

**STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR VIRGINIA  
Monday, November 13, 2006  
Omni Hotel  
Richmond, Virginia**

**SPECIAL MEETING**

**AGENDA**

**Council Meeting  
Rappahannock Room, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor**

**9:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.**

1. Action on Institutional Performance Standards

Page C 1

# State Council of Higher Education for Virginia Agenda Item

**Item:** Action on Institutional Performance Standards (IPS)

**Date of Meeting:** November 13, 2006

**Committee:**

Academic Affairs  Planning  Resources  Outreach  Executive  
Committee  Full Council

**Committee Liaison:**

**Most Recent Review/Action:**

No previous Council review/action  
 Previous review/action

**Date:** 9/30/2005

**Action:** Adopted Institutional Performance Standards for inclusion in the Governor's budget.

**Background Information/Summary of Major Elements:**

**Christopher Newport University**

Christopher Newport University's most substantial contribution to the nine educational goals of restructuring is a greater than five-fold increase in the enrollment of degree-qualified transfer students from 15 to 100.

In terms of economic development, the university's commitment is seen in its hosting of the Virginia Electronic Commerce Technology Center (VECTEC), to support small and medium sized business and other entities through e-commerce technology, the Small Business Development Institute, and the Christopher Newport University Real Estate Foundation.

**College of William and Mary**

The institution has set targets representing noticeable to significant movements in the desired direction on nearly all measures, with the exception of measures 11 and 12. The targets for measure 11 are essentially maintenance targets as W&M is already performing at a high level on student retention. Regarding measure 12, William & Mary, like many other institutions, is working to increase the number of teaching faculty to make up for the losses and unfilled positions during the budget cuts of 2002.

Most notable of all its measures are 17 and 18 which demonstrate truly substantial efforts at increasing funded research and technology transfers (through patents and licenses).

While the College has not previously established “formal” economic development partnerships (as required by measure 16), it has committed to establishing three such partnerships in 2006-07. Currently, the College has five formal relationships or activities established with K12 partners, and has committed to an additional three. Absent from the relationships described is any mention of the leadership the School of Education has and continues to provide on the Teacher Education and Licensure Phase II project, which includes long term goals leading to dramatic improvements in teacher education and preparation.

### **George Mason University**

Already the second largest institution in the state in terms of total in-state enrollment, George Mason commits to an increase over 10%, with a corresponding increase of nearly 8% in enrollment of in-state undergraduate students from under-represented populations. As the largest single enroller of transfer students, almost a quarter of all transfers from VCCS and RBC, GMU is committing to minor increases in degree-qualified transfer students. However, it is worth noting that while their actual performance has been significantly higher at times, it has never been a consistent pattern. In selecting its targets, GMU is striving for a measurable consistency.

GMU has also set its sights on increasing research expenditures by a third and significantly increasing the average number of patents and licenses awarded annually. The university has numerous established partnerships and activities related to economic development support, particularly in what might be termed ‘supporting the new economy.’ Likewise, as the second largest producer of teachers in the Commonwealth, GMU has already established numerous activities and partnerships to provide professional development to teachers.

### **James Madison University**

Recognizing the challenge before the university of a relatively low level of diversity, James Madison has set a goal of increasing its service to under-represented populations by 37% over the next six years. This will result in an increase from 26.6% to 35.9% of the in-state undergraduate population being from under-represented populations. The university has also set targets that reduce the average retention rate by a percentage point, thus giving the institution the flexibility to adjust to such a population change. However, it should be noted that Madison’s benchmark performance on retention is behind only UVA and W&M.

James Madison reports 15 existing economic development projects and involvement in five regional groups or alliances. Further, the university also reports 14 existing K12 partnerships with four under development. It is noteworthy that the institution is involved in many activities and partnerships that focus on the Shenandoah Valley and is thus keeping many of efforts where they are most needed.

## **Longwood University**

While certainly a much smaller institution than VCU, GMU, or ODU, Longwood is just as growth focused. Institutional targets for in-state enrollment represent a nearly 24% increase beyond the current benchmark. Projections of degree awards are even more aggressive with Longwood setting a target of 1,270 degrees per year, representing a 34% increase. Longwood further commits to a 22% increase in degree awards in areas currently defined as high need.

While the institution projects a significant increase of almost 20% in the average amount of student borrowing, there is matching commitment to restrict the growth in percentage of students with need who borrow to a 2.4% increase.

Longwood makes extensive economic development efforts through the Longwood Small Business Development Center, which provides services to 26 localities throughout Southside. There are 23 localities that provide direct support to this effort with Longwood. The university also has very significant outreach efforts to the K12 community that have been in place for some time. From contract teaching across 18 school divisions to working directly with children and adults in reading, mathematics, sciences and other areas of need, Longwood is fully involved in improving K12 education in Southside.

## **Old Dominion University**

By the fall of 2011, Old Dominion expects to enroll over 23,000 in-state students at all levels representing a 27.7% increase. Such significant growth over six years will affect all segments of the institution. For example, while the university has committed to increasing in-state undergraduate enrollment of students from under-represented populations by nearly a thousand (from 7,075 to 8,035) the percentage of such students this represents drops from around 51% to 45%. This percentage drop will bring ODU into line with GMU and VCU. The number of degrees conferred in high-need areas is targeted to increase by 20% over the same period of time. Enrolling somewhat fewer transfer students than GMU, Old Dominion remains one of the top three transfer leaders in the Commonwealth and has set targets to increase the number of degree-qualified transfer students by over 16%.

ODU claims 19 existing economic development relationships and commits to adding five additional relationships. Further, the university reports it is aggressively pursuing marketing of the Innovation Research Park and Mast Center as engines of economic development. Finally, Old Dominion reports 40 existing partnerships with K12 partners, with plans to increase to 45.

## **Norfolk State University**

As one of two historically black public universities in Virginia, Norfolk State is an institution struggling to serve a population with multiple challenges, not the least of which are academic preparation and ability to pay. Of NSU students with financial need, 87% must borrow to pay for college – despite the fact that NSU assesses only a 22% cost share on students, instead of the 33% expected by the state. Due in part to the inadequate academic preparation of its students, Norfolk State has the lowest

performance of the four-year institutions in terms of retention and progression. However, the institution has set an aggressive target to improve performance by four percentage points with a 2011-12 target of 75% average annual retention.

The university has a number of local efforts in economic development and K12 participation and commits to pursuing others, although the bulk of its effort is directed at improving student success at the university.

### **Radford University**

Radford is pursuing modest enrollment growth with a less modest growth in students from under-represented populations. The university is working to minimize increased student borrowing. Radford has set a goal for student retention to maintain its benchmark high of 81.4%, while increasing enrollment from under-represented populations. Institutional analysis suggests that simply maintaining this rate for the immediate future is not possible, despite increased attention and resources; however, it is to be an achievable target for 2011-12.

