



Data-Informed Peer and Aspirant Institution Identification Process

OVERVIEW

In addition to examining current and historical data from our own institution, Jacksonville University leaders frequently also want to compare our data, policies, programs, and outcomes to those of similar institutions. Prior to completing the data-informed peer and aspirant institution identification process, different groups tended to work off individualized lists as the institution did not have a publicized or shared peer and aspirant list for benchmarking purposes. The identification process centers on not identifying institutions by name until the list has been trimmed to a small number using publicly available data.

TASK FORCE

During the 2019-2020 academic year, JU utilized a Rankings Task Force to examine our positioning in national publications and ensure we are presenting ourselves to the best of our ability. Committee members include:

Scott Bacon—Senior Vice President of Marketing, Communications, and University Advancement
Amanda Billy—Director of Web Services & Marketing Data
Katie Jackson—Director of Digital Marketing
Sherri Jackson—Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs and Professor of Psychology
Kristen Kirkendall—Associate Director of Graduate Admissions and Communication
Teresa MacGregor—Executive Director of Graduate and Professional Studies
Will Miller—Executive Director of Institutional Analytics, Effectiveness, and Strategic Planning
Jeff Morris—Associate Director of Employer Engagement
Laura Phelps—Senior Director of Public & Media Relations
Bob Stewart—Senior Vice President of Enrollment Management
Matt Swanson—Associate Vice President for Financial Management and Controller
Tom Taggart—Associate Vice President of Student Experience

As part of their larger work, this taskforce undertook the following process to identify JU's current peer and aspirant institutions.

PROCESS

The committee's work began by determining which variables they felt were essential to consider when determining peer and aspirant institutions. As part of initial considerations, the following seventeen variables were included in the blinded analysis (with JU's value included within parentheses).

1. Sector (from IPEDS)
2. Carnegie Classification (from IPEDS)
3. ICUF Membership (from ICUF website)
4. Admissions Peer (from National Student Clearinghouse)
5. *U.S. News and World Report* Regional University Ranking (from *U.S. News and World Report*)
6. SACSCOC Member Institution (from SACSCOC directory)
7. Pioneer Conference Member (from Pioneer Conference website)
8. Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment (from IPEDS)
9. Percentage of Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment—Undergraduate (from IPEDS)
10. Tuition and Fees as a Percent of Core Revenues (from IPEDS)
11. Endowment Assets per FTE Enrollment (from IPEDS)
12. Instruction Expenses as a Percent of Total Core Expenses (from IPEDS)
13. Salaries and Wages for Core Expenses as a Percent of Total Core Expenses (from IPEDS)
14. Average Net Price for Students Awarded Grant or Scholarship Aid (from IPEDS)
15. Full-time Retention Rate (from IPEDS)
16. Six-year Graduation Rate (from IPEDS)
17. Percent of Undergraduate Students Awarded Pell Grants (from IPEDS)

Peer Institution Analysis

Given the number of variables, the task force opted to assign points to institutions similar to JU. For categorical variables, they received one point for matching with JU; for rational variables, they received the point if they were +/- one-quarter of a standard deviation of the national mean from JU. The data began with 3,626 potential institutions. The table below shows the variables, JU value, and the range for which points were awarded. The final column shows the total number of institutions receiving a point in that category.

Aspirant Institution Analysis

For categorical variables, institutions received the point for matching with JU; for rational variables, they received the point if they were +/- one-quarter of a standard deviation of the national mean from JU on most variables. Given the aspirational nature of this list, we awarded points for endowment per FTE, retention, and graduation rate for campuses if they were more than a one-quarter standard deviation above JU's current value. The data began with 3,626 potential institutions. The table below shows the variables, JU value, and the range that points were awarded for. The final column shows the total number of institutions receiving a point in that category.

