



Show Me

*A Report Card on
Public Higher Education in Missouri*

American Council of Trustees and Alumni

Show Me

*A Report Card on
Public Higher Education in Missouri*

American Council of Trustees and Alumni
Washington, DC

October 2008

Acknowledgments

This report was prepared by the staff of the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, primarily by ACTA program officer Sandra Czelusniak and ACTA adviser and former policy director Phyllis Palmiero. Thanks are also in order to senior consultant Barry Latzer, professor of government at John Jay College of Criminal Justice and The Graduate Center at the City University of New York, who researched general education.

The American Council of Trustees and Alumni is a national non-profit based in Washington, DC, dedicated to academic freedom, academic quality, and accountability in higher education. ACTA has also published: *Shining the Light: A Report Card on Georgia's System of Public Higher Education* (2008); *The Vanishing Shakespeare* (2007); *Intellectual Diversity: Time for Action* (2005); *Governance in the Public Interest: A Case Study of the University of North Carolina System* (2005); *The Hollow Core: Failure of the General Education Curriculum* (2004); *Becoming an Educated Person: Toward a Core Curriculum for College Students* (2003); and *Losing America's Memory: Historical Illiteracy in the 21st Century* (2000).

For further information about ACTA and its programs, please contact:

American Council of Trustees and Alumni
1726 M Street, NW, Suite 802
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: 202.467.6787; 888.258.6648
Fax: 202.467.6784
www.goacta.org • info@goacta.org

contents

	1
INTRODUCTION	
	4
CHAPTER I GENERAL EDUCATION	
	7
CHAPTER II INTELLECTUAL DIVERSITY	
	11
CHAPTER III GOVERNANCE	
BOARD STRUCTURE AND TRANSPARENCY OF OPERATIONS	
BOARD ACCOMPLISHMENTS	
	31
CHAPTER IV COST AND EFFECTIVENESS	
	43
APPENDIX A SELECTION CRITERIA FOR CORE COURSES	
	45
APPENDIX B STUDENT SURVEY DATA	
	53
APPENDIX C STUDENT SURVEY METHODOLOGY	

Introduction

MISSOURI IS THE “SHOW ME” STATE. And with this goal in mind, the American Council of Trustees and Alumni offers the following report card to examine the state of higher education in Missouri. If our nation is to ensure its continued preeminence in higher education, policymakers, trustees, alumni, and taxpayers must know what’s going on in higher education. This report card aims to do just that, and it follows similar ACTA report cards on higher education in the states of North Carolina and Georgia.

Despite high expectations, public confidence in our institutions of higher education has declined. Nearly half of the respondents in a recent survey by the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education said that public higher education in their state should be “fundamentally overhauled.” A similar number indicated that college costs are not justified by the education students receive.¹

Parents and taxpayers are frustrated by reports of students who have failed to master the reading, writing, and thinking skills we expect of college graduates. They are searching for evidence of how much or how little students learn at competing institutions. And they are wondering why a third of full-time college students don’t finish a four-year degree in six years, let alone four.²

The U.S. Secretary of Education’s Commission on the Future of Higher Education underscored the challenges in its 2006 report, *A Test of Leadership*. It said that the higher education sector’s “past attainments have led our nation to unwarranted complacency about its future.” Our universities have “remained so far ahead of our competitors for so long,” the Commission wrote, that “we began to take our postsecondary superiority for granted.” Meanwhile, other nations are “educating more of their citizens to more advanced levels than we are.”³

Against this backdrop of concern—from the highest levels of the federal government to parents and taxpayers across the country—this study takes a close look at institutions which represent a majority of Missouri’s four-year university enrollment and a range of institutional types. The report focuses on four key areas of the public’s interest: what students are learning (the curriculum), whether the marketplace of ideas is vibrant (intellectual diversity), how univer-

1 John Immerwahr and Jean Johnson, *Squeeze Play: How Parents and the Public Look at Higher Education Today*, a report prepared by Public Agenda for The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education (Washington, DC: 2007).

2 The Secretary of Education’s Commission on the Future of Higher Education, *A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of U.S. Higher Education* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 2006), 12, <http://www.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/hiedfuture/reports/final-report.pdf>.

3 *Ibid.*, vi-vii.

sities are run (governance), and what a college education costs (affordability). Applying a common benchmark used in higher education, where appropriate, to determine whether students pass or fail—64 percent—this report card offers a Passing or Failing grade on each point.

The first section focuses on **general education**—those courses completed usually within the first two years of a bachelor’s degree program, to ensure a common intellectual background, as well as college-level skills critical to workforce participation. To assess the state of general education, ACTA examines curricula at the four campuses of the University of Missouri System plus Missouri State University, Missouri Southern State University, and Truman State University. Are students studying math and science, foreign languages, and literature? Are they graduating with exposure to key areas of knowledge that will help them be informed citizens, effective workers, and life-long learners?

In the second section, we focus on **intellectual diversity**, a value that lies at the very heart of the educational enterprise. In the simplest terms, intellectual diversity means the free exchange of ideas. According to the Association of American Colleges & Universities, it is an abundance of “new knowledge, different perspectives, competing ideas, and alternative claims of truth.”⁴ A scientific survey commissioned by ACTA and conducted by a national polling firm asks students in the classrooms at Missouri’s two largest public institutions—the University of Missouri at Columbia and Missouri State University—what the intellectual atmosphere on campus is like.

The third section turns to **governance** and actions by the University of Missouri Board of Curators and the Missouri State University Board of Governors. By law in Missouri, these board members are responsible for the academic and financial well-being of the institutions they oversee and for safeguarding the public interest. In this section, we examine how well the boards are structured to do their work and what they have actually accomplished. Is the governance process open and transparent? Are the board members addressing key issues that are central to institutional excellence?

Lastly, we take a look at the University of Missouri System and Missouri State University in terms of **cost and effectiveness**. In this section, we examine trends in spending as well as tuition and fee increases, generally over a five-year period. We ask such questions as: Are students graduating in four years? Are institutions seeing better cost management and efficiency of operations? Are performance benchmarks in place?

4 Association of American Colleges & Universities, “Academic Freedom and Educational Responsibility,” a statement from the Board of Directors (2006), 2.

In some cases, we find that the institutions are doing a great job; in others, not so well. The purpose of the report is not to be punitive, but to address ways higher education in Missouri can be more accountable and transparent. Our report, in sum, is designed to showcase information and data of interest to students, parents, alumni, and taxpayers—in the true spirit of the Show Me state.

Anne D. Neal
President

CHAPTER I:

Overall Grade	GENERAL EDUCATION
P	Institutions have strong general education requirements in some core subjects; however, large numbers of Missouri students can graduate without taking courses in foreign language and economics, or broad-based courses in literature and American government/history.

“GENERAL EDUCATION” REFERS TO required undergraduate courses outside the student’s specialization or major. These courses, usually completed within the first two years of a bachelor’s degree program, are supposed to ensure a common intellectual background, exposure to a range of disciplines, a core of fundamental knowledge, and college-level skills in areas critical to good citizenship and workforce participation.

To assess the state of general education in Missouri, we looked at the four campuses of the University of Missouri System plus Missouri State University, Southern Missouri State University, and Truman State University. Together, these institutions represent more than half of Missouri’s four-year university enrollment and a range of institutional types. We gauged—using the most recent college bulletins—whether these institutions require their students to take general education courses in seven key subjects that we believe are essential to a strong contemporary liberal arts education: writing (or composition), literature, foreign language, American government or history, economics, mathematics, and physical or biological science.

In order to be counted, the subject in question must be required, not optional. Many colleges around the country give the appearance of providing a core curriculum because they require students to take courses in several subject areas other than their major—the so-called “distribution requirements.” However, a course does not satisfy our requirements when it is simply one of many from which students can pick and choose. Furthermore, to be counted, the course must be a true general education course—broad in scope, exposing the student to the rich array of material that exemplifies the subject. For further details on the criteria used, please see Appendix A.

After researching the institutions, we assigned each a Passing (P) or Failing (F) grade. Every Missouri graduate should be guaranteed exposure to all of the broad areas outlined below; however, if an institution required four or more of the seven core subjects measured, a grade of “P” was awarded. If three or fewer of the seven core subjects were required, the institution received an “F.”

On the whole, the state of Missouri earned a “P,” with five of the seven schools surveyed requiring a majority of seven core subjects.

GENERAL EDUCATION REPORT CARD

University of Missouri-Columbia	P
University of Missouri-Kansas City	P
University of Missouri-St. Louis	F
Missouri University of Science and Technology	P
Missouri State University	P
Missouri Southern State University	P
Truman State University	F

OVERALL GRADE: P

All of the institutions surveyed deserve praise for strong general education requirements in composition, math, and science. The Missouri University of Science and Technology deserves particular note for requiring economics of most of its graduates. By contrast, when ACTA surveyed 50 top colleges and universities across the country in 2004, 30 percent did not require composition, 60 percent did not require math, 38 percent did not require science, and none required economics.

