of the high-level categories with the related impact scores and fiscal year 2020-21 budget and expenses. He explained that the remaining balance will be used in fiscal year 2021-22 carryforward, specifically \$799K for Industry Competency Recognition and \$363K for the postdoc initiative, which is the Board of Trustees choice metric for the BOG's Performance Based Funding metrics. He explained that the high-level categories encompass over 80 student success tactics and technology.

Provost Furton commented on classrooms, labs, conference rooms, and offices of the future. He pointed out that FIU has six (6) preeminent programs and six (6) emerging preeminent programs, noting that said programs have been identified to advance in the rankings to Top-25 or Top-50. He provided an update on the proposed plan to strategically hire 110 faculty members, adding that to-date, 37 faculty members have been hired. Committee Chair Tovar requested that information be shared, as necessary with the Deans, to ensure greater clarity in terms of available funding lines for faculty hires. Provost Furton provided an overview of the areas for faculty positions, stating that these include preeminent and emerging preeminent programs and the FIU Center for Translational Science. He presented images of FIU classroom and lab improvements.

3.3 MacKenzie Scott Gift

Provost Furton pointed out that the \$40M unrestricted gift (from MacKenzie Scott and husband, Dan Jewitt) was received on June 15, 2021. He mentioned that MacKenzie Scott wrote about investing in higher education as this is the proven pathway to opportunity. Provost Furton explained that as they (MacKenzie Scott and husband, Dan Jewitt) considered institutions in which to invest, they considered institutions that are successfully educating students who come from communities

that have been chronically underserved. He indicated that, nationally, FIU is No. 1 for awarding bachelor's degrees to Hispanic students and No. 5 for awarding bachelor's degrees to Black students. He pointed out that approximately 87% of FIU students are minorities and more than 67% are Hispanic, adding that over 50% of undergraduate students are Pell eligible and graduate at higher rates than non-Pell students.

Provost Furton commented on the University's recommendation of building a permanent endowment for recurring investments from the Scott gift, specifically 2:1 match over the next several years for one-time non-recurring expenditures for student success and endowment earnings for student success. Trustee Cesar L. Alvarez commented that the cash gift was not provided as an endowment and therefore, perhaps is intended to meet an immediate financial need. Committee Chair Tovar concurred with Trustee Alvarez and requested that the University analyze options that can serve to both effectuate change today while also providing funding for underserved students for future generations. Trustee Marc D. Sarnoff commented that using the funds to advance the University's pursuit of Top-50 may help attract future funding. Committee Chair Tovar requested that options be presented at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee. Trustee Natasha Lowell requested that the Committee also receive information relating to scholarship students with unmet financial needs.

3.4 Higher Education Emergency Relief Funds (HEERF)

Senior Vice President for Administration and Chief Financial Officer Kenneth A. Jessell commented that the University received approximately \$245M in Federal Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act I, II, and III funds. He explained that the first round of funding, \$41M, was divided into three (3) different components, specifically \$19.15M in emergency financial aid grants to students, \$19.15M in institutional funds to cover costs associated with the changes in the delivery of instruction, and because of the University's student composition, \$2.8M in minority serving institution (MSI) funds. He explained that the second tranche of funding totaled approximately \$75M, noting that \$19.15 was designated as financial aid grants to students, \$51.75M for institutional funds to cover costs and lost revenues associated with COVID-19 that could also serve as additional aid to students, and \$4.62M in MSI funds. Sr. VP and CFO Jessell remarked on the third tranche of funding, totaling \$128M, specifically \$62.76M in financial aid grants to students, \$58.01M in institutional funds to cover costs, lost revenues, and student grants, and \$7.65M in MSI funds. He presented a summary of funding awards, pointing out that most of the student aid has been distributed and that the deadline for expenditures related to financial aid grants to students and institutional funds was extended through May 17, 2022. Sr. VP and CFO Jessell added that the deadline for expenditures of MSI funds was extended through August 2, 2022, noting that if federal funds are not committed as the deadlines approach, the University is allowed to apply for a one-year no cost extension.

