

## Revision of Indicators Measured and Scored for Annual Performance Funding Assessment Summary and Committee Recommendation

Following recommendations from the Business Advisory Council and action by the Commission on Higher Education, the Commission staff began a process of developing recommendations related to the indicators used in determining performance scores.

Each sector provided recommendations regarding indicators that were most appropriate to its mission. The staff forwarded these recommendations to Dr. Peter Ewell, Senior Associate with the National Center for Higher Education Managements Systems, for his comments. The staff then developed preliminary recommendations, circulated them, and met with institutional representatives for feedback on them. Following this additional input, the staff refined its recommendations for consideration by the Planning and Assessment Committee on December 7, 2000 and on January 9, 2001.

The current recommendations reflect what has been learned about performance measurement since 1996 when performance funding first went into effect. Experience with all of the indicators has demonstrated which ones are duplicative and could reasonably be combined with others and which should be effective measures that should be retained. In addition, some indicators that required policy changes or compliance with best practices have already been addressed and no longer require annual scoring. Based on the knowledge gained during four years of implementation, the staff, in consultation with the institutions, has recommended changes to eliminate duplication among indicators, ease reporting requirements for institutions, reduce the total number of indicators that are scored annually, and tailor the measures more effectively to the missions of each sector and the strategic goals of each institution. Still represented would be all nine of the critical success factors identified in Act 359 of 1996, with each critical success factor measured by the most appropriate and effective indicators. All indicators would continue to be assessed for compliance with standards, although not all would be scored annually.

Revision of some of the current measures may be required and may entail the collection of some base line data. The current scoring scheme may also need to be reevaluated in light of the reduced number of indicators used for scoring. The staff has developed a time line for implementation, including the development of revised measures and the collection of supporting data.

**ACTION:** The Planning and Assessment Committee recommends that the indicators listed below be used in determining annual performance scores beginning with the Spring 2002 performance rating process, with the understanding for some indicators revised measures will need to be developed and that all indicators, whether directly used in scoring process are not, are subject to assessment to determine compliance with standards.

<b>Summary of Recommended Performance Indicators</b>				
<b>Recommended Indicators</b>	<b>Indicator 1</b>	<b>Indicator 2</b>	<b>Indicator 3</b>	<b>Indicator 4</b>
<b>✓</b> : Indicates Indicator as specified in Act 359 of 1996 <b>☑</b> : Indicates a defined subpart of an indicator.				
<b>Critical Success Factor 1: Mission Focus</b>				
1B, Curricula Offered to Achieve Mission	✓	✓	✓	✓
1C, Approval of a Mission Statement	✓	✓	✓	✓
Combined 1D, Adoption of a Strategic Plan to Support the Mission Statement, and 1E, Attainment of Goals of the Strategic Plan, to provide for a campus-specific indicator related to each institution's strategic plan	✓	✓	✓	✓
<b>Critical Success Factor 2: Quality of Faculty</b>				
2A, Academic and Other Credentials of Professors and Instructors :	✓	✓	✓	✓
2A1, % headcount faculty teaching undergraduates meeting SACS requirements				☑
2A2b, % full-time faculty with terminal degrees (with refinements to this subpart to be considered)	☑	☑	☑	
2D, Compensation of Faculty	✓	✓	✓	✓
Average Compensation of All Faculty			☑	☑
2D1a Average Compensation of Instructors	☑	☑		
2D1b Average Compensation of Assistant Professors	☑	☑		
2D1c Average Compensation of Associate Professors	☑	☑		
2D1d Average Compensation of Professors	☑	☑		
<b>Critical Success Factor 3: Classroom Quality</b>				
3D, Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs	✓	✓	✓	✓
3E, Institutional Emphasis on Quality Teacher Education and Reform		✓		
3E1, Program Quality – NCATE Accreditation		☑		
3E2a – Student Performance, Performance on Professional Knowledge Portion of National Teacher Examinations		☑		
3E2b – Student Performance, Performance on Specialty Area Portions of National Teacher Examinations		☑		
3E3a – Critical Needs, Percentage of Teacher Education Graduates in Critical Shortage Areas		☑		
3E3b– CRITICAL NEEDS, PERCENTAGE OF TEACHER EDUCATION GRADUATES WHO ARE MINORITY		☑		
Further discussion of a "classroom quality" measure to apply in the future to the regional campuses.			FURTHER DISCUSSION	
<b>Critical Success Factor 4: Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration</b>				
Combined 4A, Sharing and Use of Technology, Programs, Equipment, and Source Matter Experts Within the Institution, With Other Institutions, and with the Business Community, and 4B, Cooperation and Collaboration With Private Industry, defined tailored to each sector.	✓	✓	✓	✓
<b>Critical Success Factor 5: Administrative Efficiency</b>				
5A, Ratio of Administrative Costs as Compared to Academic Costs	✓	✓	✓	✓

