

QUALITY INDICATOR SYSTEM REPORT

December 2003

Introduction

This Quality Indicator System (QIS) report is the fifth since the inauguration of QIS in 1997. During 1997, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE), in collaboration with the governing boards of the state-supported institutions of higher education, implemented HB96-1219 which the General Assembly had passed during the 1996-97 legislative session. Outlining the General Assembly's initial expectations for a quality indicator system for Colorado's state-supported higher education system, HB96-1219 was refined during the 1999 legislative session through the enactment of SB99-229 which identified state goals and institutional actions as part of a revised QIS.

The specific quality indicators involved in QIS are similar to those used in the variety of quality indicator systems found in other states: graduation rates, freshmen retention and persistence rates, passing scores or rates on tests and licensure examinations, undergraduate class size, faculty teaching workload rates, and institutional support/administrative expenditures. The indicators utilized in Colorado's QIS are also used in the CCHE's performance funding system. (Readers interested in CCHE's performance funding system can find past reports detailing the performance funding system on the CCHE's web site, under Publications. Updates for this year's QIS, as part of the Fiscal Year 2005 funding request, will be placed on the CCHE web site as completed).

This report includes a description of the nine indicators used in QIS, the institutional data for each, as well as the benchmarks for measuring institutional performance, where applicable.

Background

Colorado is one of nearly forty states that has implemented some type of a performance measurement system for their state-supported institutions of higher education. While many states rely on a greater number of indicators than Colorado (e.g., Missouri – 24, Wisconsin - 21, Kentucky – 16, Virginia – 14, Washington – 13), Colorado's QIS keeps the overall number of indicators to ten or fewer (with subcomponents). Like Colorado, other states periodically change their indicators to reflect policy changes or to enhance specified goals and objectives.

Along with the indicators common to other states, Colorado's QIS has unique aspects which result from specifics contained in SB99-229. First and foremost, Colorado's QIS focuses solely on undergraduate education. Graduate level education and research are not specifically contained in SB99-229 and thus, neither is included explicitly in Colorado's QIS. The exclusion of these two vital aspects of Colorado's higher education enterprise should not be construed as a devaluing of either, as both are recognized by the state and CCHE as important.

To the extent possible, the performance of each Colorado state-supported institution, as measured by QIS, is compared to an individual benchmark for each indicator (or subcomponent). The benchmarks are based on the performance levels of institutions from across the country representing a national comparison group for the individual Colorado institution (i.e., institutions from across the country with similar roles and missions, enrollment size, program array and complexity, etc.). To ensure that each Colorado institution has a relevant comparison group for an indicator, the comparison groups may differ from indicator to indicator. In some cases, however, the comparison group is limited by the availability of national databases and/or reliable data from similar institutions. In such cases, recent performance of the institution itself serves as the benchmark, with the expectation that improvement will occur.

Purposes of QIS

Purpose 1: Encouraging Continuous Improvement by Institutions in Achieving High Levels of Performance

In the decade of the 1990s, higher education conscientiously addressed the public expectation for an effective framework to ensure quality and accountability. Colorado's heightened attention to quality and accountability occurred in 1996 with the passage of HB96-1219, known as the Higher Education Quality Assurance Act. This legislation outlined the General Assembly's expectations and goals for higher education. It also urged higher education to "...concentrate on improving both the quality and cost-effectiveness of higher education in the state." (CRS 23-13-102) The QIS reflects this statutory purpose by encouraging state-supported institutions of higher education to strive for continuous improvement in achieving high levels of performance. This purpose is reinforced by the Commission's Performance Funding System which recognized annual improvement in performance as measured by several performance measures, (Interested readers can obtain information about the Commission's Performance Funding System by referring to the Commission's website).

Purpose 2: Measuring Institutional Performance and Accountability

Since 1985, Colorado's state-supported institutions of higher education have been involved in accountability reporting vis-à-vis several laws (HB85-11-87, HB91-1002, SB93-136, HB94-1110, and HB96-1219). The Higher Education Quality Assurance Act (HB96-1219) was refined in 1999 with the passage of SB99-229. Through this refinement, the General Assembly mandated the establishment of "...a quality indicator system to measure the overall performance of the statewide system of higher education and each governing board's and each institution's performance in achieving the statewide expectations and goals..." (CRS 23-13-105) In establishing the statewide expectations and goals, the General Assembly further expressed its expectation that "...each institution...shall work toward achieving a high quality, efficient, and expeditious undergraduate education..." (CRS 23-13-104(a)) The QIS serves as an accountability reporting process as related to these statewide expectations and goals.

Purpose 3: Determining Funding Recommendations and the Funding Distribution for the Higher Education System

The incorporation of QIS in the Commission's funding recommendation and distribution formula for the higher education system is specified in statute: "The commission shall make annual system-wide funding recommendations...in making its recommendations, the commission shall consider each governing board's and each institution's level of achievement of the statewide expectations and goals...as measured by data collected through the quality indicator system..." (CRS 23-1-105(2)) and "The commission shall establish...the distribution formula of general fund appropriations...to each governing board under the following principles...To reflect the governing board's and the institution's level of achievement of the statewide expectations and goals...as measured by data from the quality indicator system..." (CRS 23-1-105(3)(d))

Purpose 4: Build Public Support for Increased Funding for Higher Education

A recent survey of Colorado residents identified higher education as having a high level of respect with the institutions of higher education viewed as providing quality educational experiences. However, this high level of regard has not translated into a level of financial support for higher education as measured by higher education's share of the state budget. For several years, higher education staked its financial future on a growing enrollment and inflation as the primary means for keeping education's percent of the state budget on pace with the rest of state government. Unfortunately, enrollment growth often fell short of expectations. Consequently, higher education lost ground in funding support. In the past two years, however, university and college enrollments soared while the state's budget reflected the fallout of the national economy and the high technology bust. Thus, general fund support declined significantly during these years.

A strategy of building public support for increased funding for higher education is embodied in the utilization of data from QIS in the performance funding system and the College Guide. Clear, concise reporting of aspects of higher education that matter intuitively to the public – graduation rates, achievement levels of recent graduates, freshmen retention and persistence rates, class size, overhead costs – the willingness to set high performance expectations and standards (benchmarks), and the openness to compare the performance of Colorado’s institutions with the performance of like institutions across the country, these all provide a foundation which can be used to request increased financial support for higher education.

Balance and Limitations Inherent in Any Quality Indicator System

Each state-supported institution of higher education in Colorado has a particular role and mission. Each has an admission selectivity level assigned to it by statute. Each has its own particular set of academic and student support programs and services. Each has relationships with its local community, region, and the state. Some have national and international relationships. Traditions have shaped each institution. Taken as a whole, each institution has aspects that cannot be adequately taken into account or measured by any system, no matter how sophisticated that system may be when, by design, the system incorporates some amount of uniformity and commonality among the institutions. This is a limitation of any quality indicator or performance measurement system that seeks to include all institutions in some common format and approach. Whatever the quality indicator or performance measurement system employed, it must recognize this limitation and strive to balance the diversity of institutions and their respective differences with the commonality and uniformity inherent in the quality indicator or performance measurement system.

On the other hand, all state-supported institutions should be able to demonstrate good educational and administrative practices in offering their programs, allocating their resources, and being accountable to their students, taxpayers, and the public. As state-supported institutions of higher education that benefit from public funds, state-supported institutions have a special obligation to be accountable to the citizens of the state. This balance must also be achieved by a quality indicator or performance measurement system. It is believed that the quality indicator system reflected in this report strikes this balance by honoring the diversity of Colorado’s state-supported institutions of higher education while promoting continuous improvement in their operations through accountability.

QUALITY INDICATORS FOR 2003-04

Indicator 1A: Baccalaureate Graduation Rates (four-year institutions)

For baccalaureate degree-granting institutions, graduation rates are the single most common indicator used by quality indicator and performance measurement systems across the many states that use some form of a quality indicator or performance measurement system. Its inclusion is reflected in the fact that graduation rates are reported nationally by educational organizations, publications (e.g., *US News and World Report*), and other states.

Colorado’s QIS mirrors the nation’s and other states’ utilization of a similar indicator. Four-five, and six year graduation rates are calculated for each baccalaureate degree-granting institution based on the nationally accepted definition of a first-time, entering, full-time, degree-seeking student. Students meeting these criteria and beginning at a specified time constitute an entering cohort upon which the measurement is based. A graduation rate for students completing at their original institution is calculated along with a graduation rate from any four-year institution in Colorado’s state-supported system of higher education. For the latter measure, students transferring to private institutions in Colorado and to institutions outside Colorado are not counted. Since some institutions have more of a transfer role than others, the graduation rate from any four-year institution in Colorado’s state-supported system of higher education is meant to recognize this important component of an institutions’ role and mission.

Benchmark ranges for the indicator measuring graduation rates from the original institution are based on a national comparison group of similar institutions, with a predicted rate calculated based on the cohort's average test scores and percentage of undergraduates that are enrolled part-time. The benchmark midpoint equals 102% of the predicted rate. The benchmark range is the midpoint plus or minus two percentage points. The benchmark for the indicator measuring graduation rates from any four-year institution in Colorado's state-supported higher education system is based on each institution's recent performance, with the emphasis on improvement from the past year's performance level.

Indicator 1B: Three-Year Graduation Rates (two-year institutions)

This indicator is the equivalent indicator for two-year institutions as indicator 1A is for four-year institutions. This indicator measures the three-year graduation rate for first-time, full-time, certificate or associate degree-seeking freshmen who entered a two-year institution in summer or fall 1999 and either graduated from the original institution or another two-year institution in Colorado's state-supported institution of higher education within three years after entry. Individual institution benchmark values are based on recent performance with the expectation for improvement from the past year's performance level.

Indicators 2A and 2B: Freshmen Retention and Persistence Rates

These indicators mirror similar indicators used by other states which measure the percentage of first-time, full-time, certificate or degree-seeking freshmen entering in summer or fall 2001 who either completed a program by August 2002, were enrolled in the fall 2002 term at the same institution, or transferred to another Colorado state-supported institution of higher education and enrolled at that institution in the fall 2002 term. Benchmarks for the four-year institutions are based on national comparison groups, with a predicted rate calculated based on the cohort's average test scores and percentage of undergraduates that are enrolled part-time. The benchmark midpoint equals 102% of the predicted rate. The benchmark range is the midpoint plus or minus two percentage points. A second benchmark reflects recent performance of the institution with an expectation for improvement from the past year's level of performance. Benchmarks for the two-year institutions are based on recent performance with an expectation for improvement from the past year's level of performance.

Indicators 3A and 3B: Support and Success of Minority Students

These two indicators take the six-year graduation (from four-year institutions), three-year graduation (from two-year institutions), freshmen retention, and freshmen persistence rate indicators and measure them for first-time, full-time, certificate and degree-seeking freshmen minority students. Benchmarks are calculated as above.

Factors to Keep in Mind When Interpreting Graduation, Retention, and Persistence Rates

Following nationally-recognized definitions, the entering cohorts tracked in the QIS graduation, retention, and persistence rate indicators (indicators 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B) are limited to first-time, degree-seeking freshmen who entered the institution in the summer or fall and were enrolled full-time in their first fall term. All other undergraduate students new to the institution are excluded from the entering cohorts (e.g., freshmen enrolled part-time their first term, all non-degree students, and all transfer students).

For some institutions, a large percentage of their new undergraduates may be non-degree seeking students, transfers, or part-time. This translates into a small cohort for QIS purposes. Once the entry cohort is formed, no students are added, and students are removed only for death, military service, or missionary service. Finally, one also should be mindful that, while a student may have enrolled full-time in his or her first term of attendance, the student may register on either a full-or part-time basis in subsequent terms but continue to be included in the QIS calculation.

Indicator 4A: Achievement Scores on Licensure, Professional, Graduate School Admission, and Other Examinations taken by Baccalaureate Graduates (four-year institutions)

How well institutions have prepared their students is captured, in part, by how well graduating students perform on various comprehensive examinations, tests, and discipline or professional-specific licensure or certification examinations. This indicator is included in most quality indicator or performance measurement systems of other states. Benchmarks are national or statewide passing rates and scores. Passing rates and scores are reported only for institutions with 20 or more test takers over two years.

