

CHE Meeting  
July 6, 2000

**STANDARDS  
FOR  
PERFORMANCE FUNDING  
FOR  
SOUTH CAROLINA'S  
PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   | Page     |
|---|----------|
| <b>I. Summary</b>   | <b>3</b> |
| A. Basis for Standards  | 3        |
| B. Individualizing Standards                                  | 4        |
| 1. Indicator 1A   |          |
| 2. Indicators 1D and 1E                                       |          |
| C. Summary of Changes   | 6        |
| <b>II. Standards and Scoring</b>                              |          |
| A. Guiding Principles   | 9        |
| B. Scoring Scale  | 11       |
| C. Improvement Factor   | 12       |
| D. Description of the Standards                               | 13       |
| <b>III. Spread Sheet Display of Standards (Attachment 2B)</b> |          |
| A. Technical Colleges   | 1        |
| B. Regional Campuses  | 9        |
| C. Teaching Universities                                      | 17       |
| D. Research Universities                                      | 25       |

## **I. Summary**

The Commission staff has, in conjunction with institutional representatives, developed recommendations for standards for 2000-2001 and following. The Planning and Assessment Committee reviewed these standards on June 1 for the technical college sector, the regional campuses of USC, and the teaching university sector. The staff met with representatives of the research universities on June 6 to discuss standards for that sector. The Committee met again on June 20, 2000, to consider the standards.

The Committee recommends approval of the standards for all four sectors, with the understanding that for the research universities the standards related to peer data would be approved in concept while issues related to peers are resolved.

### **A. Basis for Standards**

The standards are based, where possible, on peer data. For example, an institution would receive a score of "2" or "Achieves" if it performed at a level from the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile to the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile. This provides a broad range of performance to achieve the standard and a demanding level of performance to exceed the standard. An institution performing in the range for a "1" or "2" would receive an additional 0.5 if its performance showed significant improvement over its average performance over the prior three years.

For indicators for which peer data is not available, standards have been based on the best available data, including state data and estimated data based on national sources that may not be directly comparable.

The combination of ratings based on performance and on improvement takes into account excellence achieved and, to a lesser extent, improvement demonstrated.

Improvement factors are based on improvement in comparison to a three-year average, provided three years of comparable data is available. The percentage improvement varies by indicator, reflecting the type of data being measured. Improvement factors are 3% and 5%. Some indicators do not require improvement factors since the measure itself is based on improvement. Compliance indicators also do not require an improvement factor. The improvement factor for Indicator 2D, Compensation of Faculty, is based on annual increases.

## **B. Individualizing Standards**

The Planning and Assessment Committee asked the Commission staff to examine ways to individualize standards based on an institution's mission for a limited number of indicators. As part of that process, the staff asked institutions to make suggestions. The suggestions ranged across many of the indicators and involved considerable potential modification to standards with very little consistency in approach. Having considered these suggestions and the difficulties in implementing them, the staff recommended approval of a limited approach to individualizing standards for Indicators 1A, 1D, and 1E, all of which relate to mission focus. The Committee approved this staff recommendation.

### **1. Indicator 1A, Expenditure of Funds to Achieve Mission**

For this indicator, the Committee recommends providing some choice of categories of expenditure. There are eight categories in the measure: instruction, research, public service, academic support, student services, institutional support, operation and maintenance of plant, and scholarships and fellowships. For each sector, the standard would be determined based on two designated categories (three for the research sector) with the option for the institution to select one additional category for which the desired trend is upward. For each sector the categories would be

#### **Research University Sector**

Instruction, Academic Support, Research plus the option of selecting one category selected from Public Service, Student Services, and Scholarships and Fellowships

#### **Teaching University Sector**

Instruction and Academic Support plus the option of selecting one category selected from Research, Public Service, Student Services, and Scholarships and Fellowships

#### **Regional Campus Sector**

Instruction and Academic Support plus the option of selecting one category selected from Research, Public Service, Student Services, and Scholarships and Fellowships

## Technical College Sector

Instruction and Academic Support plus the option of selecting one category selected from Research, Public Service, Student Services, and Scholarships and Fellowships

This approach maintains an emphasis on instruction and academic support (plus research for the research universities), which is in keeping with the missions of each sector, while also enabling institutions to select a category in keeping with their individual mission focus and goals. For example, an institution that is focusing on developing its student support services could choose to select student services as well as instruction and academic support.

### **2. Indicators 1D, Adoption of a Strategic Plan, and 1E, Attainment of Goals of the Strategic Plan**

For these two indicators, the Committee recommends adjusting the measurement to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Each institution would propose for 1D two specific measures in keeping with its strategic plan. At least one of the proposed measures would also be supportive of the goals and objectives of 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. The institution would also propose the appropriate quantitative standard for the measure, subject to the approval of the Commission on Higher Education. Both measures should:

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

The measure and the standards for the measure would be proposed at the beginning of the performance year. The measure would then be evaluated annually after the conclusion of the performance year. Thus, the measures proposed in 2000 for Indicator 1D would not be assessed for Indicator 1E until fall 2001, in keeping with the schedule already contained in the Performance Funding Workbook. Indicator 1D would be a compliance indicator with compliance achieved with the Commission's approval of the proposed measures and standards. Indicator 1E would be scored in relation to whether the institution did not achieve, achieved, or exceeded the approved standard for the year.

### **C. Summary of Changes in Staff Recommendations Since the Planning and Assessment Committee Meeting of June 1, 2000**

The following is a brief summary of changes in proposed standards from those discussed at the June 1, 2000, meeting of the Planning and Assessment Committee and the June 6, 2000 meeting with research university representatives. These changes were approved by the Committee on June 20, 2000.

#### **Indicators 1A, 3C, 5A, 5D, 9B**

The staff recommended that the standard range for a "2" be from the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile up to the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile if the expected trend is up, the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile down to the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile if expected trend is down. This change was indicated when the standards were discussed at the June 1 meeting of the committee.

#### **Indicator 1A**

The staff recommendation for this indicator was changed to enable the institution to choose one of the categories of expenditure in keeping with its mission and goals, in addition to designated categories. The designated categories are instruction and academic support for the technical college, regional campus, and teaching university sectors and instruction, academic support, and research for the research university sector. Institutions may select an additional category from among those that have also had an expected trend upward. This change is one component of the staff recommendation for individualizing a limited number of indicators.

#### **Indicator 1D**

The staff recommended redefining this measure so that the institution would propose two measures and standards different from the other indicators that reflect its unique mission and goals. At least one of the proposed measures would also support the Strategic Plan for Higher Education in South Carolina. This indicator would be scored as a compliance indicator, with compliance being met by the institution's proposing the measures and standards, subject to the approval of the Commission on Higher Education. This change is a component of the staff recommendation concerning individualizing a limited number of indicators. It would also help to clarify and strengthen the existing measure for 1D.

#### **Indicator 1E**

The staff recommended redefining this measure so that the institution's performance on the measures and standards for 1D would be evaluated by

comparing performance to the approved standards for each institution. This change is a component of the staff recommendation concerning individualizing a limited number of indicators. The time frame for evaluation would be consistent with the time frames in the current workbook for performance funding.

#### Indicator 2D

Rather than holding the targeted national average compensation of faculty at the same amount for three years, as suggested at the June 1 meeting, the staff recommended that the compensation figure reflect annual changes in national average faculty salary. The proposed expectation for scoring performance (i.e., that institutions are within certain percentages of the national average) will remain constant from year to year. This change will produce more consistent scoring from year to year. The proposed expectation for scoring performance (i.e., that institutions are within certain percentages of the national average) will remain constant from year to year. Additionally, the range for a "3" has been broadened to recognize institutions performing at or within 5% of the national average. Initially, the recommendation had been to be at or better than the national average in order to earn a "3". The material for the research sector discussed on June 6 contained an error - the range for a "2" had been inadvertently listed as 80-89% of the national average which was inconsistent with recommendations for other sectors. The range for the research institutions has been adjusted accordingly to 80% to 94.9% and is consistent with that used for the teaching universities.

#### Indicators 6A, 6B

For consistency across sectors and in recognizing institutional differences, the range for a "2" was broadened for the research universities and regional campuses. Additionally, for 6A for the research universities, the cut-off for a "3" was adjusted to the past sector benchmark which is consistent with that cut-off used in the other two sectors.

#### Indicators 6D, 8C1, 8C2

As a result of issues raised by institutions and also in an effort to be consistent with Life Scholarship definitions concerning residency status, the staff recommended including as South Carolina residents those true legal residents classified in Residency Class 1 for reporting purposes, plus military and dependents (Exception A), faculty and dependents (Exception B), full time employees and dependents (Exception C), and retired and dependents (Exception D). This change broadens the residency categories from just the Residency Class 1, as initially proposed.

#### Indicator 7A

So that the standards for graduation rates will be consistent with other standards related to peer data, the staff recommends that the range for a score of "2" be from the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile to the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile.

#### Indicator 8C2

The reference data for the research sector was broadened to include retention data from all four-year public institutions in the state, rather than basing the median on only three institutions' data. The resulting standard for a "2" for the research sector is 78-87%, rather than 84-92%.



## **II. Standards and Scoring**

The following recommendation addresses standards effective with the 2000-2001 performance year. The recommendations are intended to take into account to the extent possible the principles identified below:

### **A. Guiding Principles**

#### **1. High Expectations**

Standards should reflect high expectations (consistent with the mission of higher education in the state and of the sector).

#### **2. Consistency Across Years**

When feasible, standards should be consistent for multiple years so that institutions can work to achieve them over time.

#### **3. Consistency Across Institutions**

Standards should be set at consistent levels for institutions within the same sector in order to recognize comparable levels of achievement.

#### **4. Reference to Best Available Data**

Standards should be established with reference to available and comparable national data or, in the absence of that data, with reference to regional or state data.

#### **5. Incentive for Individual Improvement**

Standards should provide incentive for performing at high levels, while also recognizing that institutions are at different performance levels and that their improvement should be recognized and encouraged.

#### **6. Maximum Performance Levels**

Standards should recognize that for many indicators there are maximum performance levels beyond which continued improvement is neither feasible nor desirable.

#### **7. Simplicity and Clarity**

The system of standards should be as simple and clear as possible.

The recommendations apply these principles in the following ways:

**1. High Expectations**

To receive a score of "3" or "Exceeds Standards," South Carolina's colleges and universities should clearly surpass average levels of performance. Likewise, to receive a score of "2" or "Achieves Standards," South Carolina's colleges and universities should perform within the average range of the best available data or at a comparable level of achievement.

**2. Consistency Across Years**

Although standards may be reviewed annually, the expectation should be that where practical standards will be maintained for three years.

**3. Consistency Across Institutions**

Similar standards should, for nearly all indicators, be applicable to institutions within the same sector.

**4. Reference to Best Available Data**

National data, where it exists, should be used as a point of reference, while regional or state data should be used otherwise.

**5. Incentive for Individual Improvement**

Improvement should be rewarded if an institution's performance progresses significantly compared to its average performance.

**6. Maximum Performance Levels**

Maximum levels of performance should be indicated in the standards so that colleges and universities are not caused to perform at levels that are counter-productive.

**7. Simplicity and Clarity**

The confusing combination that currently exists of sector benchmarks on some indicators, "temporary caps" on others, criterion referencing on some, and institutionally proposed benchmarks on some should be replaced with an easily described system of standards that reflects the applications expressed above.

## **B. Scoring Scale for Each Measure**

The following scoring definitions are applied to the standards:

| <b>Score</b>                        | <b>Standard In Comparison With Best Available Data</b>   |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>3 Exceeds Standards</b>          | <b>Performance significantly above the average range or at a level defined as "exceeds standards"</b>          |
| <b>2 Achieves Standards</b>         | <b>Performance within the average range or a level defined as "achieves standards"</b>                         |
| <b>1 Does Not Achieve Standards</b> | <b>Performance significantly below the average range or at a level defined as "does not achieve standards"</b> |
| <b>+0.5 With Improvement*</b>       | <b>Improvement in comparison to the prior three-year average at a rate determined by indicator.**</b>          |

\* Limited to scoring in the "Achieves" or Does Not Achieve" Categories

\*\* Improvement rates are defined for each indicator.

## **B. Improvement Factor**

For most indicators an improvement factor is recommended. For indicators that measure financial, faculty, and some student data, for which improvement is more difficult to achieve and variation from year to year is less, an improvement factor of 3% is recommended. For most other indicators, an improvement factor of 5% is recommended. Experience with these indicators suggests that the variation is greater and that a greater degree of improvement might be expected. Indicators that are already based on improvement, such as research expenditures, do not require an additional improvement factor. Indicator 2D, Faculty Compensation, has an improvement factor consistent with the annual nature of the measure. Improvement is to be assessed in light of the average of an institution's most recent three years of performance data, with the exception of Indicator 2D, where the most recent year's data will be used, and Indicator 8B, where the most recent five years of data minus the highest year and the lowest year will be used. For indicators for which three-years of data is unavailable, any available past data will be used to assess improvement. The improvement factors for the different indicators are displayed below and also on the summary of standards and the spreadsheet display of standards.

### **Faculty, Financial, and Selected Student Indicators with a 3% Improvement Factor**

- 1A Expenditure of Funds
- 2A2a Credentials of Faculty, Terminal Degree Headcount
- 2A2b Credentials of Faculty, Terminal Degree Full Time
- 3C Ratio of Faculty to Employees
- 3E2a Teacher Education, NTE Professional Knowledge
- 3E2b Teacher Education, NTE Specialty
- 5A Administrative to Academic Expenditures
- 5D General Overhead Costs
- 7A1a Graduation Rates
- 7D Professional Examinations
- 7F Credits Hours Earned of Graduates
- 8C4 Accessibility (Minority Faculty)

### **Student Enrollment and Entrance Indicators with a 5% Improvement Factor**

- 2E1 Availability of Faculty
- 2E2 Availability of Faculty, Advisors
- 3E3a Teacher Education, Critical Shortage – Graduates in Subject Areas
- 3E3b Teacher Education, Critical Shortage – Graduates who are Minority
- 6A SAT/ACT Scores

- 6B GPA and Rank in Class
- 6D Priority on In-State Students
- 8C1 Accessibility, Minority Undergraduate Students
- 8C2 Minority Retention of Undergraduate Students
- 8C3 Minority Graduate Students

Improvement Factor Based on the legislatively approved faculty salary increase plus 1%

- 2D Compensation of Faculty (applies to all ranks)

Indicators with No Improvement Factor

- 1B Curriculum Offered
- 1E Attainment of Goals
- 2A1 Credentials of Faculty, Meeting SACS
- 3D Accreditation
- 8A Transferability of Credits
- 8B Continuing Education
- 9A Research Expenditures for Teacher Education
- 9B Research Expenditure, Public and Private Grants

Plus all compliance indicators

#### **D. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS**

##### **1A Expenditure of Funds**

This measure has been confusing to implement because each institution has chosen any combination of eight expenditure categories and because the direction on some categories has been upward and on others downward. The recommended change provides a consistent basis for comparisons across institutions focusing on the primary mission areas of instruction and academic support for all sectors, plus research for the research sector. To provide for some choice to reflect individual missions and characteristics, institutions have the option of selecting one additional category from those that have a desired upward direction, such as student services or scholarship. Standards based on percentile and peer data, with a score of "2" earned by performance between the 40<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentile. The improvement factor is 3% of the three-year average.