The university is involved in nine economic development partnerships and activities and plans to add three this year. Many of these partnerships are based in information technology; however, the institution is also leveraging its healthcare programs to include supporting a nursing program at the New College Institute. Radford has three formal partnerships in K12, including a program to work with high school teachers to prepare lessons on Appalachian Studies. It is worth noting that Radford did not mention its leadership in the Teacher Education and Licensure II project which is a significant effort to enhance teacher preparation statewide.

### **University of Mary Washington**

The University of Mary Washington has set aggressive targets. Measures include a 22% increase in in-state student enrollment, a 25% increase in projected degree awards, reductions in both average student borrowing and the percentage of students who borrow, as well as significant increases in degree-qualified transfers.

The university participates in regional economic development with seven existing relationships and is adding four more. The plans include certification and training programs in Spotsylvania and Stafford counties and are referenced in their six-year academic plans. Similarly, the university has five formal partnerships with area school districts in place, with two more under consideration. These programs include such activities as mentoring and clinical faculty training.

### **University of Virginia**

Virginia's flagship institution has committed to more than doubling the number of degree-qualified transfer students it enrolls, increasing enrollment of students from under-represented populations by nearly 50%, and decreasing the debt of students with need by 16%. The University is also committing to increase research expenditures by 50% to a three-year average of \$337 million.

The University has four economic development partnerships to which it provides direct fiscal support in excess of \$150,000 annually, as well staff participation and support. Further, the School of Nursing is working in both Southside and Southwest Virginia to increase baccalaureate and graduate nursing education.

### **University of Virginia College at Wise**

Planning on moderate enrollment growth (approximately 13%), the College at Wise is making strong commitments to increase faculty productivity from 3.5 degrees to 4.9 degrees conferred annually per FTE instructional faculty. Likewise, the college has set a goal to increase average retention rates from 74.3% to 77.4% and degree awards per FTE enrollment from 0.188 to 0.198 degrees to FTE students.

Despite its small size, the college is significantly involved in economic development, specifically through the college's Center for Economic Education to increase economic literacy among K12 teachers, students, and community members with the goal of helping individuals improve their economic futures. Likewise, the Graduate Medical Education Consortium seeks to enhance economic development by improving regional healthcare. Wise's involvement in K12 also includes a Center for Teaching Excellence, Governor's School, and the Appalachia Math-Science Partnership.

### **Virginia Commonwealth University**

Virginia Commonwealth is also pursuing a significant growth strategy. The university plans a 13.5% increase in in-state enrollment, while increasing enrollment of students from under-represented populations by 18.3%, or nearly 1,400 Virginia students. A comparable 18% increase is also seen in the measures of degrees in high-need areas. Closely related to the increase in degree production are targets to increase average retention rates by nearly three percentage points, which, when calculated over a population as large as VCU's undergraduate body, represents significant numbers of students.

Of the six research institutions, VCU is posting the smallest increase in research expenditures, but is targeting a very respectable increase in patents/licenses from an average of 25 per year to 41. VCU also reports multiple endeavors of significant involvement in economic development and K12 partnerships.

### **Virginia Military Institute**

VMI is an institution with a mission that is based in its "unique military activities." Its overall enrollments are generally trending upward, while its in-state enrollments have yet to regain the losses between 1999 and 2004. Given its unique nature, the only substantive target increase is a 20% improvement in degrees conferred in high need areas.

The Institute's commitment to economic development lies in tourism and conferences. Commitment to K12 improvement and participation is largely based in the volunteerism of cadets.

## **Virginia State University**

Virginia State is pursuing a 27% increase in enrollment by 2011-12. As an historically black land-grant university, VSU expects to see an overall decrease in students from under-represented populations, which is attributed to issues of cost and affordability. Along with this enrollment growth, the institution expects to see more degrees in high need areas (from 34 to 60), greater numbers of degree-qualified transfers (from 43 to 62), and a minor increase in retention rates (from 76.1% to 77.1%).

The university's involvement in economic development is focused in its Office Cooperative Extension through the Rural Entrepreneurship Project and the Tobacco Commission Project. While this activity is reflective of VSU's status as a land-grant institution, the institution could also provide focus on providing economic development support to the city of Petersburg. Institutional involvement with K12 is directed primarily to teacher education field experiences.

## **Virginia Tech**

Virginia Tech's targets represent the institution's planned transition from a traditional land-grant institution to a top 30 research institution. Tech's targets indicate an emphasis on increasing research expenditures and technology transfers, targets showing 66.3% and 47.6% increases respectively. Other targets are far less aggressive, particularly those focused on undergraduates, demonstrating that the institution is staying true to its stated goal of developing its research stature while still realigning many of its goals with those of the Restructuring Act.

Institutional commitment to economic development and increased participation with the K12 sector is clearly demonstrated in Tech's response to measures 16 and 19. The institution has developed four separate approaches to economic development addressing statewide needs, regional/local needs, and specific efforts in Southside and Southwest. Tech also has four existing partnerships with K12 entities spanning a breadth of content in which the institution has expertise. Finally, the School of Education is developing memoranda of understanding for professional development and licensure activities with eight Southside school divisions.

## **Richard Bland College**

Virginia's only public junior college, Richard Bland fills a unique niche. However, its unique mission and resources do not necessarily mesh well with the nine educational goals of restructuring. Yet, with the building of residence halls, the college anticipates increasing its enrollment by over 42% with a matching increase in students from under-represented populations. Further, the college has set a target of increasing its average retention rate from 58% to 64%. It should be noted that while measure 12 (degree awards per FTE enrollment) shows a 23.5% decrease, this merely reflects the substantial growth anticipated by the college.

Richard Bland does not have formal relationships or activities in economic development. Instead, faculty, staff, and high-level administrators are engaged as individuals in wide-ranging activities and volunteerism that support the economic development and vitality of Petersburg and the region. It is in this context that the college requests an exemption to this measure.

In the arena of K12 partnerships, the college works with teachers through workshops and seminars, and maintains direct contact with students through reading programs and a student leadership academy for high school students.

## **Virginia Community College System**

The community college system is the largest entity in the Commonwealth providing undergraduate education. As an open enrollment institution, the VCCS has not participated in the enrollment projection process for some years making it unable to respond to a number of the IPS measures. This is not an indication of the system's lack of commitment to Virginia's goals for higher education, but it has severely limited the Commonwealth's ability to plan for enrollment growth.

Despite the challenge of working without actual enrollment targets, VCCS has committed to increasing retention rates by three percentage points over the next six years. If accomplished, this increase would move their retention rate for baccalaureate credit students from 41.5% to 44.5% and for occupational/technical credit students from 50.7% to 54.0%.

The VCCS has proposed alternative metrics for economic development:

*Therefore, the VCCS would like to propose two alternative metrics for Standard 16. First, the VCCS proposes to increase enrollment in workforce development programs by 2% annually with a Minimal Acceptable Threshold of 1% annually. Second, the VCCS proposes to develop or revise a minimum of two statewide workforce programs annually.*

Members may wish to give consideration to these ideas or may choose to pursue a different route altogether by considering a measure that reflects the VCCS' ability to identify and respond appropriately to changing workforce needs. If such an approach were considered, the VCCS would be measured much the same way as other institutions are by surveying their "client base" as to their satisfaction. For instance, business and industry surrounding a given college would be surveyed as to frequency of contact with college leadership regarding workforce needs and their satisfaction with the response by the college (if any).