Indicator 4B: Career and Technical Graduates Employed or Continuing Their Education (two-year institutions)

A significant aspect of the role and mission of the two-year institutions is the provision of trained and skilled employees for the workforce, especially in technical areas. For some students at two-year institutions, this translates into employment immediately following their graduation. For other students, continued education at another institution is required prior to joining or re-entering the workforce. The benchmark is 90%, thereby taking into account students who may not become employed or continue their education for personal reasons related to family or exceptional circumstances.

Indicator 5: Institutional Support Expenditures

Each institution's operating budget is categorized in accordance with specific reporting requirements associated with the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO). One category – institutional support expenditures – most closely encompasses those expenditures considered to support the administration of the institution. The amount of institutional support expenditures per FTE student and the percent of the overall Educational and General operating budget represented by institutional support expenditures serve as proxies for the level of expenditures for administration, according to the role and mission, and enrollment size of the institution. Individual institutional benchmarks are based on performance levels of comparison groups.

Factors to Keep in Mind When Interpreting Indicator 5

The expenditure categories used by higher education institutions for the reporting of expenditures allow for differing assignment of functions, depending on the organizational structure of the institution. An expenditure at one institution may be categorized one way, while another institution may assign the expenditure to another category. Both institutions may be correct in their assignment of the expenditure since the particular organizational structure of the institution dictates how the expenditure is categorized. For institutions with numerous delivery sites (e.g., Colorado Mountain College), this indicator should be reviewed in the context associated with administering multiple delivery sites.

Indicator 6: Undergraduate Class Size

The inclusion of undergraduate class size by *US News and World Report* in its annual guide, *America's Best Colleges*, has brought added attention to this indicator which measures the percent of undergraduate class sections having an enrollment less than or greater than certain sizes. For the four-year institutions, the benchmarks are taken from the *US News and World Report's* publication. For the two-year institutions, the benchmarks are based on recent performance with an expectation of improvement from the past year's performance levels.

Indicator 7: Faculty Teaching Workload

The average number of hours per week devoted to organized class meetings by full-time faculty constitutes this indicator. Organized class meetings include lectures and seminars, laboratories, field instruction, studios, and on-line delivery of courses. The hours per week that are measured do not include class preparation time, grading, student advising, or individualized instruction such as independent study or supervision of dissertations, thesis, internships, cooperative education, and student teaching. National comparative data by type of institution is used for the benchmarks.

Indicators 8 and 9: Indicators Selected by the Institution

No common set of quality indicators captures the diversity and unique aspects of Colorado's twenty-eight state-supported institutions of higher education. In recognition of the diversity of Colorado's system of state-supported institutions of higher education and the individuality of each institution, two institution-specific indicators were identified by each institution which the institution felt best demonstrated its efforts to promote and enhance quality, efficiency or expediency at the undergraduate level. Like the indicators, benchmarks also were chosen by the institution.

**QIS Measure 1A: BACCALAUREATE GRADUATION RATES
AFTER FOUR, FIVE, AND SIX YEARS AT
COLORADO PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
Fall 1996, 1997, and 1998 Cohorts**

Institution	Base Year* For Cohort Entering In Fall --	# Students In Entering Cohort**	Cumulative % Graduating Four Yrs After Entry From --			Cumulative % Graduating Five Yrs After Entry From --			Cumulative % Graduating Six Yrs After Entry From --			Benchmark***	
			Orig Inst	Transf Inst	All CO Public Inst	Orig Inst	Transf Inst	All CO Public Inst	Orig Inst	Transf Inst	All CO Public Inst	Orig Inst	All CO Public Inst
			Adams State Coll	1994	437	17.4	2.3	19.7	27.5	5.9	33.4	30.4	8.7
	1995	449	13.4	2.0	15.4	27.4	4.2	31.6	31.6	7.6	39.2		
	1996	431	15.8	1.9	17.6	24.6	5.1	29.7	27.8	6.5	34.3	32.6 - 36.6	40.0
	1997	420	15.7	3.1	18.8	27.9	7.9	35.7	-	-	-	28.1 - 32.1	31.3
	1998	483	15.7	2.1	17.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.4 - 17.4	19.2
Colo State Univ	1994	2,291	29.1	0.8	29.9	57.0	2.9	59.9	61.9	4.1	66.0		
	1995	2,568	31.4	1.1	32.5	57.4	3.4	60.8	62.4	4.3	66.7		
	1996	2,723	31.2	1.3	32.5	58.9	3.8	62.7	62.9	5.2	68.1	58.4 - 62.4	68.1
	1997	2,639	32.8	1.1	34.0	57.9	3.6	61.4	-	-	-	52.7 - 56.7	63.9
	1998	3,055	33.8	1.4	35.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	26.9 - 30.9	34.6
Univ of Southern Colo (to be CSU-Pueblo)	1994	640	9.8	0.8	10.6	23.1	4.8	28.0	27.5	6.1	33.6		
	1995	590	11.7	0.8	12.5	22.0	5.3	27.3	26.6	8.3	34.9		
	1996	574	11.8	0.7	12.5	23.5	3.8	27.4	29.8	4.7	34.5	32.6 - 36.6	35.6
	1997	584	8.4	0.2	8.6	23.8	2.6	26.4	-	-	-	28.1 - 32.1	27.9
	1998	620	12.4	1.9	14.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.4 - 17.4	10.8
Fort Lewis Coll	1994	875	12.3	2.1	14.4	27.5	7.0	34.5	31.1	11.0	42.1		
	1995	1,012	9.5	2.2	11.7	22.9	6.7	29.6	28.1	10.5	38.5		
	1996	1,131	10.8	2.1	12.9	24.8	8.8	33.6	29.5	11.5	41.0	32.6 - 36.6	40.6
	1997	1,057	9.3	1.0	10.3	25.9	7.0	32.9	-	-	-	28.1 - 32.1	34.3
	1998	970	11.0	2.1	13.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.4 - 17.4	11.8
Mesa State Coll	1994	662	6.5	1.2	7.7	18.9	5.0	23.9	24.5	7.3	31.7		
	1995	667	9.0	2.5	11.5	20.1	7.8	27.9	27.4	11.1	38.5		
	1996	630	9.7	2.2	11.9	23.8	6.2	30.0	29.7	9.5	39.2	38.1 - 42.1	39.3
	1997	706	11.0	2.1	13.2	23.5	8.2	31.7	-	-	-	30.3 - 34.3	30.6
	1998	663	13.0	2.1	15.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.4 - 15.4	13.4
Metropolitan State Coll of Denver	1994	1,254	4.3	1.3	5.6	12.8	4.8	17.5	19.1	7.0	26.2		
	1995	1,239	3.9	0.9	4.8	14.9	4.4	19.4	21.5	6.6	28.1		
	1996	1,324	3.9	0.8	4.7	13.7	3.4	17.1	20.8	5.3	26.1	21.0 - 25.0	28.6
	1997	1,478	4.7	0.9	5.6	13.9	4.5	18.3	-	-	-	13.5 - 17.5	18.6
	1998	1,382	5.8	1.1	6.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.2 - 12.2	5.7
Univ of Colo - Boulder	1994	3,591	35.6	0.9	36.5	58.8	2.3	61.0	64.4	3.2	67.6		
	1995	4,164	34.8	0.4	35.2	60.2	2.2	62.4	65.4	3.4	68.8		
	1996	3,946	38.8	0.7	39.5	62.4	2.4	64.8	66.8	3.5	70.3	64.3 - 68.3	70.2
	1997	4,259	36.7	0.7	37.4	62.6	2.3	65.0	-	-	-	58.2 - 62.2	66.1
	1998	4,267	36.1	0.8	36.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	32.0 - 36.0	39.2
Univ of Colo - Colo Springs	1994	328	12.5	1.5	14.0	28.4	7.9	36.3	34.5	9.5	43.9		
	1995	373	10.7	3.5	14.2	24.9	9.9	34.9	29.0	11.3	40.2		
	1996	385	18.2	1.8	20.0	33.5	8.3	41.8	37.4	10.9	48.3	40.8 - 44.8	45.1
	1997	542	17.5	2.2	19.7	30.8	7.0	37.8	-	-	-	34.1 - 38.1	42.7
	1998	665	17.9	2.0	19.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	22.3 - 26.3	20.3
Univ of Colo - Denver	1994	265	11.7	2.3	14.0	33.2	6.8	40.0	37.4	10.6	47.9		
	1995	266	15.4	2.6	18.0	32.3	4.9	37.2	40.2	6.8	47.0		
	1996	375	14.4	2.7	17.1	34.9	7.5	42.4	43.7	10.7	54.4	33.7 - 37.7	51.7
	1997	439	14.4	2.3	16.6	32.6	6.4	39.0	-	-	-	24.6 - 28.6	43.2
	1998	394	15.0	2.3	17.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	17.4 - 21.4	17.2
Univ of Northern Colo	1994	1,609	21.0	1.6	22.6	39.9	5.9	45.8	44.3	9.2	53.4		
	1995	1,763	22.9	1.9	24.7	40.8	5.3	46.2	45.5	8.6	54.1		
	1996	1,642	25.1	2.2	27.3	43.2	6.7	49.9	47.1	9.9	56.9	48.9 - 52.9	55.1
	1997	1,908	25.7	1.0	26.7	43.2	6.1	49.3	-	-	-	45.4 - 49.4	50.9
	1998	2,164	23.8	1.8	25.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	17.9 - 21.9	27.5
Western State Coll	1994	608	10.0	0.8	10.9	22.2	5.1	27.3	28.0	8.2	36.2		
	1995	599	10.5	1.8	12.4	23.4	8.2	31.6	27.5	10.7	38.2		
	1996	632	12.0	1.7	13.8	27.1	6.0	33.1	30.4	8.2	38.6	32.6 - 36.6	39.0
	1997	562	13.7	1.8	15.5	27.4	5.9	33.3	-	-	-	28.1 - 32.1	33.7
	1998	591	13.5	1.2	14.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.4 - 17.4	15.8
Four-Year Inst Total	1994	12,560	22.0	1.2	23.2	41.1	4.2	45.4	46.3	6.2	52.4		
	1995	13,690	22.9	1.3	24.2	42.5	4.4	46.9	47.8	6.4	54.1	n/a	n/a
	1996	13,793	24.4	1.4	25.8	43.9	4.6	48.5	48.7	6.5	55.1	n/a	n/a
	1997	14,594	24.1	1.1	25.2	43.7	4.5	48.2	-	-	-	n/a	n/a
	1998	15,254	25.0	1.4	26.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Base year cohort is 1998 for four-year graduation rate, 1997 for five-year rate, and 1996 for six-year rate; graduate totals based on specified number of academic years plus the following summer.

**Cohort based on first-time, full-time, baccalaureate degree-seeking students entering in specified fall term or prior summer.