PEER INSTITUTION IDENTIFICATION DATA TABLE

Variable	JU Value	Low Threshold	High Threshold	Number Receiving Point
Sector	Private not-for-profit, 4-year or above			1,700
Carnegie Classification	Master's Colleges & Universities: Larger Programs			371
ICUF Membership	Member			28
Admissions Peer				16
<i>U.S. News and World Report</i> Regional University Ranking (45-65)	Yes			90
SACSCOC Member Institution	Yes			986
Pioneer Conference Member	Yes			10
Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment	3,236	2,501	3,999	408
Percentage of Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment—Undergraduate	76.6	69.7	83.5	393
Tuition and Fees as a Percent of Core Revenues	74	67	81	430
Endowment Assets per FTE Enrollment	\$12,162	\$7,163	\$17,161	495
Instruction Expenses as a Percent of Total Core Expenses	46	43	49	914
Salaries and Wages for Core Expenses as a Percent of Total Core Expenses	47	45	49	1,062
Average Net Price for Students Awarded Grant or Scholarship Aid	\$25,674	\$23,539	\$26,899	275
Full-time Retention Rate	71	66	75	728
Six-year Graduation Rate	43	37	49	565
Percent of Undergraduate Students Awarded Pell Grants	28	23	33	859

3,361 institutions scored at least one point out of the 17 available—with the highest scoring schools receiving 11. To limit the number of institutions to be examined more closely by the committee, we chose to remove institutions that did not receive at least 7 points, were public, did not receive a point on retention or graduation (our two key variables of focus), schools with minimal graduate work, single-gender institutions, HBCUs, and schools that received more than 75% of their points from categorization variables. This left us with a list of 23 institutions to discuss by name as a committee. Through discussion, examining websites, and studying data trends, the committee selected the ten institutions listed at the end of this report.

ASPIRANT INSTITUTION IDENTIFICATION DATA TABLE

Variable	JU Value	Low Threshold	High Threshold	Number Receiving Point
Sector	Private not-for-profit, 4-year or above			1,700
Carnegie Classification	Master's Colleges & Universities: Larger Programs			371
ICUF Membership	Member			28
Admissions Peer				16
<i>U.S. News and World Report</i> Regional University Ranking (1-10)				39
SACSCOC Member Institution	Yes			986
Pioneer Conference Member	Yes			10
Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment	3,236	2,501	3,999	408
Percentage of Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment—Undergraduate	76.6	69.7	83.5	393
Tuition and Fees as a Percent of Core Revenues	74	67	81	430
Endowment Assets per FTE Enrollment	\$12,162	\$17,162	\$21,999	110
Instruction Expenses as a Percent of Total Core Expenses	46	43	49	914
Salaries and Wages for Core Expenses as a Percent of Total Core Expenses	47	45	49	1,062
Average Net Price for Students Awarded Grant or Scholarship Aid	\$25,674	\$23,539	\$26,899	275
Full-time Retention Rate	71	77.1	100	973
Six-year Graduation Rate	43	54.1	100	1,065
Percent of Undergraduate Students Awarded Pell Grants	28	23	33	859

3,347 institutions scored at least one point out of the 17 available—with the highest scoring school receiving 12. To limit the number of institutions to be examined more closely by the committee, we chose to remove institutions that did not receive at least 9 points, were public, schools with minimal graduate work, and schools that received more than 75% of their points from categorization variables. This left us with a list of 16 institutions to discuss by name as a committee. Through discussion, examining websites, and studying data trends, the committee selected the ten institutions listed at the end of this report.