<b>Summary of Recommended Performance Indicators</b>				
<b>Recommended Indicators</b>				
<b>Critical Success Factor 6: Entrance Requirements</b>				
Combined 6A, SAT and ACT Scores of Student Body, and 6B, High School Class Standing, Grade Point Averages and Activities of Student Body	✓	✓	✓	
<b>Critical Success Factor 7: Graduates' Achievements</b>				
7A, Graduation Rate	✓	✓	✓	✓
7A1a, 150% of Program Time	☑	☑		
Revised measure to use a "student success rate" to take into account in a single measure graduates, transfer students and those who continue to be enrolled			☑	☑
7B, Employment Rate for Graduates (requiring the measure to be defined)				✓
7C, Employer Feedback on Graduates Who Were Employed or Not Employed, (requiring the measure to be defined)				✓
7D, Scores of Graduates on Post-Undergraduate Professional, Graduate, or Employment-Related Examinations and Certification Tests	✓	✓	✓	✓
7E, Number of Graduates Who Continued Their Education, be applied for the regional campus sector as a sector-specific indicator focusing on the sector's mission, requiring the measure to be defined			✓	
<b>Critical Success Factor 8: User-Friendliness of the Institution</b>				
8C, Accessibility to the Institution of All Citizens of the State	✓	✓	✓	✓
8C1, Percent of headcount Undergraduate Students Who Are Citizens of SC Who Are Minority	☑	☑	☑	☑
8C2, Retention of Minorities Who Are SC Citizens and identified as Degree Seeking Undergraduate Students	☑	☑	☑	☑
8C3, Percent of headcount Graduate Students Enrolled at the Institution Who Are Minority	☑	☑		
8C4, Percent of Headcount Teaching Faculty Who Are Minority	☑	☑	☑	☑
<b>Critical Success Factor 9: Research Funding</b>				
9A, Financial Support for Reform in Teacher Education, applied to the research and teaching sectors only	✓	✓		
9B, Amount of Public and Private Sector Grants, applied to the research universities as a unique sector indicator focusing on their mission.	✓			

**Notes:**

- 1) Indicators retained in these recommendations that are currently assessed as compliance indicators include 1C for all sectors and 1B for the regional and technical colleges. It is assumed that the suggested combined 4A/4B, would become a become a "scored" performance indicator. Currently, 4A and 4B are scored separately as compliance indicators.
- 2) Indicators retained in staff's recommendations and currently assessed either every 2 or 3 years include: 4A and 4B (currently assessed every 3 years) and 7B and 7C (currently assessed every 2 years).

3) Several of the recommended indicators require the development or refinement of the measure and/or standard before the measure could be used as suggested. Cases where there is currently no measurement that could be used until details are resolved include:

- 1 indicator (4A/4B) for Clemson and USC Columbia and the Teaching Sector Institutions;
- 4 indicators (4A/4B, 6A/6B, 7A, and 9A) for MUSC;
- 2 indicators (4A/4B and 7E) for the Regional Campuses; and
- 3 indicators (4A/4B, 7B, and 7C) for the Technical Colleges.

Cases where current measures could be substituted until recommended refinements to measures are resolved include:

- for the suggested combined measure for 1D and 1E for all institutions, the use of 1D and 1E as currently defined;
- for the suggested revised 2A2b for all institutions in the Research, Teaching and Regional Campuses Sectors, the use of 2A2b as currently defined;
- for the suggested 6A/6B combination for the Research, Teaching and Regional Campuses Sectors, the use of the current measures for 6A and 6B. (Note: As indicated above, MUSC is not currently assessed on 6A and 6B and a measure will have to be developed); and
- for the suggested 7A for the Regional Campuses and Technical Colleges Sectors, the use of 7A1a as currently defined.

**SUMMARY OF THE NUMBER OF INDICATORS AND SUBPARTS RECOMMENDED FOR ASSESSMENT AS COMPARED TO THE NUMBER CURRENTLY MEASURED FOR ANNUAL SCORING PURPOSES:**

Number of Indicators Measured (count of the ✓ in the table above):					
	Research		Teaching	Regional	Technical
	Clemson/USC C	MUSC			
<b>Recommended</b>	14	14	14	13	13
<b>Current</b>	34	28	33	26	27

  

Actual number of "points" measured (i.e., sum total of "single-part" indicators and the subpart (✓) measures for those with multiple parts):					
	Research		Teaching	Regional	Technical
	Clemson/USC C	MUSC			
<b>Recommended</b>	20	20	24	15	15
<b>Current</b>	57	42	56	41	37

12/7/00

**Indicators to be Assessed and Scored  
Based on Staff Recommendations to the Planning and Assessment Committee December 7,  
2000**

Institutions are accountable for acceptable performance on all indicators, and the Commission on Higher Education will assess performance on all of them. Annual performance scores will be based on a set of scored indicators that include some that have been combined with others. Some indicators apply to some sectors but not all sectors. If performance falls below standards on those indicators that are assessed but not scored, the Commission on Higher Education can add them to those that are scored the following year.