Source: Cohort and benchmark calculation based on SURDS files and institutional data; g:\QIS\2002\tables\1A_2A_Grads_3A_3C_Ret_4yr.xls

***Benchmark midpoint is 102% of rate predicted for the cohort, given cohort average test scores and percentage of undergraduates enrolled part-time. Benchmark range is midpoint plus/minus two percentage points. Benchmark for all Colorado Public Institutions is 102% of prior year if there was improvement last year, or

**QIS Measure 1B: GRADUATION RATES AFTER THREE YEARS FROM
 COLORADO PUBLIC TWO-YEAR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
 Fall 1999 Cohort**

Institution	Cohort Entering in Fall --	# Students in Entering Cohort**	Cumulative % Graduating With Cert or Assoc Degree Three Years After Entry From --			Benchmark	
			Orig Inst	Transf Inst	All CO Public Inst	Orig Inst	All CO Public Inst
Aims Comm Coll	1997	387	20.9	0.5	21.4	18.2	18.7
	1998	429	14.7	0.5	15.2		
	1999	300	27.7	0.7	28.3		
Arapahoe Comm Coll	1997	295	15.3	0.3	15.6	20.1	20.7
	1998	295	19.7	0.7	20.3		
	1999	285	21.8	0.7	22.5		
Colo Mountain Coll	1997	458	21.6	1.3	22.9	20.8	21.7
	1998	412	19.2	0.5	19.7		
	1999	383	19.3	1.0	20.4		
Colo NW Comm Coll	1997	159	23.9	1.3	25.2	27.3	30.5
	1998	127	26.8	3.1	29.9		
	1999	112	24.1	0.0	24.1		
Comm Coll of Aurora	1997	227	5.7	0.9	6.6	14.8	15.6
	1998	235	14.5	0.9	15.3		
	1999	320	37.8	0.6	38.4		
Comm Coll of Denver	1997	493	12.6	0.4	13.0	16.3	16.6
	1998	493	16.0	0.2	16.2		
	1999	494	15.4	0.4	15.8		
Front Range Comm Coll	1997	947	17.4	0.8	18.3	17.5	18.4
	1998	830	17.0	0.8	17.8		
	1999	912	15.5	1.1	16.6		
Lamar Comm Coll	1997	160	30.6	1.9	32.5	32.3	34.9
	1998	158	31.6	2.5	34.2		
	1999	113	32.7	0.9	33.6		
Morgan Comm Coll	1997	75	20.0	1.3	21.3	46.9	46.9
	1998	50	46.0	0.0	46.0		
	1999	67	37.3	1.5	38.8		
Northeastern Junior Coll	1997	338	39.6	0.6	40.2	40.3	41.1
	1998	320	39.4	0.9	40.3		
	1999	275	35.6	1.5	37.1		
Otero Junior Coll	1997	232	33.6	2.6	36.2	41.4	43.1
	1998	180	40.6	1.7	42.2		
	1999	211	41.2	0.9	42.2		
Pikes Peak Comm Coll	1997	649	12.5	0.5	12.9	12.2	12.8
	1998	738	11.4	0.7	12.1		
	1999	673	10.8	0.0	10.8		
Pueblo Comm Coll	1997	252	13.5	0.4	13.9	23.7	24.1
	1998	301	23.3	0.3	23.6		
	1999	247	8.5	0.0	8.5		
Red Rocks Comm Coll	1997	423	16.8	1.4	18.2	17.8	18.5
	1998	425	17.4	0.7	18.1		
	1998	345	13.9	2.0	15.9		
Trinidad State Jun Coll	1997	283	35.7	0.7	36.4	35.1	35.8
	1998	236	33.1	0.8	33.9		
	1999	236	32.6	0.8	33.5		
Two-Year Inst Total	1997	5,378	19.8	0.9	20.7	n/a	n/a
	1998	5,229	20.4	0.8	21.2		
	1999	4,973	21.1	0.8	21.9		

**Base year cohort is 1997 for three-year

Cohort based on first-time, full-time, certificate and associate degree-seeking students entering in specified fall term or prior summer.

Beginning with QIS 2002, students with registration status=2 were excluded from cohorts.

Benchmark is 102% of prior year if improvement last year, 102% of prior two years average if did not improve.

Source: Cohort and benchmark calculations based on SURDS files: g\QIS\2002\tables\1B_2B_Grads_3B_3D_Ret_2yr.xls

**QIS Measure 2A: RETENTION RATES
ONE YEAR AFTER ENTRY BY
COLORADO PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
Fall 2001 Cohort**

Institution	Base Year* For Cohort Entering In Fall --	# Students In Entering Cohort**	Percent Retained One Year After Entry From --			Benchmark***	
			Orig Inst	Transf Inst	All CO Public Inst	Orig Inst	All CO Public Inst
Adams State Coll	1999	416	63.2	10.8	74.0	67.8 - 71.8	73.4
	2000	423	58.6	11.3	70.0		
	2001	444	57.4	12.4	69.8		
Colo State Univ	1999	3,119	83.1	5.0	88.2	80.4 - 84.4	90.2
	2000	3,261	81.9	6.5	88.4		
	2001	3,685	83.1	6.2	89.3		
Univ of Southern Colo (to be CSU-Pueblo)	1999	611	66.1	12.1	78.2	67.8 - 71.8	78.8
	2000	641	64.1	12.2	76.3		
	2001	626	64.4	11.8	76.2		
Fort Lewis Coll	1999	998	55.6	12.5	68.1	67.8 - 71.8	68.4
	2000	983	54.7	11.3	66.0		
	2001	1,097	52.9	14.1	67.0		
Mesa State Coll	1999	626	57.7	13.7	71.4	67.8 - 71.8	71.3
	2000	668	60.3	8.1	68.4		
	2001	589	60.4	10.7	71.1		
Metropolitan State Coll of Denver	1999	1,440	59.9	8.9	68.8	65.2 - 69.2	72.5
	2000	1,548	62.1	9.0	71.1		
	2001	1,738	60.8	10.3	71.1		
Univ of Colo - Boulder	1999	4,552	83.4	4.2	87.6	84.2 - 88.2	88.6
	2000	5,052	82.3	3.8	86.0		
	2001	4,969	83.3	4.0	87.3		
Univ of Colo - Colo Spr	1999	684	63.2	10.7	73.8	66.1 - 70.1	77.7
	2000	743	63.7	12.5	76.2		
	2001	772	64.2	13.1	77.3		
Univ of Colo - Denver	1999	478	70.3	10.7	81.0	68.3 - 72.3	80.9
	2000	515	68.3	9.3	77.7		
	2001	492	68.1	12.6	80.7		
Univ of Northern Colo	1999	2,293	69.9	12.3	82.3	77.1 - 81.1	84.7
	2000	2,115	68.9	14.1	83.0		
	2001	2,105	68.2	14.7	82.9		
Western State Coll	1999	557	58.3	14.4	72.7	67.8 - 71.8	73.5
	2000	500	52.8	18.6	71.4		
	2001	582	58.2	14.3	72.5		
Four-Year Inst Total	1999	15,774	73.1	8.2	81.3	n/a	n/a
	2000	16,449	72.6	8.3	80.9		
	2001	17,099	73.0	8.8	82.0		

*Base year cohort is 2001.

**Cohort based on first-time, full-time, baccalaureate degree-seeking students entering in specified fall term or prior summer.

Source: Cohort and benchmark calculation based on SURDS files and institutional data; g:\QIS\2002\tables\1A_2A_Grads_3A_3C_Ret_4yr.xls

***Benchmark midpoint is 102% of rate predicted for the cohort, given cohort average test scores and percentage of undergraduates midpoint plus/minus two percentage points. Benchmark for all Colorado Public Institutions is 102% of prior year if there was improvement last year, or 102% of prior two years average if this indicator was not improved.

**QIS Measure 2B: RETENTION RATES ONE YEAR AFTER ENTRY BY
COLORADO PUBLIC TWO-YEAR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
Fall 2001 Cohort**

Institution	Base Year** For Cohort Entering In Fall --	# Students In Entering Cohort**	Percent Successful One Year After Entry At --			Benchmark	
			Orig Inst	Transf Inst	All CO Public Inst	Orig Inst	All CO Public Inst
Aims Comm Coll	1999	300	59.7	6.0	65.7	51.0	68.3
	2000	453	40.4	7.9	48.3		
	2001	407	51.1	10.1	61.2		
Arapahoe Comm Coll	1999	285	54.0	8.8	62.8	52.1	65.4
	2000	241	48.1	12.0	60.2		
	2001	447	51.7	13.0	64.7		
Colo Mountain Coll	1999	383	46.0	9.7	55.6	52.5	63.1
	2000	525	51.4	10.5	61.9		
	2001	367	47.7	11.4	59.1		
Colo NW Comm Coll	1999	112	45.5	10.7	56.3	57.7	71.0
	2000	115	56.5	13.0	69.6		
	2001	97	46.4	15.5	61.9		
Comm Coll of Aurora	1999	320	66.6	5.9	72.5	57.5	75.5
	2000	322	46.3	7.8	54.0		
	2001	352	48.0	8.0	56.0		
Comm Coll of Denver	1999	494	48.6	7.9	56.5	55.2	59.7
	2000	429	54.1	4.4	58.5		
	2001	502	54.0	5.0	59.0		
Front Range Comm Coll	1999	912	47.6	10.3	57.9	53.1	63.0
	2000	940	52.0	9.8	61.8		
	2001	1,359	51.7	12.2	63.9		
Lamar Comm Coll	1999	113	53.1	7.1	60.2	56.4	62.9
	2000	103	55.3	3.9	59.2		
	2001	183	56.8	10.4	67.2		
Morgan Comm Coll	1999	67	52.2	9.0	61.2	72.1	79.6
	2000	41	70.7	7.3	78.0		
	2001	37	59.5	2.7	62.2		
Northeastern Junior Coll	1999	275	56.0	9.1	65.1	59.2	72.4
	2000	317	58.0	12.9	71.0		
	2001	324	54.3	12.3	66.7		
Otero Junior Coll	1999	211	53.6	8.1	61.6	55.7	64.7
	2000	216	54.6	8.8	63.4		
	2001	342	45.6	12.3	57.9		
Pikes Peak Comm Coll	1999	673	44.7	4.8	49.5	48.7	55.2
	2000	656	47.7	6.4	54.1		
	2001	763	50.7	6.2	56.9		
Pueblo Comm Coll	1999	247	50.6	4.0	54.7	52.3	57.7
	2000	265	51.3	5.3	56.6		
	2001	344	56.1	5.8	61.9		
Red Rocks Comm Coll	1999	345	47.2	9.6	56.8	48.0	58.3
	2000	406	46.8	10.3	57.1		
	2001	481	55.9	9.8	65.7		
Trinidad State Jun Coll	1999	236	53.4	6.4	59.7	50.3	62.1
	2000	254	45.3	4.7	50.0		
	2001	307	53.7	7.5	61.2		
Two-Year Inst Total	1999	4,973	50.8	7.8	58.6	n/a	n/a
	2000	5,283	50.1	8.5	58.6		
	2001	6,312	51.9	9.7	61.6		

**Base year cohort is 2001; graduate totals based on Cohort based on first-time, full-time, certificate and associate degree-seeking students entering in specified fall term or prior summer.

**QIS Measure 3A: BACCALAUREATE GRADUATION RATES
AFTER SIX YEARS AT
COLORADO PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
Fall 1995 Minority Cohort**

Institution	Base Year* For Cohort Entering In Fall --	# Students In Entering Cohort**	Cumulative % Graduating Six Yrs After Entry From --			Benchmark***	
			Orig Inst	Transf Inst	All CO Public Inst	Orig Inst	All CO Public Inst
Adams State Coll	1994	129	23.3	7.8	31.0	29.2 -33.2	37.6
	1995	122	32.0	4.9	36.9		
	1996	122	15.6	9.0	24.6		
Colo State Univ	1994	332	50.3	4.2	54.5	48.6 - 52.6	59.7
	1995	345	54.5	4.1	58.6		
	1996	463	56.0	5.7	61.7		
Univ of Southern Colo (to be CSU-Pueblo)	1994	203	21.2	3.0	24.1	29.2 -33.2	25.6
	1995	199	17.6	7.5	25.1		
	1996	173	24.9	4.0	28.9		
Fort Lewis Coll	1994	139	24.5	5.8	30.2	29.2 -33.2	29.8
	1995	195	25.6	2.6	28.2		
	1996	195	27.7	5.6	33.3		
Mesa State Coll	1994	78	23.1	5.1	28.2	29.2 -33.2	36.0
	1995	85	25.9	9.4	35.3		
	1996	67	28.4	7.5	35.8		
Metropolitan State Coll of Denver	1994	345	12.8	1.4	14.2	8.1 - 12.1	22.3
	1995	403	19.4	2.5	21.8		
	1996	392	16.6	3.8	20.4		
Univ of Colo - Boulder	1994	685	51.4	3.6	55.0	50.8 - 54.8	59.3
	1995	655	52.8	5.3	58.2		
	1996	577	56.2	4.7	60.8		
Univ of Colo - Colo Spr	1994	62	32.3	9.7	41.9	32.3 - 34.3	39.1
	1995	75	26.7	8.0	34.7		
	1996	72	37.5	8.3	45.8		
Univ of Colo - Denver	1994	121	29.8	5.8	35.5	21.8 - 25.8	47.5
	1995	131	42.0	4.6	46.6		
	1996	128	50.0	3.9	53.9		
Univ of Northern Colo	1994	270	39.6	3.0	42.6	37.8 - 41.8	46.0
	1995	297	38.7	6.4	45.1		
	1996	257	44.4	7.0	51.4		
Western State Coll	1994	48	31.3	4.2	35.4	29.2 -33.2	39.1
	1995	60	25.0	13.3	38.3		
	1996	51	21.6	5.9	27.5		
Four-Year Inst Total	1994	2,412	35.9	3.9	39.8	n/a	n/a
	1995	2,567	37.5	5.1	42.7		
	1996	3,020	31.0	4.2	35.2		

*Base year cohort is 1996 for six-year rate; graduate totals based on specified number of academic years plus the following summer.

