

University of Alaska Performance Evaluation Guidelines

Board of Regents April 8-9, 2008 Valdez, Alaska

Table of Contents

Performance Evaluation Guidelines	1
Appendix A: State of Alaska Performance Evaluation Instructions	3
Appendix B: FY09 MAU Performance Evaluation Template	.6

University of Alaska System of Higher Education Performance Evaluation Guidelines April 2009

This document provides performance evaluation guidelines and requirements for reporting related to:

- I. FY09 Performance Evaluation
- II. FY10 Performance Funding Pool
- III. FY11 Budget Development Process

I. FY09 Performance

MAU performance evaluation and reporting guidelines are based on the State of Alaska's requirements, detailed in Appendix A (p. 3). Although use of the State's format has been optional in the past, it is now required. In addition, the university will begin external reporting of the new Non-Credit Instruction performance measure¹ added in 2007.

This year, MAU performance evaluations are due to Planning and Budget in the provided electronic template (Appendix B, p.6) by September 15, 2009. Note, in future years, this deadline will be moved to late August, allowing for timely submission of initial performance evaluations to the State of Alaska Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Following historical practice, preliminary FY09 values may be submitted for financial measures, i.e. university generated revenue and grant-funded research expenditures, with an opportunity for update if final figures are appreciably different.

Each MAU's performance evaluation submission will be used, in conjunction with MAU increment request detail, to compile initial MAU and UA system performance evaluations submitted to OMB. Each evaluation will be updated to reflect the Board of Regents' approved FY11 request, as well as the Governor's proposed FY11 budget, before finalization in December.

Publication of MAU level performance evaluations provides additional flexibility to highlight and detail MAU-specific strategies in support of progress on the common, system wide performance measures (referred to by the State as "End Results"). For example, UAA may use instructional and service grant activity metrics in addition to external research and UAF might report metrics for enrollment and retention on distinct student cohorts. Individual, MAU-specific strategy metrics will be discussed in the spring operating reviews and must be appropriate for external reporting, i.e. clearly defined and independently replicable from UA information systems.

II. FY10 Performance Funding Pool

Each MAU will control the distribution of its FY10 performance funding pool, to be used in support of performance-related strategies. One percent of general funds is the expected funding pool size, although annual circumstances will dictate the exact amount chosen by the MAU for internal reallocation. These performance funds should be allocated to appropriate strategic

¹ See http://www.alaska.edu/swbir/performance/metrics/Non-CreditMetric.pdf for more information on the non-credit instruction performance measure and implementation timeline.

investments and reported as part of the overall performance and accountability process. It is important to note that, although performance awards are MAU-based, accountability reporting for performance funding distributions and strategy success will continue to be required in the future.

III. FY11 Budget Development Process²

As a part of the FY11 operating request submission process, each MAU will be required to input:

- The quantitative positive impact of the request on each of the system wide performance measures, or for replacement funding requests the quantitative positive impact of the current program on each measure; and
- What MAU strategy specific sub-metric(s) will be tracked to measure intermediate
 progress toward moving common, system wide metric goals. For example, a budget
 request for a new high-demand program might propose tracking applications and
 enrollment in the program as a preliminary indicator of eventual increases in high
 demand graduates.

Many strategy specific sub-metrics could be appropriate to report in the MAU performance evaluations. The information submitted will be used to note the impact of the Governor's proposed budget on the system wide performance measures in relation to the Board of Regents' request.

2

 $^{^2~}See~approved~FY11~Operating~and~Capital~Budget~Request~Guidelines~for~full~details~on~requirements:~http://www.alaska.edu/swbir/budget/budget_planning/$

Appendix A State of Alaska Performance Evaluation Guidelines

Performance Framework

Performance is a program that provides Alaska residents with information on the state's goals for the future and reports how well it is doing. It assists in answering the question of whether government has spent money on services that produced results or created value residents expect. Performance information also provides a means of assessing proposed budget requests with the related changes in outcomes. Requests for changes in funding should incorporate performance information to help answer the following questions:

- What did we "get" for our previous investment?
- Will progress towards end results be improved or hindered by how much?
- What are the changes in outcomes with the proposed changes in funding?

