

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSAL FOR IMPLEMENTING REVISIONS OF INDICATORS MEASURED AND SCORED FOR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FOR PERFORMANCE FUNDING YEAR 2001-02 (YEAR 6)

Explanation: On February 1, 2001, the Commission approved recommendations of the Planning and Assessment Committee effective July 1, 2001, to limit the number of indicators scored annually in order to allow a more concentrated focus on sector and institutional missions and to assess those indicators no longer scored for purposes of identifying emerging issues or problems. In order to implement the recommendations approved, the Commission recognized the need for consideration of revisions to some measures and possibly to the overall scoring scheme and charged staff to work with institutions in developing its recommendations.

Staff began work by drafting preliminary recommendations and meeting with institutional representatives on February 1 to discuss the suggestions and to solicit feedback from institutions. Following that meeting, staff met with institutional representatives by sector at least once and received feedback from institutional representatives as measures were discussed. On March 1, staff met again with institutional representatives to discuss revised staff suggestions for the measures. Staff drafted its resulting recommendations for Committee consideration on March 20 and distributed the recommendations March 13 in advance of the Committee meeting on March 20 to consider the recommendations. The Committee met and approved staff recommendations with the amendment that for indicators 2A, 2D, and 5A, staff is to report back to the Committee on issues raised at the Committee meeting.

A table on the following page summarizes the action taken by the Committee and for which the Committee is requesting consideration of the Commission. Following the table, are the Committee's recommendations by indicator for those indicators that will be included in the scoring process beginning with Year 6, 2001-02. See pages 3-11. The Committee and its staff appreciate all the good work that those involved have contributed in producing the resulting recommendations. Work to address unresolved issues as indicated in the attached as well as to address other issues such as monitoring of non-scored indicators is underway, and recommendations will be made at a later point regarding these issues.

Committee Recommendation: The Committee recommends that, consistent with Commission action on February 1, 2001, the revised measures as indicated in the attached materials be approved for use beginning with the 2001-02 performance year, with the understanding that in some cases, as outlined in the attached material, measurement details or standards may require further consideration. (See "Recommended Revisions" on the summary chart on the following page and pages 3-11 for details.)

Summary Guide to Indicator Revisions

<u>1D/E</u> : Combine current 1D and 1E, related to institutional strategic plans and attainment of goals, such that institution performance on 1 not 2 goals is scored. Institutions will have to identify which of their two approved goals will be continued.	3, 4
<u>2A for Research and Teaching</u> is revised to assess for scoring purposes terminal degrees of all full-time faculty. This revises the current 2A, which assesses credentials of faculty teaching a credit course to undergraduates in the fall based on whether identified faculty meet minimum SACS requirements and whether identified headcount and full-time faculty hold terminal degrees in field. Staff is to provide additional clarification on the definition of terminal degree for first professional degrees.	4
<u>2A for Technical Colleges</u> is revised to retain the current measure 2A1 unchanged which assesses whether faculty meet minimum SACS requirements	4
<u>2D for Research and Teaching</u> , average faculty salary by rank, is amended to exclude the rank of instructor for scoring purposes. Staff is to provide additional clarification as to the definition of the faculty population that is considered here and also is to be the basis for consideration for indicator 2A.	4,5
<u>6A/B for Clemson, USC Columbia and Teaching Institutions</u> : The revision combines current 6A and 6B indicators, which assess respectively examination scores of entering freshmen and class standing/grade point averages of entering freshmen, into one indicator assessing the percentage of entering freshmen with any one or more of the identified credentials. The standard to be used to assess performance is to be proposed by staff for consideration of the P&A Committee at its May meeting.	7,8
<u>7A for Regional Campuses and Tech Colleges</u> revised to expand the graduation rate to take into account students graduating within 150% of time, still enrolled or transferring to another institutions. Staff will recommend by July the implementation schedule for this revised indicator.	8,9
<u>7E for Regional Campuses</u> is developed to assess continuing education leading to a baccalaureate degree. Staff will recommend by July the implementation schedule for this revised indicator.	10