**Cohort based on first-time, full-time, baccalaureate degree-seeking students entering in specified fall term or prior summer and reported in an ethnic/minority category.

Source: Cohort and benchmark calculation based on SURDS files and institutional data; g:\QIS\2002\tables\1A_2A_Grads_3A_3C_Ret_4yr.xls

***Benchmark midpoint is 102% of rate predicted for the cohort, given cohort average test scores and percentage of undergraduates midpoint plus/minus two percentage points. Benchmark for all Colorado Public Institutions is 102% of prior year if there was improvement last year, or 102% of prior two years average if this indicator was not improved.

**QIS Measure 3B: GRADUATION RATES AFTER THREE YEARS FROM
COLORADO PUBLIC TWO-YEAR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
Fall 1999 Minority Cohort**

Institution	Cohort Entering in Fall --	# Students in Entering Cohort**	Cumulative % Graduating With Cert or Assoc Degree Three Years After Entry From --			Benchmark	
			Orig Inst	Tranf Inst	All CO Public Inst	Orig Inst	All CO Public Inst
Aims Comm Coll	1997	123	10.6	0.0	10.6	7.2	7.5
	1998	173	3.5	0.6	4.0		
	1999	68	17.6	1.5	19.1		
Arapahoe Comm Coll	1997	46	2.2	0.0	2.2	19.4	19.4
	1998	42	19.0	0.0	19.0		
	1999	44	11.4	0.0	11.4		
Colo Mountain Coll	1997	37	24.3	0.0	24.3	17.0	17.0
	1998	33	9.1	0.0	9.1		
	1999	35	14.3	0.0	14.3		
Colo NW Comm Coll	1997	23	21.7	0.0	21.7	18.9	23.5
	1998	13	15.4	7.7	23.1		
	1999	23	13.0	0.0	13.0		
Comm Coll of Aurora	1997	85	4.7	1.2	5.9	15.1	15.1
	1998	81	14.8	0.0	14.8		
	1999	112	27.7	0.9	28.6		
Comm Coll of Denver	1997	243	9.5	0.0	9.5	14.6	14.9
	1998	280	14.3	0.4	14.6		
	1999	226	12.8	0.4	13.3		
Front Range Comm Coll	1997	158	17.1	0.0	17.1	15.7	16.1
	1998	138	13.8	0.7	14.5		
	1999	121	10.7	1.7	12.4		
Lamar Comm Coll	1997	47	21.3	0.0	21.3	31.4	31.4
	1998	39	30.8	0.0	30.8		
	1999	31	29.0	0.0	29.0		
Morgan Comm Coll	1997	10	30.0	0.0	30.0	29.2	29.2
	1998	11	27.3	0.0	27.3		
	1999	9	22.2	0.0	22.2		
Northeastern Junior Coll	1997	41	9.8	2.4	12.2	13.9	13.9
	1998	44	13.6	0.0	13.6		
	1999	40	12.5	2.5	15.0		
Otero Junior Coll	1997	79	31.6	1.3	32.9	44.7	44.7
	1998	57	43.9	0.0	43.9		
	1999	84	38.1	1.2	39.3		
Pikes Peak Comm Coll	1997	186	5.9	0.0	5.9	13.3	14.3
	1998	207	13.0	1.0	14.0		
	1999	193	9.8	0.0	9.8		
Pueblo Comm Coll	1997	118	11.9	0.8	12.7	29.0	29.0
	1998	151	28.5	0.0	28.5		
	1999	116	7.8	0.0	7.8		
Red Rocks Comm Coll	1997	72	13.9	0.0	13.9	13.9	15.3
	1998	60	13.3	1.7	15.0		
	1999	60	18.3	5.0	23.3		
Trinidad State Jun Coll	1997	162	28.4	0.0	28.4	30.8	31.6
	1998	126	30.2	0.8	31.0		
	1999	106	27.4	0.0	27.4		
Two-Year Inst Total	1997	1,430	14.3	0.3	14.6	n/a	n/a
	1998	1,455	17.3	0.5	17.9		
	1999	1,268	16.9	0.8	17.7		

**Base year cohort is 1999 for three-year graduation rate; graduate totals based on specified Cohort based on first-time, full-time, certificate and associate degree-seeking students entering in specified fall term or prior summer and reported in an ethnic minority category. Beginning with QIS 2002, students with registration status=2 were excluded from cohorts.

**QIS Measure 3C: RETENTION RATES
ONE YEAR AFTER ENTRY BY
COLORADO PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
Fall 2001 Minority Cohort**

Institution	Base Year* For Cohort Entering In Fall --	# Students In Entering Cohort**	Percent Retained One Year After Entry From --			Benchmark***	
			Orig Inst	Transf Inst	All CO Public Inst	Orig Inst	All CO Public Inst
Adams State Coll	1999	111	71.2	7.2	78.4	66.2 - 70.2	72.9
	2000	138	58.7	5.8	64.5		
	2001	127	57.5	11.0	68.5		
Colo State Univ	1999	403	80.4	6.5	86.8	77.3 - 81.3	90.4
	2000	459	81.3	7.4	88.7		
	2001	463	84.4	5.4	89.8		
Univ of Southern Colo (CSU-Pueblo)	1999	216	64.4	12.0	76.4	66.2 - 70.2	77.5
	2000	241	66.0	9.5	75.5		
	2001	257	62.6	12.5	75.1		
Fort Lewis Coll	1999	238	51.3	8.0	59.2	66.2 - 70.2	54.7
	2000	244	42.6	5.3	48.0		
	2001	309	49.5	7.4	57.0		
Mesa State Coll	1999	85	47.1	15.3	62.4	66.2 - 70.2	72.2
	2000	89	64.0	6.7	70.8		
	2001	87	60.9	13.8	74.7		
Metropolitan State Coll of Denver	1999	371	63.6	5.9	69.5	56.9 - 60.9	70.0
	2000	417	62.6	5.0	67.6		
	2001	448	59.6	7.4	67.0		
Univ of Colo - Boulder	1999	602	80.2	4.8	85.0	80.3 - 84.3	88.4
	2000	676	80.9	5.8	86.7		
	2001	696	79.6	6.5	86.1		
Univ of Colo - Colo Spr	1999	142	65.5	9.2	74.6	66.1 - 70.1	74.9
	2000	137	63.5	8.8	72.3		
	2001	146	63.7	15.8	79.5		
Univ of Colo - Denver	1999	197	69.0	6.6	75.6	62.8 - 66.8	84.6
	2000	205	75.6	7.3	82.9		
	2001	171	75.4	5.8	81.3		
Univ of Northern Colo	1999	364	67.3	11.3	78.6	74.3 - 78.3	82.8
	2000	297	68.0	13.1	81.1		
	2001	249	69.1	14.5	83.5		
Western State Coll	1999	53	60.4	18.9	79.2	66.2 - 70.2	75.6
	2000	29	48.3	20.7	69.0		
	2001	67	46.3	20.9	67.2		
Four-Year Inst Total	1999	2,782	69.3	7.9	77.2	n/a	n/a
2000	2,932	69.6	7.4	76.9			
2001	3,020	69.0	9.0	76.0			

*Base year cohort is 2001.

**Cohort based on first-time, full-time, baccalaureate degree-seeking students entering in specified fall term or prior summer and reported in an ethnic/minority category.

Source: Cohort and benchmark calculation based on SURDS files and institutional data; g:\QIS\2002\tables\1A_2A_Grads_3A_3C_Ret_4yr.xls

***Benchmark midpoint is 102% of rate predicted for the cohort, given cohort average test scores and percentage of undergraduates midpoint plus/minus two percentage points. Benchmark for all Colorado Public Institutions is 102% of prior year if there was improvement last year, or 102% of prior two years average if this indicator was not improved.

**QIS Measure 3D: RETENTION RATES ONE YEAR AFTER ENTRY BY
 COLORADO PUBLIC TWO-YEAR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
 Fall 2001 Minority Cohort**

Institution	Base Year* For Cohort Entering In Fall --	# Students In Entering Cohort**	Percent Successful One Year After Entry By --			Benchmark	
			Orig Inst	Transf Inst	All CO Public Inst	Orig Inst	All CO Public Inst
Aims Comm Coll	1999	68	50.0	7.4	57.4	38.8	45.0
	2000	149	26.2	4.7	30.9		
	2001	87	49.4	9.2	58.6		
Arapahoe Comm Coll	1999	44	54.5	11.4	65.9	51.6	60.8
	2000	30	46.7	6.7	53.3		
	2001	63	39.7	15.9	55.6		
Colorado Mountain Coll	1999	35	45.7	5.7	51.4	67.1	83.2
	2000	38	65.8	15.8	81.6		
	2001	22	68.2	0.0	68.2		
Colorado NW Comm Coll	1999	23	43.5	4.3	47.8	51.0	64.9
	2000	22	50.0	13.6	63.6		
	2001	22	40.9	13.6	54.5		
Comm Coll of Aurora	1999	112	65.2	3.6	68.8	53.9	61.2
	2000	121	40.5	10.7	51.2		
	2001	132	50.0	7.6	57.6		
Comm Coll of Denver	1999	226	51.3	4.0	55.3	55.4	59.2
	2000	219	54.3	3.7	58.0		
	2001	276	52.2	2.9	55.1		
Front Range Comm Coll	1999	121	40.5	8.3	48.8	56.6	64.0
	2000	137	55.5	7.3	62.8		
	2001	219	48.9	12.8	61.6		
Lamar Comm Coll	1999	31	54.8	3.2	58.1	49.5	57.1
	2000	26	42.3	11.5	53.8		
	2001	43	51.2	11.6	62.8		
Morgan Comm Coll	1999	9	33.3	11.1	44.4	87.4	73.7
	2000	7	85.7	14.3	100.0		
	2001	8	75.0	0.0	75.0		
Northeastern Junior Coll	1999	40	30.0	15.0	45.0	39.9	57.7
	2000	46	39.1	17.4	56.5		
	2001	50	34.0	18.0	52.0		
Otero Junior Coll	1999	84	45.2	9.5	54.8	55.2	62.4
	2000	85	54.1	7.1	61.2		
	2001	125	42.4	10.4	52.8		
Pikes Peak Comm Coll	1999	193	43.5	2.6	46.1	46.2	53.6
	2000	179	45.3	7.3	52.5		
	2001	226	44.7	5.3	50.0		
Pueblo Comm Coll	1999	116	49.1	2.6	51.7	56.0	62.7
	2000	122	54.9	6.6	61.5		
	2001	155	59.4	3.9	63.2		
Red Rocks Comm Coll	1999	60	46.7	6.7	53.3	53.4	59.9
	2000	63	52.4	6.3	58.7		
	2001	77	42.9	5.2	48.1		
Trinidad State Jun Coll	1999	106	50.0	5.7	55.7	47.7	52.8
	2000	140	43.6	4.3	47.9		
	2001	143	51.7	7.0	58.7		
Two-Year Inst Total	1999	1,268	48.4	5.5	53.9	n/a	n/a
2000	1,384	47.4	7.1	54.5			
2001	1,648	49.0	7.6	56.6			

**Base year cohort is 2001; graduate totals based on specified number of academic year(s) plus the Cohort based on first-time, full-time, certificate and associate degree-seeking students entering in

**OIS Measure 4A: ACHIEVEMENT SCORES ON LICENSURE, PROFESSIONAL, GRADUATE SCHOOL ADMISSION, and
OTHER EXAMINATIONS TAKEN BY BACCALAUREATE SENIORS AND GRADUATES DURING FY 1999-00, FY 2000-01, FY 2001-02
(FOUR-YEAR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS)**