Although Missouri has some solid requirements, there is still significant work to be done. Of the institutions surveyed, only one—Missouri Southern State University—requires students to undertake a comprehensive study of literature, and only two have foreign language requirements. The state of Missouri deserves praise for its “Constitution Requirement,” which stipulates that students take a course in American history or government; however, at most of the institutions surveyed, students may fulfill this requirement with courses that are too narrow or specialized (such as a course on Missouri history or a narrow chronological period in U.S. history) to meet our criteria. As a result, students are being deprived of parts of the broad-based, coherent body of knowledge that they need to succeed.

The following table summarizes our research.

GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Comp	Lit	Gov/				
			Lang	Hist	Econ	Math	Sci
University of Missouri-Columbia	√		√			√	√
University of Missouri-Kansas City	√		√			√	√
University of Missouri-St. Louis	√					√	√
Missouri University of Sci and Tech	√				√	√	√
Missouri State University	√			√		√	√
Missouri Southern State University	√	√		√		√	√
Truman State University	√					√	√

Notes:

University of Missouri-Columbia: Not given credit for Gov/Hist because students may satisfy this requirement with courses on the U.S. after 1945, the history of Missouri, or U.S. state government, none of which are general courses on American government or history. Given credit for Foreign Language because it is required by the College of Arts & Sciences.

University of Missouri-Kansas City: Not given credit for Lit because students may elect such narrowly focused courses as Eng 241, *Women and Literary Culture*; Humanities 203P, *Four Major American Myths*; Eng 331/Eng 333, *African American Literature*; or Eng 325, *Arthurian Legends*. Not given credit for Gov/Hist because students may elect Pol Sci 409P, *Bureaucratic Politics* or Pol Sci 102P, *Introductions to Social Science*.

University of Missouri-St. Louis: Not given credit for Foreign Language because it is only required for the BA degree.

Missouri University of Science and Technology: Examined general education and Major requirements for Engineering programs, which enroll the vast majority of students. Not given credit for Gov/Hist because students may satisfy this requirement with History 112, *Modern Western Civilization*.

Missouri State University: Not given credit for Foreign Language because it is only required for the BA degree.

Missouri Southern State University: Not given credit for Foreign Language because it is only required for the BA degree.

Truman State University: Not given credit for Lit as it is one of several options in the Liberal Studies Program, Truman's general education curriculum. Not given credit for Foreign Language because it is not required at the intermediate level.

CHAPTER II:

Overall Grade	INTELLECTUAL DIVERSITY
F	Students report that major Missouri universities do not provide an intellectual atmosphere conducive to a robust exchange of ideas.

“IN ANY EDUCATION OF QUALITY, students encounter an abundance of intellectual diversity.”⁵

In 2006, the American Association of Colleges & Universities (AAC&U)—a respected national organization of which both the University of Missouri and Missouri State University are members—issued a statement making that claim.

To experience intellectual diversity, the AAC&U explained, students should be exposed to “new knowledge, different perspectives, competing ideas, and alternative claims of truth.” They should learn to think critically—so that they understand “the inappropriateness and dangers of indoctrination ... see through the distortions of propaganda, and ... assess judiciously the persuasiveness of powerful emotional appeals.”⁶

To make this happen, the AAC&U said students “require a safe environment in order to feel free to express their own views.” They “need the freedom to express their ideas publicly as well as repeated opportunities to explore a wide range of insights and perspectives.” And as part of this process, the AAC&U noted, faculty play a critical role in helping students to “form their own grounded judgments.”⁷

The AAC&U is not alone in voicing these sentiments. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) cautioned in its 1940 Statement of Principles that faculty “should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject.”⁸ The AAUP’s 1915 Declaration of Principles is even more explicit:

5 “Academic Freedom and Educational Responsibility,” 2.

6 Ibid., 2-3.

7 Ibid., 2, 5.

8 American Association of University Professors, “1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with 1970 Interpretive Comments,” http://www.higher-ed.org/resources/AAUP_1940stat.htm.

The teacher ought also to be especially on his guard against taking unfair advantage of the student's immaturity by indoctrinating him with the teacher's own opinions before the student has had an opportunity fairly to examine other opinions upon the matters of question, and before he has sufficient knowledge and ripeness in judgment to be entitled to form any definitive opinion of his own. It is not the least service which a college or university may render to those under its instruction, to habituate them to looking not only patiently but methodically on both sides, before adopting any conclusion upon controverted issues.⁹

In recent years, anecdotal evidence has suggested that some of Missouri's public universities have not, in fact, been providing students with a wealth of intellectual diversity, nor a safe environment in which to express their opinions. In one 2006 case, a Missouri State University social work student named Emily Brooker filed a lawsuit alleging that she faced academic retaliation for refusing to sign a letter to a legislator that would violate her religious beliefs.¹⁰ In 2003, the Missouri State administration investigated a student newspaper for publishing an innocuous editorial cartoon that a handful of students deemed "offensive."¹¹

However, anecdotal evidence is only that. In order to get a more accurate picture of the intellectual environment at Missouri's public universities, ACTA decided to undertake a scientific survey of those most able to attest to the level of intellectual diversity on campus—the students themselves. ACTA commissioned Pulsar Research and Consulting, a national firm headquartered in Hartford, Connecticut, to perform a survey of students at the two largest public university campuses in the state: The University of Missouri at Columbia and Missouri State University.¹²

9 General Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure (1915), 1 AAUP Bull 17 (1915), cited in *Freedom and Tenure in the Academy*, William W. Van Alstyne, Editor (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1993), 402.

10 Elia Powers, "Did Assignment Get Too Political," *Inside Higher Ed*, 1 November 2006, <http://www.inside-highered.com/news/2006/11/01/complaint>.

11 "Press Freedom Under Assault at Southwestern Missouri State University," 26 March 2004, *FIRE Press Release*, Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, <http://www.thefire.org/index.php/article/5025.html>.

12 Christopher Barnes, a partner with Pulsar, oversaw this project. He formerly worked for the University of Connecticut Center for Survey Research and Analysis and the Connecticut Senate Democratic Caucus and has performed surveys for *TIME* magazine, among other well-known publications and organizations. The survey was performed in February 2007 and included a total of 652 students from both campuses. The survey has a margin of error of plus-or-minus four percent. See Appendix B for more detailed results.

Based on the standards outlined above, the following chart lists key indicators of intellectual diversity and attaches Missouri students' answers to the corresponding Pulsar poll questions. We would expect that institutions truly committed to intellectual diversity and professional standards would yield minimal student complaints. But the results show substantial percentages of students registering dissatisfaction on a number of key topics. It is interesting to note that of the students surveyed, 75.7 percent described their political orientation as being moderate, liberal, or radical left, while 63.2 percent of participants had majors in the sciences or professional studies.

The University of Missouri System in particular has lately made intellectual diversity and freedom of expression a central focus, adopting a resolution during a Board of Curators meeting affirming those principles and putting into place a system where students can safely report cases of professional misconduct. Websites have been established where students can voice concerns about viewpoint discrimination, and special ombudsmen now exist to address those concerns. At Missouri State, when faced with Brooker's lawsuit, the president commendably called for an external review, and then publicly released its troubling findings. While these are positive steps, there is still much of concern—as the results of the survey show. On several key indicators of intellectual diversity, over a third of students—and in some cases, over half—reported problems. Even in the questions where smaller percentages of students complained, they still represent a significant number of students experiencing problems and issues related to intellectual diversity.

We held the institutions to the common grading standard of 64 percent or below as a Failing grade (F). In other words, for the institutions to receive a Passing grade (P), the percentage of students reporting problems on key indicators had to be less than 36 percent. For this reason, we give these Missouri public universities a Failing grade on intellectual diversity.

KEY INDICATORS OF INTELLECTUAL DIVERSITY**OFFERING COMPETING IDEAS, DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES, AND ALTERNATE CLAIMS OF TRUTH****GRADE: F****QUESTION**

“On my campus, some courses have readings which present only one side of a controversial issue.”

RESULT

56.8 percent of students agreed

QUESTION

“On my campus, some panel discussions and presentations on political issues seem totally one-sided.”

RESULT

48 percent agreed

QUESTION

“On my campus, some courses present social and political issues in an unfair and one-sided manner.”

RESULT

38.1 percent agreed

TEACHING STUDENTS TO THINK CRITICALLY**GRADE: F****QUESTION**

“On my campus, some professors use the classroom to present their personal political views.”

RESULT

58.7 percent agreed

QUESTION

“On my campus, there are courses in which students feel they have to agree with the professor’s political or social views in order to get a good grade.”

RESULT

51 percent agreed

QUESTION

“On my campus, some professors frequently comment on politics in class even though it has nothing to do with the course.”

RESULT

42.1 percent agreed

OFFERING A SAFE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT FOR STUDENTS**GRADE: F****QUESTION**

“On my campus, there are certain topics or viewpoints that are off limits.”

RESULT

39.6 percent agreed

ASSURING PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY IN THE CLASSROOM**GRADE: F****QUESTION**

“Do the student evaluation forms of the faculty at your campus ask about a professor’s social, political or religious bias?”

RESULT

78 percent said no;
18.5 percent did not know

OVERALL GRADE: F

CHAPTER III:

Overall Grades	GOVERNANCE
University of Missouri Board of Curators P	The University of Missouri Board of Curators has an efficient, functioning structure and operates in an open, transparent manner. Overall, it has been an engaged governing body, taking an active interest in improving academic quality, containing costs, and debating key issues facing the University of Missouri System.
Missouri State University Board of Governors F	The Missouri State University Board of Governors has difficulty functioning as a cohesive and effective board. While the board hears many reports, it remains generally reactive. Recent structural changes and strategic plans offer hope of more meaningful future accomplishments.