Status of Other Indicators

Revisions are proposed but work to define is needed and is underway:		Page :
<u>"3" Classroom/Instructional Quality for Regional Campuses</u> . Measurement development is underway.		5
<u>4A/B</u> : Staff proposes a measure requiring each sector to define a measure and standards. Sector measures are being developed for the teaching, regional and technical sectors. The research sector has proposed a measure.		6,7
<u>6A/B for MUSC</u> . A preliminary measure to assess entrance credentials of graduate students is under discussion.		7,8
<u>7A for MUSC</u> . A preliminary measure to assess graduation of graduate students is under discussion.		8,9
<u>7B for Tech Colleges</u> . Measurement development is underway.		9
<u>7C for Tech Colleges</u> . Measurement development is underway.		10,11
<u>9A for MUSC</u> . A preliminary measure to assess grant expenditures focused on improving preK-12, child and adolescent health is under discussion.		11
Indicators to be scored but no revisions from current definitions/standards are proposed		
1B	p.3	7A for Clemson, USC Columbia and Teaching Inst. p.8
1C	p.3	7D p.10
2D for Regional Campuses/Tech Colleges	pp.4,5	8C p.10
3D	p.5	9A for Clemson, USC Columbia and Teaching Inst. p.10
3E	p.5	9B p.11
5A (Staff to report on changes in IPEDS)	p.7	

NOTE: The remaining indicators, those that will not be scored beginning in Year 6, are to be monitored by the Commission. Work on recommendations for handling this process is underway. Indicators not scored and being considered in the monitoring phase include: 1A, 2B, 2C, 2E, 2F, 3A, 3B, 3C, 5B, 5C, 5D, 6C, 6D, 7F, 8A, and 8B.

**INDICATOR BY INDICATOR SUMMARY: SCORED INDICATORS
FOR IMPLEMENTATION IN 2001-02 (YEAR 6 OF PERFORMANCE FUNDING)**

The following summarizes recommendations by indicator for those indicators to be scored in Year 6. The Committee recommends changes to some indicators in keeping with recommendations approved by the Commission on February 1, 2001. The indicators for which changes are recommended are identified below by the word "REVISION." Draft workbook pages were provided in the materials for the Committee meeting on March 20.

1B MISSION FOCUS, CURRICULA OFFERED TO ACHIEVE MISSION
Applicable to All Institutions

There are **NO PROPOSED CHANGES** to this indicator from its current definition. For the current definition and standards, see Performance Funding Workbook, September 2000, pages 69 – 71.

1C MISSION FOCUS, APPROVAL OF A MISSION STATEMENT
Applicable to All Institutions

There are **NO PROPOSED CHANGES** to this indicator from its current definition. For the current definition and standards, see Performance Funding Workbook, September 2000, pages 73 - 75. Note that for Year 7, staff will review this indicator again in the fall to determine any needed modifications.

REVISION

1D/E MISSION FOCUS, COMBINED (1D) ADOPTION OF A STRATEGIC PLAN TO SUPPORT THE MISSION STATEMENT and (1E) ATTAINMENT OF GOALS OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN

Applicable to all Institutions, with institutional differences

In order to reflect CHE's approval of assessing through a single indicator performance on one institutional goal reflective either of the institution's strategic plan or CHE's strategic plan for higher education in South Carolina, staff proposes that the current definitions of 1D and 1E be combined and revised as appropriate to result in a single scored indicator. Necessary changes to 1D and 1E as they appear in the September 2000 Workbook on pages 77-82 include: limiting the selection to one goal and scoring of the indicator each year beginning in Year 6. Institutions have recently had two goals approved as part of 1D requirements for Year 5 and for which performance in meeting those goals is to be scored beginning in Performance Year 6 as part of current 1E definitions. Staff recommends that institutions be allowed to select one of the two goals for continuation and scoring in Performance Year 6. The resulting measure is indicated below. Technical measurement details for the recommended combining of 1D and 1E may be reviewed in the attached supplement to this document.