**1B Curriculum Offered to Achieve Mission**

The percentage of programs meeting criteria provides a broad range for a score of "2" and allows for one program not to meet criteria for institutions falling outside the percentages indicated for a "2". Additionally, for the regional campuses and technical colleges, this indicator will become a compliance indicator. No improvement factor is recommended since the institution can show improvement within the measure itself.

**1C Approval of Mission Statement**

No change is recommended for this compliance indicator and no improvement factor is required.

**1D Approval of Strategic Plan**

This compliance indicator is modified so that the institution proposes two measures with two standards reflecting its mission and goals. At least one of the measures must also support the Strategic Plan for Higher Education in South Carolina. Measures and standards are subject to the approval of the Commission on Higher Education. No improvement factor is required.

**1E Attainment of Goals of Strategic Plan**

This measure addresses the goals identified for Indicator 1D and requires no improvement factor.

**2A Credentials of Faculty**

The range for a score of "2" allows for 98% of faculty or all but one faculty member not meeting SACS criteria. Ranges on terminal degrees reflect sector differences. The terminal degree measure is deferred for the technical college sector pending further study. The improvement factor for 2A2a and 2A2b related to terminal degrees is 3%. There is no improvement factor for 2A1, since this measure reflects the minimum SACS criteria and since the standard for a "2" is nearly 100%.

**2B Performance Review of Faculty**

This indicator becomes a compliance indicator rather than a measurement indicator. No improvement factor is required.

**2C Post Tenure Review**

This indicator becomes a compliance indicator rather than a measurement indicator. No improvement factor is required.

**2D Average Faculty Salary**

This measure reflects the most recent AAUP salary data inflated for the new performance year. The standards reflect the goal of reaching national averages. A score of "2" is achieved by performing within 80% - 94.9% of the average (75-94.9% of the national figure for the regional campuses and technical colleges). The targeted national average salary is to be adjusted annually with the expectation of being within indicated percentages of the national average salary to remain constant. The improvement factor is based on the state raise for unclassified faculty plus 1% (e.g., if the raise is 3%, the improvement factor is 4%).

**2E Availability of Faculty to Students**

The two parts of this measure and their standards are unchanged. The improvement factor is 5% for both parts.

**3A Class Size and Student/Faculty Ratios**

The ranges for class size and student faculty ratios have been increased to provide greater individualization for institutions. This indicator becomes a compliance indicator and requires no improvement factor.

**3B Credit Hours Taught**

This indicator is deferred for 2000-2001 pending further study.

**3C Ratio of Faculty to Employees**

The standards are based on peer data with a score of "2" achieved by performance between the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile and the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile. The improvement factor is 3%.

**3D Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs**

This measure is unchanged. The workbook will clarify that a "2" can be achieved if all but one program is accredited or on track to be accredited by April 2002. Since the measure already reflects anticipated improvement, no additional improvement factor is required.

### **3E Teacher Education**

The standards reflect broad ranges for a score of "2", especially on the specialty area examination and in critical shortage areas. The critical shortage subject areas are fixed in place for three years so that there will not be a moving target. The standard for minority teachers reflects both the percent of teachers who are minorities and gain initial certification and the percent of teachers who are minorities who are currently employed in the State. The improvement factor for the test score measures, 3E2a and 3E2b, is 3%. The improvement factor for the critical shortage areas, 3E3a and 3E3b, is 5%.

### **4A Sharing, Use of Technology**

This compliance measure has not been changed and is not on cycle for evaluation in 2000-2001. No improvement factor is required.

### **4B Cooperation and Collaboration**

This compliance measure has not been changed and is not on cycle for evaluation in 2000-2001. No improvement factor is required.

### **5A Administrative and Academic Expenditures**

The standard for this measure compares institutional performance to peer data with a score of "2" achieved by performance between the 60<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> percentile. The improvement factor is 3%.

### **5B Best Management Practices**

This indicator becomes a compliance indicator rather than a measurement. No improvement factor is required.

### **5C Elimination of Duplication**

This compliance measure has not been changed and is not on cycle for evaluation in 2000-2001. No improvement factor is required.

### **5D General Overhead Per FTE Student**

This measure compares the institution's performance to peer data with a score of "2" achieved for performance between the 60<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> percentile. The improvement factor is 3%.



**6A SAT/ACT Scores**

This measure, based on the percentage of students scoring at or above 1000 on the SAT or at or above 21 on the ACT, allows for a broad range of performance for a score of "2." The improvement factor is 5%.

**6B Rank In Class and GPA of Entering Freshmen**

The standard for the percent of entering freshmen with a GPA of 3.0 or graduating in the upper 30% of their high school class has a demanding standard for a score of "3" and a broader range for a score of "2". The improvement factor is 5%.

**6C Post Secondary Achievement**

This indicator is unchanged. No improvement factor is required.

**6D Priority on Enrolling In-State Students**

This measure of in-state student enrollment now includes those enrolled who reside within South Carolina, including military and dependents, full time employees and dependents, and retired persons and dependents. This definition is consistent with the Life Scholarship definition. The improvement factor is 5%.

**7A Graduation Rate**

This measure compares the institution's performance to peer or national data, differentiated by sector. The improvement factor is 3%. The part of the measure related to developmental students in the technical college sector is deferred.

**7B Employment/Continuing Education**

This measure is unchanged and is not on cycle for evaluation in 2000-2001. An improvement factor is not applicable at this time.

**7C Employer Feedback**

This measure is unchanged and is not on cycle for evaluation in 2000-2001. An improvement factor is not applicable at this time.

**7D Professional Examination**

Broad ranges for a score of "2" or "3" are provided to allow for differences in examinations from one institution to another. The improvement factor is 3%.

**7F Credit Hours Earned of Graduates**

The standards are somewhat more demanding than the previous sector benchmark. The improvement factor is 3%.

**8A Transferability of Credits**

This measure is unchanged. Since it relates to a best practices document, no improvement factor is recommended.

**8B Continuing Education Programs**

This measure is deferred for all sectors except the technical college sector. For the technical colleges, an institution's performance is assessed relative to its most recent five years of performance minus the high and low years. Since the measure is already based on improvement, no improvement factor is required.

**8C Accessibility**

Standards for the four parts of this measure derive from best available data. The reference data for students is the state's minority population 18 and over. This data is supported by data on minority high school graduates and minority SAT takers in the state. The standard for retention is based on averages for each sector. The percentage of minority graduates is based on the minority percentage of the population with baccalaureate degrees and is supported by data on the minority percentage with graduate/professional degrees. The percentage of minority faculty is based on the minority percentage with graduate degrees and is supported by data on the minority percentage with PhD's. The improvement factor for the student-enrollment portions of the measure—8C1, 8C2, and 8C3—is 5%. The improvement factor for the faculty-related part, 8C4, is 3%.

**9A Research Expenditure for Teacher Education**

This measure is unchanged. Since the measure is based on improvement, no additional improvement factor is required.

**9B Public and Private Sector Grants**

This measure is deferred for the teaching sector. The standard for the research sector is based on peer data, with a score of "2" achieved by performance between the 40<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentile. Since the measure is based on improvement, no additional improvement factor is required.

## Performance Improvement Funding Requests

### For Implementation in FY 2000-20001

The Commission on Higher Education awards Performance Improvement Funding to institutions or groups of institutions annually, funding permitting, for the purposes of providing additional support for improving performance on performance funding indicators. Funds are awarded in response to proposals submitted by institutions and may be funded in whole or in part. Proposals submitted for FY 2000-2001 are contingent upon scores awarded through the performance funding process in May 2000 to affect the FY 2000-2001 allocation of state appropriations. Final funding is awarded in July 2000 and will be for the period of July 2000 through August 2001. Following final action by the Commission on Higher Education funds will be available to those institutions whose proposals have been approved in response to written requests from those institutions.

The following staff recommendations were approved by the Planning and Assessment Committee on June 20, 2000, and are recommended to the Commission on Higher Education for consideration on July 6, 2000.

| Institution(s)                                   | Indicator Addressed & Proposal   | Amount Requested | Staff Recommendations   |
|--|--|------------------|---|
| <b>Research Institutions</b><br>(all 3 together) | 8C4 - % of headcount teaching faculty who are other-race<br>The funds will assist in the development of a defined program to enhance the recruitment and retention of minority faculty members.  | <b>\$950,000</b> | The staff recommended that the proposal be funded up to the level of \$950,000. These funds will support a state-wide program to recruit minority faculty members. The institutions will provide \$350,000 in matching funds.   |
| <b>Coastal Carolina</b>                          | 3D-Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs<br>The funds will allow the university to actively pursue accreditation of the Computer Science program, by providing necessary start-up costs.   | <b>\$162,640</b> | The staff recommended that the proposal be funded up to the level of \$162,640. These funds will support efforts for "start up costs" to attain accreditation of the computer science program. The institution will provide \$210,710 in matching funds.  |
| <b>Francis Marion</b>                            | 3E & 7D - Teacher Education/Professional Exams<br>Systematic organization & analysis of student data will be used to create a predictive model of performance that will assist the University in directing resources in effective and efficient manners to support students who will be taking professional exams. | <b>\$59,050</b>  | The staff recommended that the proposal be funded up to the level of \$59,050. These funds will support efforts in data analysis reporting and software purchases to enhance student performance on teacher education exams. The institution will provide \$41,028 in matching funds.             |
| <b>Lander</b>                                    | 3D-Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs<br>The proposal will address an area cited by the CHE Program Review evaluator as needing improvement in the movement towards AACSB accreditation - technological resources.  | <b>\$110,460</b> | The staff recommended that the proposal be funded up to the level of \$110,460. These funds will support efforts in technology hardware and training to attain accreditation by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business. The institution will provide \$60,600 in matching funds. |

| Institution(s)   | Indicator Addressed & Proposal   | Amount Requested | Staff Recommendations  |
|--|--|------------------|--|
| <b>USC Regional Campuses</b><br>(all 5 together)             | 1A, 5D, 6A, 6B, 7A1, 8C<br>This proposal is aimed at all the indicators to increase depth and breadth of communication. It will provide some "missing links" needed to complete video (teleconferencing and distance education) connection between the five Regional USC Campuses and the USC Columbia Campus. | <b>\$32,100</b>  | The staff recommended that the proposal be funded for the five USC Regional Campuses up to the level of \$32,100. These funds will support the costs in equipment and training to strengthen communication among the campuses. The institutions cite that matching institutional dollars are already in place in equipment and electronic means. |
| <b>State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education</b> | The State Tech Board will apply the Performance Improvement Funds to those lower-performing institutions. One third of the funding will be set aside to support the development of distance education coursework to provide the courses in transfer blocks.  | <b>\$406,490</b> | The staff recommended that the proposal be funded up to the level contributed by the Technical Sector to the performance improvement pool.   |

**Total Requested                      \$ 1,720,740**

# **Proposed Standards and Rationale – Yr 5 2000-2001**

---

**For consideration by the SC Commission on Higher Education  
July 6, 2000**

**Technical Sector**

**Regional Sector**

**Teaching Sector**

**Research Sector**

**Sorted by Sector, by Indicator**

**Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr. 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000**

**PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001**

| Only Standard Indicators No Change Proposed   |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS   |  | TECHNICAL COLLEGES SECTOR   |  |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Indicator 3: Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)   |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR: Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as indicated will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevancy of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.                                   |  | RECOMMENDED STANDARDS: The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (Round down if upward trend and up if downward trend.) Actual performance will be rounded to the 5% (five) level used in Year 4 and then computed to the scale for Year 5.  |  |
| Expenditure of Funds  |  | 1A. Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance methodology for calculation.<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-yr Avg + (3% * 3-yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score. |  | 3-+ At or above the 75th percentile of peers<br>2- 40th percentile up to 75th percentile<br>1- Below 40th percentile<br><br>The University and Academic Support Plan, Instructional, Career, and Other from categories including: Research, Public Service, Student Service, and Scholarship (includes Unrestricted Admissions only). Institutions may not choose only the best categories if the selection of an additional category is not desired.   |  |
| Currently measured based on institution's selected category (as assessed as a ratio of the total EAG Unrestricted and restricted funds are considered for the research sector and unrestricted only are considered for all other sectors. Staff proposes the measure be based on a combination of categories that are the same for all within a sector, with the option of one category chosen by the institution. Selected categories are from within an approved improvement movement. The sum of the categories will be expressed as a ratio of total EAG. Unrestricted and restricted will continue to be considered for the research sector and unrestricted for all others. |  | 1B. Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>No internal program review conducted by CHE to verify program offering. Program review completed by State Tech Board and reported for each institution.  |  | Data reference is all "MCT" peers combined & FTE > 1000 and MCT Points < 1000 FTE & FTE < 1000 (i.e., CMT/C, DTC, TOLC, WTC). IPEDS FY98 data. Data for Instruction + Academic Support + Choice as a ratio of EAG Total.<br><br>Choice A:<br>Instruction & Academic Support Only: Med=58.8%, 40th=58.0%, 75th=63.7%, 40th= 64.9%<br>Research: Med=58.8%, 75th=63.7%, 40th= 64.9%<br>(Range for "2": 58.0%, 43.0%)<br>Public Svc: Med=60.3%, 75th=63.7%, 40th= 64.9%<br>(Range for "2": 58.0%, 43.0%)<br>Student Svc: Med=60.8%, 75th=72.8%, 40th= 64.9%<br>(Range for "2": 64.0%, 17.0%)<br>Scholarship: Med=60.8%, 75th=65.8%, 40th= 59.2%<br>(Range for "2": 59.0%, 65.0%)<br><br>Choice B:<br>For Institutions < 1000 FTE:<br>Instruction & Academic Support Only: Med=59.2%, 40th=58.8%, 75th=62.5% (Range for 2:58.0% - 62.0%)<br>Research: Med=59.2%, 75th=62.5%, 40th= 58.8%<br>(Range for "2": 58.0%, 42.0%)<br>Public Svc: Med=59.4%, 75th=62.0%, 40th= 59.0%<br>(Range for "2": 58.0%, 42.0%)<br>Student Svc: Med=60.8%, 75th=71.4%, 40th= 65.5%<br>(Range for "2": 65.0%, 71.0%)<br>Scholarship: Med=60.8%, 75th=65.8%, 40th= 59.2%<br>(Range for "2": 59.0%, 65.0%) |  |
| Curricula Offered   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>Compliance indicator improvement factor does not apply.  |  | Change to compliance<br>(Compliance achieved if institution is in compliance with three criteria of indicator)  |  |
| Measure as % of programs meeting criteria for Research & Teaching Sectors. No change measured as compliance indicator for Regional & Technical Sectors. Change to Compliance  |  | 1D. Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>Compliance indicator improvement factor does not apply.  |  | Compliance - No Change  |  |
| Strategic Plan Goals  |  | Compliance indicator improvement factor does not apply.  |  | Institutionally proposed measurement standard on 2 selected goals<br><br>Assessment of 1D will remain a "compliance" indicator with compliance achieved by the institution's proposing the measures and standards and the Commission's approval of the proposed measures and standards.   |  |
| Staff recommends changing this indicator to provide an opportunity for more meaningful and individualized assessment. Staff recommends that institutions select two specific measures in keeping with their type plans. One measure selected would also be one of goals and objectives of the State's Plan for Higher Education. Refer to current "Measuring summary materials"   |  | Compliance indicator improvement factor does not apply.  |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to PAA Meeting, June 20, 2000. Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.   |  |