The Performance Framework is summarized below. Included, *in italics*, are questions that agencies can use while performing a self-assessment of their existing Framework.

Mission: Conveys why an agency exists.

Short, concise reason for being. Establishes responsibility for end results. (This section uploads from ABS.)

• Will a reader understand and support the reason for having (or funding) the agency?

Core Services: Major functions that support achieving the mission.

(This section uploads from ABS.)

- Are the functions customer oriented rather than a listing or verbose explanation of internal activities?
- Will a reader quickly and easily understand the <u>major</u> functions of the agency?

End Results: The Bottom Line!

This describes what "happens" if the agency mission is achieved.

- What "of value" was brought to the public or customer?
- What is the "bottom line" of the program?
- Stay away from strategy words such as "improve" or "increase" instead state what situation will exist if the mission is achieved.

Strategies: Steps toward achieving the desired end result

Describes what must occur to create an environment or path that will lead towards the end results.

Do the strategies describe intermediate steps that will lead toward the end result?

Targets and Status: Provides information (evidence) on whether the:

- 1. Strategies are functional
- 2. End results are being achieved
- Does the data inform you that the strategies are working or that the agency is achieving its mission (a.k.a. desired end result)?

Appendix A State of Alaska Performance Evaluation Guidelines

• Are the target, the status, and the data all expressed in the same terms (i.e., % or number)?

The Performance website is directly linked to the ABS database. Some narrative entered in ABS is uploaded to the Performance website (Mission and Core Services). All other performance related information is entered in the Performance website and is downloaded to ABS on a regular basis. The website can be found at:

http://www.gov.state.ak.us/omb/results/index.php

Changes in FY2010

Departments were notified on July 1 that the new ABS Operating release changed the way Missions and Core Services are collected to encourage shorter Core Service listings and eliminate duplicative entry in both ABS and on the web.

Any department/RDU/Component on the Performance website in which every Core Service was under 500 characters had those Core Services transferred to ABS in July 2008 into both the FY2009 and FY2010 narrative. However, if a Department/RDU/Component had even one Core Service over the 500-character limit, none of the Department/RDU/Component's Core Services were transferred and so now need to be added to ABS.

Missions were transferred from the web into ABS (again, into both FY2009 and FY2010) mid-August 2008 for those Department/RDU/Components with a Performance Framework on the web.

Core services exist on the web

- For any Department/RDU/Component that has Core Services on the web, if the text could not be transferred due to the 500-character limit, the Core Services must be manually entered in ABS. OMB Analysts will enter those Core Services into ABS FY2009 narrative, condense them as needed and notify Departments to review.
- Each Department will need to coordinate with their OMB Analyst to ensure that ABS contains the most current web version FY2009 Mission and Core Services by September 15, 2008.
- OMB programmers will populate ABS FY2010 Core Services with the updated Core Services from ABS FY2009 shortly after September 15, 2008, for each Department/RDU/Component that has a web performance framework. This update will overwrite any Core Services that were previously entered into ABS FY2010.

In mid-September OMB will start automatically updating the Performance website with the updated ABS FY2009 Mission and Core Services. Once the automatic update begins, the web will be updated hourly from ABS and the website edit option for these two items will be removed. After mid-September, Department changes to the current published Mission and Core Services will need to be forwarded to the OMB Analyst for inclusion in the FY2009 ABS transfer to the website.

Appendix A State of Alaska Performance Evaluation Guidelines

No core services exist on the web

- Departments with RDUs or Components without a Performance Framework on the web (no mission or core services) will need to manually input their Core Services into ABS FY2010 Narrative.
- Each Core Service is limited to 500 characters. The list of Core Services should be relatively short. Core Services fields are text-only with no bullets, bolding or indenting. (Core Services will be formatted with bullets in the budget summary document so there should be no hyphens or any other "bullets" added to the beginning of each Core Service.)