Proposed Measure (1D/E for all institutions): Each institution is to be assessed on its performance in attaining a measurable goal over a three-year period. Institutions are to identify, subject to the approval of CHE, the measure to be used in determining performance in attaining the selected goal and the appropriate quantitative standards for each of the three-years for which performance will be scored. Goals and their measures and targets are to be approved such that there will be no delay between ending one goal and beginning another for performance scoring purposes. The identified goal and the selected measure and standards to be used in determining achievement of the goal will meet at a minimum the following requirements:

- Be in keeping with an institution's own institutional strategic plan or the strategic plan for higher education in South Carolina as approved by the Commission on Higher Education and the Council of Public College and University Presidents;

- Support the institution's mission and not be in conflict with the sector mission;
- Be maintained for three years;
- Include annual as well as third year goals;
- Be quantifiable;
- Not duplicate an existing performance funding measure;
- Not include capital projects; and
- Be subject to approval by the Commission on Higher Education.

REVISION

2A QUALITY OF FACULTY, ACADEMIC AND OTHER CREDENTIALS OF PROFESSORS AND INSTRUCTORS

Applicable to all Institutions, but defined differently for Technical Colleges vs. all other institutions

2A as applicable to Technical Colleges: Technical colleges will continue to be scored on indicator 2A1 for purposes of the scored 2A indicator. Staff recommends no change from current definitions and standards for 2A1 that are found on pages 83-88 of the September 2000 Workbook. Staff suggests from this point forward that this indicator be referred to as 2A for Technical Colleges.

2A as applicable to the Research, Teaching and Regional Campuses sectors: Staff recommends revising the two current subparts, 2A2a and 2A2b, into one part referenced as 2A for Research, Teaching, and Regional Campuses. The measure recommended considers all full-time faculty regardless of courses taught. Faculty included in calculating average salary data for indicator 2D will serve as the basis for faculty included here in determining the percentage of those with terminal degrees in the primary teaching area. Revised data based on the proposed measure indicated below are unavailable because institutional reporting has been limited to date to those faculty identified as teaching an undergraduate credit course in the fall. Staff recommends that all other measurement details related to determining whether a not a faculty member has the terminal degree in the primary area be retained (see pages 83-88.) For standards for Year 6, staff recommends that they be those currently defined for subpart 2A2b with the understanding that the standards will be revisited as institutional data becomes available or as applicable data from national and/or regional sources is identified. For Year 6, if there are concerns related to the proposed standards, staff will receive feedback and make a revised recommendation for consideration such that the standards would be finalized not later than the July meeting of the Commission. The proposed measure is as follows:

Proposed Measure (2A for Research, Teaching, and Regional Campuses Sectors): The quality of the faculty as represented by the academic and other credentials of professors and instructors is to be measured as the percent of all full-time faculty who have terminal degrees as defined by SACS in their primary teaching area.

NOTE: The Committee has requested that staff provide additional clarification on the definition of terminal degree for first professional degrees.

REVISION (No Changes for Regional Campuses and Technical Colleges)

2D QUALITY OF FACULTY, COMPENSATION OF FACULTY

Applicable to all Institutions, but defined differently for Technical Colleges and Regional Campuses as opposed to Research and Teaching Institutions

In implementing the recommendations approved by the Commission, staff proposes that this indicator remain the same as in Year 5 (definitions and methodology for standards) for the regional campuses and technical colleges. Staff recommends that for all four year institutions, the measure remain the same as defined in Year 5 (definitions and methodology for standards), but with the rank of instructor being excluded from consideration for scoring purposes. Staff finds that this rank should be excluded for

purposes here due to definitional differences related to the treatment of this rank across institutions and due to the relatively low numbers of faculty at this rank for some institutions. These differences lead to volatility in performance that may not be reflective of an institution's performance and as such the deletion of this rank for scoring purposes in no way reflects a position that instructors should not receive competitive compensation by institutions. Data for instructors will continue to be reported to the Commission and as a result, the Commission can continue monitoring institutions' compensation of instructors to identify any emerging problems.