Exam	INSTITUTION											Benchmark	
	ASC	CSU	USC CSU-P 7/03	FLC	Mesa	Metro	UC-B	UC-CS	UC-D	UNC	WSC		
Graduate Record Examinations													
# Scores (10/99 - 9/00)													
Verbal	1	278	11	5	22	20	167	24	64	70	12	140,294	
Quantitative	1	278	11	5	22	20	167	24	64	70	12	140,269	
Analytical	1	277	11	5	22	20	167	24	64	70	12	140,270	
# Scores (10/00 - 9/01)													
Verbal	1	305	14	10	19	20	180	29	60	62	12	165,350	
Quantitative	1	305	14	10	19	20	180	29	60	62	12	165,328	
Analytical	1	304	14	10	19	20	180	29	60	62	12	165,219	
#scores (10/01 - 9/02)													
Verbal	12	389	17	11	22	17	260	33	66	67	7	224,061	
Quantitative	12	389	17	11	22	17	260	33	65	67	7	224,021	
Analytical	12	389	17	11	22	17	260	33	65	67	7	223,067	
Mean Scores													
Mean Verbal Score	10/99 - 9/00	*	461	*	*	*	*	500	*	450	425	*	426 - 526
Mean Verbal Score	10/00 - 9/01	*	471	*	*	*	*	493	457	469	425	*	429 - 529
Mean Verbal Score	10/01 - 9/02	*	466	*	*	*	*	521	450	454	448	*	426 - 526
Mean Quant Score	10/99 - 9/00	*	592	*	*	*	*	620	*	529	513	*	522 - 622
Mean Quant Score	10/00 - 9/01	*	596	*	*	*	*	609	529	523	494	*	529 - 629
Mean Quant Score	10/01 - 9/02	*	604	*	*	*	*	641	515	544	541	*	565 - 665
Mean Analytical Score	10/99 - 9/00	*	596	*	*	*	*	617	*	560	560	*	515 - 615
Mean Analytical Score	10/00 - 9/01	*	603	*	*	*	*	618	564	567	563	*	521 - 621
Mean Analytical Score	10/01 - 9/02	*	604	*	*	*	*	628	558	551	567	*	547 - 647
<i>Test cohort = seniors whose GRE test scores were reported to their respective undergraduate institution during October 2001 - September 2002. Benchmark: +/- 50 points of national mean scores for single year test takers beginning with 2001-02 test-takers. Source: Educational Testing Service Notes: 1) ETS provides requires a minimum of 25 scores to calculate a mean. 2) Due to some examinees receiving no score, the total number of scores may differ for each measure of the general test.</i>													
CPA Examination Services													
Colorado Performance Measures													
Achievement Rates by School on the May 2002 and November 2002 Examinations for First Time Candidates without a Degree													
# Test Takers	5/02	*	16	*	*	7	14	12	*	11	5	*	
# Passing	5/02	*	4	*	*	1	3	3	*	2	-	*	
% Passing	5/02	*	25.0	*	*	14.3	21.4	25.0	*	18.2	-	*	
# Test Takers	11/02	*	8	*	*	*	24	9	5	10	10	5	
# Passing	11/02	*	-	*	*	*	5	1	2	1	3	-	
% Passing	11/02	*	-	*	*	*	20.8	11.1	40.0	10.0	30.0	-	
# Test Takers	5/02 & 11/02	*	24	*	*	7	38	21	5	21	15	5	
# Passing	5/02 & 11/02	*	4	*	*	1	8	4	2	3	3	-	
% Passing	5/02 & 11/02	*	16.7	*	*	**	21.1	19.0	**	14.3	**	**	15.40%
<i>Test Cohort = scores for first time candidates without an advanced degree are used from May 2002 & November 2002. Colorado Average Pass Rate = 18% (5/2002 & 11/2002) * No test takers reported ** Institutions with less than 20 test takers will not be counted. ***Benchmark is % of 11, 857 National First Time Candidates who advanced degree</i>													
National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses (NCLEX-RN)													
# Test Takers	7/01 - 6/03			69		87			148		169		900
# Passing	7/01 - 6/03			56		77			137		153		796
% Passing	7/01 - 6/02	---	---	87.3	---	90.3	---	---	91.5	---	91.6	---	86.7
% Passing	7/01 - 6/03			81.0		89.0			93.0		91.0		88.0
<i>Test cohort = first-time registered nurse candidates tested July 2000 - June 2002; UCSS data include Beth-El College of Nursing candidates.</i>													

(Continued)

Exam	INSTITUTION											Benchmark
	ASC	CSU	USC CSU- P 7/03	FLC	Mesa	Metro	UC-B	UC-CS	UC-D	UNC	WSC	
Program for Licensing Assessments for Colorado Educators (PLACE)												
Elementary Education												
# Test Takers (10/01 - 5/03)	305	33	184	168	80	321	178	45		580	40	1,934
# Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	189	26	133	113	73	213	168	41	*	477	32	1,465
% Passing (10/00 - 5/02)	61.2	80.0	70.0	75.9	87.0	80.8	96.8	90.6	---	82.4	87.0	79.9
% Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	62.0	78.8	72.3	67.3	91.3	66.4	94.4	91.1	*	82.2	80.0	75.7
Social Studies												
# Test Takers (10/01 - 5/03)	41	128	34	32	21	75	42	7	---	86	19	485
# Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	19	92	16	19	14	32	33	6	---	51	14	296
% Passing (10/00 - 5/02)	34.3	69.1	45.2	50.0	90.5	51.6	83.3	100.0	---	51.7	50.0	59.5
% Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	46.3	71.9	47.1	59.4	66.7	42.7	78.6	*	*	59.3	*	61.0
English												
# Test Takers (10/01 - 5/03)	31	116	41	33	30	51	30	4	---	51	3	390
# Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	20	89	19	23	24	24	27	3	*	39	3	271
% Passing (10/00 - 5/02)	46.9	81.6	37.5	85.3	76.9	73.2	86.4	100.0	---	69.4	85.7	71.8
% Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	64.5	76.7	46.3	69.7	80.0	47.1	90.0	*	*	76.5	*	69.5
Science												
# Test Takers (10/01 - 5/03)	18	160	19	37	25	12	15	---	---	34	11	331
# Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	9	84	6	14	11	2	13	---	---	15	13	167
% Passing (10/00 - 5/02)	78.9	63.8	33.3	43.8	65.5	75.0	95.8	100.0	---	54.1	90.9	64.3
% Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	*	52.5	*	37.8	44.0	*	*	*	*	44.1	*	50.5
Physical Education												
# Test Takers (10/01 - 5/03)	23	44	19	27	14	20	---	---	---	107	10	264
# Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	23	38	13	16	12	12	*	*	*	67	9	190
% Passing (10/00 - 5/02)	48.1	87.3	68.4	71.4	80.0	75.0	100.0	---	---	61.0	100.0	69.5
% Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	100.0	86.4	*	59.3	*	60.0	*	*	*	62.6	*	72.0
Mathematics												
# Test Takers (10/01 - 5/03)	10	69	3	18	10	23	14	1	---	49	5	202
# Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	9	47	2	10	9	9	11	1	*	38	4	140
% Passing (10/00 - 5/02)	80.0	60.3	75.0	53.3	76.9	47.4	100.0	33.3	---	84.4	100.0	69.0
% Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	*	68.1	*	*	*	39.1	*	*	*	77.6	*	69.3
Art												
# Test Takers (10/01 - 5/03)	17	68	2	23	12	27	---	---	---	26	17	192
# Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	12	58	2	16	8	11	---	---	---	23	5	135
% Passing (10/00 - 5/02)	70.0	81.2	100.0	75.0	60.0	59.1	100.0	---	---	72.2	47.6	71.0
% Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	*	85.3	*	69.6	*	40.7	*	*	*	88.5	*	70.3
Music												
# Test Takers (10/01 - 5/03)	18	27	5	22	7	11	37	---	---	61	5	193
# Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	17	16	3	15	7	5	34	---	---	44	4	145
% Passing (10/00 - 5/02)	61.5	78.6	75.0	52.4	100.0	50.0	96.2	---	---	75.0	75.0	73.3
% Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	*	59.3	*	68.2	*	*	91.9	*	*	72.1	*	75.1
Early Childhood Education												
# Test Takers (10/01 - 5/03)	10	56	---	25	1	76	---	---	---	3	---	171
# Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	7	44	---	21	1	49	---	---	---	1	---	123
% Passing (10/00 - 5/02)	---	87.0	---	81.0	100.0	65.3	---	---	---	0.0	---	71.7
% Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	*	78.6	*	84.0	*	64.5	*	*	*	*	*	71.9

(Continued)

Exam	INSTITUTION										Benchmark	
	ASC	CSU	USC CSU- P 7/03	FLC	Mesa	Metro	UC-B	UC-CS	UC-D	UNC		WSC
Program for Licensing Assessments for Colorado Educators (PLACE)–continued												
English as a Second Language												
# Test Takers (10/01 - 5/03)	54	3	---	30	---	1	---	---	---	33	---	121
# Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	37	3	---	21	---	---	---	---	---	23	---	84
% Passing (10/00 - 5/02)	65.6	100.0	---	63.2	---	---	100.0	---	---	66.7	---	66.7
% Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	68.5	*	*	70.0	*	*	*	*	*	69.7	*	69.4
Bilingual Education												
# Test Takers (10/01 - 5/03)	2	1	---	10	---	5	---	---	---	26	---	44
# Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	0	1	---	7	---	3	---	---	---	14	---	25
% Passing (10/00 - 5/02)	*	*	---	90.0	---	80.0	100.0	---	---	52.6	---	62.3
% Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	53.8	*	56.8
Program for Licensing Assessments for Colorado Educators (PLACE)–continued												
Business Education												
# Test Takers (10/01 - 5/03)	37	30	---	9	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	76
# Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	22	15	---	4	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	41
% Passing (10/00 - 5/02)	24.2	35.0	---	33.3	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	30.3
% Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	59.5	50.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	53.9
Moderate Needs												
# Test Takers (10/01 - 5/03)	52	2	---	---	---	33	---	5	---	25	21	138
# Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	50	2	---	---	---	22	---	5	---	22	21	122
% Passing (10/00 - 5/02)	90.5	---	---	---	---	87.0	100.0	100.0	---	78.6	100.0	90.6
% Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	96.2	*	*	*	*	66.7	*	*	*	88.0	100.0	88.4
Spanish												
# Test Takers (10/01 - 5/03)	9	30	12	10	---	14	4	---	---	7	1	87
# Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	8	20	4	5	---	8	3	---	---	6	2	56
% Passing (10/00 - 5/02)	50.0	50.0	44.4	42.9	---	66.7	33.3	---	---	63.6	42.9	51.2
% Passing (10/01 - 5/03)	*	66.7	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	64.4

Test cohort = first-time candidates tested October 2001 - May 2003. Pass rates are reported only for those content areas having 20 or more test takers over the two-year testing cycle. An asterisk () indicates that the institution offers the content area, but fewer than 20 students were tested in that institution's content area over the two-year reporting cycle. Benchmark: CO Average Pass Rate (10/01 - 5/03). Source: Calculated from institutional reports. Benchmark and institution entries based on test takers and passers in all content areas at all institutions. Content areas not having at least 20 test takers state-wide are not included in table.*

QIS Measure 4B: CAREER AND TECHNICAL GRADUATES EMPLOYED
OR CONTINUING POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION AT
COLORADO PUBLIC 2-YEAR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
FY 2001-2002

College	# of Graduates	# Responding	# Employed	# Continuing Education	# Employed and Continuing Education	# Not Employed and Seeking Employment	# Not Employed and Not Seeking Employment **	% Employed and/or Engaged in Further Education
Aims	778	140	64	17	53	0	0	96.00%
ACC	611	288	183	16	74	12	3	95.79%
CCA	406	110	76	4	14	11	5	89.52%
CCD	613	295	145	41	81	20	8	93.03%
CMC	301	150	139	70	145	0	0	96.70%
CNCC	74	40	36	3	0	0	1	100.00%
FRCC	1419	620	344	29	215	32	0	94.84%
LCC	157	152	91	10	50	0	1	100.00%
MCC	203	157	60	11	83	1	2	99.35%
NJC	192	139	114	13	2	2	8	98.47%
OJC	219	182	80	12	82	2	6	98.86%
PPCC	540	268	156	16	77	11	8	95.77%
PCC	415	130	77	12	34	3	4	97.62%
RRCC	715	295	110	24	151	8	2	97.27%
TSJC	421	366	242	17	87	3	17	99.14%

** This column is excluded from the calculation of the percentages of this indicator because community colleges are not able to influence those graduates not employed and not seeking employment.