# **Technical Sector - Proposed Standards and Rationale**

---

**For consideration by the SC Commission on Higher Education  
July 6, 2000**



Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

| They shading indicates no change proposed.   |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS   |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| Indicator 3. Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)  |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR: Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving an outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevance of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.  |  |
| 28.1 Availability of Faculty<br>28.2 Availability of Adjuncts<br>(Measure on cycle every 3 years, next rating is at FY 2000-01)  |  | 28.1 & 28.2 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance.<br>Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-yr Avg + (5% * 3-yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator subject score. | <p><b>RECOMMENDED STANDARDS:</b> The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (Round down if upward trend and up if downward trend). Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5.</p> <p><b>DATA TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHING SCALE</b><br/>PROPOSED</p> <p>Score scale both parts</p> <p>3+ Above 60%<br/>2+ 60% - 69%<br/>1+ Below 60%<br/>No change to current scale</p> <p>Change to Compliance based on all three parts</p> <p>3A1a: Change range from 15-25 to 12-27<br/>3A1b: N/A<br/>3A2a: No change (Range of 0% - 20%)<br/>3A2b: No change (Range of 0% - 5%)<br/>3A3: Change range from 14-19 to 10-20</p> <p>Institutions in full compliance with all applicable parts will be in compliance. Institutions not meeting any of the parts will be out of compliance.</p> |
| 29. Class Size & Student/Faculty Ratios  |  | 29. Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>"Compliance" indicator. Improvement factor does not apply.   |  |
| 3A1a Lower Division<br>3A1b Upper Division<br>3A2a % undergraduate lecture sections 50 and up<br>3A2b % lower division lecture sections 100 and up<br>3A3 FTE students per FTE faculty |  |  |  |
| 3B Credit Hours Taught   |  | 3B Measure deferred. Improvement factor N/A at this time   |  |
| 3C Ratio of Faculty to Employees   |  | 3C Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance.<br>Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-yr Avg + (3% * 3-yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score.                  |  |
| 3D Institution of Degree-Granting Programs<br>reg to scale   |  | 3D Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>Measurement at present provides allowances for improvement in regard to achieving program accreditation   |  |

PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001

TECHNICAL COLLEGES SECTOR

\* Application to be clarified in workbook.

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001

| Daily Shading indicates no change proposed.  |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS  |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| Indicator 8, Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)  |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR: Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevance of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below. |  |  |
| 1E   | Attainment of Goals  | 1E Recommended Improvement Factor: None   | BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS<br><br>RECOMMENDED STANDARDS: The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (Round down if upward trend and up if downward trend.) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5.<br><br>DATA TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHING SCALE<br>PROPOSED  |  |
| Staff recommends changing the indicator to provide an opportunity for more meaningful and individualized assessment. Staff recommends that institutions select two specific measures as part of Indicator 10 with assessment scored as part of Indicator 1E. Refer to committee meeting summary materials. |  | An improvement factor would not be applicable as institutions are assessed annually based on their proposed goals and standards   |  |  |
| 2A1a   | Credentials of Faculty teaching SACs (teaching undergraduate)  | 2A1a. Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>No factor recommended due to the high performance of institutions on this subject   |  |  |
| 2A2a   | Credentials of Faculty, terminal degree, headcount (teaching undergraduate)  | 2A2a & 2A2b. Recommended Improvement Factor: .3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance  |  |  |
| 2A2b   | Credentials of Faculty, terminal degree, full-time (teaching undergraduate)  | 2A2a & 2A2b. Recommended Improvement Factor: .3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance  |  |  |
| 2B   | Performance Review (measured on cycle, next rating is pf yr 2001-02)<br>Recommended changing to compliance indicator | 2B. Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>"Compliance" indicator, improvement factor does not apply   | Expectation is compliance with policy best practices and therefore measurement as compliance indicator is more appropriate<br><br>Change to Compliance (Compliance achieved if institution is in compliance with all indicated best practices principles)<br><br>NA<br><br>If the Average Faculty Salary:<br>3- At or above 95% of the national average salary<br>2- 75% - 94.9% of national average salary<br>1- Below 75% of national average salary<br>For technical colleges, rank is not applicable<br><br>1999-00 average faculty salary as compiled by AAUP for 2 yr periods without rank is to be used as the reference. The reference will be related to 2000-01 by the legislated state salary increase. The related value will serve as the target for year 5. The target will be inflated accordingly each year<br><br>See Proposed Scale for Final Determination of the year 5 targeted national average salary |  |
| 2C   | Post Tenure Review (measured on cycle, next rating is pf yr 2001-02)<br>Recommended changing to compliance indicator | 2C. Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>"Compliance" indicator, improvement factor does not apply   |  |  |
| 2D   | Average Faculty Salary by Rank   | 2D. Recommended Improvement Factor: .1%<br>Legislated .1% increase for unfilled employees + .1% and improvement relative to improvement shown over the past year alone  |  |  |
| 2D1a   | Instructor   | 2D1a. Recommended Improvement Factor: .1%<br>Legislated .1% increase for unfilled employees + .1% and improvement relative to improvement shown over the past year alone  |  |  |
| 2D1b   | Assistant Professor  | 2D1b. Recommended Improvement Factor: .1%<br>Legislated .1% increase for unfilled employees + .1% and improvement relative to improvement shown over the past year alone  |  |  |
| 2D1c   | Associate Professor  | 2D1c. Recommended Improvement Factor: .1%<br>Legislated .1% increase for unfilled employees + .1% and improvement relative to improvement shown over the past year alone  |  |  |
| 2D1d   | Professor  | 2D1d. Recommended Improvement Factor: .1%<br>Legislated .1% increase for unfilled employees + .1% and improvement relative to improvement shown over the past year alone  |  |  |
| For the regional campuses, the measure is change in average salary of faculty at ranks due to low 1/3 of faculty within individual ranks   |  | Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent Past Yr + (.1% * Most Recent Past Year)) - where X = Legislated Increase + .1% - and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator subject score  |  |  |

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

| Overall Shading indicates no change proposed.  |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS  |  | TECHNICAL COLLEGES SECTOR  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| Indicator & Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed) |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS  |  | TECHNICAL COLLEGES SECTOR  |  |
| 3E Teacher Education   |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR : Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevancy of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.  |  | RECOMMENDED STANDARDS: The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (round down if upward trend and up if downward trend.) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5.  |  |
| 3E1 NCATE Accreditation  |  | 3E1 Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>"Compliance" indicator, improvement factor does not apply   |  | N/A  |  |
| 3E2a % passing Prof Knowledge  |  | 3E2a Recommended Improvement Factor: 3%<br>See 3E2b for a description of the methodology  |  | N/A  |  |
| 3E2b % passing Spec. Area  |  | 3E2b Recommended Improvement Factor: 3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equalled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent "3-Yr" Avg + (3% * "3-Yr" Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator support score. |  | N/A  |  |
| 3E3a % in shortage areas   |  | 3E3a Recommended Improvement Factor: 5%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equalled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent "3-Yr" Avg + (5% * "3-Yr" Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator support score  |  | N/A  |  |
| 3E3b % minority  |  | 3E3b Recommended Improvement Factor: 5%<br>(See 3E3a for Methodology)   |  | N/A  |  |
| 4A Sharing, use of technology  |  | 4A Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>"Compliance" indicator, improvement factor does not apply  |  | Compliance - No Change   |  |
| 4B Cooperation & Collaboration   |  | 4B Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>"Compliance" indicator, improvement factor does not apply  |  | Compliance - No Change   |  |
| 5A Administrative to Academic Expenditures   |  | 5A Recommended Improvement Factor: 3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equalled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent "3-Yr" Avg + (3% * "3-Yr" Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score            |  | <p>Use IPEDS data to establish ranges. Data for institutions identified in the MGT study of MRR to be used. For technical sector, all peers selected by technical institutions will be combined to identify the reference. Additionally, a reference for peers w/ FTE &lt; 1000</p> <p>3= At or Below the 25th percentile of peers<br/>2= 50th percentile down to 25th percentile<br/>1= Above 60th percentile</p> <p>Note: expected trend is downward (measured in tenths)</p> <p>Peer data from IPEDS FY 98<br/>Peers for small technical colleges (&lt; 1000 FTE) to be based on MGT peers &lt; 1000 FTE. All other technical colleges will have reference as all MGT peers<br/>"Small" applies to CMTC, DTC, TCC, WTC<br/>"All" applies to all other technical colleges<br/>Median: ALL: 28.0% SMALL: 32.8%<br/>60th Percentile: ALL: 29.4% SMALL: 33.7%<br/>25th Percentile: ALL: 22.8% SMALL: 25.0%<br/>Range for 2: ALL: 30.0% 23.0% SMALL: 34.0% 25.0%</p> |  |

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001  
TECHNICAL COLLEGES SECTOR

| Grey Shading Indicates no change proposed. |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS |  | RECOMMENDED STANDARDS - The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (round down if upward trend and up if downward trend.) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5. |  | BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS |  | DATA TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHING SCALE PROPOSED |  |
|--|--|--------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| 58   | (measured on cycle, next rating is pf yr 2000-01)  |                                | 58 Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>"Compliance" Indicator, Improvement factor does not apply.  |  |  |   |  |  |  |
| 59   | Elimination of Duplication<br>(measured on cycle, next rating is pf yr 2000-01)  |                                | 59 Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>"Compliance" Indicator, Improvement factor does not apply.  |  |  |   |  |  |  |
| 60   | General Overhead per FTE Students<br>(FY 8 to Fall FTE Students)<br>Expected trend is down   |                                | 60 Recommended Improvement Factor: 3%<br>"Compliance" Indicator, Improvement factor does not apply.<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance.<br>Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance < (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg. - (3% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score. |  |  |   |  |  |  |
| 6A   | SAT/ACT scores (% >= 1000 SAT or 21 ACT)<br><br>A technical adjustment to the ACT requirement: ACT adjusted from 20 as applied in the past to 21 (the approximate national average) as stated in the measure |                                | 6A Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance.<br>Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg. + (5% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score.   |  |  |   |  |  |  |
| 6B   | % entering freshmen with rank in top 30% or GPA of 3.04 and higher   |                                | 6B Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance.<br>Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg. + (5% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score.   |  |  |   |  |  |  |
| 6C   | Policy for considering post-secondary adjustments  |                                | 6C Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>"Compliance" Indicator, Improvement factor does not apply.  |  |  |   |  |  |  |

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr. 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001

| Only Shading Indicates no change proposed.  |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS  |  | TECHNICAL COLLEGES SECTOR   |  |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| Indicator & Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)  |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR: Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevancy of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.                               |  | RECOMMENDED STANDARDS: The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (Round down if upward trend and up if downward trend.) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5. |  |
| IF Avg credit hours earned of graduates Expected trend is down  |  | IF Recommended Improvement Factor = 3% Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance. Methodology for Calculation: If Performance <= (that Recent 3-yr Avg - (3% * 3-yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score.  |  | N/A   |  |
| IA Relevancy of credits to and from institution No change to scale used   |  | IA Recommended Improvement Factor: None   |  | 3- compliance on all applicable parts<br>2- compliance on all but 1 applicable part<br>1- non-compliance on more than 1 applicable part   |  |
| IB Continuing Education Units This measure is change to be nonapplicable for all sectors except the technical colleges. In past years the measure was applicable for institutions with at least 1,000 CEUs produced annually.                   |  | IB Recommended Improvement Factor: None Indicator is assessed relative to institution's past performance  |  | 3- Above 10% of 3-yr average<br>2- 80% to 10% of 3-yr average<br>1- Below 80% of 3-yr average<br>"3-yr average" refers to the average made up of data available from the most recent ended 5 years minus the high and low values.   |  |
| IC Access to citizens<br>IC1 % SC undergraduate minority (measured)   |  | IC1 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5% Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance. Methodology for Calculation: If Performance >= (that Recent 3-yr Avg + (5% * 3-yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score. |  | 3- Population that or Exceeded<br>2- 75% of minority pop 18+ up to minority pop 18+<br>1- Below 75% of minority population<br>(Population = % minority 18+ in the service area)<br>(measured in thirds)   |  |
| IC2 retention of SC minority undergrads (degree seeking students considered in IC1) Additionally, consistent with Indicator IC1, staff propose a change to the definition used for SC resident. See Indicator 6D for the definition recommended |  | IC2 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5% (see IC1 for Methodology)   |  | 3- Above 10% of SC technical sector median retention<br>2- at or within +/- 10% of SC technical sector median retention<br>1- Below 10% of SC technical sector median student retention<br>(measured in thirds)   |  |
|   |  |   |  | Overall retention reference is the retention (as defined for measurements) of all students regardless of race for technical colleges. The reference used to establish the range is the technical college median for fall 1999 - 95.4% (range for "Z" is 49.0 - 60.0)<br>(based on revised IC2 per def'n change Fall 1999)                     |  |

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

Any blanking indicates no change proposed.

IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS

Indicator A: Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)

IMPROVEMENT FACTOR: Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevancy of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.

60 Priority on serving in-state students

60 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%

The measure is currently defined as "the state for the purpose of including all eligible state workers of out-of-state labor in hiring with the intention of the measure to assess SC readiness. SC readiness is to be determined by the institution used to determine applicability for LIFE activities. Therefore, SC Resident and Resident Exemption Categories of (1) Resident and dependent (2) Faculty and administration employees and their dependents (3) Full-time employees and their dependents and (4) retired persons and their dependents as defined in SC Code of Laws 36-112-10 and promulgated regulations governing labor and laws (see HJR-550) for LIFE employment.

Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance. If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (5% \* 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score.

7A Graduation Rate

7A1a with 150% of program time

7A1a Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%

Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance. Methodology for Calculation: If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (3% \* 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator subject score.

7A2 Rate excluding developmental students

Measure defined. Improvement factor N/A at this time

7B Employment/Continuing Education at Higher Level

Improvement factor N/A at this time

7C Employer Feedback

Improvement factor N/A at this time

7D % Passing professional exams

Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%

Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance. Methodology for Calculation: If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (3% \* 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator subject score.

PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001

TECHNICAL COLLEGES SECTOR

RECOMMENDED STANDARDS: The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (Round down if upward trend and up if downward trend) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5

DATA TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHING SCALE  
PROPOSED

N/A

Use available IPEDS data and SC data as a reference to establish expectation of being in the upper quartile for ascending expectations and slightly below average up to the upper quartile for meeting expectations. A broad range for meeting expectations is provided to allow for differences within sectors across institutions.

(measured in tenths)

3- Above 24.0%  
2- 10.0% - 24.0%  
1- Below 10.0%

Order the subject for year 5. Future consideration of supplementing 7A1a with course completion rates, transfer, or other suitable measure is recommended

Date: 7/23

Needs Assessment, Not Measured in Yr 6

Needs Assessment, Not Measured in Yr 6

Standards are based on performance of SC institutions. Program and exam mix varies from institution and the ranges here should reward institutions for high performance while allowing for differences in program and exam mix. Staff will continue to explore availability of national data for future use in determining standards. As of this time, national data is not available for all exams measured across institutions

Standards are based on performance of SC institutions. Program and exam mix varies from institution and the ranges here should reward institutions for high performance while allowing for differences in program and exam mix. Staff will continue to explore availability of national data for future use in determining standards. As of this time, national data is not available for all exams measured across institutions

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr. 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

| PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001   |  | TECHNICAL COLLEGES SECTOR  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| Indicator & Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS   | RECOMMENDED STANDARDS - The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (Round down if upward trend and up if downward trend.) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5.   |  |
| BC<br>BC3<br>Access to citizens (continued)<br>% minority grad students<br>(headcount)  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR : Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevancy of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below. | <p>MA</p> <p>1990 Census, educational attainment of persons 25+ indicates 12.0% of those with BA degrees and higher are minority. The figure would be used as the population reference. (SC % is 13.4%) Range for 2-10.0% - 13.0%</p>  |  |
| BC4<br>% minority faculty<br>(headcount faculty teaching in full)   | BC3 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%<br>(see BC1 for Methodology)   | <p>MA</p> <p>3= Above 10% of US minority pop w/ bacc. degrees<br/>2= At or within +/- 10% of US minority pop w/ bacc. degrees<br/>1= Below 10% of US minority pop w/ bacc. degrees</p> <p>Use as reference points the state and US Census data for minority population with Master's or higher. The measure consistent both full and part-time faculty and therefore, staff not included in the reference those with master's degrees.</p> <p>Additionally, in determining the reasonableness of using the US Census data as a reference, staff has reviewed peer data, data presented in the Chronicle regarding percent of minority faculty and an annual study by NSF of earned research doctorates (that study showed of the 28,216 doctorates earned by US Citizens, 14% were earned by minorities)</p> |  |
| BA<br>BA1<br>Research expenditures for higher education institutions<br>(No change to scale used)                                     | BA Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Indicator is assessed relative to institution's past performance   | <p>MA</p>  |  |
| BB<br>public and private grant expenditures<br>(restricted research expenditures compared to most recent 3-year average expenditures) | BB Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Indicator is assessed relative to institution's past performance   | <p>MA</p>  |  |

# **Regional Sector - Proposed Standards and Rationale**

---

**For consideration by the SC Commission on Higher Education  
July 6, 2000**



Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001  
REGIONAL CAMPUSES SECTOR

| Only Shading Indicates to change proposed.  |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS  | BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| Indicator 8: Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)   |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR: Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevance of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.   | RECOMMENDED STANDARDS: The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (Round down if upward trend and up if downward trend.) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5.  |  |
| IE: Attainment of Goals   | Staff recommends changing the indicator to provide an opportunity for more meaningful and individualized assessment. Staff recommends that institutions select two specific measures as part of indicator 1D with assessment scored as part of indicator 1E. Refer to committee meeting summary materials.   | IE: Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>An improvement factor would not be applicable as institutions are assessed annually based on their proposed goals and standards.  | Institutionally proposed measurement standard on 2 selected goals will be used in determining performance.<br>IE is to be scored in relation to whether the institution did not achieve, achieved, or exceeded the approved standard for the year.   |  |
| 2A: Credentials of Faculty (teaching undergraduate)   | 2A1a: Recommended Improvement Factor: None.<br>No factor recommended due to the high performance of institutions on this subject.<br>2A2a & 2A2b: Recommended Improvement Factor: .3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance.<br>Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg * (3% - 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator subject score. |   | Scale proposed based on state data and expectation in regard to SACs for minimum requirements.<br>Scales for 2A parts 2a and 2b reflect consideration of state performance funding data. The percentages reflect approximately the upper quartile for a 3 and the 2nd quartile for a 2 using increments of 5 percentage points.<br>3= 100.0%<br>2= 98.0% or at but one if % < 98%<br>1= Below 98.0%<br>(measured to thirds)<br>3= Above 55%<br>2= 40% - 55%<br>1= Below 40%<br>3= Above 74%<br>2= 70% - 74%<br>1= Below 70%  |  |
| 2A2a: Credentials of Faculty (terminal degree, headcount (teaching undergraduate))  |  |   | (2A2a and 2A2b are measured to whole %)  |  |
| 2A2b: Credentials of Faculty (terminal degree, full-time (teaching undergraduate))  |  |   | Change to Compliance (Compliance achieved if institution is in compliance with all indicated best practices principles)  |  |
| 2B: Performance Review (measured on cycle, most rating is of yr 2001-02) Recommended changing to compliance indicator                       |  | 2B: Recommended Improvement Factor: None.<br>"Compliance" indicator, improvement factor does not apply  | Change to Compliance (Compliance achieved if institution is in compliance with all indicated best practices principles)  |  |
| 2C: Peer/Teach Review (measured on cycle, most rating is of yr 2001-02) Recommended changing to compliance indicator                        |  | 2C: Recommended Improvement Factor: None.<br>"Compliance" indicator, improvement factor does not apply  | Change to Compliance (Compliance achieved if institution is in compliance with all indicated best practices principles)  |  |
| 2D: Average Faculty Salary by Rank  |  | 2D: All Parts: Recommended Improvement Factor: .1%<br>Legislated % increase for undesignated employees + 1% and improvement relative to improvement shown over the past year above<br>Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent Peer/Teach Yr * (1% - Most Recent Peer/Teach Yr)) - where X = Legislated Increase + 1 - and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator subject score | Assess performance in relation to national performance. Scale is based on being within a percentage of national average salary data. Since national faculty salary levels are generally higher than the state average, the goal to be within range of the national average is an appropriate target.<br>Measure Average Faculty Salary:<br>3- At or above 95% of the national average salary<br>2- 75% - 94.9% of national average salary<br>1- Below 75% of national average salary<br>* Due to the low # of faculty at different ranks, faculty ranks will be combined for a single # for these institutions<br>1999-00 and faculty salary as compiled by AAUP for 2-yr public inst with inst is to be used as the reference. The reference will be referred to 2000-01 by the legislated state salary increase<br>The related value will serve as the target for yr 5<br>The target will be updated accordingly each year |  |
| 2D1a: Instructor  |  |   | 1999-00 Salaries reported by AAUP in April 2000 for 2-yr Public inst with academic rank<br>Avg Salary: \$46,541  |  |
| 2D1b: Assistant Professor   |  |   |  |  |
| 2D1c: Associate Professor   |  |   |  |  |
| 2D1d: Professor   |  |   |  |  |
| For the regional campuses, the measure is change in average salary of faculty all ranks due to low tiers of faculty within individual ranks |  |   | Staff Proposed Scale for Final Determination of the year 5 targeted national average salary  |  |

**Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000**

**PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001**

| Key Finding indicates no change proposed  |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS   |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| Indicator 3, Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)   |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR: Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevance of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.  |  |
| <p><b>1A. Expenditure of Funds</b><br/>Currently measured based on institutionally selected category(ies) expressed as a ratio of the total E&amp;G Unrestricted and restricted funds are considered for the research sector and unrestricted only are considered for all other sectors. Staff proposes the measure be based on a combination of categories that are the same for all within a sector, with the option of one category chosen by the institution. Selected categories are those with an expected upward movement. The sum of the categories will be expressed as a ratio of total E&amp;G (Unrestricted and restricted will continue to be considered for the research sector and unrestricted for all others).</p> |  | <p><b>1A. Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%</b><br/>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance methodology for calculation:<br/>If Performance &gt;= (Most Recent 3-yr Avg + (3% * 3-yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score.</p>  |  |
| <p><b>1B. Curricula Offered</b><br/>Measured as % of programs meeting criteria for Research &amp; Teaching Sectors - No change<br/>Measured as compliance indicator for Regional &amp; Technical Sectors - Change to Compliance</p>   |  | <p><b>1B. Recommended Improvement Factor: None</b></p>   |  |
| <p><b>1C. Mission Statement</b><br/>Strategic Plan Goals</p>  |  | <p><b>1C. Recommended Improvement Factor: None</b><br/><b>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor: None</b><br/>Compliance Indicator: improvement factor does not apply</p>   |  |
| <p>Staff recommends changing the indicator to provide an opportunity for more meaningful and individualized assessment. Staff recommends that institutions select two specific measures in keeping with their "core" plans. One measure selected would also be "core" for Higher Education. Refer to Attachment 2B for summary materials</p>  |  | <p>Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to Attachment 2A, Meeting, June 20, 2000. Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details</p>   |  |
| <p><b>BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS</b></p>   |  | <p><b>RECOMMENDED STANDARDS:</b> The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (Round down if upward trend and up if downward trend.) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5</p>   |  |
| <p>The proposed change in the measure will allow a focus on institutions' primary mission while providing an opportunity for institutions to select an additional area of focus based on individual mission and characteristics</p>   |  | <p><b>3+ At or above the 75th percentile of peers</b><br/><b>2+ 40th percentile up to 75th percentile</b><br/><b>1+ Below 40th percentile</b></p>  |  |
| <p>IPEDS data from peers to establish will be used for comparison. Data for institutions identified in the IAGT study will be used. For the research sector only, peers will be individualized for each of the three institutions. Issues related to research peers are being resolved at present.</p>  |  | <p><b>Use Institution and Academic Support Jobs</b><br/><b>Institutional Choice of One from categories including:</b><br/>Research, Public Service, Student Services, and Student Affairs (includes Unrestricted funds only)<br/><b>Institutions may not use to choose only the data categories if the selection of an additional category is not desired.</b></p>   |  |
| <p><b>DATA TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHING SCALE PROPOSED</b></p>  |  | <p><b>Choice is:</b><br/>Institution &amp; Academic Support Only: Med=58.3%, 40th=55.2%, 75th=61.5% (Range for 2.55, 0% - 61.0%)<br/>+Research: Med=56.4%, 75th=61.5%, 40th= 55.2% (Range for 2: 55.0%, 41.0%)<br/>+Public Svc: Med=58.0%, 75th=63.4%, 40th= 56.6% (Range for 2: 56.0%, 43.0%)<br/>+Student Svc: Med=60.0%, 75th=72.5%, 40th= 60.0% (Range for 2: 60.0%, 72.0%)<br/>+Scholarship: Med=59.2%, 75th=64.0%, 40th= 57.8% (Range for 2: 57.0%, 64.0%)</p> |  |
| <p><b>COMPLIANCE - No Change</b></p>  |  | <p><b>Change to compliance</b><br/>(Compliance achieved if institution is in compliance with the criteria of indicator)</p>  |  |

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001

| IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS  |   | REGIONAL CAMPUSES SECTOR   |  |
|---|---|--|--|
| Indicator & Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS  | BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS  | RECOMMENDED STANDARDS: The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. Round down if upward trend and up if downward trend. Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5   |
| 2B1 Availability of Faculty<br>2B2 Availability of Academic Programs<br>2B3 (Assessment on cycle every 2 years, next rating in FY 2000-01)  | 2B1 & 2B2 Recommended Improvement Factor .33%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance (Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent "3-Yr" Avg + (5% * "3-Yr" Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator target score.<br>3A. Recommended Improvement Factor: None.<br>"Compliance" indicator. Improvement factor does not apply. | Same scale both parts<br>3a: Above 80%<br>2a: 80% - 89%<br>1a: Below 80%<br>No change to current scale   | DATA TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHING SCALE PROPOSED   |
| 3A1a Class Size & Student/Faculty Ratios<br>3A1b Lower Division<br>3A2a % Undergrad Lecture Sections 50 and up<br>3A2b % Lower Division Lecture Sections 100 and up<br>3A3 FTE students per FTE Faculty<br><br>Scoring scale based on being in compliance with the three parts of this measure. Compliance is being within the range on all three parts. (Part 1 = 3A1a, 3A1b, Part 2 = 3A2a, 3A2b and Part 3 = 3A3)  | 3A Recommended Improvement Factor: None.<br>"Compliance" indicator. Improvement factor does not apply.  | Staff proposes to recommend adjusting the ranges for lower and upper division classes and student/faculty ratio to align better with current state averages and to make this a compliance indicator based on compliance with the three parts | Change to Compliance based on all three parts<br>3A1a: Change range from 16-25 to 12-27<br>3A1b: To be applicable in yr 5 - Range is 7-22 *<br>3A2a: No change (Range of 0% - 20%)<br>3A2b: No change (Range of 0% - 5%)<br>3A3: Change range from 14-19 to 10-20<br>* the part was not applicable in year 4<br>Institutions in full compliance with all applicable parts will be in compliance. Institutions not meeting any of the parts will be out of compliance |
| 3B Credit Hours Taught<br>After one consideration of data for this indicator in regard to setting an appropriate standard, staff recommends that the measure be deferred for the current year only. Staff wishes to explore concerns of institutions and staff related to the appropriate faculty exclusion and/or method of instructor exclusion in order to set appropriate standards that take into account various program areas across institutions while encouraging institutions to strive toward intended purpose of this measure | 3B Measure deferred, Improvement factor N/A at this time  | Defer for this year only while data issues being resolved  |  |
| 3C Ratio of Faculty to Employees  | 3C Recommended Improvement Factor .33%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance (Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent "3-Yr" Avg + (3% * "3-Yr" Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score.  | Use IPEDS data to establish ranges. Data for institutions identified in the MGT study of HERR to be used. For regional sector, all peers selected by regional institutions will be combined to identify the reference for the targets        | Peer data from PEDS Fall Staff 97<br>For the Regional Campuses, MGT Peers<br>Median 39.6%<br>40th Percentile 37.9%<br>75th Percentile 43.7%<br>Range for 2: 37.0% to 43.0%.  |
| 3D Evaluation of Degree-Granting Programs<br>Change to scale  | 3D Recommended Improvement Factor: None.<br>Measurement at present provides allowances for improvement in regard to achieving program accreditation   | 3- 100%<br>2- 90 - 99% (for all but one program *)<br>1- 89% or less<br>Applies only to USC - Lancaster<br>* Application to be clarified in workbook   |  |