TRUSTEES MUST BE STEWARDS of the public interest, helping colleges and universities provide a high-quality education at an affordable price. They must support their institutions but be prepared to question the status quo. They must trust the president but feel free to seek other sources of information. Even in a world of shared governance, it is trustees who hold the ultimate responsibility for the academic and financial health of their institutions. In the words of Henry Clay, “Government is a trust, and the officers of the government are trustees; and both the trust and trustees are created for the benefit of the people.”

Lay governance is designed to bring the viewpoint of informed citizens to the very heart of the university. However, experience shows that the full promise and actual practice of lay boards are often worlds apart. Some boards rubber-stamp administrative recommendations, while others—working closely with administrators—look at the big picture and willingly exercise the authority needed to make tough choices.

The preeminence of our system of higher education can be ensured only if there is informed leadership from those who are vested with the financial and academic health of our colleges and universities—namely, college and university trustees.

This section of the report examines the effectiveness of the Board of Curators of the University of Missouri System (UM) and the Board of Governors of Missouri State University (MSU).

This section is divided into two parts for both UM and MSU. **Part I** examines the effectiveness of the boards' structure and transparency of operations, based on elements considered to be effective governance practices by such organizations as Independent Sector, ACTA's Institute for Effective Governance, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate. The elements examined include: availability and accessibility of board members' names and contact information; meeting frequency; member attendance; board size; the boards' periodic review of bylaws and/or policies; member engagement in professional development; transparency of the boards' activities and actions; the boards' committee structures including use of an executive committee; the boards' role in presidential searches and assessment of the president; and the boards' involvement in the development and monitoring of long-range plans.

Part II examines the boards' actual outcomes with particular emphasis on academic quality and fiscal accountability. Elements examined include actions the boards have taken to improve academic quality, assess student learning, and control costs. This part also examines whether the items brought by the administrations to the boards were ever rejected or received dissenting votes. Both criteria are designed to assess whether board members are asking questions and engaging the issues thoughtfully as opposed to simply rubber-stamping administrative/staff recommendations.

In a nutshell, Part I examines how well the boards are structured to do their work, and Part II examines what the boards have actually accomplished in a given period.

The analysis covers board actions for a period of a little more than two years, from roughly January 2006 through May 2008. To the extent they were available, board meeting minutes, board meeting summaries (for MSU), board press releases, board bylaws and policies, the universities' latest strategic plans, and other university published/web-based documents were examined.

Grading is on a Pass/Fail basis. The board received a Passing grade (P) if the board, via its structure and formal actions, demonstrated that good governance practices were being implemented. If good governance was not in practice, the board received a Failing grade (F).

PART I: BOARD STRUCTURE AND TRANSPARENCY OF OPERATIONS

The **University of Missouri System** is under the direction of a Board of Curators. According to the Missouri Constitution, each board member is appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the State Senate, and each member serves for a six-year term, with the terms of three members expiring every two years. No more than one curator is appointed from the same congressional district, and no more than five curators are to belong to any one political party. The Board of Curators also has a non-voting student representative.

Missouri State University is under the general control and management of a nine-member Board of Governors, which according to Missouri statutes, “possess full power and authority to adopt all needful rules and regulations for the guidance and supervision of the University.” All members are appointed by the governor with the consent of the State Senate, and each serves a six-year term. As with the University of Missouri System, a current Missouri State University student also sits on the board as a non-voting member.

Governance

Element	Evaluation
Names and contact information of board members publicly available and easily accessible	<p>To hold a board accountable, the public needs to know and have access to its members.¹³</p>
UM Grade: F	<p>University of Missouri System</p> <p>The names, photographs, biographies, and terms for each member are available and accessible on the Board of Curators’ website. In addition, there is an email address (boardofcurators@umsystem.edu) as well as a campus mailing address for the board. However, the public cannot contact their representatives directly—as they can in other states—since the board provides only generic email and mailing addresses. Accordingly, UM receives an “F.”</p>
MSU Grade: F	<p>Missouri State University</p> <p>MSU board members’ names, pictures, biographical information, the district they serve, and their terms of service are available and accessible on the Board of Governors’ website. However, direct contact information is not available. In fact, communication for Board of Governors members is directed through the president’s office. Hence, the Failing grade.</p>

13 Martin Anderson, *Impostors in the Temple*, (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1996), 202.

Governance

Element	Evaluation
Board meets frequently	<p>A board should meet as often as necessary to conduct its business.¹⁴ While the necessary number of meetings to conduct business will vary, meeting regularly, at least quarterly, and calling other meetings as necessary, is a good general practice.</p>
UM Grade: P	<p>University of Missouri System</p> <p>The bylaws for the University of Missouri Board of Curators provide for an annual meeting during the month of May or June, and regular meetings at a time and place to be fixed by the board. [University of Missouri Board of Curators Bylaws, Article III Section 1, Parts a. and b.] In practice, the board meets an average of six times a year, with most of the meetings taking place over the course of two days. These meetings usually include, in addition to the full meetings of the board, committee meetings, board development sessions, and closed meetings as needed, typically to discuss such issues as contracts, personnel, and legal matters. In addition to these regular meetings, the board, at its discretion, convenes a number of special meetings, with advance notice given on the UM System website.</p>
MSU Grade: P	<p>Missouri State University</p> <p>While the MSU Board of Governors' bylaws require only an annual meeting—the meeting at which the budget is presented—they do provide for regular and/or special meetings at the board's discretion. In practice, the MSU Board of Governors meets at least six times a year in regular meetings and calls a number of special meetings as needed [Bylaws of Board of Governors of MSU, Article II, Sections 6 and 7].</p>

14 *Principles for Good Governance and Ethical Practice: A Guide for Charities and Foundations* (Washington, DC: Panel on the Nonprofit Sector, 2007), 13.

Governance**Element****Evaluation**

Board members attend regularly

A board that meets to conduct business cannot be effective if a majority of the board members are not present or members fail to attend regularly.¹⁵

UM Grade: P**University of Missouri System**

The bylaws of the University of Missouri Board of Curators stipulate that if a member is found by unanimous vote of the board to have failed to attend two (2) consecutive meetings in any calendar year without good cause, he or she shall be dismissed from the board. [University of Missouri Board of Curators Bylaws, Article III, Section 2, Part a.] During the period reviewed, no such action needed to be taken, as there was only one instance of a curator being absent for the entirety of a meeting. Meeting attendance averaged close to 100 percent, an excellent record deserving of a Passing grade.

MSU Grade: I**Missouri State University**

The MSU board's bylaws outline an attendance policy and a process for removal of any board member similar to UM's. [Bylaws of Board of Governors of MSU, Article II, Section 14 a.] During the period reviewed, no such action was taken.

Chronic vacancies in the positions hampered effective and cohesive work. Due largely to these vacancies, board meeting attendance was 71 percent during the period under review. Because the MSU board is relatively small, active engagement by the full board is essential. Until vacancies are properly filled, the board's effectiveness will be impaired. Accordingly, the board receives an Incomplete.

¹⁵ "Best Practices in University Governance," expert testimony by ACTA's Institute for Effective Governance at U.S. Senate Finance Committee Roundtable Discussion, March 3, 2006.

Governance**Element****Evaluation**

Effective board size

While there is no magic number for the size of a governing board, an effectively functioning board should generally be no fewer than seven or greater than 15.¹⁶

UM Grade: P**University of Missouri System**

UM's governing board has nine members and a non-voting student member. The board members participate regularly in board and committee meetings, and the committees are structured to permit a substantive examination of issues.

MSU Grade: P**Missouri State University**

The MSU Board of Governors has a workable size of nine voting members and a non-voting student member, thus receiving a Passing grade. Frequent unfilled vacancies during the period under review made it difficult for the board to maximize its effectiveness.

Periodic review of bylaws and/or policies

Periodic review of bylaws and policies helps boards ensure that they are abiding by the rules they have set for themselves.¹⁷

UM Grade: P**University of Missouri System**

The University of Missouri Board of Curators regularly reviews and amends its Collected Rules and Regulations and bylaws, as evidenced by the bylaws themselves and meeting minutes for the period reviewed.

MSU Grade: P**Missouri State University**

The MSU board periodically amends its bylaws. In recent years, the board has taken steps to expand and refine its committee structure. For these positive measures, the MSU board receives a Passing grade.

16 "Ensuring Quality Trusteeship in Higher Education," expert testimony by ACTA at U.S. Senate Finance Committee Roundtable Discussion, March 3, 2006.

17 *Principles for Good Governance and Ethical Practice*, 18.

**Governance
Element**
Evaluation

Pre-service training and/or professional development

Trustees should be oriented in their new role and receive expert advice from inside and outside the institution throughout their board service.¹⁸

UM Grade: P
University of Missouri System

According to recent board minutes, the board does have a New Curator Orientation, as well as frequent “Development Sessions” aimed at improving governing practice. Most often, these presentations are from administrators from various parts of the university system, although trustees do sometimes hear presentations from outside higher education experts. During its October 2006 meeting, the board approved the creation of a Governance Committee, aimed at helping the board function more effectively and efficiently. This includes overseeing the orientation process for new members, coordinating periodic board self-assessment, encouraging in-service educational opportunities for board members, ensuring that the board adheres to its rules of conduct, and periodically reviewing its bylaws and procedures. This effort shows the board’s general awareness of the need for ongoing development. Accordingly, the board receives a Passing grade.