**QIS Measure 5: INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT EXPENDITURES
PER FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT**

Institution	Institutional Support Expenditures (1)	Total Current Fund Expenditures & Transfers (2)	Total Student FTE (3)	Institutional Support Expenditures per Student FTE [= Col 1 / Col 3] (4)	Benchmark -- Comparison Group Avg of Inst Support Expenditures per Student FTE (5)	Inst Support Expenditures as % of Total Current Fund Expend & Transfers [= Col 1 / Col 2] (6)	Benchmark Comparison Group Avg of Inst Support Expenditures as % of Total Current Fund Expend & Transfers (7)
Four-Year Institutions							
Adams State Coll	\$2,314,986	\$31,205,759	3,948	\$586	\$1,465 - \$1,525	7.42%	9.60% - 10.00%
Colorado State Univ	\$16,473,000	\$516,181,845	22,360	\$737	\$1,999 - \$2,081	3.19%	5.26% - 5.48%
Colorado State Univ - Pueblo	\$2,341,232	\$51,574,996	4,134	\$566	\$1,178 - \$1,226	4.54%	9.01% - 9.37%
Fort Lewis Coll	\$3,614,754	\$49,481,107	4,024	\$898	\$1,371 - \$1,427	7.31%	9.70% - 10.10%
Mesa State Coll	\$1,767,255	\$42,507,397	4,327	\$408	\$1,295 - \$1,347	4.16%	9.25% - 9.63%
Metropolitan State Coll of Denver	\$9,177,403	\$106,064,514	12,379	\$741	\$1,546 - \$1,610	8.65%	11.17% - 11.63%
Univ of Colo - Boulder	\$33,753,675	\$662,543,832	25,060	\$1,347	\$1,977 - \$2,057	5.09%	5.22% - 5.44%
Univ of Colo - Colorado Springs	\$6,314,837	\$64,216,824	4,817	\$1,311	\$1,593 - \$1,658	9.83%	10.16% - 10.58%
Univ of Colo - Denver	\$11,398,833	\$128,631,791	8,453	\$1,348	\$1,512 - \$1,574	8.86%	7.64% - 7.96%
U of Northern Colo	\$6,242,784	\$132,826,733	10,884	\$574	\$1,472 - \$1,532	4.70%	7.34% - 7.64%
Western State Coll	\$1,812,452	\$26,180,871	2,184	\$830	\$1,436 - \$1,494	6.92%	10.54% - 10.97%
Two-Year Institutions							
Aims Comm Coll	\$4,908,582	\$35,566,319	3,711	\$1,323	\$1,302 - \$1,356	13.80%	13.13% - 13.67%
Arapahoe Comm Coll	\$2,864,660	\$29,689,992	3,652	\$784	\$1,339 - \$1,393	9.65%	13.38% - 13.92%
Colorado Mountain Coll	\$6,105,335	\$40,558,341	3,386	\$1,803	\$1,943 - \$2,023	15.05%	14.00% - 14.58%
Colorado NW Comm Coll	\$1,090,953	\$11,168,677	899	\$1,214	\$1,630 - \$1,696	9.77%	13.38% - 13.92%
Comm Coll of Aurora	\$2,123,926	\$19,051,953	2,210	\$961	\$1,286 - \$1,338	11.15%	12.50% - 13.02%
Comm Coll of Denver	\$2,906,487	\$32,099,280	3,340	\$870	\$1,348 - \$1,403	9.05%	13.15% - 13.69%
Front Range Comm Coll	\$5,913,746	\$55,147,734	6,836	\$865	\$1,316 - \$1,370	10.72%	13.74% - 14.30%
Lamar Comm Coll	\$773,934	\$7,447,615	623	\$1,242	\$1,785 - \$1,857	10.39%	13.19% - 13.74%
Morgan Comm Coll	\$991,787	\$9,040,483	794	\$1,249	\$1,635 - \$1,701	10.97%	13.49% - 14.05%
Northeastern Junior Coll	\$1,337,828	\$17,171,599	1,884	\$710	\$1,322 - \$1,376	7.79%	12.51% - 13.03%
Otero Junior Coll	\$835,619	\$14,921,517	929	\$899	\$1,716 - \$1,786	5.60%	13.56% - 14.12%
Pikes Peak Comm Coll	\$3,928,425	\$45,581,842	5,290	\$743	\$1,297 - \$1,349	8.62%	13.36% - 13.90%
Pueblo Comm Coll	\$2,590,140	\$29,158,701	2,580	\$1,004	\$1,286 - \$1,338	8.88%	12.50% - 13.02%
Red Rocks Comm Coll	\$2,746,787	\$28,716,201	3,822	\$719	\$1,341 - \$1,395	9.57%	13.35% - 13.89%
Trinidad State Junior Coll	\$1,359,218	\$18,172,684	1,228	\$1,107	\$1,593 - \$1,659	7.48%	13.48% - 14.04%

Full-time Equivalent Students are calculated as full-time headcount plus one-third of part-time headcount.
Date Source: NCHEMS NCES Finance Dataset, 2001-2002
Date Source: NCHEMS Enrollment Dataset, Fall 2001

**QIS Measure 6: CLASS SIZE COMPARISONS FOR
COLORADO PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS
Fall 2001**

Institution	Total # of Sections	Number of Sections with Student Enrollment of --		Percent of Sections with Student Enrollment of --		Benchmarks**	
		<20	≥50	<20	≥50	<20	≥50
Adams State Coll	443	211	26	47.6%	5.9%	50.5%	3.3%
Colo State Univ	2,564	994	449	38.8%	17.5%	43.0%	11.0%
Univ of Southern Colo (CSU-Pueblo 20	578	247	42	42.7%	7.3%	39.3%	5.6%
Fort Lewis Coll	753	369	28	53.6%	4.4%	52.5%	3.4%
Mesa State Coll	1,070	492	81	46.0%	7.6%	39.5%	3.3%
Metropolitan State Coll of Denver	2,193	734	140	33.5%	6.4%	39.5%	3.3%
Univ Colo - Boulder	2,954	1,350	468	45.7%	15.8%	43.0%	11.0%
Univ Colo - Colo Spr	888	337	99	38.0%	11.1%	39.3%	5.6%
Univ Colo - Denver	971	398	81	41.0%	8.3%	43.0%	11.0%
Univ of Northern Colo	1,357	388	213	28.6%	15.7%	43.0%	11.0%
Western State Coll	462	164	6	35.5%	1.3%	52.5%	3.4%
Total Public Four-Year Inst	14,233	5,684	1,633	39.9%	11.5%	n/a	n/a

Source: Institution reporting in 2002-2003 Common Data Set, Part I-3.

**Benchmarks calculated from national data published by *U.S. News and World Rep* September 2003 and benchmarks based on public sector, Carnegie classification, and institutional undergraduate enrollment.

**QIS Measure 6: CLASS SIZE COMPARISONS FOR
COLORADO PUBLIC TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS
Fall Term 2001**

Institution	Class Sizes for Fall Term --	Total # of Sections	Number of Sections with Student Enrollment of --		Percent of Sections with Student Enrollment of --		Benchmarks	
			≤15	≥35	≤15	≥35	≤15	≥35
Aims Comm Coll	1999	1,282	943	20	73.6%	1.6%	75.4%	1.6%
	2000	1,243	919	19	73.9%	1.6%		
	2001	1,262	943	25	74.7%	2.0%		
Arapahoe Comm Coll	1999	1,054	583	25	55.3%	2.4%	56.2%	2.0%
	2000	1,010	554	16	54.9%	1.6%		
	2001	963	511	10	53.1%	1.0%		
Comm College of Aurora	1999	491	235	1	47.9%	0.2%	50.8%	0.3%
	2000	484	241	2	49.8%	0.4%		
	2001	625	351	2	56.2%	0.3%		
Comm Coll of Denver	1999	856	481	14	56.2%	1.6%	57.5%	1.5%
	2000	811	457	11	56.4%	1.4%		
	2001	861	433	25	50.3%	2.9%		
Colo Mountain Coll	1999	1,813	1,378	19	76.0%	1.0%	75.6%	1.3%
	2000	1,774	1,283	27	72.3%	1.5%		
	2001	1,161	815	35	70.2%	3.0%		
Colo NW Comm Coll	1999	756	550	50	72.8%	6.6%	88.6%	3.4%
	2000	634	551	1	86.9%	0.2%		
	2001	719	616	3	85.7%	0.4%		
Front Range Comm Coll	1999	1,668	759	40	45.5%	2.4%	45.3%	2.4%
	2000	1,669	725	39	43.4%	2.3%		
	2001	1,763	789	44	44.8%	2.5%		
Lamar Comm Coll	1999	237	171	1	72.2%	0.4%	74.3%	0.6%
	2000	277	202	2	72.9%	0.7%		
	2001	360	291	2	80.8%	0.6%		
Morgan Comm Coll	1999	363	302	2	83.2%	0.6%	83.0%	0.5%
	2000	375	298	1	79.5%	0.3%		
	2001	384	310	2	80.7%	0.5%		
Northeastern Junior Coll	1999	653	428	28	65.5%	4.3%	71.1%	3.9%
	2000	686	478	24	69.7%	3.5%		
	2001	671	461	22	68.7%	3.3%		
Otero Junior Coll	1999	292	177	15	60.6%	5.1%	61.2%	4.8%
	2000	288	171	13	59.4%	4.5%		
	2001	303	184	25	60.7%	8.3%		
Pikes Peak Comm Coll	1999	1,663	987	11	59.4%	0.7%	63.6%	0.5%
	2000	1,686	1,051	3	62.3%	0.2%		
	2001	1,630	1,010	8	62.0%	0.5%		
Pueblo Comm Coll	1999	1,117	770	10	68.9%	0.9%	72.3%	1.0%
	2000	985	698	11	70.9%	1.1%		
	2001	999	670	33	67.1%	3.3%		
Red Rocks Comm Coll	1999	1,912	1,424	23	74.5%	1.2%	72.2%	1.2%
	2000	1,426	955	17	67.0%	1.2%		
	2001	1,336	796	15	59.6%	1.1%		
Trinidad State Jun Coll	1999	663	573	7	86.4%	1.1%	87.0%	0.8%
	2000	645	543	3	84.2%	0.5%		
	2001	629	538	2	85.5%	0.3%		
	1999	14,820	9,761	266	65.9%	1.8%		
	2000	13,993	9,126	189	65.2%	1.4%		
	2001	13,666	8,718	253	63.8%	1.9%		

Source: Common Data Set 2002-2003

QIS Measure 7: FACULTY INSTRUCTIONAL WORKLOAD

ACADEMIC YEAR 2001-2002

Avg. Weekly Teaching Hours per Instructor Category*-

Institution	Type A (Group) Instruction					Benchmark -- Nat'l Study of Postsecondary Faculty	Type B (Individualized Instruction)	
	Tenured Faculty FTE	Tenure-Track Faculty FTE	Other** Full-time Faculty FTE	Faculty FTE Total	Total Full-time Faculty FTE		Enrollments for All Full-time Faculty Categories	Avg. Student Enrollment per Full-time Faculty FTE
Four-Year Public Institutions								
Adams State Coll	13.8	14.6	15.3	96.0	14.2	11.1 - 11.5	864	9.0
Colo State Univ	8.5	7.8	14.3	866.0	9.2	7.8 - 8.1	7,374	8.5
U of Southern CO (to be CSU-Pueblo)	11.1	11.1	11.4	156.0	11.1	11.1 - 11.5	341	2.2
Fort Lewis Coll	13.8	10.4	13.6	169.7	12.7	11.1 - 11.5	925	5.5
Mesa State Coll	17.6	18.1	18.8	199.0	18.0	11.1 - 11.5	175	9.7
Metropolitan St Coll of Denver	11.1	12.9	15.9	374.0	12.4	11.1 - 11.5	8,051	21.5
Univ of Colo - Boulder	4.9	5.2	11.8	1,034.0	6.2	7.8 - 8.1	7,724	7.5
Univ of Colo - Colo Springs	10.7	10.7	12.6	202.0	11.4	9.2 - 9.6	2,475	12.3
Univ of Colo - Denver	7.4	9.3	13.0	400.0	9.4	9.2 - 9.6	3,235.0	8.1
Univ of Northern Colo	11.6	10.8	13.0	414.0	11.7	9.2 - 9.6	4,422	10.7
Western State Coll	12.6	11.5	---	80.0	12.2	11.1 - 11.5	662	8.3
Two-Year Public Institutions								
Aims Comm Coll				117.0	17.8	17.2 - 17.9	656	5.6
Arapahoe Comm Coll				86.2	18.5	17.2 - 17.9	336	3.9
Colo Mountain Coll				75.0	21.2	17.2 - 17.9	882	11.8
Colo NW Comm Coll				48.0	16.5	17.2 - 17.9		0.0
Comm Coll of Aurora				29.2	14.7	17.2 - 17.9	68	2.3
Comm Coll of Denver				77.0	32.9	17.2 - 17.9	46	0.6
Front Range Comm Coll				126.9	17.1	17.2 - 17.9	135	1.1
Lamar Comm Coll				18.9	30.3	17.2 - 17.9	35	1.9
Morgan Comm Coll				35.4	27.2	17.2 - 17.9	40	1.1
Northeastern Junior Coll				59.0	18.5	17.2 - 17.9	329	5.6
Otero Junior Coll				33.0	21.8	17.2 - 17.9	238	7.2
Pikes Peak Comm Coll				139.6	23.2	17.2 - 17.9	2,244	16.1
Pueblo Comm Coll				78.8	13.6	17.2 - 17.9	1,081	13.7
Red Rocks Comm Coll				68.8	16.8	17.2 - 17.9	105	1.5
Trinidad State Junior Coll				41.5	22.9	17.2 - 17.9	61	1.5

*Full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty totals represent state-funded (or general funded) instruction in fall and spring term. by contracts, grants, or extended studies fees were excluded from FTE totals.