Sr. VP and CFO Jessell described the federal guidance related to the spending of CARES funds, stating that emergency financial aid grants can be awarded to students who are or were enrolled on or after March 13, 2020 for any component of their cost of attendance, such as tuition, food, health care or childcare. He added that FIU cannot direct or control what students may use their emergency financial aid grants on, adding that the University must prioritize students with exceptional need. Sr. VP and CFO Jessell remarked on allowable uses of institutional funds,

specifically personal protective equipment, vaccinations, testing, lost revenues, and minor remodeling, such as alterations in a previously completed building for purposes associated with COVID-19, extension of utility lines, and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems to help with air filtration to prevent the spread of COVID-19. He described unallowable uses, such as funding contractors for the provision of pre-enrollment recruitment activities, capital outlays associated with facilities related to athletics, sectarian instruction, or religious worship, executive salaries and bonuses, construction or purchase of real property, and costs specifically prohibited under Uniform Guidance. In terms of the MSI funds, he commented that allowable uses include defraying institutional expenses associated with COVID-19, technology costs associated with the transition to distance education, payroll, lost revenues, and additional emergency financial aid grants to students. He mentioned that prohibited uses include those previously mentioned.

In terms of lost revenue reimbursements, Sr. VP and CFO Jessell provided an overview of allowed sources and unallowed sources. In terms of allowed academic sources, he highlighted tuition and fees, enrollment declines, unpaid student accounts receivable, room and board, and supported research. Relating to allowed auxiliary services, he commented on cancelled ancillary events, disruption of food service, dormitory and childcare services, use of facilities, except if associated with sectarian instruction or religious worship, and bookstore and parking revenues. Pertaining to unallowed sources, he remarked on capital outlays associated with facilities and acquisition of real property, among others previously mentioned.

Sr. VP and CFO Jessell provided an overview of the commitments in terms of financial aid funds, institutional funds, and MSI funds. He added that of the \$245M received, \$134M has been expended and committed. He indicated that institutional expenses and commitments totaled \$30.43M, explaining that the related categories include housing and meal plan refunds, remote learning and technology, discharge of student debt, emergency grants to students, personal protection equipment, testing tab, contact tracing, vaccination program, and allowable overhead. Sr. VP and CFO Jessell pointed out that the University incurred \$54.12M in institutional and MSI lost revenues. He commented on the anticipated uses for the remaining \$51.81M in unused institutional funds, including up to \$27M on installation/renovation of HVAC systems to prevent the spread of COVID-19, \$13.5M in additional financial aids to students, and up to \$10M for the discharge of student debt.

4. New Business

No new business was raised.

5. Concluding Remarks and Adjournment

With no other business, Committee Chair Roger Tovar adjourned the meeting of the Florida International University Board of Trustees Strategic Planning Committee on Tuesday, September 14, 2021, at 1:43 p.m.

Wall Street Journal/Times Higher Education US College Rankings

The first rankings were launched in 2015. This ranking is powered by a survey of more than 170,000 current US college students, collected through *THE*'s annual US Student Survey.

The methodology is made up of 15 performance indicators. It is designed to answer the questions that matter most to students and their families. The 2022 ranking includes almost 800 universities.

The student-focused *WSJ/THE* College Rankings differ considerably from the *THE* World University Rankings, which have a heavier emphasis on research excellence on a global scale.

All ranked institutions have an overall score and four pillar scores. However, for each pillar, only institutions ranked in the top 400 overall, or the top 400 in that pillar, have a publicly visible score.

This page intentionally left blank

Wall Street Journal / Times Higher Education rankings over the last 5 years using average ranking where there is a range

| Overall Rank | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|--|--|
| Universities | Type | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 5 Year Change | | |
| Eckerd College | Private | 296 | 389 | 326 | 332 | 333 | 342 | -46 | | |
| Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, Daytona Beach | Private | 241 | 196 | 207 | 229 | 270 | 253 | -12 | | |
| Florida Institute of Technology | Private | 166 | 213 | 210 | 245 | 270 | 244 | -78 | | |
| Florida International University | Public | 501-600 | 501-600 | 501-300 | 375 | 374 | 337 | +213 | | |
| Florida State University | Public | 238 | 255 | 266 | 208 | 187 | 173 | +65 | | |
| Rollins College | Private | 225 | 251 | 251 | 264 | 270 | 264 | -39 | | |
| University of Central Florida | Public | 496 | 482 | 443 | 311 | 323 | 297 | +199 | | |
| University of Florida | Public | 58 | 58 | 73 | 63 | 56 | 54 | +4 | | |
| University of Miami | Private | 43 | 44 | 47 | 49 | 53 | 49 | -6 | | |
| University of South Florida (Tampa) | Public | 437 | 437 | 461 | 276 | 276 | 271 | +166 | | |