Departments are encouraged to use the draft mode during FY2010 budget development and throughout each year when making proposed changes to the web-entered Performance Framework. Departments need to notify and confer with their OMB Analyst PRIOR to posting on the Performance website. If the situation warrants, OMB may restrict a department's web edit access to draft mode so that OMB may review and approve proposed departmental edits prior to their posting on the website.

All Performance Framework changes that Departments want reflected in their FY2010 Budget Summary need to be completed in the web by October 15th. Any changes to the Framework between October 15th and late December will require OMB Analyst approval prior to inclusion in the FY2010 Budget Summary. During that period, changes to the End Results, Strategies, Targets and Status will be allowed in draft mode for purposes of discussion with and approval by OMB. Changes to Data and Analysis will also require discussion with, approval by and input to the published web pages by OMB. OMB will review all performance information and contact Departments to discuss potential improvements.

The actual Performance data that will be in the FY2010 Budget Summary should be the latest available data as of the prior quarter. In some cases that may be through FY2008 or a prior fiscal year and in other instances, departments may be able to include data from the first quarter of FY2009.

For the FY2010 budget, Departments will edit, as needed, their Mission / Core Services in their ABS narrative and submit to OMB as usual for review. Once the Department has received OMB approval and has printed its FY2010 Budget Summary, the web will be "unlocked" and synchronized with approved Missions and Core Services from the FY2010 Budget Summary.

			M	AU Pr	opose	d Targ	gets ar	d Goa	als, FY1	10-FY	15					
High Demand Job Area Awards																
	Perform	nance		Percent Change												
Target Level High Nominal	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY08- FY09	FY09- FY10	FY10- FY11	FY11- FY12	FY12- FY13	FY13- FY14	FY14- FY15	
Low																
-	Undergraduate Retenti Performance Targets and Goals, FY11-FY15						n			Darsont (Thomas					
	Perform	iance	_	1 a	rgets and	Goals, F	(11-F Y 15		_	FY09-	FY10-	Percent C FY11-	FY12-	FY13-	FY14-	
Target Level	FY09	FY10		FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15		FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	
High																
Nominal																
Low																
						Ctudo	nt Cuadio	Поль								
	Student Credit Hours Performance Targets and Goals, FY10-FY15							Hours				Percent (Thange			
									FY08-	FY09-	FY10-	FY11-	FY12-	FY13-	FY14-	
Target Level	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	
High																
Nominal																
Low																
					Jon Cra	dit Instm	actional	Draduati	ivity Unita							
	Non-Credit Instructional Product Performance Targets and Goals, FY10-FY15					Percent Change										
m . r . 1			EVIO					FX/15	FY08-	FY09-	FY10-	FY11-	FY12-	FY13-	FY14-	
Target Level	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	
High																
Nominal																
Low																
					IJr	niversity	Generat	ed Reve	eniie							
	Perform	nance	University Generated Reve						Percent Change							
Torget Level	EVOS	EVOO	FY10	EV11	EV12	FY13	EV14	FY15	FY08- FY09	FY09-	FY10- FY11	FY11-	FY12- FY13	FY13- FY14	FY14- FY15	
Target Level	FY08	FY09	F110	FIII	F112	F113	Г114	F113	F109	FY10	ГПП	Г112	F113	Г114	F113	
High																
Nominal																
Low																
						Restr	icted Re	search								
	Perform	nance		Targets and Goals, FY10-FY1					Percent Chang							
Target Level	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY08- FY09	FY09- FY10	FY10- FY11	FY11- FY12	FY12- FY13	FY13- FY14	FY14- FY15	
High	1 100	1107	1110			1 1 1 5		1110	. 107							
Nominal																
Low																

High Demand Job Area Degrees, Certificates and Occupational Endorsements

Target: A target of #,### degrees and certificates awarded in high demand job area programs in FY11. **Status:** Prepare a status statement comparing the MAU FY09 performance on this measure to that of FY08 or FY05 and where it landed in relation to the FY09 Target.