Finally, the VCCS involvement with the K12 community is most substantial in terms of teacher preparation and dual enrollment. However, VCCS and the Virginia Department of Education are partners in a grant to redesign American high schools, specifically to reduce the number of graduates who place into developmental education courses. It is here that the VCCS has the greatest potential to have a positive effect on student learning in K12; as the collegiate provider of remedial and developmental education of high school graduates, it is the only entity in a position to identify trends and problems and recommend viable solutions.

### **Materials Provided:**

- Attachment: Benchmarks and Targets for action

### **Financial Impact:**

Public institutions annually deemed certified by SCHEV as having met approved targets for the Institutional Performance Standards shall receive various financial benefits as described in Chapter 933 of the Code of Virginia.

### **Timetable for Further Review/Action:**

SCHEV is required to assess and certify institutional performance by June 1 of each year.

### **Resolution:**

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia approves the benchmarks and targets for the Institutional Performance Standards submitted by Virginia's public institutions for the years 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09. These targets, and those targets submitted for later years, shall be used in the development of the Council's revision of the six-year statewide strategic plan.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia directs the challenges below to Virginia's public institutions for consideration as they review their six-year academic, enrollment, and financial plans and in preparation of the 2008 review of the Institutional Performance Standards:

#### **Christopher Newport University**

- Institution should make a more substantial effort to enroll underrepresented students as demonstrated through significantly enhanced targets in 2008.
- Institution should commit to objectively demonstrating student learning achievement outcomes in 2008 and beyond.
- Institution should undertake significant efforts to increase the graduation rates, as reflected in measure 12, such that a target of ratio of .20 can be established for 2014.
- Institution shall develop K12 partnerships and activities that improve student learning, improve teaching effectiveness, and enhance administrative leadership.

#### **College of William and Mary**

- Institution should commit to objectively demonstrating student learning achievement outcomes in 2008 and beyond.
- While the Council recognizes the challenges faced by the institutions from enrollment growth and severe budget cuts in previous years, the Council challenges the institution to find ways

to increase the productivity of its faculty as expressed in terms of degrees conferred per full-time instructional faculty.

#### **George Mason University**

- Institution should revisit its effort to enroll underrepresented students to ensure its targets track with enrollment projections thus resulting in at least maintaining the percentage of such students enrolled.
- Institution should commit to objectively demonstrating student learning achievement outcomes in 2008 and beyond.
- Institution should extend itself on its targets for measures 11 and 12 for the 2008 cycle and to improve student retention and completion.
- While the Council recognizes the challenges faced by the institutions from enrollment growth and severe budget cuts in previous years, the Council challenges the institution to find ways to increase the productivity of its faculty as expressed in terms of degrees conferred per full-time instructional faculty.

#### **James Madison University**

- Institution should commit to objectively demonstrating student learning achievement outcomes in 2008 and beyond.
- While the Council recognizes the challenges faced by the institutions from enrollment growth and severe budget cuts in previous years, the Council challenges the institution to find ways to increase the productivity of its faculty as expressed in terms of degrees conferred per full-time instructional faculty.

#### **Longwood University**

- Institution should revisit its effort to enroll underrepresented students to ensure its targets track with enrollment projections thus resulting in at least maintaining the percentage of such students enrolled.
- Institution should commit to objectively demonstrating student learning achievement outcomes in 2008 and beyond.
- While the Council recognizes the challenges faced by the institutions from enrollment growth and severe budget cuts in previous years, the Council challenges the institution to find ways to increase the productivity of its faculty as expressed in terms of degrees conferred per full-time instructional faculty.

#### **Norfolk State University**

- Institution should commit to objectively demonstrating student learning achievement outcomes in 2008 and beyond.
- Institution should develop programs and/or approaches to increasing student retention to reach a target of 81% by 2014.

#### **Old Dominion University**

- Institution should revisit its effort to enroll underrepresented students to ensure its targets track with enrollment projections

thus resulting in at least maintaining the percentage of such students enrolled.

- Institution should commit to objectively demonstrating student learning achievement outcomes in 2008 and beyond.
- Institution should develop programs and/or approaches to increasing student retention to reach a target of 81% by 2014.
- While the Council recognizes the challenges faced by the institutions from enrollment growth and severe budget cuts in previous years, the Council challenges the institution to find ways to increase the productivity of its faculty as expressed in terms of degrees conferred per full-time instructional faculty.

#### **Radford University**

- Institution should commit to objectively demonstrating student learning achievement outcomes in 2008 and beyond.
- While the Council recognizes the challenges faced by the institutions from enrollment growth and severe budget cuts in previous years, the Council challenges the institution to find ways to increase the productivity of its faculty as expressed in terms of degrees conferred per full-time instructional faculty.

#### **University of Mary Washington**

- Institution should revisit its effort to enroll underrepresented students to ensure its targets track with enrollment projections thus resulting in at least maintaining the percentage of such students enrolled.
- Institution should commit to objectively demonstrating student learning achievement outcomes in 2008 and beyond.
- While the Council recognizes the challenges faced by the institutions from enrollment growth and severe budget cuts in previous years, the Council challenges the institution to find ways to increase the productivity of its faculty as expressed in terms of degrees conferred per full-time instructional faculty.

#### **University of Virginia**

- Institution should commit to objectively demonstrating student learning achievement outcomes in 2008 and beyond.
- While the Council recognizes the challenges faced by the institutions from enrollment growth and severe budget cuts in previous years, the Council challenges the institution to find ways to increase the productivity of its faculty as expressed in terms of degrees conferred per full-time instructional faculty.

#### **University of Virginia's College at Wise**

- Institution should commit to objectively demonstrating student learning achievement outcomes in 2008 and beyond.
- While the Council recognizes the challenges faced by the institutions from enrollment growth and severe budget cuts in previous years, the Council challenges the institution to find ways to increase the productivity of its faculty as expressed in terms of degrees conferred per full-time instructional faculty.

### **Virginia Commonwealth University**

- Institution should commit to objectively demonstrating student learning achievement outcomes in 2008 and beyond.
- Institution should develop programs and/or approaches to increasing degree awards per FTE faculty with a goal of reaching 2.8 by 2014.
- While the Council recognizes the challenges faced by the institutions from enrollment growth and severe budget cuts in previous years, the Council challenges the institution to find ways to increase the productivity of its faculty as expressed in terms of degrees conferred per full-time instructional faculty.

### **Virginia Military Institute**

- Institution should revisit its effort to enroll underrepresented students to ensure its targets track with enrollment projections thus resulting in at least maintaining the percentage of such students enrolled.
- Institution should commit to objectively demonstrating student learning achievement outcomes in 2008 and beyond.
- Institution should develop an appropriate partnership with the city of Lexington to improve economic development.
- Institution should pursue additional efforts to participate in the improvement of the teaching of math and science in secondary schools.
- While the Council recognizes the challenges faced by the institutions from enrollment growth and severe budget cuts in previous years, the Council challenges the institution to find ways to increase the productivity of its faculty as expressed in terms of degrees conferred per full-time instructional faculty.