Proposed Measures:

2D for Research Institutions and Four-year Colleges and Universities: The measure is the average faculty salary by rank for the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor.

NOTE: The Committee has requested that staff provide additional clarification as to the definition of the faculty population that is considered here and also is to be the basis for consideration for indicator 2A.

* **2D for Regional Campuses of the University of South Carolina:** The measure is the average of faculty salaries. Faculty with ranks of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor and professor will be included in determining the average.

* **2D for Technical Colleges:** The measure is the average of faculty salaries. (Technical Colleges do not utilize ranking of faculty.)

* *No changes from current measure as effective in Year 5.*

3D CLASSROOM QUALITY, ACCREDITATION OF DEGREE-GRANTING PROGRAMS
Applicable to All Institutions

There are **NO PROPOSED CHANGES** to this indicator from its current definition. For the current definition and standards, see Performance Funding Workbook, September 2000, pages 121 - 122. Note that the current methodology for the "counting of programs" will continue in Year 6 and that for Year 7, staff will review this indicator to determine whether any revision to this methodology is to be made.

3E CLASSROOM QUALITY, INSTITUTIONAL EMPHASIS ON QUALITY TEACHER
EDUCATION AND REFORM
Applicable to Teaching Sector Institutions

There are **NO PROPOSED CHANGES** to this indicator from its current definition. For the current definition and standards, see Performance Funding Workbook, September 2000, pages 121 - 122. Staff intends to make recommendations in the future, possibly to become effective in Year 6 to align this measure, particularly subparts 3E2a and 3E2b, with Title 2 reporting requirements when known. Such a proposed revision may require a different reporting cycle for parts 3E2a and 3E2b and corresponding data for 7D in the upcoming year.

IN PROCESS

- 3 **CLASSROOM QUALITY, INDICATOR TO BE DEFINED ASSESSING CLASSROOM/ INSTRUCTIONAL QUALITY OF PROGRAMS**
Applicable to Regional Campuses. This measure has not yet received a specific number.

At present, measurement details are being worked-out. Staff is working with regional campus representatives to identify a measure that could be used to provide a measure to assess classroom/instructional quality. For this measure, the Commission approved the development of a measure for regional campuses. Staff's expectations continue to be that a measure be developed by the fall so that data collection could occur and a determination made as to whether or not the measure could become effective the following year. Any measure developed would therefore not be applicable to the Year 6 scoring process. Preliminary discussions with regional campus representatives suggest that an expansion of questions asked on the current course evaluation instrument could provide the basis for this measure, with consideration given to uniformity of administration across campuses.

IN PROCESS

- 4A/B **COOPERATION AND COLLABORATION, COMBINED, (4A) SHARING AND USE OF TECHNOLOGY, PROGRAMS, EQUIPMENT, SUPPLIES, AND SOURCE MATTER EXPERTS WITHIN THE INSTITUTION, WITH OTHER INSTITUTIONS, AND WITH THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY and (4B) COOPERATION AND COLLABORATION WITH PRIVATE INDUSTRY**
Applicable to All Institutions, with differences across sectors

Staff is in the process of working with sectors to define this indicator as applicable for all institutions within a sector. Staff recommends that for the upcoming year, the measure be scored as a compliance indicator for all sectors as measures are developed and data collected. Because of the nature of this indicator and timeframes involved, staff will continue to work with sector representatives to clarify measurement expectations. Staff recommends that the sectors which have not yet identified a sector focus area provide a progress report on measurement development to the Planning and Assessment Committee on May 22. Staff recommends that all measurement issues related to identifying the focus area and determining the measure be resolved not later than October 2001. It is recommended that data collection and identification of standards for the defined sector measures should occur by Spring of 2002 so that the measure can be implemented and scored beginning in Year 7 (2002-03). Below, staff indicates the recommended language for the general measure, followed by details of sector activity regarding measurement development.