MSU Grade: F
Missouri State University

The board has adopted a policy to send two members to a trustee conference annually, preferably early in their six-year tenure. Board members may also attend workshops and other professional activities with the board chair’s approval. Despite these positive provisions, there is little evidence that formal orientation, professional development, or self-assessment occur or that the board members take significant advantage of outside training, which can illuminate best practices. Accordingly, the board receives a Failing grade.

18 “Best Practices in University Governance” and *Principles for Good Governance and Ethical Practice*, 17.

Governance

Element	Evaluation
Transparency of board activities and actions	<p>The ability of the public to see how the board operates and what it is doing is a critical element to a board's success.¹⁹</p> <p>Transparency helps the board communicate with the university community at large and build trust and confidence in the university's overseers.</p>
UM Grade: P	<p>University of Missouri System</p> <p>The UM Board of Curators gives advance notice of its meetings on its website, and archives meeting minutes for the board through January 2003. In January 2008 the board began streaming live audio of open sessions of board meetings on the website and keeps an archive of those recordings for future reference. The board also archives meeting agendas, public notices, and various meeting documents on the website, as well as system bylaws and policies.</p>
MSU Grade: P	<p>Missouri State University</p> <p>None of the MSU policies are posted on its website. However, the MSU board does provide advance notice of its meetings, and agendas and board bylaws are posted on the website. In addition, the Board of Governors' website has current and prior meeting minutes going back to 2004. Since March 2007, the board's Office of University Communications has also begun publishing on the website "Meeting Reviews" that highlight board actions taken at each meeting. In its recently adopted strategic plan, the board identified a goal of "practic[ing] transparency of operations and decision making."</p>

19 *Principles for Good Governance and Ethical Practice*, 12.

**Governance
Element**
Evaluation

Functioning
committee
structure

For a board to conduct its work effectively and delve into issues in meaningful ways, it should have standing committees with specific roles and duties.²⁰

UM Grade: P
University of Missouri System

The bylaws of the UM Board of Curators provide for an Executive Committee as well as the appointment of other standing or special committees as the board deems necessary to carry out specified objectives. The members of these committees are appointed by the chair, subject to the approval of the board. According to the bylaws, membership on these standing committees need not be limited to board members.

The UM Board of Curators has an Executive Committee, plus seven standing committees: Academic and Student Affairs, Compensation and Human Resources, External Affairs, Finance and Audit, Governance, Physical Facilities and Management Services, and Resources and Planning. These committees convene during several of the two-day meetings, make reports, and refer actions to the full board during its open meetings. They also schedule their own separate meetings as needed, and the board has also made use of ad hoc committees, such as one that addressed changes to the board's Conflict of Interest Policy.

MSU Grade: P
Missouri State University

The MSU board bylaws provide for an Executive Committee and other committees are established as the chair deems necessary. According to the bylaws, membership on committees need not be confined to members of the board, and the board chair and president are to be ex-officio members of all committees.

Until recently, the board had only an Executive Committee. However, in March 2007, the board established three additional committees: Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Finance and Budget. Each committee consists of three board members and members of the university administration.

Although the results of this board restructuring remain to be seen, the board is to be commended for taking this important first step and receives a Passing grade.

²⁰ "Best Practices in University Governance."

Governance

Element	Evaluation
Executive Committees	<p>Executive Committees are typically responsible for developing meeting agendas, planning board activities, reviewing compensation and reappointments, and monitoring committee work. In some cases, they also act on emergency or other items when the full board cannot convene. Given the important issues the Executive Committee frequently addresses, it is important that it not represent a quorum so that its actions are not binding on the full board.²¹</p>

UM Grade: P

University of Missouri System

According to the board’s bylaws, the Executive Committee consists of three members of the board appointed by the chair and subject to the board’s approval. The chair fills vacancies as they arise, and sits on the committee as an ex-officio member, voting in the absence of any committee member.

Advance notice of Executive Committee meetings is posted on the UM website along with the meeting’s agenda; minutes from those meetings are not posted online.

The Executive Committee represents less than a majority of the board. Under the terms of the bylaws, Executive Committee actions do not require full board review and modifications of these actions are prospective only. Board members do, however, receive a complete record of the committee’s actions on a monthly basis and do frequently ratify committee actions during regularly-scheduled board meetings. Accordingly, UM receives a Passing grade.

21 Ibid.

Governance**Element****Evaluation****MSU Grade: P****Missouri State University**

MSU's Executive Committee is made up of no more than three voting members of the Board of Governors and also includes the board chair and president as ex-officio members.

At MSU, no advance notice of Executive Committee meetings is provided; however, minutes are available on the website from December 2006 to the present.

The Executive Committee represents less than a majority of the board. As at UM, under the terms of the bylaws, Executive Committee actions do not require full board review and modifications of these actions are prospective only. The board members receive a complete record of the committee's action on a monthly basis, and minutes indicate that the board frequently does vote to approve the minutes of the Executive Committee. Accordingly, MSU receives a Passing grade.

Involvement in presidential search committees

Selecting a president is a board's most important decision. While boards should seek input from higher education's varied consistencies, they should always maintain control over the search process and ultimately the candidates from which they will make their selection. Boards must remember that they hire, fire, and evaluate the chief executive and to delegate or abdicate their most important fiduciary duty is not good governance practice.²²

UM Grade: P**University of Missouri System**

The University of Missouri engaged in a search for a new president in 2007. According to university communications, the Board of Curators itself served as the presidential search committee, with a 19-member presidential search advisory committee drawn from a wide array of university constituencies including faculty, students, staff, and alumni.

²² *Selecting a New President: What to do Before You Hire a Search Firm* (Washington DC: ACTA's Institute for Effective Governance, 2004).

**Governance
Element**
Evaluation

The Board of Curators conducted initial interviews of candidates, referred finalists to the advisory committee, which performed subsequent interviews and provided its impressions to the Board of Curators; the board then made the final decision. The board also employed an executive search consultant to assist in identifying potential candidates.

The University News Service issued regular releases of presidential search events, even posting video footage of a public presidential search forum. The board should be commended for taking an active role in the presidential search process and for making the process accessible to the wider public.

MSU Grade: F
Missouri State University

The MSU Board of Governors conducted a search for its current president in 2004. While no specific policy or documentation of procedures used is available on MSU's website, a 2004 Faculty Senate report stipulated that the presidential search committee be comprised of three members of the board (one of whom would serve as chair of the committee); five representatives of the faculty; two representatives from the staff; and three representatives of the alumni and friends of the university. The search committee would send three finalists to the Board of Governors. Since board members were a small minority of this search committee, the board receives a Failing grade.

Governance**Element****Evaluation**

Renewal of presidential contracts based on regular evaluation

Regular evaluations of the president prior to compensation adjustments and contract renewals or reappointments are important to ensure that board goals are being achieved.²³

UM Grade: P**University of Missouri System**

In June of 2008, the University of Missouri Board of Curators extended the term of President Gary Forsee's appointment from three to five years, deferring the performance-based component to five years before any payment would occur. The board approved initial performance goals for Forsee's first year in office, including the development of a strategic plan and confirmation of key accountability measures for the university. Likewise, in 2005, when the board voted to extend the contract of the previous president, Elson Floyd, a performance appraisal provided the basis for his contract renewal and pay raise.

The board maintains a Performance Award Program for the president. The criteria include: establishing overall performance measures for the UM System, communicating the value of higher education to the Missouri public, and setting long-term targets for the university (which include graduation/retention rates, improving the quality of incoming freshmen, and an emphasis on new funding sources). According to meeting minutes for the last two years of Floyd's term as president, the board regularly conducted performance appraisals during the last scheduled meeting of the calendar year.

MSU Grade: P**Missouri State University**

Michael T. Nietzel became president of MSU on July 1, 2005. The Board of Governors renewed his contract in May 2007, giving him a four-percent salary increase and extending his contract through 2011. The action was taken in executive session. Following state law, the board announced the terms of the renewal, outlining its satisfaction with Nietzel in a variety of areas and its revision of the president's retention incentive agreement to ensure he would remain at MSU to implement the strategic plan. In May 2008, the board extended the contract an additional year to 2012 and announced a new endowed University Leadership Chair to be filled by the president and future incumbents based on exemplary performance and annual reviews.

²³ *Principles for Good Governance and Ethical Practice*, 15 and *Assessing the President's Performance: A "How To" Guide for Trustees* (Washington DC: ACTA's Institute for Effective Governance, 2006).