**Based on faculty who are neither tenured or tenure-track but have the expectation of an on-going appointment and are full-time as defined by the institution.

Notes: (1) Average measures for group and individual instruction should not be combined. Group instruction is measured in contact hours while individualized instruction is based on student headcount.

(2) Type A instruction involves direct contact of faculty with students and includes the following: lecture, lab, recitation/discussion/seminar, audit, private instruction, physical education/recreation activity, studio, and field instruction.

(3) Type B instruction encompasses distance education and a variety of individualized faculty/student relationships such as independent study, master's thesis/doctoral dissertation, student teaching, co-ops, internships, and practica.

QIS Measures 8 and 9: INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC INDICATORS

Institution	Indicator #8	Indicator #9
Four-Year Public Institutions		
<u>ASC</u>	<p><u>Indicator #8:</u> Progress in providing education access to students, relative to their particular role and mission and geographic location</p> <p>Measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Number of off-campus (state and cash funded) delivery sites. Number of courses offered at off-campus sites and at non-traditional times Number of students served at off-campus sites and at non-traditional times <p>Results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The number of state-funded sites remained the same but the number of cash-funded sites rose from 128 to 155 between FY02 and FY 03. The number of off-campus and non-traditional time courses rose from 1,892 to 2,019. The number of students at off-campus and at non-traditional times rose from 22,519 to 23,834. 	<p><u>Indicator #9:</u> The academic, intellectual and social experiences will be used to measure the success of college in providing personal attention to faculty interaction with students. The questions from the 2003 National Study on Student Engagement (NSSE) included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Participated in community-based projects as part of regular course. Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor. Had serious conversations with students who are very different in terms of religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values. Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework. Community learning, senior experience. <p>Measure: Meet or exceed national average scores based upon NSSE benchmarks.</p> <p>Results: Exceeded the national average scores.</p>
<u>CSU</u>	<p><u>Indicator #8:</u> First-year seminars and capstone courses</p> <p>Measure: CSU will be in the top quartile when compared to national peer institutions in terms of requiring all first-year students to complete a first-year seminar during the first 45 credits of their college careers and requiring all students to complete a senior capstone experience.</p> <p>Results: CSU continues to be the only institution among 19 peer institutions to require a first year seminar for all incoming students. CSU is the only one of a set of peer institutions to require a capstone course of all undergraduate degree recipients.</p>	<p><u>Indicator #9:</u> Service-learning and volunteerism to enhance students' sense of civic engagement, educational success, and development of life skills.</p> <p>Measure: CSU will be above the median in volunteerism and service-learning activities compared national comparison of 16 peer institutions.</p> <p>Results: CSU has more than twice the number of courses with a service-learning component than peer institutions and more in terms of faculty teaching and faculty trained.</p>
<u>CSU-P</u>	<p><u>Indicator #8:</u> Increase minority graduation rates.</p> <p>Measure: Exceed the prior year's percentage of minority graduates, based on the SURDS degree files submitted to CCHE.</p> <p>Results: The proportion of CSU-P graduates receiving a baccalaureate degree who are minority in FY 2002-03 declined slightly, from 31.8% in FY 02 to 31.6% in FY 03. The minority graduation rate for baccalaureate degrees at CSU-P remains high and increased from three years ago.</p>	<p><u>Indicator #9:</u> The number of publicly available computer workstations to students will exceed national averages of four-year public colleges and universities.</p> <p>Measure: National standard for ratio of computers available for general student use to headcount.</p> <p>Results: According to <i>Campus Computing 2002: 13th Annual Survey of Computing and Information Technology in Higher Education</i> by Kenneth Green, 4-year public universities average 14.9 students per workstation and 4-year public colleges average 11.3 students for each workstation. At CSU-P, the ratio of students to workstations for fall 2002 was 7.2:1 but was an</p>

Institution	Indicator #8	Indicator #9
		increase from the fall 2001 ratio of 6.95:1.
<u>FLC</u>	<p>Indicator #8 National and liberal arts peer comparison on student learning outcomes and institutional resources.</p> <p>Measure: The questions from the 2003 National Study on Student Engagement (NSSE) were organized around seven principles of good practice and used to assess student engagement at FLC. Compared FLC mean with Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges (COPLAC) mean.</p> <p>Results: FLC met or exceeded the national average scores for liberal arts colleges in most principles (Indicator #8s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Encourage student-faculty contact: FLC was above or the same as COPLAC in 4 of 4 measures. 2. Encourage Student Cooperation: FLC was above or the same in 3 of 4 measures. 3. Encourage Active Learning: FLC was above or the same in 4 of 4 measures. 4. Give Prompt Feedback to Students FLC was above or the same as COPLAC in 4 of 4 measures. 5. Emphasize Time on Task: FLC was above or the same in 2 of 4 measures. 6. Communicate High Expectations: FLC was above or the same as COPLAC in 4 of 4 measures. 7. Respect Diverse Talents and Ways of Learning: FLC was equal to or above the national college average in 3 of 4 measures. <p>FLC has designed actions to encourage improvement in each of these areas.</p>	<p>Indicator #9:Improving the academic preparation of entering freshmen.</p> <p>Measure: Compare FLC index scores year-to-year to see improvement in first-time freshmen.</p> <p>Results: FLC reported the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The percentage of window admissions fell from 12.1% in fall 2002 to 10.4% in 2003. 2. The percentage of enrolled freshmen with an Index of less than 80 fell from 17% to 14% between fall 2002 and fall 2003. 3. The enrolled index of 92 and higher rose from 46% to 47%. 4. The enrolled average index score rose slightly from 92.2 in fall 2002 to 92.4 in fall 2003.
<u>Mesa</u>	<p>Indicator #8: Progress in providing educational access to students, relative to their particular role and mission and geographic location.</p> <p>Measure: Maintain or show an increase in access to courses at off-campus sites and at non-traditional times.</p> <p>Results: Mesa State showed an increase of 11% from 2002 to 2003.</p>	<p>Indicator #9: Student participation in a co-curricular experience (internship, practica, field-experience, structured research project, etc.) as part of their education.</p> <p>Measure: Equal or exceed the average of previous two years in percent of graduates with co-curricular experience (69%)</p> <p>Results: Mesa State exceeded the benchmark of 69% by two percentage points.</p>
<u>Metro</u>	<p>Indicator #8: Metro State student participation in workplace experiences</p> <p>Measure: Increase the percent of MSCD graduates with workplace experience (e.g., cooperative education, service learning, practica, internships).</p> <p>Results: The percentage for 2002-2003 graduates was</p>	<p>Indicator #9: Metro State student satisfaction with instructional effectiveness</p> <p>Measure: The Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey uses a scale that assesses student academic experience, curriculum and the commitment to academic excellence. The benchmark will be exceeded if there is a</p>

Institution	Indicator #8	Indicator #9
	45%, exceeding the prior year benchmark of 43.9%.	<p>significant difference between the mean score for Metro and the national group mean.</p> <p>Results: Metro's mean score was 5.30 for 2003 for instructional effectiveness. The national group mean was 5.09 and the difference was significant at the .001 level.</p>
UCB	<p><u>Indicator #8:</u> Undergraduate participation in Special Academic Opportunities.</p> <p>Measure: Percent participating in special academic opportunities, of calendar year 2002 bachelors degree recipients who entered CU-Boulder as full-time fall freshmen.</p> <p>Benchmark: Maintain the participation level at or above 67%.</p> <p>Results: 75% of calendar year 2002 bachelor's recipients who had entered as freshmen (N=3,076) had participated in at least one special opportunity. This exceeds the benchmark and institution's long-term goal. The four most popular programs each garnered participation by over 15% of the 2002 graduates: honors courses (17%), study abroad (27%), formal minors (18%) and first-year residential academic programs (23%). UCB is especially pleased that 27% of graduates entering as freshmen had studied abroad, for this program is probably the most intense. Comparable overall (unduplicated) participation figures from other institutions are not available. Informal comparisons with estimates published in the Best Colleges issue of U.S. News and World Report show that CU-Boulder has much higher rates of participation in study abroad and honors than do other public AAU institutions that reported.</p>	<p><u>Indicator #9:</u> State appropriations per in-state undergraduate student FTE.</p> <p>Measure: State appropriations per in-state FTE. Rate for all student proxies for an undergraduate-only rate.</p> <p>Benchmark: AAU public average.</p> <p>Results (all figures rounded to the nearest \$100):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ CU-Boulder: \$4,400 in state appropriations per in-state FTE ◆ AAU publics (for which data are available) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Average \$12,500 (without Colorado) ◆ Median \$11,700 (without CO), N=13 ◆ The result for CU-Boulder is 35% of the AAU average ◆ Among the public research universities with available data, CU-Boulder's 2002-03 state appropriations per in-state student ranked lowest. This demonstrates an impressive return on state investment. CU-Boulder's resident undergraduate tuition and fees per academic year (\$3,566) also ranked lowest.
UCCS	<p><u>Indicator #8:</u> Student Academic Quality.</p> <p>a. Increased Academic Quality of Students.</p> <p>Measure: Average CCHE admission index scores for admitted freshmen will be at least 101.</p> <p>Result: Average index score for fall 2003 admitted freshmen remains five points above the benchmark of 101.</p> <p>b. Use of Transfer Window.</p> <p>Measure: Use of up to one-quarter of allowable "window" undergraduate transfers for a fall semester.</p> <p>Result: For Fall 2003, less than one-quarter of the allowable "window" admits for under-graduate transfers were used (2.4% of all admitted).</p> <p>c. Increase Number of Colorado Residents Enrolled at UCCS.</p>	<p><u>Indicator #9:</u> Academic Program Quality.</p> <p>Measure: Percent of professional programs that have current specialized accreditation of those eligible to apply for such status compared to similar programs at CCHE-designated peer institutions for UCCS. UCCS professional programs include: business, education, engineering, nursing, public administration, and other appropriate programs.</p> <p>Result: All of CU-Colorado Springs professional programs have specialized accreditation. Only 83% of similar programs at peer institutions are accredited, indicating that UCCS offers high quality professional programs tailored to serving the business, industry, government, education, and health care sectors compared to like institutions nationally.</p>