### **Virginia State University**

- Institution should commit to objectively demonstrating student learning achievement outcomes in 2008 and beyond.
- Institution should develop an appropriate partnership with the city of Petersburg to improve economic development.
- While the Council recognizes the challenges faced by the institutions from enrollment growth and severe budget cuts in previous years, the Council challenges the institution to find ways to increase the productivity of its faculty as expressed in terms of degrees conferred per full-time instructional faculty.

### **Virginia Tech**

- Institution should commit to objectively demonstrating student learning achievement outcomes in 2008 and beyond.
- Institution should commit to exploring opportunities for increasing the production of graduates in high-need areas, specifically engineering.

### **Richard Bland College**

- **Institution should commit to objectively demonstrating student learning achievement outcomes in 2008 and beyond.**
- **Institution should commit to developing the capability to establish a 70% retention rate as a target for 2014.**
- **Institution should develop an appropriate partnership with the city of Petersburg to improve economic development.**
- **While the Council recognizes the challenges faced by the institutions from enrollment growth and severe budget cuts in previous years, the Council challenges the institution to find ways to increase the productivity of its faculty as expressed in terms of degrees conferred per full-time instructional faculty.**

### **Virginia Community College System**

- **VCCS leadership shall plan on submitting projections of future enrollment to the Council beyond the current demand methodology during Spring 2007 as part of the biennial enrollment projection process.**
- **Institution should commit to objectively demonstrating student learning achievement outcomes in 2008 and beyond.**
- **VCCS leadership shall plan on submitting projections of future degree awards to the Council beyond the current demand methodology during Spring 2007 as part of the biennial enrollment projection process.**
- **While the Council recognizes the challenges faced by the institutions from enrollment growth and severe budget cuts in previous years, the Council challenges the institution to find ways to increase the productivity of its faculty as expressed in terms of degrees conferred per full-time instructional faculty.**

### Institutional Performance Standards, Benchmarks and Targets

A final review of the data for annual certification of institutions regarding the educational-related goals of the Restructured Higher Education and Administration Act.

#### Measure 1: Institution Meets 95% of its In-State Enrollment Targets

	Bench-mark	AY0607	AY0708	AY0809	AY0910	AY1011	AY1112	Net Change
CNU	4,613	4,667	4,743	4,801	4,739	4,717	4,694	1.8%
	Threshold	4,434	4,506	4,561	4,502	4,482	4,459	
CWM	4,660	4,803	4,914	4,987	5,026	5,061	5,095	9.3%
	Threshold	4,563	4,668	4,738	4,775	4,808	4,840	
GMU	24,794	25,099	25,463	25,940	26,417	26,897	27,405	10.5%
	Threshold	23,844	24,190	24,643	25,096	25,552	26,035	
JMU	11,610	11,790	12,015	12,135	12,273	12,324	12,341	6.3%
	Threshold	11,201	11,414	11,528	11,659	11,708	11,724	
LU	4,163	4,325	4,514	4,674	4,853	5,008	5,146	23.6%
	Threshold	4,109	4,288	4,440	4,610	4,758	4,889	
NSU	4,655	4,825	5,019	5,249	5,526	5,825	5,825	25.1%
	Threshold	4,584	4,768	4,987	5,250	5,534	5,534	
ODU	18,314	19,053	19,681	20,390	21,243	22,241	23,384	27.7%
	Threshold	18,100	18,697	19,371	20,181	21,129	22,215	
RBC	1,398	1,403	1,413	1,615	1,697	1,904	1,990	42.3%
	Threshold	1,333	1,342	1,534	1,612	1,809	1,891	
RU	8,391	8,500	8,623	8,727	8,839	8,947	8,947	6.6%
	Threshold	8,075	8,192	8,291	8,397	8,500	8,500	
UMW	3,746	3,858	3,992	4,150	4,318	4,448	4,583	22.3%
	Threshold	3,665	3,792	3,942	4,102	4,226	4,354	
UVA	15,411	15,499	15,587	15,675	15,807	15,936	16,075	4.3%
	Threshold	14,724	14,808	14,891	15,017	15,139	15,271	
UVA-W	1,791	1,844	1,896	1,930	1,959	1,995	2,020	12.8%
	Threshold	1,752	1,801	1,834	1,861	1,895	1,919	
VCU	26,014	26,818	27,468	28,031	28,615	29,129	29,536	13.5%
	Threshold	25,477	26,095	26,629	27,184	27,673	28,059	
VMI	706	716	721	733	735	763	786	11.3%
	Threshold	680	685	696	698	725	747	
VSU	3,592	3,798	3,960	4,111	4,245	4,401	4,551	26.7%
	Threshold	3,608	3,762	3,905	4,033	4,181	4,323	
VT	18,832	19,043	19,202	19,400	19,615	19,837	20,094	6.7%
	Threshold	18,091	18,242	18,430	18,634	18,845	19,089	

NOTE: Under current practice, the Virginia Community College System does not participate in the enrollment projection process and has requested an exemption to this measure.

**Measure 2: Enrollment of under-represented populations**

	Bench-mark	AY0607	AY0708	AY0809	AY0910	AY1011	AY1112	Net Change
CNU	1,054	1,065	1,065	1,070	1,070	1,070	1,070	1.5%
	Threshold	896	896	901	901	901	901	
CWM	1,098	1,180	1,210	1,230	1,250	1,280	1,310	19.3%
	Threshold	1,132	1,152	1,182	1,202	1,232	1,262	
GMU	7,197	7,256	7,314	7,424	7,535	7,648	7,763	7.9%
	Threshold	6,871	6,929	7,039	7,150	7,263	7,378	
JMU	2,971	3,034	3,367	3,811	3,940	4,031	4,076	37.2%
	Threshold	2,827	3,160	3,604	3,733	3,824	3,869	
LU	985	985	995	1,010	1,025	1,040	1,055	7.1%
	Threshold	936	946	960	965	988	1,003	
NSU	4,088	4,150	4,280	4,440	4,600	4,800	5,070	24.0%
	Threshold	3,851	3,981	4,141	4,301	4,501	4,771	
ODU	7,075	7,235	7,395	7,555	7,715	7,875	8,035	13.6%
	Threshold	6,656	6,816	6,976	7,136	7,296	7,456	
RBC	378	380	382	434	457	512	535	41.5%
	Threshold	347	349	401	424	479	502	
RU	2,753	2,660	2,805	2,877	2,950	3,097	3,110	13.0%
	Threshold	2,485	2,578	2,722	2,711	2,846	2,864	
UMW	787	792	797	802	807	812	817	3.8%
	Threshold	736	741	746	751	756	761	
UVA	3,377	3,469	3,509	3,549	3,606	3,651	3,701	9.6%
	Threshold	3,318	3,358	3,398	3,455	3,500	3,550	
UVA-W	914	969	997	1,024	1,051	1,079	1,106	21.0%
	Threshold	848	876	930	958	985	1,012	
VCCS	73,696	75,907	78,184	80,530	82,945	85,434	87,997	19.4%
	Threshold	75,170	76,673	78,207	79,771	81,366	82,994	
VCU	7,437	8,000	8,200	8,400	8,600	8,700	8,800	18.3%
	Threshold	7,736	7,936	8,136	8,336	8,436	8,536	
VMI	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	0.0%
	Threshold	148	148	148	148	148	148	
VSU	2,630	2,730	2,780	2,830	2,880	2,930	2,980	13.3%
	Threshold	2,454	2,504	2,554	2,604	2,654	2,704	
VT	4,970	5,100	5,135	5,171	5,206	5,283	5,364	7.9%
	Threshold	5,004	5,039	5,075	5,110	5,187	5,268	