Governance**Element****Evaluation**

Development of a long-range plan

Trustees, working with the university stakeholders, have a responsibility to clarify the mission, articulate the vision, and set broad strategic goals for the institution in achieving that vision. Once approved, the strategic plan should become the guiding plan that drives decision-making and evaluation processes.²⁴

UM Grade: P**University of Missouri System**

The UM System president announced a strategic plan in December of 2006, which outlined the following themes: Access to Quality Learning and Teaching, Academic and Research Achievement and Quality, Community-University Engagement, Valuing People and Creating a High-Performing Organization, and Developing and Managing Resources and Improving Processes. It does not appear that the board had a significant role in drafting the plan, which, according to a series of planning documents, originated with a meeting of the General Officers during a retreat from November 30 to December 1, 2006. Board minutes show discussion of the strategic plan during several of the 2006 and 2007 meetings, however, and board committees are structured to address the plan's key components. Accordingly, the board receives a Passing grade.

MSU Grade: P**Missouri State University**

After undertaking a 24-month strategic planning process, the university devised a long-range plan entitled *Imagining and Making Missouri's Future: A Long-Range Vision and Five-Year Plan (2006-2011)*, which was approved by the Board of Governors in September 2006. The plan contains five goals: Democratizing Society, Incubating New Ideas, Imagining Missouri's Future, Making Missouri's Future, and Modeling Ethical and Effective Behavior. It does not appear that the board played a substantial role in the development of the strategic plan. However, according to board minutes, the board discussed the plan at its summer 2006 retreat and requested 60 days to review the plan before ultimately approving it. The plan includes a Public Scorecard designed to monitor the institution's progress annually and provide public accountability. For these positive steps, the board receives a Passing grade.

²⁴ *Strategic Planning: And Trustee Responsibility* (Washington DC: ACTA's Institute for Effective Governance, 2005).

PART II: BOARD ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Governance

Element	Evaluation
---------	------------

Actions to improve academic quality

UM Grade: P

University of Missouri System

The Board of Curators has an Academic and Student Affairs Committee that makes reports to the board and presents actions for the board to approve. Most of the time, the committee presents new programs to the board for approval, but it has also made presentations on topics such as intellectual pluralism and campus climate. In October 2007, the full board took an active role in support of academic freedom and intellectual diversity, passing a resolution affirming its “unwavering commitment to the principles of academic freedom and intellectual inquiry that are the foundation of the American Land-Grant and Research University.” UM campuses launched websites where students could voice concerns about viewpoint discrimination and appointed special ombudsmen to handle the complaints.

While no actions have been taken regarding general education curricula during the period observed, the strategic plan does emphasize the need to attract and retain high-quality faculty, as well as to increase the quality of the incoming student body with regard to test scores and high school class rank. The Academic and Student Affairs committee in 2007 also made it a goal to monitor student success during 2008, in the form of annual reports to the committee. In addition, the committee, in its October 2006 meeting, proposed a “Program Review and Audit,” which aims to “assess each academic unit’s quality and effectiveness, to stimulate program planning and improvement, and to encourage strategic development in alignment with campus priorities.”

While the results remain to be seen in many areas, the board is to be commended for moving forward concretely to advance intellectual pluralism. Accordingly, it receives a Passing grade.

MSU Grade: F

Missouri State University

When the board adopted its strategic plan, it outlined its intent to examine the curriculum (both major programs of study and individual courses) using a variety of measures. Stated goals included strengthening promotion and tenure procedures, creating new graduate programs, providing an RFP process for funds to support research initiatives, and conducting “rigorous” external

Governance**Element****Evaluation**

program reviews that would eliminate programs and courses not appropriate for the university mission. According to the President's 2007 Report to the Campus, the university also planned to review the general education program to see if the courses are the "right kinds of courses and of the right quality and content."

Despite these stated intentions, during the two-year period reviewed, the MSU board took no substantive actions to improve academic quality. Indeed, until March 2007, there was not even a committee dedicated to Academic Affairs. Accordingly, MSU receives a Failing grade.

Actions to assess student learning

UM Grade: P

University of Missouri System

The university's strategic plan lists, among other goals, that the University of Missouri System would strive to "lead public universities in the state in student retention and graduation rates" and "assess educational outcomes to improve the quality of student learning." This includes the formulation of an annual institutional outcomes report, which measures such strategic indicators as the average ACT score of entering freshmen, the percentage of undergraduate class sections taught by ranked faculty, the number of students involved with service learning, the percentage of students scoring above the 50th percentile on the Collegiate Academic Assessment Proficiency Test (CAAP), and the results of University of Missouri seniors on the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

Furthermore, the Academic and Student Affairs Committee, in outlining its Goals and Objectives for 2008, declared that it would monitor student success through annual reports to the committee. It would also "review national trends in higher education and identify the implications for the University of Missouri" and "identify appropriate performance measures that are consistent with accountability measures being used nationally." The University of Missouri also joined the Voluntary System of Accountability, a nationwide project measuring graduation and retention rates, student engagement, and learning outcomes, and has committed to reviewing the progress of strategic academic initiatives across the university system.

The plans underscore the board's commitment to improved student learning. For this reason, the board receives a Passing grade.

Governance**Element****Evaluation****MSU Grade: I****Missouri State University**

The board—during the two-year review period—did not take any specific actions to address the assessment of student learning. However, as articulated in the university’s long-range plan, student success is a priority.

In response to the Spellings Commission report, in January 2007, MSU’s president articulated how MSU will hold itself more accountable for student learning and performance. He reiterated the approved long-range plan, emphasizing performance measures in a variety of areas, including: quality indicators of entering first-time freshmen; retention rate of first-year and transfer students; six-year graduation rates; number and percentage of students involved in research projects and community service; number and percentage of students winning state, national, and international awards; number and percentage of students authoring refereed publications and conference paper/presentations; pass rates on licensure exams; and student learning measures consonant with those suggested by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) and nationally-normed student satisfaction measures.

MSU is now a member of the HLC Academy for Assessment of Student Learning. In addition, the university intends to participate in the National Study of Student Engagement (NSSE) every two years and use the results of that assessment to improve the academic climate and student engagement at the institution. The president has articulated institutional interest in assessing student learning through a reliable, nationally-normed instrument, such as the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) or the National Adult Literacy Survey (NALS). In addition, MSU has joined the national Voluntary System of Accountability project which will measure persistence, graduation and retention rates, student engagement, and learning outcomes.

It appears that the university leadership is committed to assessing student learning and to using the results of such assessments to improve student success. However, the board has remained largely uninvolved, and the jury is out on the ultimate implementation of the plans. Accordingly, the board receives an Incomplete.

Governance**Element****Evaluation**

Actions to control costs and increase efficiency

UM Grade: I

University of Missouri System

The Board of Curators has demonstrated growing dedication to controlling costs and increasing efficiency—largely in response to pressure from elected officials in the state. Faced with reduced state appropriations, in 2006, then-president Elson Floyd and the board identified nearly \$20 million in savings. Measures included eliminating unnecessary academic and nonacademic programs, enhancing efficiency and productivity, reducing costs in administrative service areas, and enhancing the use of technology without increasing costs. Actual spending dedicated to instruction has been rising, while administrative expenditures have been declining. Due to this positive trend, in April of 2007, curators unanimously approved a “1% efficiencies account” for contributions to university compensation funded through dollars saved by operating efficiencies.

Recent board actions have shown a commitment to controlling costs and enhancing efficiency, but there is much work to be done. Accordingly, the board receives an Incomplete.

MSU Grade: F

Missouri State University

In March 2008, the board voted to keep student fee increases at the rate of inflation, after pressure from the governor. In addition, the board endorsed alternative tuition programs in the strategic plan, giving students options, including one that freezes basic fees during the period of the plan.

In May 2006, the board adopted a performance-based compensation system for the university, and MSU for the last three years has reallocated one percent of its operating budget toward new initiatives. One-half of the reallocation stays with the individual departments while the other half goes predominately to a salary pool for improving compensation university-wide. On the capital construction side, the board has implemented a Facilities Reutilization Plan which focuses on better utilizing existing space by renovating rather than constructing.

Governance

Element	Evaluation
	<p>To focus more effectively on budget and finance items, the board recently created a new Finance and Budget Committee. The president has developed a financial planning calendar to better communicate the financial and budgeting process, and the board now keeps informed about “big ticket” spending by reviewing all expenditures greater than \$100,000. In its strategic plan, the board outlined its intent to eliminate programs and courses “not appropriate for the university mission.” It also recently adopted and implemented a Whistleblower Policy modeled after provisions in the Sarbanes-Oxley Act.</p> <p>While these are steps in the right direction, there is no evidence that the board has seriously engaged in program reviews or shut down unproductive and obsolete courses. The rate of administrative spending far outpaces the rate of spending for instruction, and the number of course offerings continues to grow with no offsetting reductions. Accordingly, the board receives a Failing grade.</p>

Avoiding the rubber stamp

UM Grade: F

University of Missouri System

During the period from January 2006 to April 2008, there were over 200 motions brought before the University of Missouri Board of Curators. Only eight of them recorded any “no” votes at all, and only two of those recorded more than one “no” vote. The rest of the actions passed without challenge, albeit with a number of recorded abstentions. Therefore, the UM board receives a Failing grade. However, it bears mentioning that a significant minority of the board voted against the administration’s proposal to raise tuition by 3.8 percent, narrowly losing by a 4-5 margin.

MSU Grade: F

Missouri State University

Over a two-year period, the MSU Board of Governors approved every one of the almost 200 items brought before it, and all but one unanimously. Accordingly, MSU receives a Failing grade.