Proposed Measure (4A/B general measure as applicable to all institutions): Indicator 4A/B is defined tailored to each sector. 4A/B is intended to measure sector focused efforts of institutional cooperative and collaborative work with business, private industry and/or the community. Each sector, subject to approval of the Commission, will develop a common measure that will be the focus of the sector for a timeframe to be determined in excess of 1 year. Standards will be adopted for use in scoring individual institutional performance annually after the first year of implementation.

Sector Definitions of 4A/B to begin with Year 6 (2002-03):

The **Research Sector** has identified a specific focus area and also goals and targets to be assessed for five years. The area of focus, outlined below, is to enhance collaborative research efforts within the sector. This sector will continue to work on definitional issues.

Proposed Measure (4A/B, Research Sector): To enhance collaborative research within the Research Sector including the development and use of an integrated faculty and grants database system.

The **Teaching Sector** has identified focusing on business, community, and public school representation on academic program advisory boards as the area for which the sector would like to craft a measure. The teaching university sector will pursue a measure aimed at assessing institutional involvement in the community or with area business and industry by focusing on the representation of business and community and public school representatives on academic program advisory boards. The measure being discussed would identify current involvement, increasing involvement where needed, and optimum levels of representation. The sector is working to define a measure and standards focusing the institution's activities related to outreach efforts to gain involvement by such groups on campuses.

The **Regional Campuses** are in the process of identifying a focus area in order to begin discussion of potential measures and continue to work with staff in identifying a sector focus that will lead to measurement development. One suggestion the sector has determined it may wish to pursue is a measure that assesses community outreach activity by the faculty and staff of the campus. The sector has suggested that the focus could borrow from a recently adopted faculty senate document outlining service activities which include, but are not limited to: service to the community, the local campus, the regional campuses/greater University and the profession. Staff will continue to work with the campuses and expect to have a progress report from the sector available for the Committee in May.

The **Technical Colleges** are in the process of identifying a focus area in order to begin discussion of potential measure. The technical colleges also continue to work with staff in identifying a sector focus that will lead to measurement development. One suggestion the sector is pursuing is the identification of an area of focus related to the mission of the sector and relevant state-level strategic plans in order to develop a "quantifiable" best practices-type measure. Staff will continue to work with the colleges and expect to have a progress report from the sector available for the Committee in May.

5A ADMINISTRATIVE EFFICIENCY, PERCENTAGE OF ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS AS COMPARED TO ACADEMIC COSTS
Applicable to All Institutions

There are **NO PROPOSED CHANGES** to this indicator from its current definition. For the current definition and standards, see Performance Funding Workbook, September 2000, pages 133 - 135.

NOTE: The Committee has requested that staff provide additional clarification regarding changes to IPEDS reporting in relation to this indicator.

REVISION (IN PROCESS for MUSC)

6A/B ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS, COMBINED (6A) SAT AND ACT SCORES OF STUDENT BODY and (6B) HIGH SCHOOL STANDING, GRADE POINT AVERAGES, AND ACTIVITIES OF THE STUDENT BODY
Applicable to All Research, Teaching and Regional Campuses Sector Institutions, defined differently for MUSC vs. other institutions

6A/B for Research, except MUSC, Teaching and Regional Campuses Sector Institutions: In implementing the recommendations approved by the Commission, staff recommends that indicators 6A and 6B be combined such that the measure consider the percentage of first-time entering freshmen who have an SAT of ≥ 1000 or ACT of ≥ 21 or a high school GPA of ≥ 3.0 or high school class standing in the top 30% of those reporting any of the aforementioned credentials. Staff and institutional representatives have reviewed recalculated historical data encompassing this proposed definition. Staff is in the process

of reviewing other relevant data in order to make recommendations related to the standard for this revised indicator. Staff expects to resolve the issue of the standard by the Committee's May meeting.