The following is a list of all indicators identified in Act 359 of 1996. Notations indicate whether the indicator is scored annually or assessed for compliance with standards and whether it is scored or assessed in combination with another indicator.

**1. Mission Focus**

- 1A, Expenditure of Funds to Achieve Mission (combined with scored indicator 5A)
- 1B, Curriculum Offered to Achieve Mission (scored)
- 1C, Approval of Mission Statement (scored)
- 1D, Adoption of Strategic Plan (combined with scored indicator 1E)
- 1E, Attainment of Goals of Strategic Plan (scored)

**2. Quality of Faculty**

- 2A, Academic and Other Credentials of Professors and Instructors (scored)
- 2B, Performance Review System for Faculty (assessed for compliance with standards)
- 2C, Post Tenure Review of Tenured Faculty (assessed for compliance with standards)
- 2D, Compensation of Faculty (scored)
- 2E, Availability of Faculty to Students (combined with indicator 2B, which is assessed for compliance with standards)
- 2F, Community and Public Services Activities of Faculty (combined with indicator 2B, which is assessed for compliance with standards)

**3. Classroom Quality**

- 3A, Class Size and Student/Teacher Ratios (assessed for compliance with standards)
- 3B, Number of Credit Hours Taught by Faculty (assessed for compliance with standards)
- 3C, Ratio of Full-time Faculty to Other Full-time Employees (assessed for compliance with standards)
- 3D, Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs (scored)
- 3E, Institutional Emphasis on Quality of Teacher Education (scored)

**4. Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration**

- 4A, Sharing and Use of Technology, Programs, Equipment, Supplies and Source Matter Experts within the Institution, with Other Institutions, and with the Business Community (scored)

- 4B, Cooperation and Collaboration with Private Industry (combined with scored indicator 4A)
- 5. **Administrative Efficiency**
  - 5A, Administrative Costs as Compared to Academic (scored)
  - 5B, Use of Best Management Practices (assessed for compliance with standards)
  - 5C, Elimination of Unjustified Duplication (combined with indicator 5B, which is assessed for compliance with standards)
  - 5D, Amount of General Overhead Costs (combined with scored indicator 5A)
- 6. **Entrance Requirements**
  - 6A, SAT and ACT Scores (combined with scored indicator 6B)
  - 6B, High School Standing, GPA, Activities (combined with indicator 6A into a single scored indicator)
  - 6C, Post-Secondary Non-Academic Achievement (assessed for compliance with standards)
  - 6D, Priority on Enrolling In-state Students (assessed for compliance with standards)
- 7. **Graduates' Achievement**
  - 7A, Graduation Rate (scored)
  - 7B, Employment Rate (scored)
  - 7C, Employer Feedback (scored)
  - 7D, Scores on Examinations (scored)
  - 7E, Graduates Who Continue Education (scored)
  - 7F, Credit Hours Earned of Graduates (assessed for compliance with standards)
- 8. **User-Friendliness of the Institution**
  - 8A, Transferability of Credits (assessed for compliance with standards)
  - 8B, Continuing Education Programs (assessed for compliance with standards)
  - 8C, Accessibility to the Institution (scored)
- 9. **Research Funding**
  - 9A, Financial Support for Reform in Teacher Education (scored)
  - 9B, Public and Private Sector Grants (scored)

**Summary**

23	Indicators scored singly or in combination on an annual basis
14	Indicators assessed for compliance with standards singly or in combination
37	Total indicators

### Time Line for Developing Measures Related to Changes in Indicators

- 1/9/01      **Planning and Assessment Committee** meets at 10:30 am and considers the staff recommendation concerning indicators to be used in determining annual performance scores.
- 1/18/01      Staff distributes to institutional representatives an outline of proposed revisions to measures.
- 2/1/01      **The Commission on Higher Education** meets at 10:30 am and considers the Planning and Assessment Committee's recommendation concerning indicators to be used in determining annual performance scores. **Institutional representatives** meet with staff at 1:00 pm following the Commission meeting to discuss the outline of proposed revisions to measures and determine next steps.
- 2/7-2/20/01      Meetings with working groups of institutional representatives are scheduled, as needed, to refine identified measures.
- 2/22/01      Staff distributes to institutional representatives a preliminary staff recommendation regarding revisions to measures.
- 3/1/01      **Institutional representatives** meet with staff at 1:00 pm following the Commission meeting to discuss the preliminary staff recommendation regarding revisions to measures.
- 3/13/01      Staff recommendation regarding measures distributed with agenda and material for the 3/20/01 meeting of the Planning and Assessment Committee.
- 3/20/01      **The Planning and Assessment Committee** meets at 10:30 am and considers the staff recommendation regarding revisions in measures.
- 4/5/01      **The Commission on Higher Education** meets at 10:30 to consider the Planning and Assessment Committee's recommendation regarding revisions in measures.

Note: For a limited number of measures, additional data may need to be collected and analyzed to determine appropriate standards for performance. This process may extend beyond 4/5/01. This time line assumes that changes to measures and standards would be effective beginning with the 2001-2002 year.