UM SYSTEM GRADE: P

MSU GRADE: F

CHAPTER IV:

Overall Grades	COST AND EFFECTIVENESS
University of Missouri System F	The University of Missouri System has had recent success in stemming costs and increasing effectiveness; however, graduation rates remain disturbingly low while costs remain high.
Missouri State University F	Missouri State University has done little to contain costs and increase effectiveness; however, signs of progress appear on the horizon.

PRICES OF PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES rose more rapidly between 1997-98 and 2007-08 than in the preceding decade, and tuition and fee levels at four-year public colleges across the country increased 31 percent in just five years—and that’s after adjusting for inflation.²⁵ Faced with these increases, according to a 2007 survey by the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 60 percent of people believe that higher education is being priced beyond the income of the average middle class family.²⁶ In fact, on average, lower income families spent 39 percent of their annual income for their children to attend public four-year colleges in 2003-04,²⁷ compared with 13 percent in 1980.²⁸

According to the Lumina Foundation for Education, “Rising prices are the tip of the iceberg. The amount of money that colleges and universities spend to provide education to their students is rising faster than consumer prices and health care costs.”²⁹ With costs out of control, many question the effectiveness and cost management of the higher education enterprise. In fact, four out of ten Americans surveyed consider waste and mismanagement a major factor in driving up higher education costs.³⁰

25 College Board, *Trends in College Pricing* 2007, 10.

26 *Squeeze Play: How Parents and the Public Look at Higher Education Today*, 15.

27 *Trends in College Pricing*, 18.

28 The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, *Losing Ground: A National Status Report on the Affordability of American Higher Education* (Washington, DC: 2007), 5.

29 Lumina Foundation for Education, *Hitting Home: Quality, Cost, and Access Challenges Confronting Higher Education Today* (2007), 3.

30 *Squeeze Play: How Parents and the Public Look at Higher Education Today*, 23.

Given these numbers and growing public concern, it is imperative that higher education earn the confidence of the public in the use of funds.

This section examines the University of Missouri System (UM) and Missouri State University (MSU) in terms of cost and effectiveness. The report takes a look at trends in spending and tuition and fee increases. It examines whether the UM System and MSU are successful in graduating full-time freshmen and retaining such students after their first year of study.

In addition, it evaluates the handling of unproductive programs and whether institutions use performance as a criterion in funding allocations.

The period of evaluation is generally five years; however, periods of measure may vary based on data availability and the specific measure (e.g., latest median household income available is for 2006). Comments relative to each element include the period reviewed.

Grading is on a Pass/Fail basis. The following describes the various elements used to evaluate the UM System and MSU and explains the grading criteria.

Instructional vs. administrative spending. This measure assesses UM and MSU's commitment to instructional versus administrative spending. It examines instructional and administrative expenditures as a percentage of Educational and General expenditures (E&G) and total expenditures relative to the base year. The percentage change in instructional and administrative spending over the period is also examined. If instructional spending as a percent of total expenditures increased or the percentage increase in instructional spending was equal to or higher than administrative spending increases, signifying that instruction was a priority, UM and/or MSU received a Passing grade. If the opposite was true, UM and/or MSU received a Failing grade.

Trend in in-state undergraduate tuition and fees. This measure assesses UM and MSU's commitment to keeping tuition and fee increases at reasonable levels. If over the five-year period, tuition and fees increased at a rate equal to or less than the rate of inflation (using the Consumer Price Index), UM and/or MSU received a Passing grade. If however, tuition and fees increased greater than the rate of inflation, UM and/or MSU received a Failing grade.

Tuition and fees as a percentage of median household income. This measure indicates how well UM and MSU have kept higher education affordable relative to median household income. If the amount of median family income required to pay for tuition and fees decreased or remained relatively unchanged from the base year, UM and/or MSU received a Passing grade. Conversely, if tuition and fees required a greater percentage of a family's median income, UM and/or MSU received a Failing grade.

Ratio of new programs to closed programs. This is an efficiency measure that attempts to assess how well UM and MSU are monitoring program growth through approval and closure of new programs. If UM and/or MSU established twice as many or more programs than it closed, it received a Failing grade.

Baccalaureate graduation rates for first-time, full-time freshmen. This measure examines the current four-, five-, and six-year graduation rates for UM and MSU. While optimally 100 percent of first-time, full-time freshmen should graduate in four years and certainly by six years, we applied a 64 percent benchmark—a typical grading scale used to assess students’ Pass/Fail rate. If less than 64 percent of students graduated in four, five, or six years, UM and/or MSU received a Failing grade. The national six-year baccalaureate graduation rate of 55.8 percent³¹ is unacceptable, and is not used as a standard for grading purposes.

First-year retention rates for first-time, full-time freshmen. This measure depicts the percentage of first-time, full-time students enrolled as freshmen who continue the following year as sophomores. In effect, this is the first-year drop-out rate. It is an important measure for two reasons: first, remaining after the first year is an indicator that the student is more likely to complete his or her degree; and second, it can also suggest—especially to an institution that has a large “drop-out” rate after the first year—that the students were not sufficiently prepared (either academically or socially) to succeed. Both are important indicators for board members to examine. If the first- to second-year retention rates were less than 64 percent, then UM and/or MSU received a Failing grade.

Performance as a criterion for funding. Rewards and incentives for good outcomes can lead to better results. Building on the philosophy that “what gets measured gets better,” this measure ascertains whether or not UM and/or MSU uses, either in part or fully, performance as a criterion for funding. If performance is used as a criterion, UM and/or MSU received a Passing grade. If not, UM and/or MSU received a Failing grade.

31 Graduation Rates, NCHEMS Information Center for State Higher Education Policy Making and Analysis, <http://www.higheredinfo.org/dbrowser/index.php?level=nation&mode=graph&state=0&submeasure=27>.

Cost/Effectiveness**Element**

Instructional vs.
administrative spending

UM Grade: P

Evaluation**University of Missouri System**

In 2002, 47 percent of UM's Educational and General (E&G) expenditures and 33 percent of total expenditures supported Instruction while Administration took up seven percent of E&G expenses and five percent of total expenses. For Instruction, the picture changed slightly in 2007, with 46 percent of E&G expenditures supporting Instruction. However, a significantly smaller portion of the total budget (28 percent) was spent on Instruction in 2007, marking a five percent decline in proportional spending from the 2002 base year.

For Administrative costs, proportional spending decreased about 1.5 percent during the period, with seven percent of E&G expenditures and three percent of total expenditures supporting Administration. For both Instruction and Administrative costs, the decline in relative proportion of costs to total spending is related more to the significant increase (79.6 percent) in Auxiliary Enterprise spending for the period than decreases in actual spending for Instructional and Administrative costs.

While the proportion of E&G spending declined in both Instruction and Administration, and the proportion of total spending on Instruction and Administration declined significantly (mostly due to the change in Auxiliary Enterprise funding), actual spending on Instruction increased 11 percent during the five-year period while actual spending on Administrative costs went down 15 percent. This signifies a greater priority on Instruction than Administration, and hence the Passing grade.

Cost/Effectiveness

Element

Evaluation

UM INSTRUCTIONAL VS. ADMINISTRATIVE SPENDING

	2007	2002
INSTRUCTION*		
Expenditures on Instruction	\$591,233,952	\$534,759,554
Instruction as a % of E&G	46.2%	47.1%
Instruction as a % of Total	27.5%	32.9%
\$ Change from 2002	\$56,474,398	
% Change from 2002	10.6%	
<i>* Instruction = Instruction and Academic Support</i>		
ADMINISTRATION**		
Expenditures on Administration	\$67,071,494	\$78,459,800
Administration as a % of E&G	5.2%	6.9%
Administration as a % of Total	3.1%	4.8%
\$ Change from 2002	\$(11,388,306)	
% Change from 2002	-14.5%	
<i>** Administration = Institutional Support</i>		

Source: IPEDS Finance, Missouri Department of Higher Education

Cost/Effectiveness**Element****Evaluation****MSU Grade: F****Missouri State University**

In 2002, 58 percent of MSU's Educational and General (E&G) expenditures and 49 percent of total expenditures supported Instruction, while 8.4 percent of E&G expenses and seven percent of total expenses supported Administration. For Instruction, the picture changed slightly in 2007, with 56 percent of E&G expenditures and 46 percent of total expenditures supporting Instruction, marking a slight decline in proportional spending (about two percent) from the 2002 base year.

For Administrative costs, proportional spending increased about one percent during the period, with nine percent of E&G expenditures and seven percent of total expenditures supporting administrative costs. This marks a small increase in proportional spending on Administrative costs with respect to total spending—about half a percent. While the proportion of E&G and total spending on Instruction and Administration changed only slightly, MSU spent 17 percent more on Instruction in 2007 than it did in 2002, while Administration spending grew nearly twice that rate (30 percent) during the same period. Thus, the Failing grade.