**Measure 3: Institution Meets 95% of its Projected Degree Awards**

	Bench-mark	AY0607	AY0708	AY0809	AY0910	AY1011	AY1112	Net Change
CNU	880	890	900	955	980	1,010	1,010	14.8%
	Threshold	846	855	907	931	960	960	
CWM	1,997	1,981	2,082	2,133	2,165	2,177	2,190	9.7%
	Threshold	1,882	1,978	2,026	2,057	2,068	2,081	
GMU	6,394	6,647	6,788	7,099	7,254	7,415	7,574	18.5%
	Threshold	6,315	6,449	6,744	6,891	7,044	7,195	
JMU	3,935	3,918	3,930	4,050	4,192	4,192	4,192	6.5%
	Threshold	3,722	3,734	3,848	3,982	3,982	3,982	
LU	946	964	1,037	1,075	1,160	1,219	1,270	34.2%
	Threshold	916	985	1,021	1,102	1,158	1,207	
NSU	1,065	1,104	1,132	1,159	1,201	1,243	1,287	20.8%
	Threshold	1,049	1,075	1,101	1,141	1,181	1,223	
ODU	3,920	4,098	4,236	4,381	4,542	4,726	4,940	26.0%
	Threshold	3,893	4,024	4,162	4,315	4,490	4,693	
RBC	230	232	234	236	270	270	270	17.4%
	Threshold	220	222	224	257	257	257	
RU	2,108	2,140	2,172	2,207	2,241	2,273	2,273	7.8%
	Threshold	2,033	2,063	2,097	2,129	2,159	2,159	
UMW	1,154	1,200	1,247	1,295	1,343	1,392	1,442	25.0%
	Threshold	1,140	1,185	1,230	1,276	1,322	1,370	
UVA	5,946	6,097	6,144	6,189	6,229	6,323	6,367	7.1%
	Threshold	5,792	5,837	5,880	5,918	6,007	6,049	
UVA-W	283	291	300	305	310	315	320	13.1%
	Threshold	276	285	290	295	299	304	
VCU	4,933	5,189	5,376	5,514	5,640	5,765	5,885	19.3%
	Threshold	4,930	5,107	5,238	5,358	5,477	5,591	
VMI	276	296	280	292	292	292	292	5.8%
	Threshold	281	266	277	277	277	277	
VSU	700	724	759	774	787	827	874	24.9%
	Threshold	688	721	735	748	786	830	
VT	6,506	6,555	6,596	6,672	6,766	6,804	6,876	5.7%
	Threshold	6,227	6,266	6,338	6,428	6,464	6,532	

NOTE: Under current practice, the Virginia Community College System does not participate in the enrollment projection process and has requested an exemption to this measure.

**Measure 4: Affordability Measure to be Developed**

SCHEV will establish a working group to develop an appropriate definition and methodology for the measure. Consisting of professional staff from the public institutions, this group will begin meeting in late 2006 with the goal of reporting out to Council in January, 2008 to allow Council to adopt a final measure no later than May, 2008.

There is no institutional response required at this time.

**Measure 5.1: Average need-based borrowing.**

	Bench-mark	AY0607	AY0708	AY0809	AY0910	AY1011	AY1112	Net Change
CNU	\$3,199	\$3,150	\$3,125	\$3,125	\$3,125	\$3,125	\$3,125	-2.3%
	Threshold	\$3,420	\$3,395	\$3,395	\$3,395	\$3,395	\$3,395	
CWM	\$3,030	\$3,220	\$3,250	\$3,280	\$3,320	\$3,350	\$3,380	11.6%
	Threshold	\$3,394	\$3,424	\$3,454	\$3,494	\$3,524	\$3,554	
GMU	\$3,914	\$4,021	\$4,128	\$4,235	\$4,342	\$4,449	\$4,556	16.4%
	Threshold	\$4,171	\$4,278	\$4,385	\$4,492	\$4,599	\$4,706	
JMU	\$3,844	\$4,074	\$4,319	\$4,578	\$4,852	\$5,144	\$5,453	41.9%
	Threshold	\$4,210	\$4,455	\$4,714	\$4,988	\$5,280	\$5,589	
LU	\$3,322	\$3,422	\$3,525	\$3,631	\$3,740	\$3,852	\$3,968	19.4%
	Threshold	\$3,594	\$3,702	\$3,812	\$3,927	\$4,045	\$4,167	
NSU	\$3,501	\$3,614	\$3,726	\$3,838	\$3,950	\$4,062	\$4,174	19.2%
	Threshold	\$3,726	\$3,838	\$3,950	\$4,062	\$4,174	\$4,286	
ODU	\$3,703	\$3,700	\$3,700	\$3,700	\$3,700	\$3,700	\$3,700	-0.1%
	Threshold	\$3,851	\$3,851	\$3,851	\$3,851	\$3,851	\$3,851	
RBC	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.0%
	Threshold	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
RU	\$3,409	\$3,547	\$3,653	\$3,726	\$3,800	\$3,876	\$3,954	16.0%
	Threshold	\$3,636	\$3,742	\$3,815	\$3,889	\$3,965	\$4,043	
UMW	\$3,470	\$3,465	\$3,460	\$3,455	\$3,450	\$3,445	\$3,440	-0.9%
	Threshold	\$3,547	\$3,542	\$3,537	\$3,532	\$3,527	\$3,522	
UVA	\$2,648	\$3,032	\$3,167	\$3,038	\$3,174	\$3,307	\$3,395	28.2%
	Threshold	\$3,289	\$3,424	\$3,295	\$3,431	\$3,564	\$3,652	
UVA-W	\$3,887	\$4,068	\$4,159	\$4,249	\$4,339	\$4,430	\$4,250	9.3%
	Threshold	\$3,720	\$3,810	\$3,901	\$3,991	\$4,082	\$4,172	
VCCS	\$1,945	\$2,436	\$2,680	\$2,948	\$3,243	\$3,567	\$3,924	101.7%
	Threshold	\$2,481	\$2,730	\$3,003	\$3,303	\$3,633	\$3,997	
VCU	\$3,806	\$3,806	\$3,806	\$3,806	\$3,806	\$3,806	\$3,806	0.0%
	Threshold	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500	
VMI	\$2,348	\$2,350	\$2,400	\$2,450	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	6.5%
	Threshold	\$2,550	\$2,600	\$2,650	\$2,700	\$2,700	\$2,700	
VSU	\$3,978	\$4,389	\$4,608	\$5,080	\$5,335	\$5,602	\$5,602	40.8%
	Threshold	\$4,439	\$4,458	\$5,130	\$5,385	\$5,652	\$5,652	
VT	\$3,569	\$3,593	\$3,618	\$3,642	\$3,667	\$3,692	\$3,717	4.1%
	Threshold	\$3,738	\$3,762	\$3,787	\$3,812	\$3,837	\$3,862	