| Public Rank | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|--|--|
| Universities | Type | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 5 Year Change | | |
| Florida International University | Public | 129-165 | 134-166 | 135-173 | 109 | 111 | 101 | +45 | | |
| Florida State University | Public | 50 | 52 | 59 | 55 | 45 | 43 | +7 | | |
| University of Central Florida | Public | 125 | 125 | 112 | 88 | 92 | 88 | +37 | | |
| University of Florida | Public | 12 | 12 | 15 | 12 | 11 | 11 | +1 | | |
| University of South Florida (Tampa) | Public | 105 | 107 | 122 | 73 | 74 | 74 | +31 | | |

Detailed methodology: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/wall-street-journal-times-higher-education-college-rankings-2021>

Wall Street Journal/Times Higher Education College Rankings 2021 methodology - Ranking of US universities and colleges puts student success and learning at its heart, September 14, 2020
 The *Wall Street Journal/Times Higher Education* College Ranking is a pioneering ranking of US colleges and universities that puts student success and learning at its heart.

Wall Street Journal / Times Higher Education Ranking Metrics

| Institution | Finance per student | Faculty per student | Papers per faculty | Student engagement w faculty | Interaction w faculty | Student recommendation | Subject breadth | Grad rate | Academic reputation | Grad salary | Debt after graduation | Faculty diversity | Int'l students | Student diversity | Student inclusion |
|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| FIU | <u>9.6</u> | 9.3 | 54.8 | 78.6 | 78.3 | 82.5 | 80.5 | 61 | 20.6 | 57.3 | 89.2 | <u>98.5</u> | 63.4 | <u>51.1</u> | 83.5 |
| Arizona State University | 69.4 | 19.1 | <u>60.4</u> | 80.7 | 81.1 | 85 | 93.7 | 51.3 | 53.1 | <u>18.5</u> | 72.8 | 81.4 | 89 | 82.1 | 36.6 |
| FAMU | 28.1 | 33.1 | <u>33.6</u> | 81.6 | <u>83.1</u> | 83 | <u>52.5</u> | 35.1 | <u>0.8</u> | 56 | <u>32</u> | 81.7 | <u>21.2</u> | <u>51.1</u> | <u>96.9</u> |
| FSU | 44.9 | 15.9 | 52.6 | 81.8 | 81.2 | <u>90.5</u> | 93.1 | 86 | 36.5 | 60.8 | 81.5 | 74.4 | 34.1 | 71.7 | 41.9 |
| George Mason University | 30.7 | 26.5 | 50.7 | 78.5 | 79.6 | <u>77.2</u> | 73.1 | 77.6 | 31.3 | 80.2 | 74.8 | <u>73.7</u> | 57 | 93.3 | 39.2 |
| Georgia State University | 15.5 | 11.3 | 50 | 79.2 | 79.8 | 79 | 55.3 | 42.3 | 13 | 44.9 | 61.4 | 84.2 | 36.7 | <u>94</u> | 86.7 |
| Rutgers University | 54.3 | 30.6 | 49.5 | <u>76.7</u> | <u>76.1</u> | 80.5 | <u>98.6</u> | 84.6 | 56.8 | 52.3 | 60.5 | 87.5 | 78.3 | 92.6 | 36.6 |
| UCF | 12.8 | <u>7.1</u> | 54.8 | 79.4 | 79.2 | 87.6 | 89.5 | 72.5 | 23.6 | 57.2 | 83 | 83.9 | 35.5 | 88.7 | 61 |
| UF | <u>70.3</u> | 24.8 | 55.4 | <u>82.6</u> | 80.2 | 88.2 | 95.9 | <u>92.8</u> | <u>81.9</u> | <u>90.7</u> | <u>94.6</u> | 77.2 | 36.1 | 82.9 | <u>29.1</u> |
| USF | 32.1 | 13.5 | 57 | 79.1 | 80.2 | 85.7 | 86.1 | 73.5 | 16.1 | 45.8 | 83 | 86.9 | <u>67</u> | 87.6 | 55.6 |
| Wayne State University | 69.1 | <u>41.6</u> | 52.6 | 77.5 | 80.7 | 78.6 | 95.3 | <u>25.3</u> | 11.5 | 55 | 56.2 | 88.4 | 31.7 | 75.8 | 75.7 |
| Average | 39.8 | 22.7 | 50.7 | 79.6 | 80.0 | 83.4 | 82.2 | 65.5 | 30.2 | 60.3 | 69.7 | 82.0 | 44.2 | 82.0 | 58.1 |
| Difference | -30.2 | -13.4 | 4.1 | -1.0 | -1.7 | -0.9 | -1.7 | -4.5 | -9.6 | -3.0 | 19.5 | 16.5 | 19.2 | -30.9 | 25.4 |