MSU INSTRUCTIONAL VS. ADMINISTRATIVE SPENDING

	2007	2002
INSTRUCTION*		
Expenditures on Instruction	\$101,710,408	\$87,225,252
Instruction as a % of E&G	56.4%	58.1%
Instruction as a % of Total	45.9%	48.5%
\$ Change from 2002	\$14,485,156	
% Change from 2002	16.6%	
<i>* Instruction = Instruction and Academic Support</i>		
ADMINISTRATION**		
Expenditures on Administration	\$16,501,454	\$12,659,454
Administration as a % of E&G	9.1%	8.4%
Administration as a % of Total	7.4%	7.0%
\$ Change from 2002	\$3,842,000	
% Change from 2002	30.3%	
<i>** Administration = Institutional Support</i>		

Source: IPEDS Finance, Missouri Department of Higher Education

Cost/Effectiveness

Element

Evaluation

In-state undergraduate tuition and fee trends

UM Grade: F

MSU Grade: F

**University of Missouri System/
Missouri State University**

Inflation-adjusted tuition and required fees at UM increased by nearly 24 percent during the period reviewed. Although MSU has recently committed to keeping fee increases proportional to the rate of inflation, MSU's tuition and required fees increased by nearly 20 percent after adjusting for inflation for the period 2006-07 compared to 2002-03. Hence, UM and MSU receive Failing grades.

TRENDS IN UNDERGRADUATE TUITION AND REQUIRED FEES

	2006-2007	2002-2003	% CHANGE
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI SYSTEM			
Not adjusted for inflation	\$7,825	\$5,647	38.6%
Inflation adjusted (using CPI expressed in 2006 \$)	7,825	6,328	23.7%
MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY			
Not adjusted for inflation	\$5,738	\$4,274	34.3%
Inflation adjusted (using CPI expressed in 2006 \$)	5,738	4,790	19.8%

Source: IPEDS Finance, Missouri Department of Higher Education

Cost/Effectiveness

Element

Evaluation

Annual in-state undergraduate tuition and fees as a percentage of median household income

UM Grade: F

MSU Grade: F

**University of Missouri System/
Missouri State University**

In 2006-07, annual in-state undergraduate tuition and required fees at both UM and MSU required a greater percentage of inflation-adjusted median household income than they did just four years earlier. At UM, 12.7 percent of median household income was needed to cover in-state undergraduate tuition and fees in 2002-03. In 2006-07, that percentage was 14.8 percent, two percent more than the previous period and a jump of 16 percent after adjusting for inflation. In 2002-03, 9.6 percent of median household income was required to pay for annual in-state tuition and fees at MSU; in 2006-07, 10.8 percent of median household income was required. Due to these increases, UM and MSU receive Failing grades.

UNDERGRADUATE TUITION AND FEES AS A PERCENTAGE OF MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME

	2006-2007	2002-2003	CHANGE	% CHANGE
University of Missouri System	14.76%	12.69%	2.06%	16.26%
Missouri State University	10.82%	9.61%	1.21%	12.62%

Source: Missouri Department of Higher Education and U.S. Census Bureau

Ratio of new programs to closed programs

UM Grade: F

MSU Grade: F

**University of Missouri System/
Missouri State University**

During the two-year period examined, UM discontinued four academic programs but approved 14 new ones, still a very high ratio of new programs to closed programs. During the the same period, MSU's Board of Governors approved 15 new degree programs and terminated none. The MSU strategic plan states that "any academic programs and courses not appropriate for the university mission [would] be eliminated." Hopefully, future reviews will include a review of program productivity in terms of enrollment and degree generation. UM and MSU receive Failing grades.

Cost/Effectiveness

Element

Evaluation

Baccalaureate graduation rates for first-time, full-time freshmen

UM Grade: F

MSU Grade: F

**University of Missouri System/
Missouri State University**

Neither UM nor MSU has made easily accessible the four- and five-year graduation rates of their students. However, they do collect the data and can provide it. The data show that UM only graduates 34 percent of its first-time, full-time freshmen in four years, 56 percent within five years, and 61 percent within six years—up slightly from five years prior. While better than the national six-year graduation rate average of about 56 percent, it is still unacceptable that 39 percent of students enrolling at UM full-time do not graduate within six years. Using the criteria of 64 percent or lower as Failing, UM receives a grade of “F.”

MSU only graduates 27 percent of its first-time, full-time freshmen in four years, 48 percent within five years, and 54 percent within six years—up approximately seven percent from five years ago. Despite MSU’s stated goal to improve graduation rates and its progress in that area, 46 percent of MSU’s graduates still do not graduate within six years, and nearly 75 percent do not graduate in four. Hence, MSU’s Failing grade.

BACCALAUREATE GRADUATION RATES FOR FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME FRESHMEN

INSTITUTION	CLASS OF 2001 ENTERING COHORT-GRADUATION RATE			CLASS OF 1997 ENTERING COHORT-GRADUATION RATE			CHANGE 2001 COHORT VS. 1997 COHORT		
	FOUR YEAR	FIVE YEAR	SIX YEAR	FOUR YEAR	FIVE YEAR	SIX YEAR	FOUR YEAR	FIVE YEAR	SIX YEAR
University of Missouri System	34.0%	56.0%	61.0%	29.0%	54.0%	60.0%	5.0%	2.0%	1.0%
Missouri State University	27.0%	48.0%	54.0%	19.0%	42.0%	48.0%	8.0%	6.0%	6.0%

Source: UM and MSU Institutional Research

Cost/Effectiveness

Element

Evaluation

Percent of first-time, full-time freshmen continuing after the first year (first to second year retention rate)

**University of Missouri System/
Missouri State University**

For UM, the fall 2002 retention rate was 82 percent. Five years later, it increased slightly to 83 percent. Based on the grading scale, UM receives a Passing grade.

UM Grade: P

In the fall of 2002, 74 percent of first-time, full-time freshmen returned for their second year at MSU. Five years later, the number remains unchanged. This means that about one-fourth of the full-time freshmen do not return for their second year. According to our grading scale, MSU receives a Passing grade for its retention rate, but the numbers are still worrisome.

MSU Grade: P

While these results are troubling, MSU has made graduation and retention a priority and even hired a consultant to examine the reasons why students leave. The board has set as its goal to reach 80 percent retention, and to aid it in doing so the university has initiated a number of programs including participation in the National Survey of Student Engagement and implementing a First Year Experience program.

FIRST-YEAR RETENTION RATES OF FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME FRESHMEN

INSTITUTION	2006 COHORT	2002 COHORT	CHANGE
University of Missouri System	83.0%	82.0%	1.0%
Missouri State University	74.0%	74.0%	0.0%

Source: UM and MSU Institutional Research

Cost/Effectiveness

Element

Evaluation

Performance as a criterion for funding

UM Grade: P

MSU Grade: P

Missouri has a long history of using performance in the allocation of state appropriations, especially with its Funding for Results Program. In recent years, the governor and General Assembly have shown a renewed commitment to higher education accountability in conjunction with increases in base funding. In 2007, the governor signed into law S.B. 389, requiring educational institutions and the Missouri Department of Higher Education to develop institutional and statewide performance measures by the 2008-09 academic year. In addition, a Higher Education Funding Task Force has been created to make recommendations on performance funding.

Both UM and MSU have instituted performance measures—such as the performance protocols delineated in UM’s strategic plan and the MSU Public Scorecard—that would tie dollars to performance standards.

UM SYSTEM GRADE: F

MSU GRADE: F

appendices

APPENDIX A SELECTION CRITERIA FOR
CORE COURSES

APPENDIX B STUDENT SURVEY DATA

APPENDIX C STUDENT SURVEY
METHODOLOGY

Appendix A

SELECTION CRITERIA FOR CORE COURSES

The criteria for the seven courses used to evaluate each college's general education program are:

1. Writing or Composition

Does not include remedial writing. Also excludes courses taught by faculty not trained to teach writing, such as so-called writing-intensive seminars, or writing "for" a discipline (such as business or law), where the instructors are not from the English or composition department.

2. Literature

Broad course on literature, such as a "great works" course. Does not include narrow, esoteric, or single author courses.

3. Foreign Language

Competence at the intermediate level, as indicated by more than one year of college work, or three years of high school work, or an appropriate examination score.

4. American Government or American History

Colleges were credited for requiring either subject. The government course should be devoted primarily to American national government and politics. The history course should be broad enough to give a sense of the general sweep of American history. We excluded courses on one particular era, e.g., the U.S. post-1945, or a single issue, or courses on the politics and history of a particular state.

5. Economics

A general course, such as macro- or microeconomics, taught by faculty in the economics or business department.

6. Mathematics

Includes college-level, but not remedial mathematics. Includes advanced algebra, trigonometry, calculus, computer programming, statistics/probability, or mathematical reasoning at or above the intermediate level. Logic courses taught

by philosophers, linguistics courses, or computer literacy (“computer science”) courses were not credited, as the math content is usually minimal.

7. Natural or Physical Science

Includes such sciences as astronomy, biology, chemistry, geology, and physics. Environmental science counts if taught by faculty in one of the preceding departments. Psychology, generally considered a social science, was not counted, except for courses on the biological or chemical aspects of the brain.