**Measure 5.2: Percentage of need-based borrowing.**

	Bench-mark	AY0607	AY0708	AY0809	AY0910	AY1011	AY1112	Net Change
CNU	47.0%	47.0%	47.0%	47.0%	47.0%	47.0%	47.0%	0.0%
	Threshold	52.3%	52.3%	52.3%	52.3%	52.3%	52.3%	
CWM	66.1%	65.0%	63.0%	61.0%	59.0%	59.0%	59.0%	-10.7%
	Threshold	70.5%	68.5%	66.5%	64.5%	64.5%	64.5%	
GMU	72.3%	74.1%	75.9%	77.7%	79.5%	81.4%	83.2%	15.0%
	Threshold	76.7%	78.5%	80.3%	82.1%	83.9%	85.7%	
JMU	74.0%	74.0%	74.0%	74.0%	74.0%	74.0%	74.0%	0.0%
	Threshold	76.0%	76.0%	76.0%	76.0%	76.0%	76.0%	
LU	73.7%	74.0%	74.3%	74.6%	74.9%	75.2%	75.5%	2.4%
	Threshold	78.0%	78.3%	78.4%	78.9%	79.6%	79.5%	
NSU	87.0%	87.0%	87.0%	87.0%	87.0%	87.0%	87.0%	0.0%
	Threshold	89.0%	89.0%	89.0%	89.0%	89.0%	89.0%	
ODU	63.9%	63.5%	63.5%	63.5%	63.5%	63.5%	63.5%	-0.6%
	Threshold	71.2%	71.2%	71.2%	71.2%	71.2%	71.2%	
RBC	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Threshold	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
RU	36.5%	38.0%	38.7%	39.5%	40.3%	41.1%	41.9%	14.8%
	Threshold	42.9%	43.7%	44.4%	45.2%	46.0%	46.8%	
UMW	81.9%	81.3%	80.7%	80.2%	79.6%	79.0%	78.4%	-4.3%
	Threshold	85.6%	85.0%	84.5%	83.9%	83.3%	82.7%	
UVA	63.7%	63.5%	63.4%	63.3%	63.2%	63.1%	63.0%	-1.1%
	Threshold	67.5%	67.4%	67.3%	67.2%	67.1%	67.0%	
UVA-W	46.6%	48.9%	50.0%	51.1%	52.3%	53.4%	54.5%	17.0%
	Threshold	45.8%	46.9%	48.0%	49.2%	50.3%	51.4%	
VCCS	5.3%	19.0%	19.0%	19.0%	19.0%	19.0%	19.0%	258.5%
	Threshold	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	
VCU	84.0%	84.0%	84.0%	84.0%	84.0%	84.0%	84.0%	0.0%
	Threshold	89.0%	89.0%	89.0%	89.0%	89.0%	89.0%	
VMI	48.8%	49.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	2.5%
	Threshold	58.0%	59.0%	59.0%	59.0%	59.0%	59.0%	
VSU	81.0%	82.0%	84.0%	85.0%	86.0%	87.0%	88.0%	8.6%
	Threshold	83.2%	85.2%	96.2%	87.2%	88.2%	89.2%	
VT	81.2%	81.0%	80.9%	80.8%	80.7%	80.6%	80.5%	-0.9%
	Threshold	83.9%	83.8%	83.7%	83.5%	83.4%	83.3%	

**Measure 6: Institution Conducts Biennial Assessment of Tuition and Fee Levels**

Institution conducts a biennial assessment of the impact of tuition and fee levels net of financial aid on applications, enrollment, and student indebtedness incurred for the payment of tuition and fees and provides the State Council with a copy of this study upon its completion and makes appropriate reference to its use within the required six-year plans. The institution shall also make a parent- and student-friendly version of this assessment widely available on the institution's website. SCHEV staff will develop and issue guidelines as to what the Council will need to receive in order to certify compliance. Methodology and approach will be left to the institution to determine.

There is no institutional response required at this time.

**Measure 7: Degrees conferred in high-need areas.**

	Bench-mark	AY0607	AY0708	AY0809	AY0910	AY1011	AY1112	Net Change
CNU	50	55	60	60	60	60	60	20.00%
	Threshold	43	48	48	48	48	48	
CWM	150	195	203	211	219	227	235	56.70%
	Threshold	147	155	163	171	179	187	
GMU	1,435	1,491	1,513	1,541	1,569	1,596	1,600	11.50%
	Threshold	1,371	1,393	1,421	1,449	1,476	1,480	
JMU	576	629	909	711	754	770	787	36.60%
	Threshold	575	565	660	700	710	720	
LU	275	285	295	305	315	325	335	21.80%
	Threshold	214	224	234	244	254	264	
NSU	211	220	260	295	329	360	400	89.60%
	Threshold	176	216	251	285	316	356	
ODU	1,502	1,567	1,614	1,661	1,708	1,755	1,800	19.80%
	Threshold	1,510	1,557	1,604	1,651	1,698	1,743	
RU	523	525	521	530	538	540	543	3.80%
	Threshold	437	433	442	450	452	455	
UMW	243	245	247	249	251	253	255	4.90%
	Threshold	210	216	222	228	234	240	
UVA	1,508	1,567	1,579	1,591	1,601	1,625	1,636	8.50%
	Threshold	1,458	1,470	1,482	1,492	1,516	1,527	
UVA-W	35	42	46	49	53	56	60	71.40%
	Threshold	38	42	45	49	52	56	
VCCS	1,945	1,984	2,024	2,064	2,105	2,147	2,190	12.60%
	Threshold	1,964	1,984	2,004	2,024	2,064	2,085	
VCU	1,102	1,175	1,200	1,225	1,250	1,275	1,300	18.00%
	Threshold	1,146	1,171	1,196	1,221	1,246	1,271	
VMI	68	68	70	73	76	79	82	20.60%
	Threshold	57	59	62	65	68	71	
VSU	34	38	43	47	52	56	60	76.50%
	Threshold	14	19	24	28	32	36	
VT	1,878	1,741	1,786	1,728	1,804	1,867	1,900	1.20%
	Threshold	1,659	1,704	1,646	1,722	1,785	1,818	

**Measure 8: Programs Reviewed Under the Criteria of Southern Association of Colleges and Schools**

Institution reports on total programs reviewed under Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) assessment of student learning outcomes criteria within the institution's established assessment cycle in which continuous improvement plans addressing recommended policy and program changes were implemented.