Proposed Measure (6A/B Research, except MUSC, Teaching, and Regional Campuses Sectors):

Percent of first-time entering freshmen who take the SAT or ACT test or who have reported a high school grade point average (GPA) or who have reported a high school class standing who meet or exceed the Commission-approved target score on such tests. *NOTE: Target scores are defined as 1000 on the SAT or 21 on the ACT; both are based on approximate national averages for test takers. For high school GPA, the target is 3.0 or higher on a 4.0 scale and for high school class rank, the target is within the top 30% of their senior year class.*

Staff Explanation of 6A/B for MUSC: Staff recommends that the measure for MUSC assess entrance credentials of all first-time, full-time entering graduate and first professional students and could be titled "Entrance Examination Scores, College Grade Point Average, and College Rank of Entering Graduate and First Professional Students." The measure is envisioned as being limited to students who are required to have test scores for admission or who have a college GPA or college rank for admissions purposes. The proposed measure is listed below, but it is understood that there are technical measurement details, such as the appropriate timeframe for inclusion of students in the count (e.g., fall vs. fall and immediate preceding summer) or whether students in a limited number of programs may need to be excluded, that will need to be finalized as data based on this proposed measure is collected and reviewed for the first time. Staff will continue to work with representatives to resolve measurement details by the July meeting of the Committee. Staff recommends that the measure be applicable for scoring in Year 6 but recognizes that unanticipated data collection issues may result in an alternate recommendation. Any such recommendation could be made by the July meeting as well.

Proposed Measure (6A/B MUSC): Percent of first-time, full-time entering graduate and first professional students who take required entrance examination tests or who have reported a college grade point average (GPA) or who have reported a college rank who meet or exceed the Commission-approved target such tests or credentials.

Explanation: This measure would limit those included in the denominator to only those students for which one or more of the "pieces" indicated were required for admission to their program of study. The numerator would be a count of those students included in the denominator who meet or exceed at least one of the requirements. Staff proposes that the target college GPA be 3.00 and the college rank be "in the top 30%." For the exams, staff proposes that the target be set at or above the national average for the exam presented. As is the case with 6A/B for other institutions, the targets would be adopted and retained for a period of time and then reviewed at a later point to determine if an adjustment is needed. In cases where national average data is not available for exams, staff and institutional representatives will work to determine an approximate average.

REVISION (IN PROCESS for MUSC)

7A GRADUATES' ACHIEVEMENTS, GRADUATION RATES

Applicable to All Institutions, but defined differently for Clemson, USC Columbia and Teaching Sector Institutions as opposed to MUSC or Regional Campus and Technical College Sector Institutions

7A for Clemson, USC Columbia, and Teaching Sector: CHE approved that this indicator remain consistent with Rate 1 of 7A1 as currently defined. The measure is revised to reflect the prior "rate 1" as the measure for this indicator. Because the measure has not changed, standards set in Year 5 will remain in effect for Year 6.

Proposed Measure (7A, Research, except MUSC, and Teaching): First-time student graduation number and rate defined as the number and rate at which first-time, full-time degree-seeking students graduate. Rates are calculated using 150% of program time.

7A for MUSC: Staff recommends that this measure assess completion rates for all first-time, full-time entering graduate and first professional students, excluding doctoral students. The measure envisioned would assess whether students in the identified cohort complete their programs within a determined timeframe encompassing "normal program time" as indicated in the catalog plus an additional allowance such as one year. Staff recognizes the need to work out technical details related to the cohort definition as well as to whether there might be a limited number of graduate level programs that may need to be excluded for reasons related to the program structure and expectations of students. We suggest that these details be worked out using the IPEDS graduation rate survey methodology for determining graduation of undergraduates within 150% of program time as a guide. Staff will continue to work with representatives to resolve measurement details by the July meeting of the Committee. Staff recommends that the measure be applicable for scoring in Year 6 but recognizes that unanticipated data collection issues may result in an alternative recommendation. Any such recommendation could be made by the July meeting as well.

Proposed Measure (7A, MUSC): First-time full-time graduate students, except those in PhD programs, and first professional students who complete graduate degree programs within an allowable timeframe.

Explanation: The measure would capture completion of programs of first-time, full-time graduate students in master level and first professional programs. Technical details related to cohort development, allowable time for program completion and other points requiring further consideration will need to be finalized.