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001  
REGIONAL CAMPUSES SECTOR

| Improvement Factor All Sectors  |   | Regional Campuses Sector   |   |
|---|---|--|---|
| Indicator & Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)  | Improvement Factor All Sectors  | Brief Rationale for Recommended Standards  | Recommended Standards: The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (round down if upward trend and up if downward trend) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5 |
| 3E Teacher Education  |   |  |   |
| 3E1 NCATE Accreditation   | 3E1 Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>"Compliance" Indicator, improvement factor does not apply  |  | NA  |
| 3E2a % passing Prof Knowledge   | 3E2a Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%<br>See 3E2b for a description of the methodology   |  | NA  |
| 3E2b % passing Spec Area  | 3E2b Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance<br>Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (3% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator support score |  | NA  |
| 3E3a % in shortage areas<br>Subject areas should be on critical shortage list for three years to provide stability and to allow time once new areas added. Application will be clarified in the revised workbook. | 3E3a Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance<br>Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (5% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator support score |  | NA  |
| 3E3b % minority   | 3E3b Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%<br>(See 3E3a for Methodology)  |  | NA  |
| 4A Sharing, use of technology<br>(measured on cycle, need rating is pf yr 2001-02)  | 4A Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>"Compliance" Indicator, improvement factor does not apply   |  | Compliance - No Change  |
| 4B Cooperation & Collaboration<br>(measured on cycle, need rating is pf yr 2001-02)   | 4B Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>"Compliance" Indicator, improvement factor does not apply   |  | Compliance - No Change  |
| 5A Administrative Academic Expenditures<br>Expected trend is down   | 5A Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance<br>Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (3% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score           | Use IPEDS data to establish ranges. Data for institutions identified in the NGT study of HERT to be used. For regional sector, all peers selected by regional institutions will be combined to identify the reference for the ranges | Peer data from IPEDS FY 98<br>Median of all 2 yr institutions identified for use in NGT study for regional<br>Median: 26.1%<br>60th Percentile: 29.4%<br>25th Percentile: 19.6%<br>Range for 2: 36.0% to 20.0%<br>(measured in tenths)  |

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

| Grey Shading Indicates No Change Proposed  |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS   |  | PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001<br>REGIONAL CAMPUSES SECTOR   |  |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Indicator & Short Title (and information related to measurement change being proposed) |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR: Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevancy of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.                                  |  | BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS<br><br>RECOMMENDED STANDARDS: The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number, (rounded down if upward trend and up if downward trend). Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5.<br><br>DATA TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHING SCALE<br>PROPOSED   |  |
| SB   | (measured on cycle, next rating is pf yr 2000-01)  | SB Recommended Improvement Factor: None.<br>"Compliance" Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply.   |  | Achieved if institution is in compliance with all indicated best practices principles   |  |
| SC   | Elimination of Duplicate   | SC Recommended Improvement Factor: None.<br>"Compliance" Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply.   |  | Compliance - No Change  |  |
| SD   | General Overhead per FTE Students (FY 3 to Fall FTE Students)<br>Expected trend is down  | SD Recommended Improvement Factor: 3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance methodology for calculation.<br>If Performance <= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg - (3% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score. |  | 3= At or Below the 25th percentile of peers<br>2= 60th percentile down to 25th percentile<br>1= Above 60th percentile<br><br>Note: expected trend is downward.<br><br>(measured to nearest whole \$)  | Peer data from IPEDS FY 98<br>Median of all 2 yr institutions identified for use in MCT's study for reports<br>Median: \$1,211<br>60th Percentile: \$1,349<br>25th Percentile: \$850<br>Range for 2: \$1,349 - \$851 |
| SA   | SAT/ACT scores (% >= 1000 SAT or 21 ACT)<br><br>A technical adjustment to the ACT requirement: ACT adjusted from 20 as applied in the past to 21 (the approximate national average) as stated in the measure | SA Recommended Improvement Factor: 5%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance methodology for calculation.<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (5% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score. |  | 3= Above 28.0%<br>2= 15.0% - 28.0%<br>1= Below 15.0%<br><br>State performance funding data and past sector benchmarks used as reference. In assessing the reasonableness of the scale proposed in light of issues raised, staff has analyzed relevant SAT data and available data on SC high school graduates. The standards proposed allow for the recognition of high performance while providing a broad range for the score of 2 to allow for differences in measures and admission policies across institutions. In the past, the sector benchmark has served as the standard for beyond which the institution was not expected to show increasing performance. The proposed scale is consistent with this past expectation. |  |
| SB   | % entering freshmen with rank in top 30% or GPA of 3.04 and higher   | SB Recommended Improvement Factor: 5%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance methodology for calculation.<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (5% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score. |  | 3= Above 49.0%<br>2= 35.0% - 49.0%<br>1= Below 35.0%<br><br>State performance funding data is used as a reference in determining the reasonableness of the proposed scale. In addition, available data from SC SDE, SC CHE, NCES, ETS have been reviewed in light of the state performance funding data.  |  |
| SC   | Policy for considering post-secondary achievement  | SC Recommended Improvement Factor: None.<br>"Compliance" Indicator: improvement factor does not apply.   |  | Compliance - No Change  |  |

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001  
REGIONAL CAMPUSES SECTOR

| IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS   |  | RECOMMENDED STANDARDS  |  | BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS   |  | DATA TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHING SCALE PROPOSED  |  |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| <p>Grey shading indicates no change proposed.</p> <p>Indicator 8, Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)</p> |  | <p>IMPROVEMENT FACTOR : Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevancy of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.</p>  |  | <p>RECOMMENDED STANDARDS: The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (round down if upward trend and up if downward trend) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5.</p> |  |   |  |
| 8D   | <p>Priority on enrolling in-state students</p> <p>The measure is currently defined as "in-state for her purposes" including all deliverable state workers of out-of-state tuition. In keeping with the intention of the measure as identified originally, staff proposes changing the measure to assess SC residency. SC residency is to be defined consistently with the definition used to determine eligibility for LIFE scholarships. Therefore, SC Resident will include the residency categories of (1) Resident and Resident Exception Categories of (A) Military &amp; Dependents, (B) Faculty and administration employees and their dependents, (C) Full-time employee and their dependents and (D) retired persons and their dependents as defined in SC Code of Laws 58-112-10 and promulgated regulations governing tuition and fees. (see REG-3300) for LIFE reg)</p> <p>Graduation Rate</p> | <p>8D Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%</p> <p>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance Methodology for Calculation:</p> <p>If Performance &gt;= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (5% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score</p>   |  |   |  |   |  |
| 7A   | <p>Graduation Rate</p> <p>7A is with 100% of program time</p>  | <p>7A is Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%</p> <p>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance Methodology for Calculation:</p> <p>If Performance &gt;= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (3% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator subject score</p> <p>Measure deferred, Improvement factor N/A at this time</p> |  |   |  |   |  |
| 7A2  | <p>rate excluding developmental students</p>   |  |  |   |  |   |  |
| 7B   | <p>Employment / Continuing Educ. at a higher level measured on cycle, and rating is p/y 2001-02</p>  | <p>Improvement factor N/A at this time</p>   |  |   |  |   |  |
| 7C   | <p>Employer Feedback</p> <p>measured on cycle, and rating is p/y 2001-02</p>   | <p>Improvement factor N/A at this time</p>   |  |   |  |   |  |
| 7D   | <p>% Passing professional exams</p>  | <p>Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%</p> <p>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance Methodology for Calculation:</p> <p>If Performance &gt;= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (3% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to this indicator subject score</p>   |  |   |  |   |  |
|  |  | <p>Use available PEDS data to establish expectation of being in the upper quartile for exceeding expectations and slightly below average up to the upper quartile for meeting expectations. A broad range for meeting expectations is provided to allow for differences within sectors across institutions</p>   |  | <p>3= At or above 75th percentile of peers<br/>2= 40th percentile to 75th percentile<br/>1= At or below 40th percentile</p>   |  | <p>PEDS data from 1997 QRS survey<br/>Indicate values for all MGT of<br/>For the Regional Campuses, MGT Peers :<br/>Median: 22.2%<br/>40th Percentile: 15.8%<br/>75th Percentile: 31.6%<br/>Range for 2: 16.0% to 31.0%</p> |  |
|  |  | <p>Standards are based on performance of SC institutions. Program and exam mix varies from institution and the ranges here should reward institutions for high performance while allowing for differences in program and exam mix. Staff will continue to explore availability of national data for future use in determining standards. As of this time, national data is not available for all exams measured across institutions</p>      |  | <p>3= Above 89.0%<br/>2= 80.0% - 89.0%<br/>1= Below 80.0%<br/>(Only applicable currently for USC Larkaster)</p>   |  |   |  |

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr. 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001  
REGIONAL CAMPUSES SECTOR

| Grey Shading Indicates no change proposed.   |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS  |  | BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS |  | RECOMMENDED STANDARDS. The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (round down if upward trend and up if downward trend) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5. | DATA TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHING SCALE PROPOSED |  |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Indicator & Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed) |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR: Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevancy of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below. |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 7F Avg credit hours earned of graduates<br>Expected trend is down                          |  | 7F Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 7G   |  | Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg - (3% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score          |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8A   |  | 8A Recommended Improvement Factor: None   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8B   |  | 8B Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>Indicator is assessed relative to institution's past performance   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C   |  | 8C Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C1  |  | Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg * (5% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score          |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C2  |  | 8C2 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%<br>(see 8C1 for Methodology)  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C3  |  | 8C3 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C4  |  | 8C4 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C5  |  | 8C5 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C6  |  | 8C6 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C7  |  | 8C7 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C8  |  | 8C8 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C9  |  | 8C9 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C10   |  | 8C10 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C11   |  | 8C11 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C12   |  | 8C12 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C13   |  | 8C13 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C14   |  | 8C14 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C15   |  | 8C15 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C16   |  | 8C16 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C17   |  | 8C17 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C18   |  | 8C18 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C19   |  | 8C19 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C20   |  | 8C20 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C21   |  | 8C21 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C22   |  | 8C22 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C23   |  | 8C23 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C24   |  | 8C24 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C25   |  | 8C25 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C26   |  | 8C26 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C27   |  | 8C27 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C28   |  | 8C28 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C29   |  | 8C29 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C30   |  | 8C30 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C31   |  | 8C31 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C32   |  | 8C32 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C33   |  | 8C33 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C34   |  | 8C34 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C35   |  | 8C35 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C36   |  | 8C36 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C37   |  | 8C37 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C38   |  | 8C38 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C39   |  | 8C39 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C40   |  | 8C40 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C41   |  | 8C41 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C42   |  | 8C42 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C43   |  | 8C43 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C44   |  | 8C44 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C45   |  | 8C45 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C46   |  | 8C46 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C47   |  | 8C47 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C48   |  | 8C48 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C49   |  | 8C49 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C50   |  | 8C50 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C51   |  | 8C51 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C52   |  | 8C52 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C53   |  | 8C53 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C54   |  | 8C54 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C55   |  | 8C55 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C56   |  | 8C56 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C57   |  | 8C57 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C58   |  | 8C58 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C59   |  | 8C59 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C60   |  | 8C60 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C61   |  | 8C61 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C62   |  | 8C62 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C63   |  | 8C63 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C64   |  | 8C64 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C65   |  | 8C65 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C66   |  | 8C66 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C67   |  | 8C67 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C68   |  | 8C68 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C69   |  | 8C69 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C70   |  | 8C70 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C71   |  | 8C71 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C72   |  | 8C72 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C73   |  | 8C73 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C74   |  | 8C74 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C75   |  | 8C75 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C76   |  | 8C76 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C77   |  | 8C77 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C78   |  | 8C78 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C79   |  | 8C79 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C80   |  | 8C80 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C81   |  | 8C81 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C82   |  | 8C82 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C83   |  | 8C83 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C84   |  | 8C84 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C85   |  | 8C85 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C86   |  | 8C86 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C87   |  | 8C87 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C88   |  | 8C88 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C89   |  | 8C89 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C90   |  | 8C90 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C91   |  | 8C91 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C92   |  | 8C92 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C93   |  | 8C93 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C94   |  | 8C94 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C95   |  | 8C95 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C96   |  | 8C96 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C97   |  | 8C97 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C98   |  | 8C98 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C99   |  | 8C99 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8C100  |  | 8C100 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%   |  |   |  |  |  |  |

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001

REGIONAL CAMPUSES SECTOR

| IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS   |  |
|--|--|
| Indicator A, Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR : Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevancy of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.   |
| BC Access to citizens (continued)<br>% minority grad students<br>(headcount)   | BC3 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%<br>(see BC1 for Methodology)   |
| BC4 % minority faculty<br>(headcount faculty teaching in fall)   | BC4 Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance.<br>Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent "3-Yr" Avg + (5% * "3-Yr" Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator subject score. |
| BA research expenditures in<br>master's education (continued)<br>No change to scale level  | BA Recommended Improvement Factor : None<br>Indicator is assessed relative to institution's past performance   |
| BB public and private grant expenditures<br>(restricted research expenditures compared to most recent 3-year average expenditures) | BB Recommended Improvement Factor : None<br>Indicator is assessed relative to institution's past performance   |

BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS

RECOMMENDED STANDARDS: The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (Round down if upward trend and up if downward trend.) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5.

DATA TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHING SCALE PROPOSED

NA

Use as reference points the state and us census data for minority population with master's or higher. This measure considers both full and part-time faculty and librarians, staff has included in the reference those with master's degrees.  
Additionally, in determining the reasonableness of using the US census data as a reference, staff has reviewed peer data presented in the Chronicle regarding percent of minority faculty and an annual study by NSF of earned research doctorates that study showed of the 28,218 doctorates earned by US Citizens, 14% were earned by minorities.

3= Above 10% of US minority pop w/ graduate degrees  
2= at or within +/- 10% of US minority pop w/ grad degrees  
1= Below 10% of US minority pop w/ graduate degrees

(measured in tenths)

1990 Census, educational attainment of persons 25+ indicates 11.0% of those with graduate degrees and higher are minority. This figure would be used as the population reference. (SC % is 13.2%) Range for 2= 10.0% - 13.0%.