**All institutions have provided appropriate descriptions of current practice and future intent to relative to SACS criteria.**

## **Measure 9: Access to Lower Division Courses**

SCHEV will establish a working group to develop an appropriate definition and methodology for the measure. Consisting of professional staff from the public institutions, this group will begin meeting in October, 2006 with the goal of reporting out to Council in January, 2008 to allow Council to adopt a final definition no later than May, 2008.

There is no institutional response required at this time.

**Measure 10: Degrees conferred per full-time faculty.**

	Bench-mark	AY0607	AY0708	AY0809	AY0910	AY1011	AY1112	Net Change
CNU	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	0.30%
	Threshold	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	
CWM	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4	5.30%
	Threshold	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.3	
GMU	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.6	-6.10%
	Threshold	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.5	
JMU	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	0.00%
	Threshold	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	
LU	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0.00%
	Threshold	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	
NSU	2.2	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.7	25.70%
	Threshold	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.6	
ODU	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	-4.30%
	Threshold	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	
RBC	5.3	5.2	5.4	4.1	5.6	4.3	6.4	22.40%
	Threshold	5.2	5.5	4.8	6.3	4.9	7.5	
RU	5.3	5.1	5.1	5.1	5	5	4.1	-22.80%
	Threshold	5	5.1	5	5	5	4.1	
UMW	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.6	7.00%
	Threshold	4	4	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.2	
UVA	5.3	5.2	5.2	5.1	5.1	5	5	-4.80%
	Threshold	5	5	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.7	
UVA-W	3.5	3.9	4.1	4.3	4.5	4.7	4.9	40.00%
	Threshold	3.5	3.7	3.9	4.1	4.2	4.4	
VCCS	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	-1.50%
	Threshold	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	
VCU	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	5.10%
	Threshold	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4	
VMI	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	0.00%
	Threshold	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	
VSU	1.8	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.8	-3.30%
	Threshold	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.5	
VT	5.9	5.3	5.3	5.2	5.2	5.2	5.2	-11.90%
	Threshold	5	5	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8	

**Measure 11: Average progression and retention rates.**

	Bench-mark	AY0607	AY0708	AY0809	AY0910	AY1011	AY1112	Net Change
CNU	82.5%	83.5%	84.5%	85.5%	85.5%	85.5%	85.5%	3.6%
	Threshold	79.4%	80.4%	81.4%	81.4%	81.4%	81.4%	
CWM	94.0%	94.0%	94.0%	94.0%	94.0%	94.0%	94.0%	0.0%
	Threshold	92.0%	92.0%	92.0%	92.0%	92.0%	92.0%	
GMU	78.0%	78.2%	78.6%	79.0%	79.3%	79.6%	80.0%	2.6%
	Threshold	77.2%	77.6%	78.0%	78.3%	78.6%	78.7%	
JMU	88.6%	88.0%	87.8%	87.6%	87.6%	87.6%	87.6%	-1.1%
	Threshold	87.4%	87.2%	87.0%	87.0%	87.0%	87.0%	
LU	75.0%	76.0%	77.0%	78.0%	79.0%	80.0%	80.0%	6.7%
	Threshold	72.0%	73.0%	74.0%	75.0%	76.0%	76.0%	
NSU	71.0%	72.0%	72.0%	73.0%	73.0%	74.0%	75.0%	5.6%
	Threshold	70.0%	70.0%	71.0%	71.0%	72.0%	73.0%	
ODU	77.2%	77.4%	77.6%	77.8%	78.0%	78.2%	78.4%	1.6%
	Threshold	74.9%	75.1%	75.3%	75.5%	75.7%	75.9%	
RBC	58.0%	58.0%	58.0%	64.0%	64.0%	64.0%	64.0%	10.3%
	Threshold	51.5%	55.5%	61.5%	61.5%	61.5%	61.5%	
RU	81.4%	77.0%	78.0%	78.0%	79.0%	80.0%	81.4%	0.0%
	Threshold	75.5%	76.5%	76.5%	77.5%	78.5%	79.9%	
UMW	84.8%	85.0%	85.2%	85.4%	85.6%	85.8%	86.0%	1.4%
	Threshold	82.9%	83.1%	83.3%	83.5%	83.7%	83.9%	
UVA	92.4%	92.0%	92.0%	92.0%	92.0%	92.0%	92.0%	-0.4%
	Threshold	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	
UVA-W	74.3%	75.4%	75.8%	76.2%	76.6%	77.0%	77.4%	4.2%
	Threshold	72.8%	73.2%	73.6%	74.0%	74.4%	74.8%	
VCCS	41.5%	42.0%	42.5%	43.0%	43.5%	44.0%	44.5%	7.2%
	Threshold	39.0%	39.5%	40.0%	40.5%	41.0%	41.5%	
VCU	80.1%	81.0%	81.4%	81.8%	82.2%	82.6%	83.0%	3.6%
	Threshold	80.5%	80.9%	81.3%	81.7%	82.1%	82.5%	
VMI	82.7%	83.0%	83.5%	83.5%	84.0%	84.0%	84.5%	2.2%
	Threshold	81.5%	82.0%	82.5%	82.5%	82.5%	83.0%	
VSU	76.1%	76.1%	76.1%	76.1%	76.1%	77.1%	77.1%	1.3%
	Threshold	74.9%	74.9%	74.9%	74.9%	75.9%	75.9%	
VT	87.2%	88.2%	87.5%	87.5%	87.8%	87.8%	87.8%	0.7%
	Threshold	86.2%	85.5%	85.5%	85.8%	85.8%	85.8%	

**Measure 12: Undergraduate degree awards per FTE enrollment.**

	Bench-mark	AY0607	AY0708	AY0809	AY0910	AY1011	AY1112	Net Change
CNU	0.186	0.188	0.188	0.188	0.188	0.188	0.188	1.0%
	Threshold	0.173	0.173	0.173	0.173	0.173	0.173	
CWM	0.235	0.227	0.238	0.240	0.243	0.244	0.244	3.8%
	Threshold	0.216	0.226	0.228	0.232	0.232	0.232	
GMU	0.222	0.223	0.223	0.223	0.223	0.223	0.223	0.2%
	Threshold	0.220	0.220	0.220	0.220	0.220	0.220	
JMU	0.226	0.218	0.208	0.230	0.225	0.225	0.225	-0.4%
	Threshold	0.200	0.190	0.213	0.208	0.208	0.208	
LU	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.0%
	Threshold	0.188	0.188	0.188	0.188	0.188	0.188	
NSU	0.168	0.168	0.168	0.168	0.170	0.170	0.173	3.0%
	Threshold	0.155	0.155	0.155	0.158	0.158	0.160	
ODU	0.200	0.203	0.203	0.205	0.205	0.208	0.208	3.7%
	Threshold	0.193	0.193	0.195	0.195	0.198	0.198	
RBC	0.170	0.170	0.165	0.200	0.135	0.190	0.130	-23.5%
	Threshold	0.078	0.075	0.093	0.060	0.088	0.058	
RU	0.227	0.227	0.227	0.227	0.227	0.227	0.229	-6.6%
	Threshold	0.210	0.210	0.210	0.210	0.210	0.212	
UMW	0.240	0.243	0.245	0.250	0.253	0.255	0.258	7.5%
	Threshold	0.233	0.235	0.238	0.240	0.243	0.248	
UVA	0.245	0.245	0.245	0.245	0.245	0.245	0.245	0.0%
	Threshold	0.238	0.238	0.238	0.238	0.238	0.238	
UVA-W	0.188	0.190	0.193	0.193	0.195	0.195	0.198	5.3%
	Threshold	0.175	0.175	0.178	0.178	0.180	0.180	
VCCS	0.175	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-100.0%
	Threshold	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
VCU	0.165	0.173	0.175	0.175	0.175	0.175	0.175	6.1%
	Threshold	0.165	0.168	0.168	0.168	0.168	0.168	
VMI	0.180	0.180	0.185	0.188	0.180	0.180	0.183	1.4%
	Threshold	0.168	0.173	0.175	0.168	0.168	0.170	
VSU	0.178	0.178	0.178	0.178	0.170	0.170	0.170	-4.2%
	Threshold	0.165	0.165	0.165	0.158	0.158	0.158	
VT	0.220	0.218	0.215	0.215	0.218	0.215	0.218	-1.1%
	Threshold	0.203	0.200	0.200	0.203	0.200	0.203	