Institution	Indicator #8	Indicator #9																																				
	<p>Measure: The number of undergraduate students who are Colorado residents enrolled at UCCS compared with the previous fall semester.</p> <p>Result: CU-Colorado Springs enrolled 228 more Colorado undergraduate residents in Fall 2003 than were enrolled in Fall 2002.</p> <p>d. Increase Number of Ethnic Minority Students Enrolled at UCCS.</p> <p>Measure: The number of undergraduate students reporting as African-American, Asian-American/Pacific Islander, Latino/Chicano or Native American/American Indian in Fall 2003 compared with the previous fall semester, indicating that UCCS is attracting more ethnic minority students while increasing the academic quality of students.</p> <p>Result: UCCS enrolled 25 more ethnic minority undergraduate students in Fall 2003 than were enrolled in Fall 2002.</p>																																					
UCD	<p><u>Indicator #8:</u> Maintain a diverse student population by ensuring that our minority students have the appropriate support necessary to succeed at the same rate as CU-Denver's overall rate.</p> <p>a. Measure: Fall to fall retention rate of our first-time full-time minority undergraduates. (Source: Two most recent fall SURDS enrollment files).</p> <p>Benchmark = Rate equal to or greater than the overall rate for the same period.</p> <p>Results: Minority retention rate of 75.4% compared with a total rate of 68.1% for those starting in fall 2001.</p> <p>b. Measure: Increase or maintain the share of undergraduate degrees awarded to minority Colorado residents on a three-year average (SURDS).</p> <p>Benchmark = Previous three-year average.</p> <p>Results: Minority average increased to 26.7% for the three-year (01,02 03) average from 25.9% for the three-year (00,01,02) average.</p>	<p><u>Indicator #9:</u> Provide undergraduate students a broad and convenient variety of enrollment opportunities that aid in progress toward their educational goals.</p> <p>a. Measure: Increase in the most recent fiscal year undergraduate enrollment, courses, and sections offered in online education.</p> <p>Results:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="2">Enrollment:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FY 01 - 02 = 3,622</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>FY 02 - 03 = 4,899</td> <td>+35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Courses:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FY 01 - 02 = 88</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>FY 02 - 03 = 114</td> <td>+30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Sections:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FY 01 - 02 = 165</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>FY 02 - 03 = 206</td> <td>+25%</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Measure: Increase in most recent academic year in number of high school students participating in higher education opportunities.</p> <p>Results: Overall +10%</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="2">PSEO Enrollment:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>AY 01 - 02 = 94</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>AY 02 - 03 = 77</td> <td>-18%</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">CU-Succeed Enrollment:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>AY 01 - 02 = 2,813</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>AY 02 - 03 = 3,210</td> <td>+14%</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Pre-Collegiate Enrollment:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>AY 01 - 02 = 639</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>FY 02 - 03 = 602</td> <td>-6.0%</td> </tr> </table>	Enrollment:		FY 01 - 02 = 3,622		FY 02 - 03 = 4,899	+35%	Courses:		FY 01 - 02 = 88		FY 02 - 03 = 114	+30%	Sections:		FY 01 - 02 = 165		FY 02 - 03 = 206	+25%	PSEO Enrollment:		AY 01 - 02 = 94		AY 02 - 03 = 77	-18%	CU-Succeed Enrollment:		AY 01 - 02 = 2,813		AY 02 - 03 = 3,210	+14%	Pre-Collegiate Enrollment:		AY 01 - 02 = 639		FY 02 - 03 = 602	-6.0%
Enrollment:																																						
FY 01 - 02 = 3,622																																						
FY 02 - 03 = 4,899	+35%																																					
Courses:																																						
FY 01 - 02 = 88																																						
FY 02 - 03 = 114	+30%																																					
Sections:																																						
FY 01 - 02 = 165																																						
FY 02 - 03 = 206	+25%																																					
PSEO Enrollment:																																						
AY 01 - 02 = 94																																						
AY 02 - 03 = 77	-18%																																					
CU-Succeed Enrollment:																																						
AY 01 - 02 = 2,813																																						
AY 02 - 03 = 3,210	+14%																																					
Pre-Collegiate Enrollment:																																						
AY 01 - 02 = 639																																						
FY 02 - 03 = 602	-6.0%																																					

Institution	Indicator #8	Indicator #9
<u>UNC</u>	<p><u>Indicator #8:</u> After Graduation Performance.</p> <p>Measure: Percent of undergraduate student degree recipients who are employed and/or engaged in further study one year after graduation.</p> <p>Benchmark: 95% were placed, based on UNC annual survey of graduates</p> <p>Results: 95.6% of 2001-02 UNC graduates are employed or attending graduate school based on response rate of 60.8%.</p>	<p><u>Indicator #9:</u> Student Evaluation of Instructional Quality.</p> <p>Measure: Student response to 14 questions regarding instructional effectiveness.</p> <p>Benchmark: National average for students completing Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory in Spring 2001.</p> <p>Results: UNC students expressed greater satisfaction with instructional effectiveness than did national group of four-year public institutions. On a 7-point scale, UNC scored 5.12 while the national average was 5.06.</p>
<u>WSC</u>	<p><u>Indicator #8:</u> Quality instruction delivered by full-time faculty.</p> <p>Measure: Western State College will meet or exceed the mean of its CCHE-defined peer group in percent of full-time faculty.</p> <p>Result: Mean full-time faculty of CCHE-defined peer group was 82.5% as reported in the US News and World Report Best Colleges. Western State College had 93% full-time faculty and exceed the peer group by 10.5%.</p>	<p><u>Indicator #9:</u> Quality instruction as measured by student ratings of instructors and courses.</p> <p>Measure: Western State College will meet or exceed the mean rating for all institutions participating in the IDEA Center's evaluation of instruction.</p> <p>Result: Western exceeded the national average score (4.05) on the fall 2002-spring 2003 IDEA teaching evaluation in areas of teaching and course excellence by an average of 0.25.</p>
Two-Year Public Institutions		
<u>Aims CC</u>	<p><u>Indicator #8:</u> Providing Instructional Alternatives for Students.</p> <p>Measure: For fall 2003, classes offered at non-traditional times, places, blocks, learning and delivery modes.</p> <p>Results: For this indicator last year, 30% of total sections were related to non-traditional delivery. These alternatives accounted for 34.9% of total sections for 2003.</p>	<p><u>Indicator #9:</u> Articulation and collaboration throughout the service area.</p> <p>Measure: Number of articulation agreements, collaboration with high schools, collaboration in the workplace.</p> <p>Results: Articulation agreements – 28; collaboration – 24 advanced studies sections, 197 students served; collaboration – 187 customized job training sections and 1,533 students served. Numbers consistent with previous years.</p>
<u>ACC</u>	<p><u>Indicator #8:</u> Percent of minority student compared to availability in service area</p> <p>System Benchmark: 1.03 Results: 1.58</p>	<p><u>Indicator #9:</u> Percent of course section offered at non-traditional times.</p> <p>System Benchmark: 38.76 Results: 62.0</p>

Institution	Indicator #8	Indicator #9
<u>CMC</u>	<p>Indicator #8: Participation Rate. Because CMC's commitment to access for residents of its communities remains strong, the College has selected the following goal as one of our Quality Action Projects through the North Central Association Academic Quality Improvement Project.</p> <p>Measure: Participation rate is defined as the number of in-district students, 18 and older, at Colorado Mountain College (unduplicated headcount), divided by the number of residents, 18 and older, in the College District. The statewide average for this indicator is 2.3%. Because of Colorado Mountain College's commitment to student access, and its location of campuses throughout the District, the goal for CMC's participation rate will continue to be at least 150% of the statewide average participation rate. Student access is identified as one of the four priorities for AQIP, with a 14% participation rate for all students at the target.</p> <p>Benchmark (Statewide): 2.3% (average of CCC) 150% goal 3.45%</p> <p>Results: CMC Rate 13.8%</p>	<p>Indicator #9: Minority participation rate</p> <p>Measure: One of Colorado Mountain College's accreditation goals is to have 20% of the annual student headcount made up of minority students. Currently, we are meeting that goal collegewide, with 21.7% minority students. Because the minority percentages in the communities making up CMC's District vary widely, and because a large number of minority student are in pre-college level course, the College is in the process of further refining its 20% accreditation goal. We may set goals based on community percentage, and may further set goals for minority student progression through college courses. The percentage of minority students by campus: Timberline, 17.5%; Alpine, 6.3%; Roaring Fork, 28.7%; Summit, 20.0%; Vail/Eagle, 41.5%; Aspen, 19.7%; Rifle, 27.8%; and distance education, 8.7%.</p> <p>Benchmark/Goal: 20% of annual student headcount</p> <p>Results: 21.7%</p>
<u>CNCC</u>	<p>Indicator #8: Percent of students expressing satisfaction with instruction.</p> <p>System Benchmark: 93.84 Results: 93.30</p>	<p>Indicator #9: Percent of course sections offered at nontraditional times.</p> <p>System Benchmark: 38.76 Results: 49.70</p>
<u>CCA</u>	<p>Indicator #8: Percent of course sections offered at nontraditional times.</p> <p>System Benchmark: 38.76 Results: 56.92</p>	<p>Indicator #9: Percent of minority students compared to availability in service area.</p> <p>System Benchmark: 1.03 Results: 1.26</p>
<u>CCD</u>	<p>Indicator #8: Percent of students expressing satisfaction with instruction.</p> <p>System Benchmark: 93.84 Results: 95.5</p>	<p>Indicator #9: Percent of successful students (graduation and/or transfer) of color compared to percent of adult service area who are people of color.</p> <p>System Benchmark: 1.03 for each Results: 1.28 Graduates; 1.19 Transfers</p>
<u>FRCC</u>	<p>Indicator #8: Percent of students expressing satisfaction with instruction.</p> <p>System Benchmark: 93.84 Results: 93.33</p>	<p>Indicator #9: Percent of course sections offered at nontraditional times and percent of course sections offered in nontraditional formats.</p> <p>System Benchmark: 38.76 Results: 54.3</p>

Institution	Indicator #8	Indicator #9
<u>LCC</u>	<p><u>Indicator #8:</u> Service area participation rates.</p> <p>System Benchmark: 3.4 Results: 9.0</p>	<p><u>Indicator #9:</u> Percent of course section offered at nontraditional times</p> <p>System Benchmark: 38.76 Results: 37.20</p>
<u>MCC</u>	<p><u>Indicator #8:</u> Percent of students expressing satisfaction with instruction.</p> <p>System Benchmark: 93.84 Results: 99.0</p>	<p><u>Indicator #9:</u> Service area participation rates.</p> <p>System Benchmark: 3.4 Results: 7.1</p>
<u>NJC</u>	<p><u>Indicator #8:</u> Percent of course sections in off-campus locations other than state-owned facilities.</p> <p>System Benchmark: 18.36 Results: 29.0</p>	<p><u>Indicator #9:</u> Service area participation rates.</p> <p>System Benchmark: 3.4 Results: 8.2</p>
<u>OJC</u>	<p><u>Indicator #8:</u> Percent of students expressing satisfaction with instruction.</p> <p>System Benchmark: 93.84 Results: 97.5</p>	<p><u>Indicator #9:</u> Service area participation rates.</p> <p>System Benchmark: 3.4 Results: 9.16</p>
<u>PPCC</u>	<p><u>Indicator #8:</u> Percent of minority students compared with availability in service area</p> <p>System Benchmark: 1.03 Results: 1.89</p>	<p><u>Indicator #9:</u> Percent of course sections offered in nontraditional formats.</p> <p>System Benchmark: 30.6 Results: 50.3</p>
<u>PCC</u>	<p><u>Indicator #8:</u> Percent of graduates of color compared to percent of adult service area who are people of color.</p> <p>System Benchmark: 1.03 Results: 1.41</p>	<p><u>Indicator #9:</u> Percent of minority students compared to availability in service area.</p> <p>System Benchmark: 1.03 Results: 1.30</p>
<u>RRCC</u>	<p><u>Indicator #8:</u> Percent of minority students compared with availability in service area</p> <p>System Benchmark: 1.03 Results: 2.05</p>	<p><u>Indicator #9:</u> Evaluation by students of entire educational experience on CCSSE (scale 1-4 w/4 = Excellent). Benchmark based on overall mean for all participants nationally.</p> <p>System Benchmark: 3.08 Results: 3.21</p>

Institution	Indicator #8	Indicator #9				
<u>TSJC</u>	<p><u>Indicator #8</u>: Percent of minority faculty, executive and other professional staff compared with statewide availability; percent of minority clerical, technical, skilled craft and maintenance staff compared with service area availability,</p> <p>System Benchmark: 1.03 for each</p> <p>Results:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Minority faculty</td> <td>2.65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Minority staff</td> <td>1.20</td> </tr> </table>	Minority faculty	2.65	Minority staff	1.20	<p><u>Indicator #9</u>: Percent of minority students compared with availability in service area</p> <p>System Benchmark: 1.03</p> <p>Results: 1.07</p>
Minority faculty	2.65					
Minority staff	1.20					