NA

NA



Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001

| Grey Shading Indicates No Change Proposed   |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS  |  | TEACHING SECTOR   |  |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| Indicator 8: Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)   |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR: Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevance of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.                                       |  | BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS   |  |
| 1A. Expenditure of Funds<br>Currently measured based on Institutionally selected category(ies) expressed as a ratio of the total E&G Unrestricted and restricted funds are considered for the research sector and unrestricted only are considered for all other sectors. Staff proposes for the measure be based on a combination of categories that are the same for all within a sector, with the option of one category chosen by the Institution. Selected categories are those with an expected upward movement. The sum of the categories will be expressed as a ratio of total E&G. Unrestricted and restricted will continue to be considered for the research sector and unrestricted for all others. |  | 1A. Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance.<br>Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance > (Most Recent 3-yr Avg * 3%) - 3-yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score. |  | The proposed change in the measure will allow a focus on institutions' primary missions while providing an opportunity for institutions to select an additional area of focus based on individual mission and characteristics.<br>IPEDS data from peers to establish will be used. Data for institutions identified in the MGT study will be used. For the research sector only, peers will be individualized for each of the three institutions. Issues related to research peers are being resolved at present. |  |
| 1B. Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%   |  | 3+ At or above the 75th percentile of peers<br>2+ 40th percentile up to 75th percentile<br>1+ Below 40th percentile   |  | Use Instruction and Academic Support Data.<br>Institutions: Choice of One from categories including Research, Public Services, Student Services, and Scholarship (includes Unrestricted (odgers only). Institutions may not choose only the base categories if the selection of an additional category is not finalized. (unrestricted to justify)  |  |
| 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%   |  | Data reference is all MGT peers combined and using IPEDS FY98 data.<br>Data for Instruction + Academic Support + Choice as a ratio of E&G Total.  |  | Choice is:<br>Instruction & Academic Support Only: Med=99.3%<br>40th=57.8%, 75th=82.5% (Range for 2:56.0% - 82.0%)<br>Research: Med=60.0%, 75th=63.2%, 40th= 56.3%<br>(Range for 2: 59.0%, 63.0%)<br>+Public Svc: Med=80.6%, 75th=83.6%, 40th= 68.4%<br>(Range for 2: 59.0%, 83.0%)<br>+Student Svc: Med=66.2%, 75th=71.6%, 40th= 67.2%<br>(Range for 2: 62.0%, 71.0%)<br>+Scholarship: Med=63.0%, 75th=68.6%, 40th= 61.6%<br>(Range for 2: 61.0%, 66.0%)   |  |
| 1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 3+ 100%<br>2+ 80% - 98% (no more than 1 not approved)<br>1+ Below 80%<br>No change in locale<br>Application to be defined in workbook<br>Compliance - No Change   |  | Institutionally proposed measurement standard on 2 selected goals<br>Assessment of 1D will remain a "compliance" indicator with compliance achieved by the institution's proposing the measures and standards and the Commission's approval of the proposed measures and standards.   |  |
| 1E. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |
| 1F. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |
| 1G. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |
| 1H. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |
| 1I. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |
| 1J. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |
| 1K. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |
| 1L. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |
| 1M. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |
| 1N. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |
| 1O. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |
| 1P. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |
| 1Q. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |
| 1R. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |
| 1S. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |
| 1T. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |
| 1U. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |
| 1V. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |
| 1W. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |
| 1X. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |
| 1Y. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |
| 1Z. Recommended Improvement Factor = None   |  | 1C. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>1D. Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>Compliance Indicator: Improvement factor does not apply   |  | Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&A Meeting, June 20, 2000 Attachment 2A, Section 1B for related measurement details.  |  |

# **Teaching Sector - Proposed Standards and Rationale**

---

**For consideration by the SC Commission on Higher Education  
July 6, 2000**

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001  
TEACHING SECTOR

**RECOMMENDED STANDARDS:** The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (Round down if upward trend and up if downward trend.) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5.

DATA TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHING SCALE  
PROPOSED

same scale both years

3+ Above 80%  
2+ 60% - 80%  
1- Below 60%  
No change to current scale

Change to Compliance based on all three parts

3A1a: Change range from 20-30 to 20-35  
3A1b: Change range from 15-25 to 12-27  
3A2a: No change (Range of 0% - 20%)  
3A2b: No change (Range of 0% - 5%)  
3A3: Change range from 14-19 to 10-20

Institutions in full compliance with all applicable parts will be in compliance. Institutions not meeting any of the parts will be out of compliance

Deficit for this year only while data issues being resolved

Use IPEDS data to establish ranges. Data for institutions identified in the MCT study of MRR to be used. For teaching sector, all peers selected by teaching institutions will be combined to identify the reference for the ranges

(measured in terms)

Peer data from IPEDS Fall 97  
For the Teaching Sector: 4 yr MCT Peers  
Median 37.0%  
40th Percentile 35.7%  
75th Percentile 41.3%  
Range for 2 35.0% to 41.0%

3+ 100%  
2+ 80 - 99% (for all but one program)  
1- 60% or less

\* Application to be clarified in workbook

Very Strongly indicates no change proposed.

IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS

**IMPROVEMENT FACTOR:** Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevance of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.

2E1 & 2E2: Recommended Improvement Factor = 0.5

Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance (2000-01) for Calculation:  
If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-yr Avg + (5% \* 3-yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator student score.

3A: Recommended Improvement Factor: None.  
Compliance indicator. Improvement factor does not apply.

3A1a Lower Division  
3A1b Upper Division  
3A2a % undergraduate lecture sections 50 and up  
3A2b % lower division lecture sections 100 and up  
3A3 FTE students per FTE Faculty

Scoring scale based on being in compliance with the three parts of the measure. Compliance is being within the range on all three parts.  
(Part 1 = 3A1a, 3A1b, Part 2 = 3A2a, 3A2b and Part 3 = 3A3)

3B Credit Hours Taught

3B Measure deferred, improvement factor N/A at this time

After due consideration of data for the indicator in regard to setting an appropriate standard, staff recommends that the measure be deferred for the current year only. Staff wishes to explore concerns of institutions and staff related to the appropriate faculty exclusion and/or method of instruction exclusion in order to set appropriate standards that take into account various program mixes across institutions while encouraging institutions to achieve desired purpose of the measure

3C Ratio of Faculty to Employees

3C: Recommended Improvement Factor = 0.5

Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance (2000-01) for Calculation:  
If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-yr Avg + (3% \* 3-yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score

\* Institution of Degree-Granting Programs  
\*\* change to scale

3C: Recommended Improvement Factor: None.  
Measurement at present provides allowances for improvement in regard to achieving program accreditation

**Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000**

**PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 3 2000-2001**

| Study showing indicators no change proposed  |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS  |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| Indicator 8, Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR: Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevancy of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.  | BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS   |  |
| 1E. Attainment of Goals  | 1E. Recommended Improvement Factor: None.<br><br>An improvement factor would not be applicable as institutions are assessed annually based on their proposed goals and standards.  | RECOMMENDED STANDARDS: The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (Round down if upward trend and up if downward trend) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5.  |  |
| 2A. Credentials of Faculty Meeting SACs (teaching undergraduate)   | 2A. Recommended Improvement Factor: None.<br><br>No factor recommended due to the high performance of institutions on this subject.  | TEACHING SECTOR   |  |
| 2A1a. Credentials of Faculty Meeting SACs (teaching undergraduate)   | 2A1a. Recommended Improvement Factor: None.<br><br>No factor recommended due to the high performance of institutions on this subject.  | DATA TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHING SCALE PROPOSED  |  |
| 2A2a. Credentials of Faculty Meeting SACs (teaching undergraduate)   | 2A2a & 2A2b. Recommended Improvement Factor: -3%<br><br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance as calculated for the 2000-01 year.<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-yr Avg + 3% * 3-yr Avg) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator subject score. | Initially proposed measurement standard on 2 selected goals will be used in determining performance.<br><br>IE is to be scored in relation to whether the institution did not achieve, achieved, or exceeded the approved standard for the year.  |  |
| 2B. Performance Review (measured on cycle, past rating is of yr 2001-02)   | 2B. Recommended Improvement Factor: None.<br><br>Compliance indicator, improvement factor does not apply.  | Scale proposed based on state data and expectation in regard to SACs for minimum requirements.<br><br>Scale for 2A parts 2a and 2b select consideration of state performance history data. The percentages reflect approximately the upper quartile for a 3 and the 2nd quartile for a 2 using increments of 5 percentage points.<br><br>3= 100.0%<br>2= 98.0% or all but one if % < 99%<br>1= Below 98.0%<br>(measured to tenths)<br><br>3= Above 69%<br>2= 60% - 69%<br>1= Below 60%<br><br>3= Above 84%<br>2= 80% - 84%<br>1= Below 80%<br><br>(2A2a and 2A2b are measured to whole %) |  |
| 2C. Post Tenure Review (measured on cycle, past rating is of yr 2001-02)   | 2C. Recommended Improvement Factor: None.<br><br>Compliance indicator, improvement factor does not apply.  | Expectation is compliance with policy best practices and therefore measurement as compliance indicator is more appropriate.   |  |
| 2D. Average Faculty Salary by Rank   | 2D. Recommended Improvement Factor: None.<br><br>Legislated % increases for underpaid employees + 1% and improvement relative to improvement shown over the past year done.  | Expectation is compliance with policy best practices and therefore measurement as compliance indicator is more appropriate.   |  |
| 2D1a. Instructor   | 2D1a. Recommended Improvement Factor: None.<br><br>Legislated % increases for underpaid employees + 1% and improvement relative to improvement shown over the past year done.  | Assess performance in relation to national performance. Scale is based on being within a percentage of national average salary data.  |  |
| 2D1b. Assistant Professor  | 2D1b. Recommended Improvement Factor: None.<br><br>Legislated % increases for underpaid employees + 1% and improvement relative to improvement shown over the past year done.  | Since national faculty salary levels are generally higher than the state average, the goal to be within range of the national average is an appropriate target.   |  |
| 2D1c. Associate Professor  | 2D1c. Recommended Improvement Factor: None.<br><br>Legislated % increases for underpaid employees + 1% and improvement relative to improvement shown over the past year done.  | For all parts, if 3= At or above 95% of the national average salary 2= 80% - 94.9% of national average salary 1= At or below 80% national average salary  |  |
| 2D1d. Professor  | 2D1d. Recommended Improvement Factor: None.<br><br>Legislated % increases for underpaid employees + 1% and improvement relative to improvement shown over the past year done.  | 1999-00 average faculty salaries as compiled by AAUP for 4-yr Public Comprehensive (I/A) by rank is to be used as reference. The reference will be related to 2000-01 by the legislated state salary increase. The related value will serve as the target for year 5. The target will be updated accordingly each year.   |  |
| For the regional campuses, the measure is change to average salary of faculty at ranks due to low numbers of faculty within individual ranks |  | See Proposed Scale for Final Determination of the year 5 targeted national average salary   |  |

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PE FY 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - VR 5 2000-2001

| Only Shading Indicates no change proposed.  |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS   |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| Indicator & Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)  |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR: Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevancy of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.  |  |
| 58 (measured on cycle, next rating is of FY 2000-01)  | 58. Recommended Improvement Factor: None. "Compliance" Indicator, improvement factor does not apply.   |  |  |
| 59. <b>Completion of Degree:</b><br>(measured on cycle, next rating is of FY 2000-01)<br>General Overhead per FTE Student<br>(FY 5 to Fall FTE Students)<br>Expected trend is down                                      | 59. Recommended Improvement Factor: None. "Compliance" Indicator, improvement factor does not apply.<br>59. Recommended Improvement Factor: 3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance. Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-yr Avg + (5% * 3-yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score. |  |  |
| 60. <b>SAT/ACT scores (% &gt;= 1000 SAT or 21 ACT)</b><br>A technical adjustment to the ACT requirement: ACT adjusted from 20 as applied in the past to 21 (the approximate national average) as stated in the measure. | 60. Recommended Improvement Factor: 5%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance. Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-yr Avg + (5% * 3-yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score.   |  |  |
| 61. % entering freshmen with rank in top 30% or GPA of 3.0 or higher  | 61. Recommended Improvement Factor: 5%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance. Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-yr Avg + (5% * 3-yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score.   |  |  |
| 62. Policy for considering post-secondary achievements  | 62. Recommended Improvement Factor: None. "Compliance" Indicator, improvement factor does not apply.   |  |  |
|   |  | BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS  |  |
|   |  | TEACHING SECTOR  |  |
|   |  | RECOMMENDED STANDARDS: The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (Rounded down if upward trend and up if downward trend.) Actual performance will be rounded to the nearest whole level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5.   |  |
|   |  | DATA TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHING SCALE PROPOSED   |  |
|   |  | Best practices and therefore measurement as compliance indicator is more appropriate.  |  |
|   |  | Achieved if institution is in compliance with all indicated best practices practices.  |  |
|   |  | Compliance - No Change   |  |
|   |  | 3= At or below the 25th percentile of peers<br>2= 60th percentile down to 25th percentile<br>1= Above 60th percentile  |  |
|   |  | Note: expected trend is downward.<br>(measured to nearest whole \$)  |  |
|   |  | Peer data from PEEDS FY98:<br>For the Teaching Sector, 4-yr AGT Peers:<br>Median: \$1,338<br>80th Percentile: \$1,444<br>25th Percentile: \$1,008<br>Range for 2: \$1,444 - \$1,009  |  |
|   |  | State performance funding data and peer sector benchmarks used as reference. In assessing the reasonableness of the scale proposed in light of issues raised, staff has analyzed relevant SAT data and available data on SC high school graduates. The standards proposed allow for the recognition of high performance while providing a broad range for the score of 2 to allow for differences in missions and admission policies across institutions. In the past, the sector benchmark has served as the standard for beyond which the institution was not expected to show increasing performance. The proposed scale is consistent with the past expectation. |  |
|   |  | State performance funding data is used as a reference in determining the reasonableness of the proposed scale. In addition, available data from SC SDE, SC CHE, NCES ETS have been reviewed in light of the state performance funding data.  |  |
|   |  | 3= Above 64.0%<br>2= 50.0% - 64.0%<br>1= Below 50.0%   |  |
|   |  | Compliance - No Change   |  |

**PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001**

20 of 32

**Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000**

**PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001**

| <b>(Any Shading Indicates No Change Proposed)</b>  |  | <b>IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS</b>   |  | <b>TEACHING SECTOR</b>   |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Indicator &amp; Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)</b>  |  | <b>IMPROVEMENT FACTOR: Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevance of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.</b>                                      |  | <b>BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS</b>   |  |
| <b>7F Avg credit hours earned of graduates Expected trend is down</b>  |  | <b>7F Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%</b><br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance.<br>Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance < (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg - (3% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score. |  | <b>Reference used is state data. All institutions have scored at or below the current sector benchmark of 110%. The average is 106% for all institutions for which the measure is applicable.</b><br><br><b>1= Above 110%<br/>2= 106% - 110%<br/>3= Below 106%</b> |  |
| <b>7G Transferability of credits to and from institutions (No change to scale used)</b>  |  | <b>7G Recommended Improvement Factor: None</b>  |  | <b>2= compliance on all applicable points<br/>3= compliance on all but 1 applicable point<br/>4= non-compliance on more than 1 applicable point<br/>No change to scale used</b>  |  |
| <b>28 Continuing Education Units</b>   |  | <b>28 Recommended Improvement Factor: None</b><br>Indicator is assessed relative to institution's past performance  |  | <b>2= compliance on all applicable points<br/>3= compliance on all but 1 applicable point<br/>4= non-compliance on more than 1 applicable point<br/>No change to scale used</b>  |  |
| <b>29 The measure is change to be nonapplicable for all sectors except the technical colleges. In past years the measure was applicable for institutions with at least 1,000 CEUs produced annually.</b> |  | <b>29 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%</b><br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance.<br>Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance > (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (5% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score. |  | <b>3= At or above state minority population<br/>2= 75% of SC minority 18+ up to SC minority 18+<br/>1= Below 75% of SC minority 18+ (measured in tenths)</b>   |  |
| <b>30 Access to citizens</b>   |  | <b>30 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%</b><br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance.<br>Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance > (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (5% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score. |  | <b>3= Above 5% of SC teaching sector median retention<br/>2= at or within +/- 5% of SC teach sector median retention<br/>1= Below 5% of SC teach sector median student retention (measured in tenths)</b>  |  |
| <b>31 % SC undergraduate minority (Race/ethnicity)</b>   |  | <b>31 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%</b><br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance.<br>Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance > (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (5% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score. |  | <b>3= Above 5% of SC teaching sector median retention<br/>2= at or within +/- 5% of SC teach sector median retention<br/>1= Below 5% of SC teach sector median student retention (measured in tenths)</b>  |  |
| <b>32 retention of SC minority undergraduate (degree seeking students considered in 3C1)</b>   |  | <b>32 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%</b><br>(see 3C1 for methodology)  |  | <b>Overall retention reference is the retention (as defined for measurement) of all students regardless of race/ethnicity. The level would be proposed as the state minority population reference. The indicated range for a 2 is 21.0% - 28.0%.</b>               |  |

(Based on revised 3C2 per 06/11 change, Fall 1999)

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001

TEACHING SECTOR

**BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS**

RECOMMENDED STANDARDS: The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number (round down if upward trend and up if downward trend). Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5.