NOTE: Under current practice, the Virginia Community College System does not participate in the enrollment projection process, to which any targets under this measure would be associated, and has requested an exemption to this measure.

### **Measure 13: Increased Number of Transfer Agreements**

Institution increases the number of undergraduate programs or schools for which it has established a uniform articulation agreement by program or school for associate degree graduates transferring from all colleges of the Virginia Community College System and Richard Bland College consistent with a target agreed to by the institution, the Virginia Community College System, and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia.

**All institutions have provided appropriate descriptions of current numbers of transfer programs and plans to increase such, as appropriate, in the near future. SCHEV staff will continue to monitor these efforts through its transfer coordination function.**

**Measure 14: Increase in degree-qualified transfers.**

	Bench-mark	AY0607	AY0708	AY0809	AY0910	AY1011	AY1112	Net Change
CNU	15	25	35	50	60	80	100	566.7%
	Threshold	15	15	15	25	45	65	
CWM	36	44	58	65	73	80	87	141.7%
	Threshold	36	50	57	65	72	79	
GMU	325	328	332	332	334	338	334	2.8%
	Threshold	0	0	0	0	0	0	
JMU	168	175	180	180	180	180	180	7.1%
	Threshold	160	165	165	165	165	165	
LU	75	76	83	88	90	92	94	25.3%
	Threshold	65	72	77	79	81	83	
NSU	51	53	76	86	119	156	198	288.2%
	Threshold	0	0	0	0	0	0	
ODU	732	752	772	792	812	832	852	16.4%
	Threshold	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RU	101	105	110	116	122	128	130	28.7%
	Threshold	86	91	97	103	110	111	
UMW	74	81	88	95	102	109	116	56.8%
	Threshold	69	76	83	90	97	104	
UVA	78	98	117	139	161	161	161	106.4%
	Threshold	78	97	119	141	141	141	
UVA-W	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
	Threshold	0	0	0	0	0	0	
VCU	185	185	190	195	200	205	210	13.5%
	Threshold	135	140	145	150	155	160	
VSU	43	48	55	57	59	60	62	44.2%
	Threshold	0	0	0	0	0	0	
VT	105	96	107	118	124	143	151	43.8%
	Threshold	83	94	105	112	129	135	

NOTE: Does not apply to the Virginia Community College System or Richard Bland College.

**Measure 15: Dual Enrollment of High School Students.**

	Bench-mark	AY0607	AY0708	AY0809	AY0910	AY1011	AY1112	Net Change
RBC	298	300	300	300	300	300	300	0.70%
	Threshold	197	197	197	197	197	197	
VCCS	22,001	22,661	23,341	24,041	24,762	25,505	26,270	19.40%
	Threshold	22,331	22,665	23,004	23,349	23,699	24,054	

**Measure 16: Institutional Commitment to Economic Development**

For the 2006 submission, spring 2007 certification, institutions were required to provide a brief description of their current and proposed activities. In late spring of 2007, institutions will be asked for a list of partners, recipients, and participants related to their economic development activities. SCHEV will then survey these populations (and others that SCHEV may identify) to determine the levels of satisfaction and accomplishment with these activities.

**Measure 17: Research expenditures (three-year averages, in millions).**

	Bench-mark	AY0607	AY0708	AY0809	AY0910	AY1011	AY1112	Net Change
CWM	\$39.2	\$48.1	\$50.7	\$53.5	\$56.5	\$59.7	\$63.0	60.8%
	Threshold	\$42.4	\$45.0	\$47.9	\$50.8	\$54.0	\$57.3	
GMU	\$41.6	\$43.7	\$45.9	\$48.1	\$50.6	\$53.1	\$55.7	34.0%
	Threshold	\$43.7	\$45.8	\$48.1	\$50.5	\$53.1	\$55.7	
ODU	\$47.1	\$50.0	\$52.3	\$54.0	\$56.0	\$58.0	\$60.0	27.4%
	Threshold	\$41.3	\$43.6	\$45.3	\$47.3	\$49.3	\$51.3	
UVA	\$224.0	\$264.1	\$278.7	\$293.8	\$311.6	\$324.0	\$337.0	50.4%
	Threshold	\$201.9	\$215.3	\$230.2	\$246.0	\$261.1	\$275.5	
VCU	\$118.7	\$125.0	\$125.0	\$125.0	\$125.0	\$125.0	\$125.0	5.3%
	Threshold	\$114.8	\$116.9	\$118.0	\$118.0	\$118.0	\$118.0	
VT	\$248.5	\$294.7	\$315.3	\$337.4	\$361.0	\$386.3	\$413.3	66.3%
	Threshold	\$257.7	\$278.3	\$300.4	\$324.0	\$349.3	\$376.3	

**Measure 18: Patents and Licenses (three-year averages).**

	Bench-mark	AY0607	AY0708	AY0809	AY0910	AY1011	AY1112	Net Change
CWM	2	3	4	5	6	7	7	250.0%
	Threshold	2	3	3	4	4	4	
GMU	2	5	8	10	11	13	14	600.0%
	Threshold	0	0	0	0	0	0	
ODU	12	14	17	17	19	21	25	108.3%
	Threshold	13	16	16	18	20	24	
UVA	54	55	55	56	56	57	57	5.6%
	Threshold	53	53	54	54	55	55	
VCU	25	31	33	35	37	39	41	64.0%
	Threshold	21	23	25	27	29	31	
VT	21	24	26	27	28	30	31	47.6%
	Threshold	13	15	16	17	19	20	

**Measure 19: Enhanced Participation and Cooperation in K12**

For the 2006 submission, spring 2007 certification, institutions were required to provide a brief description of their current and proposed activities. In late spring of 2007, institutions will be asked for a list of partners, recipients, and participants related to their K12 activities. SCHEV will then survey these populations (and others that SCHEV may identify) to determine the levels of satisfaction and accomplishment with these activities.