Appendix B

STUDENT SURVEY DATA



**American Council of Trustees and Alumni
Missouri Public Universities Survey
Total Sample
February 2007**

School

	Unweighted N	Weighted N	%
Missouri State	323	268	41.3
University of Missouri	329	381	58.7
Total	652	649	100.0

Q1. Are you a freshman, sophomore, junior or senior?

	n	%
Freshman	167	25.8
Sophomore	141	21.7
Junior	150	23.0
Senior	191	29.4
Total	649	100.0

Q2. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some professors make negative comments in class about liberals.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	152	23.6
Disagree	370	57.4
Agree	114	17.7
Strongly Agree	8	1.3
Total	645	100.0
No Answer	4	
Total	649	

Q3. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some professors make positive comments in class about liberals.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	60	9.3
Disagree	222	34.2
Agree	309	47.6
Strongly Agree	57	8.9
Total	649	100.0

Q4. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some professors make negative comments in class about conservatives.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	83	12.9
Disagree	278	42.9
Agree	232	35.8
Strongly Agree	55	8.4
Total	647	100.0
No Answer	2	
Total	649	



**American Council of Trustees and Alumni
Missouri Public Universities Survey
Total Sample
February 2007**

Q5. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some professors make positive comments in class about conservatives.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	83	12.9
Disagree	337	52.6
Agree	207	32.2
Strongly Agree	14	2.2
Total	641	100.0
No Answer	8	
Total	649	

Q6. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some professors make negative comments about people of faith.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	181	28.0
Disagree	335	52.0
Agree	107	16.6
Strongly Agree	21	3.3
Total	645	100.0
No Answer	4	
Total	649	

Q7. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some professors make positive comments about people of faith.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	77	12.0
Disagree	270	41.9
Agree	266	41.2
Strongly Agree	32	4.9
Total	645	100.0
No Answer	4	
Total	649	

Q8. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, there are certain topics or viewpoints that are off limits.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	108	16.7
Disagree	283	43.7
Agree	214	33.0
Strongly Agree	42	6.6
Total	648	100.0
No Answer	1	
Total	649	



**American Council of Trustees and Alumni
Missouri Public Universities Survey
Total Sample
February 2007**

Q9. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, students don't feel free to express their patriotism.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	202	31.4
Disagree	372	57.7
Agree	57	8.8
Strongly Agree	13	2.1
Total	645	100.0
No Answer	4	
Total	649	

Q10. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some panel discussions and presentations on political issues seem totally one-sided.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	38	6.0
Disagree	291	46.0
Agree	246	38.9
Strongly Agree	57	9.1
Total	633	100.0
No Answer	16	
Total	649	

Q11. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, there is no effective way to complain about a professor's bias without risking retaliation.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	58	9.0
Disagree	367	57.2
Agree	174	27.1
Strongly Agree	43	6.7
Total	641	100.0
No Answer	8	
Total	649	

Q12. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some courses present social and political issues in an unfair and one-sided manner.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	42	6.6
Disagree	353	55.2
Agree	214	33.5
Strongly Agree	29	4.6
Total	640	100.0
No Answer	9	
Total	649	



**American Council of Trustees and Alumni
Missouri Public Universities Survey**

**Total Sample
February 2007**

Q13. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, there are courses in which students feel they have to agree with the professor's political or social views in order to get a good grade.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	62	9.6
Disagree	254	39.5
Agree	275	42.7
Strongly Agree	53	8.3
Total	644	100.0
No Answer	5	
Total	649	

Q14. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some courses have readings which present only one side of a controversial issue.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	42	6.5
Disagree	235	36.7
Agree	317	49.5
Strongly Agree	47	7.3
Total	641	100.0
No Answer	8	
Total	649	

Q15. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, there are courses in which the professor creates an environment that is hostile to certain political or social views.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	118	18.3
Disagree	384	59.7
Agree	129	20.0
Strongly Agree	13	2.0
Total	644	100.0
No Answer	5	
Total	649	



**American Council of Trustees and Alumni
Missouri Public Universities Survey
Total Sample
February 2007**

Q16. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some professors penalize students because of the student's political or social views.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	180	27.8
Disagree	390	60.2
Agree	73	11.3
Strongly Agree	4	0.7
Total	647	100.0
No Answer	2	
Total	649	

Q17. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some professors use the classroom to present their personal political views.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	68	10.6
Disagree	199	30.8
Agree	312	48.3
Strongly Agree	67	10.4
Total	647	100.0
No Answer	2	
Total	649	

Q18. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some professors frequently comment on politics in class even though it has nothing to do with the course.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	80	12.4
Disagree	293	45.6
Agree	230	35.7
Strongly Agree	41	6.4
Total	643	100.0
No Answer	6	
Total	649	

Q19. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some professors are intolerant of certain political and social viewpoints.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	110	17.0
Disagree	384	59.4
Agree	140	21.7
Strongly Agree	12	1.8
Total	646	100.0
No Answer	3	
Total	649	



**American Council of Trustees and Alumni
Missouri Public Universities Survey
Total Sample
February 2007**

Q20. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some courses present only a negative view of the United States.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	198	30.8
Disagree	359	55.7
Agree	82	12.8
Strongly Agree	4	0.6
Total	644	100.0
No Answer	5	
Total	649	

Q21. Do the student evaluation forms of the faculty at your campus ask about a professor's social, political or religious bias?

	n	%
Yes	22	3.5
No	493	78.0
Don't Know	117	18.5
Total	633	100.0
No Answer	16	
Total	649	

Q22. How would you describe your views? Radical left, Liberal, Moderate, Conservative, or Ultraconservative?

	n	%
Radical Left	11	1.8
Liberal	176	28.5
Moderate	281	45.4
Conservative	149	24.0
Ultraconservative	2	0.4
Total	620	100.0
No Answer	29	
Total	649	

Q23. What is your current major?

	n	%
Fine Arts	47	7.3
Humanities	62	9.6
Professional	306	47.1
Science	105	16.1
Social Science	62	9.5
Other	68	10.4
Total	649	100.0



**American Council of Trustees and Alumni
Missouri Public Universities Survey
Total Sample
February 2007**

Q24. Are you: Male or Female?

	n	%
Male	298	47.0
Female	336	53.0
Total	634	100.0
No Answer	15	
Total	649	

Q25. What is your race/ethnicity?

	n	%
White	520	82.8
Black	43	6.9
Hispanic	13	2.1
Asian	25	3.9
Multi-racial or other	27	4.3
Total	628	100.0
No Answer	21	
Total	649	

Appendix C

STUDENT SURVEY METHODOLOGY

Methodology

The American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA) commissioned Pulsar Research and Consulting to conduct a survey of undergraduates at the two largest public universities in Missouri – the University of Missouri and Missouri State University. The goal of the study was to measure student attitudes regarding the campus climate. Pulsar conducted more than 320 interviews at each of the universities.

Questionnaire Design

The survey instrument was based on the instrument used in the 2004 ACTA survey of students at the top fifty colleges and universities in the United States. The instrument includes a series of questions designed to evaluate student perceptions of the political climate on campus as well as their experiences with the inclusion of political commentary and material in courses. It also includes demographics questions that were used to ensure the sample accurately represented the student population. The survey instrument was pre-tested to ensure the questions were properly constructed and understood by respondents.

Data Collection

Pulsar researchers have determined that in-person interviewing is the most effective method of interviewing large numbers of college students at a single institution. The method has the lowest level of coverage error and previous experiments revealed it to be an efficient and representative methodology.

Students were intercepted at various times of day and at several places of high student traffic on or adjacent to each campus to insure randomness. Times of day ranged from 9am until 9pm for each school. A few examples of both indoor and outdoor places of high student traffic that could be utilized depending

on the school included eateries, coffee houses, exercise facilities, student centers, and major walkways. The process took place for multiple days per campus until sufficient completed interviews were achieved. Respondents are guaranteed anonymity, as names and contact information are not recorded with the dataset.

Respondent Selection

Respondent selection was accomplished through the following steps. Operations staff collected demographics, population statistics, and geographic maps for each school. Dormitory and other residential student data, as well as classroom buildings and other data germane to establishing traffic flow estimates were assembled. A list of preliminary sites was selected based on these estimates. Survey supervisors verified established flow at selected locations and verified that key traffic flow areas were not inadvertently omitted. Where appropriate, off campus sites were added to the list of intercept locations. Following the verification a final selection of sites was determined and specific times and locations and given a target number of completes for each intercept location selected based on the flow data gathered. Different times were used at each location, based on traffic flow counts. Sampling ratios at individual sites varied by traffic volume and school size to accommodate target completes. A ratio was established for respondent selection and every n th person was verbally asked the screening questions. Refusals were replaced with the next person. Data collection continued at each school until the total number of completes for the particular school were collected. Demographic questions were used to monitor potential bias on contact rates and did not reveal any issues.

Weighting

Data for the representative schools were weighted to account for variance in enrollment between the two schools. Enrollment data was gathered from individual schools as well as from the National Center For Education Statistics' (NCES) restricted Peer Analysis System (IPEDS).

Imported Variables

In order to further enrich the analysis, supplementary variables were created using publicly available institutional characteristics. The two sources used were the

NCES (<http://nces.ed.gov/>) and The College Board (both in hard copy and at www.collegeboard.com).

Sampling Error

Sampling error for 652 completed surveys is +/-4%.



ACTA
AMERICAN COUNCIL OF
TRUSTEES AND ALUMNI

American Council of Trustees and Alumni
1726 M Street, NW, Suite 802
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: 1-888-ALUMNI-8 or 202-467-6787
Fax: 202-467-6784

Email: info@goacta.org • Website: www.goacta.org