DATA TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHING SCALE  
PROPOSED

| Key: Showing indicators no change proposed.   |   | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS   |   |
|---|---|--|---|
| Indicator A: Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed) |   | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR: Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Rationale of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.  |   |
| 6D  | Priority on serving in-state students<br>The measure is currently defined as "the state for the purpose" including all eligible state residents of out-of-state tuition. In keeping with the direction of the measure as described originally, staff proposes changing the measure to assess SC residency. SC residency is to be defined consistently with the definition used to determine eligibility for LIFE scholarships. Therefore, SC Resident will include the residency categories of (1) Resident and Resident Emulation Categories of (A) Military & Dependents, (B) Faculty and administration employees and their dependents, (C) Full-time employees and their dependents and (D) retired persons and their dependents as defined in SC Code of Laws 36-112-10 and promulgated regulations governing tuition and fees. (See REG-3300) for LIFE reg) | 6D: Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance methodology for Calculation.<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (5% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score            | <p>The indicator should assess institutions' priority on serving those individuals who are SC residents or live within the borders of SC and therefore, staff proposes changing from "in-state for fees" to "citizens" as defined by Reg. Class 1 - CHEMS variable and the Res. Class acceptance codes of A, B, C, and D.</p> <p>This definition is consistent with that currently used in determining student eligibility for SC LIFE scholarships which are awarded to assist those from SC in attending post-secondary schools provided designated scholarship and residency requirements are met.</p> <p>Performance of SC institutions has been reviewed in preparing the recommended scale.</p> <p>Use variable PREDS data to establish expectation of being in the upper quartile for exceeding expectations and slightly below average up to the upper quartile for meeting expectations. A broad range for meeting expectations is provided to allow for differences within sectors across institutions.</p> <p>(measured in tenths)</p> |
| 7A  | Graduation Rate   | 7A: Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance methodology for Calculation.<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (3% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator student score.   |   |
| 7A1a  | with 150% of program time   | 7A1a: Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance methodology for Calculation.<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (3% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator student score. |   |
| 7A2   | Time excluding developmental students   | Measure defined, improvement factor N/A at this time   |   |
| 7B  | Employment/Continuing Education (Higher level measured for each, last rating is for 2001-02)  | Improvement factor N/A at this time  |   |
| 7C  | Employer Feedback<br>(measured on scale, last rating is for 2001-02)  | Improvement factor N/A at this time  |   |
| 7D  | % Passing professional exams  | Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance methodology for Calculation.<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (3% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator student score        | <p>Standards are based on performance of SC institutions. Program and exam variables from institution and the ranges here should reward institutions for high performance while allowing for differences in program and exam mix.</p> <p>Staff will continue to explore availability of national data for future use in determining standards. As of this time, national data is not available for all exams measured across institutions.</p>  |



# **Research Sector - Proposed Standards and Rationale**

---

**For consideration by the SC Commission on Higher Education  
July 6, 2000**

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001

| Only existing indicators no change proposed  |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS | TEACHING SECTOR  |  |
|--|--|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Indicator 8. Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR: Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevancy of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.  |                                | <p><b>BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS</b></p> <p>RECOMMENDED STANDARDS: The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (Round down if upward trend and up if downward trend) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5.</p> <p><b>DATA TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHING SCALE PROPOSED</b></p>   |  |
| NC<br>Access to classes (continued)<br>% minority grad students<br>(headcount)   | EC3 Recommended Improvement Factor = 0.5%<br>(see EC1 for Methodology)   |                                | <p>Use as reference points state and use population for those with baccalaureate degrees.</p> <p>3+ Above 10% of US minority pop w/ bacc. degrees<br/>2+ at or within +/- 10% of US minority pop w/ bacc. degrees<br/>1- Below 10% of US minority pop w/ bacc. degrees</p> <p>1990 Census, educational attainment of persons 25+ indicates 12.0% of those with baccalaureate degrees and higher are minority<br/>The figure would be used as the population reference (SC % is 13.4%) Range for 2+ = 10.0% - 13.0%</p>   |  |
| EC4<br>% minority faculty<br>(headcount faculty teaching in lab)   | EC4 Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance<br>Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Ideal Recent 3-Yr Avg * (3% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator subpart score. |                                | <p>Use as reference points the state and its census data for minority population with master's or higher. This measure considers both full and part-time faculty and therefore, staff has included in the reference those with master's degrees.</p> <p>3+ Above 10% of US minority pop w/ graduate degrees<br/>2+ at or within +/- 10% of US minority pop w/ grad. degrees<br/>1- Below 10% of US minority pop w/ graduate degrees</p> <p>(measured in tenths)</p> <p>1990 Census, educational attainment of persons 25+ indicates 11.9% of those with graduate degrees and higher are minority<br/>The figure would be used as the population reference (SC % is 13.2%) Range for 2+ = 10.0% - 13.0%</p> |  |
| EC5<br>Research expenditures for faculty education reform<br>No change to scale used   | EA Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>Indicator is assessed relative to institution's past performance  |                                | <p>3+ 120% and above<br/>2+ 80% - 119%<br/>1- below 80%</p> <p>(Measured by Yr4)</p> <p>Define consideration of the measure for the teaching sector while pressing study of applicability of the measure for the teaching sector</p>   |  |
| EC6<br>public and private grant expenditures<br>(instituted research expenditures compared to most recent 3-year average expenditures) | EB Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>Indicator is assessed relative to institution's past performance  |                                |  |  |

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

| PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| RESEARCH SECTOR  |  |   |  |
| RECOMMENDED STANDARDS: The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number (round down if upward trend and up if downward trend) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5 |  | DATA TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHING SCALE PROPOSED (data under review)  |  |
| BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS  |  |   |  |
| The proposed change in the measure will allow a focus on institutions' primary missions while providing an opportunity for institutions to select an additional area of focus based on individual mission and characteristics  |  | 3= At or above the 75th percentile of peers<br>2= 40th percentile up to 75th percentile<br>1= Below 40th percentile   |  |
| IPEDS data from peers to establish will be used to compare. Data for institutions identified in the MGT study will be used. For the research sector only, peers will be individualized for each of the three institutions. Issues related to research peers are being resolved at present  |  | Institution, Academic Support, Research & Institutional Change of One from categories including public service, student services, and academic, (unrestricted and restricted dollars included). Institution may not choose only the best categories. If the selection of an additional category is not desired, (data measured to left) |  |
| Peer Data from IPEDS for FY 98 to be used in determining applicable range as indicated at left.  |  | Data pending resolution of issues related to the appropriate peer set   |  |
| 3= 100%<br>2= 80% - 99% (or no more than 1 not approved)<br>1= 60% or lower<br>No change in scale<br>* application to be detailed in notebook  |  | 3= 100%<br>2= 80% - 99% (or no more than 1 not approved)<br>1= 60% or lower<br>No change in scale<br>* application to be detailed in notebook   |  |
| Compliance - No Change   |  | Compliance - No Change  |  |
| Institutionally proposed measurement standard on 2 selected goals  |  | Institutionally proposed measurement standard on 2 selected goals   |  |
| Assessment of 1D will remain a "compliance" indicator with compliance achieved by the institution's proposing the measures and standards and the Commission's approval of the proposed measures and standards  |  | Assessment of 1D will remain a "compliance" indicator with compliance achieved by the institution's proposing the measures and standards and the Commission's approval of the proposed measures and standards   |  |

**Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000**

**PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001  
RESEARCH SECTOR**

| Improvement Factor ALL SECTORS   |   | RESEARCH SECTOR   |  |
|--|---|---|--|
| <p><b>IMPROVEMENT FACTOR : Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevancy of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.</b></p> |   | <p><b>BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS</b></p> <p><b>RECOMMENDED STANDARDS:</b> The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (round down if upward trend and up if downward trend) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5.</p> <p><b>DATA TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHING SCALE</b><br/>PROPOSED (data under review)</p> |  |
| 1E   | <p><b>Attainment of Goals</b></p> <p>Staff recommends changing this indicator to provide an opportunity for more meaningful and individualized assessment. Staff recommends that institutions select two specific measures as part of indicator 1E with assessment scored as part of indicator 1E. Refer to committee meeting summary materials</p> | 1E  | <p>Staff recommends adjustment to measure to provide more meaningful and individualized assessment. Please refer to P&amp;A Meeting, June 20, 2000, Attachment 2A, Section 1B related measurement details</p> <p>Institutionally proposed measurement standard on 2 selected goals will be used in determining performance</p> <p>1E is to be scored in relation to whether the institution did not achieve, achieved, or exceeded the approved standard for the year</p>  |
| 2A   | <p><b>Credentialed of Faculty</b><br/>Meeting SACs (teaching undergraduates)</p> <p><b>Credentialed of Faculty</b><br/>terminal degree, headcount (teaching undergraduates)</p> <p><b>Credentialed of Faculty</b><br/>terminal degree, full-time (teaching undergraduates)</p>  | 2A  | <p>Scale proposed based on state data and expectation in regard to SACs for minimum requirements</p> <p>3= 100.0%<br/>2= 98.0% - 99.9% or all but one if % is &lt; 98%<br/>1= Below 98.0%<br/>(measured to tenths)</p> <p>Scales for 2A parts 2a and 2b reflect consideration of state performance funding data. The percentages reflect approximately the upper quartile for a 3 and the 2nd quartile for a 2 using increments of 5 percentage points</p>   |
| 2B   | <p><b>Performance Review</b><br/>(measured on cycle, next rating is pf yr 2001-02)<br/>Recommend changing to compliance indicator.</p>  | 2B  | <p>Expectation is compliance with policy best practices and therefore measurement as compliance indicator is more appropriate</p> <p>Change to Compliance (Compliance achieved if institution is in compliance with all indicated best practices principles)</p>   |
| 2C   | <p><b>Post Tenure Review</b><br/>(measured on cycle, next rating is pf yr 2001-02)<br/>Recommend changing to compliance indicator.</p>  | 2C  | <p>Expectation is compliance with policy best practices and therefore measurement as compliance indicator is more appropriate</p> <p>Change to Compliance (Compliance achieved if institution is in compliance with all indicated best practices principles)</p>   |
| 2D   | <p><b>Average Faculty Salary by Rank</b><br/>Instructor<br/>Assistant Professor<br/>Associate Professor<br/>Professor</p> <p>For the regional campuses, the measure is change to average salary of faculty at ranks due to low numbers of faculty within individual ranks</p>   | 2D  | <p>Expectation is compliance with policy best practices and therefore measurement as compliance indicator is more appropriate</p> <p>Change to Compliance (Compliance achieved if institution is in compliance with all indicated best practices principles)</p> <p>For all parts, if</p> <p>3= At or above 95% of the peer average salary<br/>2= 80% - 94.9% of peer average salary<br/>1= Below 80% of peer average salary</p> <p>For each institution, the average salary will be based on appropriate peer salary average at each rank</p> <p>Average Salary of Peers to be Identified<br/>Reference for National Average to be determined<br/>Reference if not for the timeframe assessed will be inflated up to the current year</p> |

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

| Grey Shading Indicates no change proposed.   |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS   |  | RESEARCH SECTOR  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Indicator A, Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)  |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR : Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevancy of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.   |  | RECOMMENDED STANDARDS: The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (round down if upward trend and up if downward trend) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5.   |  |
| 2B1 Availability of Faculty<br>2B2 Availability of Advisors<br>2B3 (Measured on scale every 2 years, next rating is pf yr 2000-01)   |  | 2E1 & 2E2 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance.<br>Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (5% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator subject score. |  | BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS<br>DATA TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHING SCALE<br>PROPOSED (data under review)   |  |
| 3A Class Size & Student/Faculty Ratios<br>3A1a Lower Division<br>3A1b Upper Division<br>3A2a % undergrad lecture sections 50 and up<br>3A2b % lower division lecture sections 100 and up<br>3A3 FTE Students per FTE Faculty<br><br>Scoring scale based on being in compliance with the three parts of the measure. Compliance is being within the range on all three parts (Part 1 = 3A1a, 3A1b, Part 2 = 3A2a, 3A2b and Part 3 = 3A3)  |  | 3A Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>"Compliance" indicator, improvement factor does not apply.  |  | Same scale both parts<br>3= Above 80%<br>2= 80% - 60%<br>1= Below 60%<br>No change to current scale  |  |
| 3B Credit Hours Taught<br><br>After due consideration of data for this indicator in regard to setting an appropriate standard, staff recommends that the measure be deferred for the current year only. Staff wishes to explore concerns of institutions and staff related to the appropriate faculty exclusion and/or method of instruction exclusion in order to set appropriate standards that take into account various program mixes across institutions while encouraging institutions to strive toward intended purpose of this measure |  | 3B Measure deferred, improvement factor N/A at this time   |  | Staff proposes to recommend adjusting the ranges for lower and upper division classes and student/faculty ratio to align better with current state averages and to make this a compliance indicator based on compliance with the three parts   |  |
| 3C Ratio of Faculty to Employees   |  | 3C Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance.<br>Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (3% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score                 |  | Change to Compliance based on all three parts<br>3A1a: Change range from 25-35 to 25-40<br>3A1b: Change range from 20-30 to 20-35<br>3A2a: No change (Range of 0% to 20%)<br>3A2b: No change (Range of 0% to 5%)<br>3A3: Change range from 14-19 to 10-20<br><br>Institutions in full compliance with all applicable parts will be in compliance. Institutions not meeting any of the parts will be out of compliance<br><br>(3A1a, 3A2b are N/A for MUSC) |  |
| 3D Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs<br>No change to scale   |  | 3D Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>Measurement at present provides allowances for improvement in regard to achieving program accreditation   |  | Institutions in full compliance with all applicable parts will be in compliance. Institutions not meeting any of the parts will be out of compliance<br><br>(3A1a, 3A2b are N/A for MUSC)  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Defer for the year only while data issues being resolved   |  |
|  |  |  |  | Use IPEDS data to establish ranges. Data for institutions identified in the MGT study of MRR to be used. For research sector, peers individualized for each (measured to levels)   |  |
|  |  |  |  | Peer data from IPEDS Fall Start 97 to be used in establishing ranges as indicated<br><br>Data pending resolution of issues related to the appropriate peer set   |  |
|  |  |  |  | 3= 100%<br>2= 90 - 99% (or all but one program *)<br>1= 60% or less<br>* application to be clarified in workbook   |  |

