# UW Flexible Option

## Metrics Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FOCUS</strong></th>
<th><strong>A. GOALS</strong></th>
<th><strong>B. PACE</strong></th>
<th><strong>C. ACADEMIC OUTCOMES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBE student-level metrics</strong></td>
<td>Student’s overall personal educational goal(s) for engaging in Flex</td>
<td>Measuring rate of assessment completion within each subscription period to reach personal educational goal(s)</td>
<td>Mastered competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction with the educational experience (including professional advancement and acceptance into further educational programs)</td>
<td>Assessing rate against student’s planned rate</td>
<td>The personal educational value of mastered competencies (including what the student knows and has learned, personal cost-benefit, or the question of “Was it worth it?”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measuring nature of student’s engagement with curriculum</td>
<td>The educational and professional impact of mastered competencies (questions such as “Was the student able to successfully transfer?” “Was the student able to successfully move on to graduate programs?” “Did one receive a job? Did one learn the skills desired to do the job better?”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New use of aggregated CBE student-level metrics for CBE program-level metrics</td>
<td>Aggregating student-level goals to identify themes or categories of goals</td>
<td>Perceiving that past learning and experience are valued and effectively assessed in Flex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment of alignment between student-level categories and program goals as devised by faculty who created program</td>
<td>Aggregating average (mean, mode, median) numbers of competencies mastered in a 12-month cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aggregating to identify average (mean, mode, median) levels of satisfaction</td>
<td>Can measure ratio of competencies attempted vs. completed to assess which competencies are “easier” or “harder” from a program perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aggregating to identify goals by types of students (by demographics, professional interests, etc.)</td>
<td>Aggregate to identify clusters of students by performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aggregating to determine relationship between student effort and meeting of goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBE program-level metrics relevant to IPEDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of competencies mastered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leads, apps, admits, enrollments</td>
<td>Time-to-degree</td>
<td>Time to mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree completion</td>
<td>All-you-can-learn vs. single subscriptions</td>
<td>Average attempts to mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenue generated against business plan projections</td>
<td>Subscriptions per year per student</td>
<td>Usage of rubrics to demonstrate gains in metacognitive skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access by demographics/equity goals</td>
<td>Persistence/retention</td>
<td>Value of competencies to industry and employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly articulated competencies with assessments that effectively lead to demonstration of mastery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>