Finance per student – spending on teaching associated activity per full-time equivalent student (IPEDS). This is adjusted using regional price comparisons (BEA)

Faculty-to-student ratio – the number of faculty per student as provided by IPEDS

Papers per faculty – the number of academic papers published by faculty from a college in the period 2015-2019 (Elsevier) divided by the size of the faculty (IPEDS)

Student engagement – the average score of the four questions (critical thinking, connections, applying learning to the real world, challenge) in the THE US Student Survey

Interaction – the average score of two questions (interaction with faculty and collaborative learning) in the THE US Student Survey

Student recommendation (THE US Student Survey)

Subject breadth – the number of courses offered (IPEDS)

Graduation rate – the proportion of bachelor's or equivalent graduates six/eight years after entry (IPEDS; six years for full-time students and eight years for part-time students).

Value-added salary – the average calculated residual of the value-added models for salary 10 years after entry.

Debt after graduation – the median loan debt accumulated by students at the institution, after they graduate. This is the GRAD_DEBT_MDN variable released by College Scorecard

Reputation – the total votes received for teaching excellence in the THE Academic Reputation survey, which is conducted in partnership with Elsevier.

International students – the proportion of students identified as non-resident aliens (IPEDS)

Student diversity – a Gini-Simpson calculation of the likelihood of two undergraduates being from different racial/ethnic groups (IPEDS)

Faculty diversity – a Gini-Simpson calculation of the likelihood of two faculty members being from different racial/ethnic groups (IPEDS)

Student inclusion – the post-normalisation average of the proportion of Pell Grant recipients (IPEDS)

The ranking includes clear performance indicators designed to answer the questions that matter most to students and their families when making one of the most important decisions of their lives – who to trust with their education. Does the college have sufficient resources to teach me properly? Will I be engaged, and challenged, by my teacher and classmates? Does the college have a good academic reputation? What type of campus community is there? How likely am I to graduate, pay off my debt and get a good job?

The ranking includes the results of the *THE US Student Survey*, which examines a range of key issues including students’ engagement with their studies, their interaction with their teachers and their satisfaction with their experience.

The ranking adopts a balanced scorecard approach, with 15 individual performance indicators combining to create an overall score that reflects the broad strength of the institution.

Data sources

Data come from a variety of sources: the US government ([Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System – IPEDS](#)), the [College Scorecard](#), the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), the *THE US Student Survey*, the *THE Academic Survey*, and the Elsevier bibliometric dataset. Our data are, in most cases, normalised so that the value we assign in each metric can be compared sensibly with other metrics.

Key changes since last year

Student survey

We had planned to conduct our student survey during Spring 2020, but we had to cancel it because of the coronavirus pandemic and subsequent difficulties for institutions in the US. Not only could we not expect institutions to invest time and effort surveying their students at this time, but the data collected would probably have been coloured by students’ experience of a sudden move to online-only teaching and therefore would not generate a reliable indicator of general teaching success. We hope to be able to return to a normal survey collection for our 2022 ranking, but for this ranking the data for the three student engagement metrics has not been updated: **we are using the scores obtained by institutions last year.**

Student inclusion

Our student inclusion metric previously used data from the College Scorecard (CSC) on first generation student enrolment and from IPEDS on Pell Grant enrolment. The CSC data are no longer being published, so for this year we are using the Pell Grant data from IPEDS only. We will review this for the coming ranking to ensure we are still able to measure economic diversity in a meaningful way.

Value-added salary

Following the March 2019 [executive order](#) on accountability at colleges and universities, College Scorecard is now focusing on collecting outcomes data at the field-of-study level and as a result is no longer publishing overall salary values 10 years after matriculation. These longitudinal data were what we used in our value-added model, and we are not able to replace it with the new values published. This year we are reusing last year’s scores from the value-added metric. We will be reviewing our methodology for next year to find a suitable replacement for this measure for future rankings.