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001

RESEARCH SECTOR

| Grey Shading Indicates no change proposed.   |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS  |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| Indicator & Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)     |  | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR: Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevancy of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.   |  |
| 3E Teacher Education   |  |   |  |
| 3E1 NCATE Accreditation  |  | 3E1 Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>"Compliance" indicator. Improvement factor does not apply  |  |
| 3E2a % passing Prof Knowledge  |  | 3E2a Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%<br>See 3E2b for a description of the methodology   |  |
| 3E2b % passing Spec Area   |  | 3E2b Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (3% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator support score  |  |
| 3E3a % in shortage areas   |  | 3E3a Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (5% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator support score  |  |
| 3E3b % minority  |  | 3E3b Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%<br>(See 3E3a for Methodology)  |  |
| 4A Growing use of technology   |  | 4A Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>"Compliance" indicator. Improvement factor does not apply   |  |
| 4B Measured on cycle need rating in FY 2001-02   |  | 4B Recommended Improvement Factor = None<br>"Compliance" indicator. Improvement factor does not apply   |  |
| 5A Administrative Expenditures   |  | 5A Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance <= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg - (3% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score  |  |
| BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS  |  | RECOMMENDED STANDARDS: The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number (rounded down if upward trend and up if downward trend) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5  |  |
| DATA TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHING SCALE PROPOSED (data under review)                             |  | COMPLIANCE - No Change<br>3= Above 94%<br>2= 90.0% - 94.0%<br>1= Below 90.0%<br>(measured to tenths) (N/A for MUSC)<br><br>3= Above 89%<br>2= 80.0% - 89.0%<br>1= Below 80%<br>(measured to tenths)<br>(N/A for MUSC)<br><br>3= Above 34%<br>2= 20% - 34%<br>1= Below 20%<br>(measured to whole percent)<br>(N/A for MUSC)<br><br>3= Above 20%<br>2= 10% - 20%<br>1= Below 10%<br>(measured to whole percent)<br>(N/A for MUSC)<br><br>COMPLIANCE - No Change<br><br>COMPLIANCE - No Change<br><br>3= At or Below the 25th percentile of peers<br>2= 60th percentile down to 25th percentile<br>1= Above 60th percentile<br><br>Note: expected trend is downward (measured in tenths) |  |
| Peer Data from IPEDS for FY 98 to be used in determining applicable range as indicated at left |  | Data pending resolution of issues related to the appropriate peer set   |  |

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 8, 2000

PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001

RESEARCH SECTOR

| Grey Shading Indicates Not Change Proposed.  |   | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS   |
|--|---|--|
| Indicator & Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)   | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR: Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Reversity of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.   |  |
| SD Priority on enrolling in-state students<br>The measure is currently defined as "in-state for the purposes" including all eligible state residents of out-of-state labor. In keeping with the definition of the measure as identified originally, staff proposes changing the measure to assess SC residency. SC residency is to be defined consistently with the definition used to determine eligibility for LIFE scholarships. Therefore, SC Residency will include the residency categories of (1) Resident and Resident Exception Categories of (A) Military & Dependents, (B) Faculty and administration employees and their dependents, (C) Full-time employees and their dependents and (D) new persons and their dependents as defined in SC Code of Laws 36-112 and promulgated regulations. Potentially labor and fees (see REC-35001 for LIFE mgt) | SD Recommended Improvement Factor = .5%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance. Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (5% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score.     |  |
| 7A Graduation Rate<br>7A1 with 150% of program time  | 7A1A Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance. Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (3% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score.    |  |
| 7A2 Time excluding developmental students  | Measure deferred; improvement factor N/A at this time   |  |
| 7B Employment/Continuing Educ. at a higher level<br>Measured on GEDs, most likely in FY 2001-02  | Improvement factor N/A at this time   |  |
| 7C Employee Feedback<br>(measured on GEDs, most likely in FY 2001-02)  | Improvement factor N/A at this time   |  |
| 7D % Passing professional exams  | Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance. Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (3% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator support score. |  |
| BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS  |   | RECOMMENDED STANDARDS: The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (round down if upward trend and up if downward trend) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5. |
| The indicator should assess institutions' priority on enrolling those students who are SC residents or live within the borders of SC and therefore, staff proposes changing from "in-state for fees" to "citizens" as defined by Rec. Class-1 CHEMIS variable and the Rec. Class exceptions codes of A, B, C, and D. This definition is consistent with that currently used in determining student eligibility for SC LIFE scholarships which are intended to assist those from SC in attending post-secondary schools provided designated scholarship and residency requirements are met. Performance of SC institutions has been reviewed in proposing the recommended scale.  |   | 3+ Above 75.0%<br>2+ 65.0% - 75.0%<br>1- Below 65.0%   |
| Use available IPEDS data to establish expectations of being in the upper quartile for exceeding expectations and slightly below average up to the upper quartile for meeting expectations. A broad range for meeting expectations is provided to allow for differences within sectors across institutions.   |   | 3+ At or above 75th percentile of peers<br>2+ 40th percentile up to 75th percentile<br>1- Below 40th percentile<br>N/A for MSC<br>(measured in tenths)   |
| N/A  |   | IPEDS data from 1997 GRS survey to be used in determining range indicated<br>Data pending resolution of issues related to the appropriate peer set.  |
| N/A  |   |  |
| Needs Refinement, Not Measured in Yr 5   |   |  |
| Needs Refinement, Not Measured in Yr 5   |   |  |
| Standards are based on performance of SC institutions. Program and exam data varies from institution and the ranges here should reward institutions for high performance while allowing for differences in program and exam mix. Staff will continue to explore availability of national data for future use in determining standards. As of this time, national data is not available for all exams measured across institutions.   |   | 3+ Above 80.0%<br>2+ 80.0% - 89.0%<br>1- Below 80.0%   |

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001

| Every Standard Indicates No Change Proposed   |   | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS   |  |
|---|---|--|--|
| Indicator 6. Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed) |   | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR: Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevance of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.                                    |  |
| 58  | (measured on cycle, next rating is of Yr 2000-01)   | 58 Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>"Compliance" indicator, improvement factor does not apply.  | <p>BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS</p> <p>RECOMMENDED STANDARDS: The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (Round down if upward trend and up if downward trend.) Actual performance will be rounded to the significant level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5.</p> <p>DATA TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHING SCALE PROPOSED (data under review)</p> |
| 59  | Dimension of Satisfaction<br>(measured on cycle, next rating is of Yr 2000-02)              | 59 Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>"Compliance" indicator, improvement factor does not apply.  |  |
| 60  | General Overhead per FTE Students<br>(FY 5 to Fall FTE Students)<br>Expected trend is down. | 60 Recommended Improvement Factor: 5%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance. Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance <= (Ideal Recent 3-Yr Avg - (3% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score. |  |
| 61  | SAT/ACT scores (% >= 1000 SAT or 21 ACT)  | 61 Recommended Improvement Factor: 5%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance. Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Ideal Recent 3-Yr Avg - (5% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score. |  |
| 62  | % entering freshmen with rank in top 30% or GPA of 3.04 and higher                          | 62 Recommended Improvement Factor: 5%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance. Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Ideal Recent 3-Yr Avg - (5% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score. |  |
| 63  | Policy for considering post-secondary achievement   | 63 Recommended Improvement Factor: None<br>"Compliance" indicator, improvement factor does not apply.  |  |



Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

| PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001   |   |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|
| RESEARCH SECTOR   |   |  |  |
| Only existing standards not change proposed   | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS  | BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS  | RECOMMENDED STANDARDS - The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (round down if upward trend and up if downward trend) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5.  |
| Indicator 8, Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)   | IMPROVEMENT FACTOR : Institutions are to be assessed as indicated below as to their annual improvement. Institutions scoring 1 or 2 on an indicator and improving as outlined will be awarded an additional 0.5. Relevancy of the improvement factor to the indicator and calculation methodology are noted below.                                      | DATA TO BE USED IN ESTABLISHING SCALE<br>PROPOSED (data under review)  |  |
| 7F<br>Avg credit hours earned of graduates<br>Expected trend is down  | 7F Recommended Improvement Factor = 3%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance<br>Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance <= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg - (3% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score.  | Reference used is state data. All institutions have scored at or below the current sector benchmark of 110%. The average is 108% for all institutions for which the measure is applicable.   | 1= Above 110%<br>2= 108% - 110%<br>3= Below 108%<br>N/A for MUSC   |
| 8A<br>Responsibility of credit to and from institutions<br>No change to scale used  | 8A Recommended Improvement Factor - None  |  | 2= Compliance of all applicable parts<br>3= Compliance on all but 1 applicable part<br>4= Non-compliance on more than 1 applicable part<br>No change to scale used   |
| 8B<br>Continuing Education Units<br>The measure is change to be nonapplicable for all sectors except the technical colleges. In past years the measure was applicable for institutions with at least 1,000 CEUs produced annually.  | 8B Recommended Improvement Factor - None<br>Indicator is assessed relative to institution's past performance  |  | Deliber for all in this sector<br>(The indicator was applicable for all 3 in yr 4 of performance funding)  |
| 8C<br>Access to citizens<br>% SC undergraduate minority (headcount)<br>Staff proposes that "SC Resident" for this indicator be consistent with that used for Indicator 8D, which is an assessment of enrolling SC Resident students. Refer to Indicator 8D for the definition to be applied here for "SC Resident". | 8C1 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%<br>Improvement based on whether or not an institution equaled or surpassed its most recent 3-yr average performance<br>Methodology for Calculation:<br>If Performance >= (Most Recent 3-Yr Avg + (5% * 3-Yr Avg)) and the institution has scored a 1 or 2, a total of 0.5 will be added to the indicator score. | Staff proposes that SC resident be considered those classified per CHEMS as RES_CLASS = 1 and exceptions A, B, C, and D. Refer to indicator 8D for additional details.<br>State population data is used as the reference. The has been used in the past for this indicator as the sector benchmark. In determining its reasonableness, staff have reviewed data relevant to SAT takers and high school seniors and find similar percentages for the state overall. | 3= At or above state minority population<br>2= 75% of SC minority 18+ up to SC minority 18+<br>1= At or below 75% of SC minority 18+<br>(measured in tenths)   |
| 8C2<br>Retention of SC minority undergrads<br>(degree seeking students considered in 8C1)<br>Additionally, consistent with indicator 8C1, staff proposes a change to the definition used for SC resident. See indicator 8D for the definition recommended.  | 8C2 Recommended Improvement Factor = 5%<br>(See 8C1 for Methodology)  | Staff recommends that overall retention of SC 4 yr institutions be used in determining the reference point for this indicator. It would be expected that the retention of students should not depend on minority status and therefore the reference is the ability of institutions in the state to retain students from one year to the next. The definition of SC Resident will be consistent with that recommended for 8C1 and 8D.                               | Current sector benchmark of 28.7% represents SC minority population 18+ (% is based on 1990 census population estimates. The level would be proposed as the state minority population reference. The indicated range for a 2 is 21.0% - 28.0%).<br>Overall retention reference is the retention (as defined for measurement) of all students regardless of race. For the research sector, the median of all 4 year institutions is to be considered in determining the indicated range. The median is 83.0% and the range for a 2 is 78% to 87%<br>(based on revised SC2 per definition change, Fall 1999) |

Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)  
For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000

| Proposed Standards for Performance Funding (PF Yr 2000-01 to Impact FY 2001-02)<br>For Consideration of SC Commission on Higher Education, July 6, 2000 |  | PROPOSED STANDARDS AND RATIONALE - YR 5 2000-2001   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| Grey Shading indicates no change proposed.  |  | RESEARCH SECTOR   |  |
| IMPROVEMENT FACTOR ALL SECTORS  |  | RECOMMENDED STANDARDS: The Proposed Scale is to be calculated as indicated and then rounded up or down depending on expected trend to the nearest whole number. (Round down if upward trend and up if downward trend.) Actual performance will be rounded to the significance level used in Year 4 and then compared to the scale for Year 5.   |  |
| Indicator & Short Title (and information related to any measurement change being proposed)  |  | BRIEF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED STANDARDS   |  |
| <p>BC Access to citizens (continued)</p> <p>BC3 % minority grad students (headcount)</p>  |  | <p>Use as reference points state and us population for those with baccalaureate degrees</p> <p>3+ Above 10% of US minority pop w/ bacc. degrees<br/>2+ At or within +/- 10% of US minority pop w/ bacc. degrees<br/>1+ Below 10% of US minority pop w/ bacc. degrees</p> <p>(measured in tenths)</p> <p>1990 Census, educational attainment of persons 25+ indicates 12.0% of those with baccalaureate degrees and higher are minority. This figure would be used as the population reference. (SC % is 13.4%) Range for 2 = 10.0%-13.0%</p>  |  |
| <p>BC4 % minority faculty (headcount faculty teaching in fall)</p>  |  | <p>Use as reference points the state and us census data for minority population with Master's or higher. The measure considers both full and part-time faculty and therefore, staff has included in the reference those with master's degrees.</p> <p>Additionally, in determining the reasonableness of using the US census data as a reference, staff has reviewed peer data, data presented in the Chronicle regarding percent of minority faculty and an annual study by NSF of earned research doctorates (that study showed of the 28,218 doctorates earned by US Citizens, 11% were earned by minorities)</p> <p>3+ Above 10% of US minority pop w/ graduate degrees<br/>2+ At or within +/- 10% of US minority pop w/ grad. degrees<br/>1+ Below 10% of US minority pop w/ graduate degrees</p> <p>(measured in tenths)</p> <p>1990 Census, educational attainment of persons 25+ indicates 11.9% of those with graduate degrees and higher are minority. This figure would be used as the population reference. (SC % is 13.2%) (range for 2 indicated is 10.0%-13.0%)</p> |  |
| <p>BC5 Research expenditures for teacher education reform. No change to scale used.</p>   |  | <p>3+ 120% and above<br/>2+ 80% - 119%<br/>1+ Below 80%</p> <p>(Measured in tenths)</p>   |  |
| <p>BC6 public and private grant expenditures (restricted research expenditures compared to most recent 3-year average expenditures)</p>                 |  | <p>Use PEDS data to establish ranges. Data for institutions identified in the MCT study of MCT to be used. For research sector, point individualized for each</p> <p>3+ At or above the 75th percentile of peers<br/>2+ 40th percentile up to 75th percentile<br/>1+ Below 40th percentile</p> <p>(Measured in tenths)</p> <p>PEDS Finance Surveys (FY98 / Avg. of FYs 95,98,97) to be used in establishing the ranges</p> <p>Data pending resolution of issues related to the appropriate peers</p>  |  |