[Insert Chart]
Analysis of results and challenges:
Campus Performance Highlights
Funding Impact
There is a delay between investments made in a program and degree production. This delay is due to a lag between enrollment growth and degree production, because it takes one to four years to complete most programs.
Past State-Funded Program Increments (if any)
Internal Reallocations (1% Performance Related and others)
FY11 Operating Request
FY11 Capital Request
Looking to the Future

A1: Strategy - Create MAU-specific Strategy

Looking to the Future -

University Generated Revenue

Target: A target of \$### million in university and federal receipts in FY11. Status: Prepare a status statement comparing the MAU FY09 performance on this measure to that of FY08 or FY05 and where it landed in relation to the FY09 Target. [Insert Chart] **Analysis of results and challenges:** Campus Performance Highlights **Funding Impact** Past State-Funded Program Increments (if any) <u>Internal Reallocations</u> (1% Performance Related and others) FY11 Operating Request FY11 Capital Request Looking to the Future

B1: Strategy – Create MAU-specific Strategy

Target #1: Create MAU-specific Target Based on the Measure

Status: Prepare a status statement comparing the MAU FY09 performance on this strategy target to that of FY08 and where it landed in relation to the FY09 Target.

[Insert Chart]

Analysis of results and challenges:

Funding Impact

Prior Year Program Increments (if any) –

Internal MAU Reallocations (1% Performance Related and others) –

FY11 Operating Program Increment Requests –

FY11 Capital Request -

Looking to the Future –

Target #2:

Status: Prepare a status statement comparing the MAU FY09 performance on this strategy target to that of FY08 and where it landed in relation to the FY09 Target.

[Insert Chart]

Analysis of results and challenges:

Funding Impact

Prior Year Program Increments (if any) –

Internal MAU Reallocations (1% Performance Related and others) –

FY11 Operating Program Increment Requests –

FY11 Capital Request -

Looking to the Future –

Restricted Research Expenditures

Target: A target of \$### million in grant funded expenditures in FY11. Status: Prepare a status statement comparing the MAU FY09 performance on this measure to that of FY08 or FY05 and where it landed in relation to the FY09 Target. [Insert Chart] Analysis of results and challenges: Campus Performance Highlights **Funding Impact** Past State-Funded Program Increments (if any) <u>Internal Reallocations</u> (1% Performance Related and others) **FY11 Operating Request** FY11 Capital Request Looking to the Future

C1: Strategy – Create MAU-specific Strategy

Looking to the Future -

Undergraduate Retention

Target: A target ##% retention rate for first-time, full-time students in undergraduate degree and certificate programs in FY11. Status: Prepare a status statement comparing the MAU FY09 performance on this measure to that of FY08 or FY05 and where it landed in relation to the FY09 Target. [Insert Chart] **Analysis of results and challenges:** Campus Performance Highlights **Funding Impact** Past State-Funded Program Increments (if any) <u>Internal Reallocations</u> (1% Performance Related and others) **FY11 Operating Request** FY11 Capital Request Looking to the Future

D1: Strategy - Create MAU-specific Strategy

Student Credit Hours

Target: A target of a ###,### Student Credit Hours (SCH) attempted in FY11. Status: Prepare a status statement comparing the MAU FY09 performance on this measure to that of FY08 or FY05 and where it landed in relation to the FY09 Target. [Insert Chart] Analysis of results and challenges: Campus Performance Highlights **Funding Impact** Past State-Funded Program Increments (if any) <u>Internal Reallocations</u> (1% Performance Related and others) FY11 Operating Request FY11 Capital Request Looking to the Future

E1: Strategy – Create MAU-specific Strategy

Looking to the Future -

Non-Credit Instructional Productivity Units

Target: A target of a ### Non-Credit Instructional Productivity Units (NCUs) attempted in FY11. **Status:** Prepare a status statement comparing the MAU FY09 performance on this measure to that of FY08 and where it landed in relation to the FY09 Target.

[Insert Chart]
Analysis of results and challenges:
Campus Performance Highlights
Funding Impact
Past State-Funded Program Increments (if any)
<u>Internal Reallocations</u> (1% Performance Related and others)
FY11 Operating Request
FY11 Capital Request
Looking to the Future

F1: Strategy – Create MAU-specific Strategy

Looking to the Future -