7A For Regional Campuses and Technical Colleges: Staff recommends that this indicator for Regional Campuses and Technical Colleges be defined as an expanded GRS rate in that students transferring out of the cohort and continued enrollment of those in the cohort are taken into account. Staff recognizes that some definitional issues may need further clarification. It is further recommended that until this indicator can be fully implemented, 7A as applicable to 4-yr institutions should apply and be scored using standards defined for regional campuses and technical colleges in Year 5. Staff will determine by July whether the indicator as revised can be implemented for Year 6 as a scored indicator or whether 7A1a as defined in Year 5 will have to be substituted for scoring in Year 6.

Proposed Measure (7A, Regional Campuses and Technical Colleges): "Success Rate" defined as the "GRS Rate Plus" which will be the determination for the first-time, full-time degree-seeking student Graduation Rate Survey (GRS) cohort as defined for 2-year institutions, the percentage of those graduating within 150% of normal program time who graduated or those

who as of 150% of program time have transferred to another institution or those who as of 150% of program time have continued to be enrolled either full- or part-time.

IN PROCESS

7B GRADUATES' ACHIEVEMENTS, EMPLOYMENT RATE FOR GRADUATES
Applicable to Technical College Sector Institutions

At present, technical college representatives and staff continue to work to define this measure. To date, staff recommends that this measure focus on graduates of technical/career preparation programs and whether such graduates have been employed in field. Technical Colleges are working to determine how best to relate this measure to program evaluation activities aimed at surveying graduates and identifying employment. The present process is being reviewed to determine the changes needed to process and current procedures in order to ensure consistent data across institutions. Staff also notes that if survey requirements are such that graduates are surveyed every other year, staff finds that the score earned based on the survey results be continued in the off-year(s). Like 4A/B (see above), staff recommends that the sector provide the Committee with a progress report regarding measurement development. At that time, staff will make recommendations regarding the timeframe for implementing this measure. Staff anticipates that the measure will likely be a compliance indicator for Year 6 with measurement development and data collection occurring such that the measure could be scored in Year 7 (2002-03).

IN PROCESS

7C GRADUATES' ACHIEVEMENTS, EMPLOYER FEEDBACK ON GRADUATES WHO WERE EMPLOYED AND NOT EMPLOYED
Applicable to Technical College Sector Institutions

At present, technical college representatives and staff continue to work to define this measure. To date, technical sector representatives are exploring basing this measure on surveying program advisory boards to determine whether or not employers are satisfied with graduates of programs. For data of this sort, a survey of advisory board members every two years may be sufficient. Staff notes that if survey requirements are such that advisory boards are not surveyed each year, the score earned as a result of the last survey should be carried forward until such time a later survey and results are available. Like 4A/B and 7B (see above), staff recommends that the sector provide the Committee with a progress report regarding measurement development. At that time, staff will make recommendations regarding the timeframe for implementing this measure. Staff anticipates that the measure will likely be a compliance indicator for Year 6 with measurement development and data collection occurring such that the measure could be scored in Year 7 (2002-03).

7D GRADUATES' ACHIEVEMENTS, SCORES OF GRADUATES ON POST-UNDERGRADUATE PROFESSIONAL, GRADUATE, OR EMPLOYMENT-RELATED EXAMINATIONS AND CERTIFICATION TESTS
Applicable to All Institutions

There are **NO PROPOSED CHANGES** to this indicator from its current definition. For the current definition and standards, see Performance Funding Workbook, September 2000, pages 133-135. Staff notes that for institutions with teacher education examinations the reporting timeframe for these exams may be changed to be reflective of national "Title 2" reporting requirements for South Carolina. See Indicator 3E also.