Metrics used

Resources (30%)

Students and their families need to know that their college has the right resources to provide the facilities, teaching and support that are needed to succeed at college.

By looking at the **amount of money that each institution spends on teaching per student** (11%), we can get a clear sense of whether it is well funded, with the money to provide a positive learning environment. This metric takes into account spending on both undergraduate and graduate programmes, which is consistent with the way that the relevant spend data is available in IPEDS. The Department of Education requires schools to report key statistics such as this to IPEDS, making it a comprehensive source for education data. The data on academic spending per institution are adjusted for regional price differences, using regional price parities data from the US Department of Commerce's Bureau of Economic Analysis.

By looking at the **ratio of students to faculty members** (11%), we get an overall sense of whether the college has enough teachers to teach. It gives a broad sense of how likely it is that a student will receive the individual attention that can be necessary to succeed at college, and also gives a sense as to potential class sizes. The source of this statistic is IPEDS. We are using the average of two years of data for this metric to provide a better long-term view.

Faculty who are experts in their academic fields and pushing the boundaries of knowledge at the forefront of their discipline can significantly enhance a student's educational experience when they are able to distil their knowledge and demonstrate the power of real-world problem-solving and enquiry. So our teaching resources pillar also gives a sense of whether faculty are experts in their academic disciplines by looking at research excellence. We look at the **number of published scholarly research papers per faculty member** (8%) at each institution, giving a sense of their research productivity, and testing to see whether staff are able to produce research that is suitable for publication in the world's top academic journals, as indexed by Elsevier.

Engagement (20%)

Decades of research has found that the best way to truly understand teaching quality at an institution – how well it manages to inform, inspire and challenge students – is through capturing what is known as “student engagement”. This was described by Malcolm Gladwell in *The New Yorker* in 2011 as “the extent to which students immerse themselves in the intellectual and social life of their college – and a major component of engagement is the quality of a student's contacts with faculty”.

THE has captured student engagement across the US through its US Student Survey, carried out in partnership with two leading market research providers. In 2018 and 2019, we gathered the views of more than 170,000 current college and university students on a range of issues relating directly to their experience at college (see key changes detailed above).

Students answer 12 core questions about their experience that are either multiple choice or on a scale from 0 to 10, and also provide background information about themselves. The survey was conducted online and respondents were recruited by research firm Streetbees using social media, facilitated, in part, by student representatives at individual schools. We also worked with participating institutions that distributed the survey to random samples of their own students. Respondents were verified as students of their reported college using their email addresses. We used an aggregated group of respondents from both years (2018 and 2019 surveys). At least 50 validated responses in the 2019 survey were required for a university to be included.

To capture **engagement** with learning (7%), we look at the answers to four key questions:

- to what extent does the student’s college or university support critical thinking? For example, developing new concepts or evaluating different points of view;
- to what extent does the teaching support reflection on, or making connections among, the things that the student has learned? For example, combining ideas from different lessons to complete a task;
- to what extent does the teaching support applying the student’s learning to the real world? For example, taking study excursions to see concepts in action;
- to what extent do the classes taken in college challenge the student? For example, presenting new ways of thinking to challenge assumptions or values

To capture a student’s opportunity to **interact with others** (4%) to support learning, we use the responses to two questions: to what extent does the student have the opportunity to interact with faculty and teachers? For example, talking about personal progress in feedback sessions; and to what extent does the college provide opportunities for collaborative learning? For example, group assignments.

The final measure in this area from the survey is around **student recommendation** (6%): if a friend or family member were considering going to university, based on your experience, how likely or unlikely are you to recommend your college or university to them? In this pillar of indicators we also seek to help a student understand the opportunities that are on offer at the institution, and the likelihood of getting a more rounded education, by providing an indicator of the **number of different subjects taught** (3%). While other components of the Engagement pillar are drawn from the student survey, the source of this metric is IPEDS. We are using the average of two years of data for this metric in order to provide a better long-term view.

Outcomes (40%)

At a time when US college debt stands at \$1.6 trillion, and when the affordability of going to college and value for money are prime concerns, this section looks at perhaps the single most important aspect of any higher education institution – their record on delivering successful outcomes for their students.