Jacksonville University Data-Informed Peer Institutions

Institution	Website	Location	Carnegie Classification	FTE	% UG	% Tuition	Endow per FTE	Instruct Exp %	Salary Exp %	Net Price	Retention	Grad Rate	Pell %
Jacksonville University	http://www.ju.edu	Jacksonville, Florida	Master's Colleges & Universities: Larger Programs	3236	76.6	74	\$12,162	46	47	\$25,674	71	43	28
Bellarmino University	https://www.bellarmino.edu/	Louisville, Kentucky	Master's Colleges & Universities: Larger Programs	3123	80.0	83	\$15,961	51	51	\$24,711	72	65	25
Dallas Baptist University	https://www.dbu.edu/	Dallas, Texas	Doctoral Universities: Moderate Research Activity	3901	70.3	76	\$11,919	45	50	\$25,693	70	58	27
Gardner-Webb University	https://gardner-webb.edu/	Boiling Springs, North Carolina	Doctoral Universities: Moderate Research Activity	2690	74.3	73	\$20,733	46	51	\$20,753	71	49	41
Houston Baptist	https://hbu.edu/	Houston, Texas	Master's Colleges & Universities: Medium Programs	2804	78.7	71	\$35,946	44	49	\$21,084	72	48	43
King's College	https://www.kings.edu/	Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania	Master's Colleges & Universities: Small Programs	2242	93.7	70	\$32,844	47	46	\$26,615	73	67	25
Lynchburg College	https://www.lynchburg.edu/	Lynchburg, Virginia	Master's Colleges & Universities: Medium Programs	2519	78.9	69	\$38,483	54	55	\$24,202	75	59	30
Manhattanville College	https://www.mville.edu/	Harrison, New York	Master's Colleges & Universities: Larger Programs	2252	75.1	85	\$12,728	43	51	\$23,680	74	55	32
Mary Hardin-Baylor University	https://go.umhb.edu/	Belton, Texas	Master's Colleges & Universities: Medium Programs	3619	87.4	71	\$24,327	47	49	\$24,579	73	48	40
Walsh University	https://www.walsh.edu/	North Canton, Ohio	Master's Colleges & Universities: Small Programs	2344	79.4	77	\$10,091	49	52	\$19,417	74	61	30
Wingate University	https://www.wingate.edu/	Wingate, North Carolina	Master's Colleges & Universities: Medium Programs	3380	76.1	44	\$27,585	46	50	\$18,094	73	52	35

Jacksonville University Data-Informed Aspirant Institutions

Institution	Website	Location	Carnegie Classification	FTE	% UG	% Tuition	Endow per FTE	Instruct Exp %	Salary Exp %	Net Price	Retention	Grad Rate	Pell %
Jacksonville University	http://www.ju.edu	Jacksonville, Florida	Master's Colleges & Universities: Larger Programs	3236	76.6	74	\$12,162	46	47	\$25,674	71	43	28
Baldwin Wallace University	https://www.bw.edu/	Berea, Ohio	Master's Colleges & Universities: Larger Programs	3529	86.5	69	42244	53	49	23990	78	67	30
Florida Southern College	https://www.flsouthern.edu/	Lakeland, Florida	Master's Colleges & Universities: Small Programs	2845	86.5	70	26406	40	39	24888	80	63	26
Gannon University	http://www.gannon.edu/	Erie, Pennsylvania	Master's Colleges & Universities: Larger Programs	3531	78.0	75	15344	51	48	21793	85	68	23
Lipscomb University	https://www.lipscomb.edu/	Nashville, Tennessee	Doctoral Universities: Moderate Research Activity	4380	64.5	72	17640	44	47	2505	79	59	26
Loyola University New Orleans	https://www.loyno.edu/	New Orleans, Louisiana	Master's Colleges & Universities: Larger Programs	3269	77.4	62	64269	45	48	24524	80	56	32
Rollins College	https://www.rollins.edu/	Winter Park, Florida	Master's Colleges & Universities: Larger Programs	3015	83.8	57	103322	40	46	35522	83	75	27
Saint Mary's College of California	https://www.stmarys-ca.edu/	Moraga, California	Master's Colleges & Universities: Larger Programs	3482	77.5	67	47965	43	50	33414	86	76	25
Springfield College	https://springfield.edu/	Springfield, Massachusetts	Master's Colleges & Universities: Larger Programs	3091	71.5	71	22586	46	50	28453	87	74	23
Stetson University	https://www.stetson.edu/	DeLand, Florida	Master's Colleges & Universities: Medium Programs	4139	73.6	63	50316	47	49	27287	78	62	32
The University of Findlay	https://www.findlay.edu/	Findlay, Ohio	Master's Colleges & Universities: Larger Programs	3855	75.9	75	9024	49	46	22430	81	61	19

Map of Jacksonville University Data-Informed Peer and Aspirant Institutions