REVISION

7E GRADUATES' ACHIEVEMENTS, NUMBER OF GRADUATES WHO CONTINUED THEIR EDUCATION
Applicable to Regional Campus Sector Institutions

Staff recommends that this indicator for the regional campuses assess continuing education leading to a baccalaureate degree. The measure recommended focuses on the first-time full-time degree seeking student cohort (same as that used for Graduation Rate Survey (GRS) graduation rate) and a determination of those earning a baccalaureate degree within 150% of program time for a baccalaureate degree (i.e., graduation within 6 years) from a South Carolina public institution or other institution as can be documented. This suggested measure would capture students who receive four-year degrees. It would include but not be limited to students who receive AA/AS degrees from the regional campus. Staff are in the process of reviewing data collection issues for the measure as proposed for purposes of developing recommendations, to be made not later than July 2001, regarding implementation and standards for use in Year 6.

Proposed Measure (7E Regional Campuses): Percentage of first-time, full-time degree-seeking students who earn a baccalaureate degree within 150% of normal program time (6 years for a baccalaureate degree) from in-state public institutions or from other institutions provided appropriate documentation can be presented by the reporting regional campus.

8C USER-FRIENDLINESS OF INSTITUTION, ACCESSIBILITY TO THE INSTITUTION OF ALL CITIZENS OF THE STATE
Applicable to All Institutions

There are **NO PROPOSED CHANGES** to this indicator from its current definition. For the current definition and standards, see Performance Funding Workbook, September 2000, pages 175-180.

IN PROCESS for MUSC (No Changes for Clemson, USC and Teaching Sector)

9A RESEARCH FUNDING, FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR REFORM IN TEACHER EDUCATION
Applicable to Research and Teaching Sector Institutions, defined differently for MUSC as opposed to other institutions

9A for Clemson, USC Columbia and institutions in the teaching sector: There are no proposed changes to this indicator from its current definition. For the current definition and standards, see Performance Funding Workbook, September 2000, pages 181-182. As discussed with institutional representatives, staff notes that additional discussions with these institutions may be needed to improve the consistency of grants reported by the institutions to provide clarification of "allowable grants."

9A for MUSC: The Commission approved developing a complementary measure to be applied. Staff have worked with institutional representatives to identify a measure for 9A in the spirit of that applicable to other research institutions and to the teaching universities. It has been determined that this measure could focus on MUSC's outreach efforts focusing on improving the health of pre-K - 12 children and adolescents. The proposed measure could be constructed similar to that used for other institutions which focuses on improving teacher education. As indicated below the measure will be an assessment of MUSC's expenditures through public service grants and contracts focusing on pre-K - 12 child and adolescent health, including programs with schools and school districts. The measure would be based on MUSC's improvement in expenditures over time. This is similar to the measure applied for the teaching sector and other research institutions. Staff finds that the focus is in keeping with MUSC's mission as well as institutional goals and serves as a nice corollary to 9A as assessed for other institutions. Staff recognizes that institutional representatives working with staff will need to work out technical measurement details as data is collected and reviewed for purposes of this measure. Staff will continue to work with representatives and hopes to resolve measurement details by the July meeting of the Committee. Staff recommends that the measure be applicable for scoring in Year 6 but recognizes that unanticipated data collection issues may result in an alternative recommendation. Any such recommendation could be made by the July meeting as well.

Proposed Measure (9A for MUSC): RESEARCH FUNDING, FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR REFORM IN "IMPROVING PRE-K - 12, CHILD and ADOLESCENT HEALTH"

The amount of grants and awards expended to support the improvement in child and adolescent (pre-K - 12) health, including public service grants and contracts with schools or school districts or other such entities, as compared to the average from the prior three years.

Explanation: Staff recognizes that as the technical details are defined the wording of the proposed measure may require adjustment. The measure however will focus on current year expenditures as compared to the average expenditures over the past three years. The focus is limited to MUSC's outreach efforts in addressing and focusing on health issues and health care needs of children and adolescents. Staff will work with institutional representatives in determining unresolved technical details for assessing the measure as proposed.

**9B RESEARCH FUNDING, AMOUNT OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR GRANT
Applicable to Research Sector Institutions**

There are **NO PROPOSED CHANGES** to this indicator from its current definition. For the current definition and standards, see Performance Funding Workbook, September 2000, pages 183-184.