We look at the **graduation rates** for each institution (11%) – a crucial way to help students to understand whether colleges have a strong track record in supporting students enough to get them through their course and ensure that they complete their degrees. We use reported graduation rates for all students including part-time and transfer students.

This pillar also includes a value-added indicator, measuring the **value added by the teaching at a college to salary** (12%) (see key changes detailed above). Using a value-added approach means that the ranking does not simply reward the colleges that cream off all the very best students, and shepherd them into the jobs that provide the highest salaries in absolute terms. Instead it looks at the success of the college in transforming people’s life chances, in “adding value” to their likelihood of success. The *THE* data team uses statistical modelling to create an expected graduate salary for each college based on a wide range of factors, such as the demographic make-up of its student body and the characteristics of the institution. The ranking looks at how far the college either exceeds expectations in getting students higher average salaries than one would predict based on its students and its characteristics, or falls below what is expected. The value-added analysis uses research on this topic by Brookings Institution, among others, as a guide.

We also include a metric on **debt after graduation** (7%). The concern over student debt and the cost of higher education in general has come to the forefront of public discussion recently. A measure of the debt accrued by a college’s students when they graduate reflects this concern and

holds institutions accountable for the cost that they represent to individuals and funding sources. We are using the cumulative median debt reported in College Scorecard, which represents the “median loan debt accumulated at the institution by all student borrowers of federal loans”. This pillar also looks at the overall **academic reputation** of the college (10%), based on *THE*'s annual Academic Reputation Survey, a survey of leading scholars that helps us determine which institutions have the best reputation for excellence in teaching. We used the total teaching votes from our 2019 and 2020 reputation surveys.

Environment (10%)

This category looks at the make-up of the student body at each campus, helping students understand whether they will find themselves in a diverse, supportive and inclusive environment while they are at college. We look at the **proportion of international students on campus (2%)**, a key indicator that the university or college is able to attract talent from across the world and offers a multicultural campus where students from different backgrounds can, theoretically, learn from one another.

We also look more generally at student diversity – both **racial and ethnic diversity (3%)**, and the **inclusion of students with lower family earnings (2%)**. For the former, we use IPEDS data on diversity. For the latter, we look at the proportion of students who receive Pell Grants (paid to students in need of financial support), as reported in IPEDS.

We also use a measure of the **racial and ethnic diversity of the faculty (3%)**, drawing on IPEDS data.

Technical overview of metrics

Resources

- Finance per student – spending on teaching associated activity per full-time equivalent student (IPEDS). This is adjusted using regional price comparisons (BEA)
- Faculty-to-student ratio – the number of faculty per student as provided by IPEDS
- Papers per faculty – the number of academic papers published by faculty from a college in the period 2015-2019 (Elsevier) divided by the size of the faculty (IPEDS)

Engagement

The data from the student survey have been rebalanced by gender to reflect the actual gender ratio at the college.

- Student engagement – the average score of the four questions (critical thinking, connections, applying learning to the real world, challenge) in the *THE* US Student Survey
- Interaction – the average score of two questions (interaction with faculty and collaborative learning) in the *THE* US Student Survey
- Student recommendation (*THE* US Student Survey)
- Subject breadth – the number of courses offered (IPEDS)

Outcomes

- Graduation rate – the proportion of bachelor's or equivalent graduates six/eight years after entry (IPEDS; six years for full-time students and eight years for part-time students). This covers both first-time and transfer students

- Value-added salary – the average calculated residual of the value-added models for salary 10 years after entry. This is calculated using a range of independent variables for the College Scorecard data representing the years 2013, 2014 and 2015. It also draws on data from IPEDS and the BEA
- Debt after graduation – the median loan debt accumulated by students at the institution, after they graduate. This is the GRAD_DEBT_MDN variable released by College Scorecard.
- Reputation – the total votes received for teaching excellence in the *THE* Academic Reputation survey, which is conducted in partnership with Elsevier. We use only votes provided by academics associated with US institutions.

Environment

- International students – the proportion of students identified as non-resident aliens (IPEDS)
- Student diversity – a Gini-Simpson calculation of the likelihood of two undergraduates being from different racial/ethnic groups (IPEDS)
- Faculty diversity – a Gini-Simpson calculation of the likelihood of two faculty members being from different racial/ethnic groups (IPEDS)
- Student inclusion – the post-normalisation average of the proportion of Pell Grant recipients (IPEDS)

This page intentionally left blank