

The Rating Process Year Two Performance Funding

Committee process

1. The committee reviews the process and guidelines and participates in a training session.
2. The committee reviews the staff recommendations, indicator by indicator, sector by sector, and identifies recommended ratings which require further consideration.
3. In cases in which questions are raised, the committee members discuss the recommendation, hear institutional comments, and then ballot by writing down a specific rating number for the indicator. The rating number receiving the largest number of ballots receives committee approval. In cases of a tie between two rating numbers, the decision will be made by averaging the two ratings. In cases in which there are three or more rating numbers expressed on the ballots, there will be a second ballot to decide between the two numbers receiving the most votes on the first ballot.
4. After this process has been completed for all indicators for all institutions in a sector, the committee chair entertains a motion to approve the recommendations for all the indicators for the institutions in that sector, as amended by the committee through its balloting process.
5. The committee then moves on to the next sector, considering staff recommendations in the same manner as outlined above.
6. Committee recommendations are placed on the agenda for the meeting of the Commission on Higher Education on July 9, 1998.

Commission process

1. The Commission receives the report of the Planning and Assessment Committee with recommended ratings for the institutions. The committee chair, or a committee member presenting the report for the committee chair, moves the adoption of the committee's recommendations.
2. Time is provided for institutional presidents or representatives to comment on their ratings and for Commission members to ask questions and raise issues, proceeding institution by institution, sector by sector. Motions from Commission members to amend the committee recommendations are in order.
3. The chair entertains a motion to adopt the committee's recommendations, as amended, is then acted upon for that sector.
4. This process is repeated for each sector.

Additional factors affecting ratings recommended by the for year two

The staff applied the rating scale precisely to the institutions' performance. In doing so, there were a limited number of situations in which the need for further clarification or definition was evident in order to avoid inequities. These are outlined below:

1) Situations in which actual performance was almost the same as the institutional benchmark but not exactly the same. If the staff applied the rating scale assuming that "meeting" the benchmark meant having the exact same number, then a minor difference in the number, even as small as one digit up or down, would cause the rating to shift from a 4 to a 3 or to a 5.

Staff recommendation: The staff applied a modest range of 1% above and 1% below the institutional benchmark. If an institution's actual performance fell within the range, then the staff recommended a score of 4.

2) Situations in which it was mathematically impossible to receive a score of 3. This situation developed when the institution proposed a benchmark which was either the same as the previous year's actual performance or which moved away from the sector benchmark, or when the institution's performance for the prior year was within a mid-point range, such as class size, and the actual performance moved outside that range. In these situations, an institution, if it failed to meet its benchmark, had no way of showing "progress" and thus could not receive a score of 3.

Staff recommendation: In these situations, the staff applied a range of 10% to the institutional benchmark. An institution received a rating of 3, rather than a rating of 2, if its actual performance fell within this range.

3) Situations that warranted a score of 6 based on "substantially exceeding" the institutional benchmark and exhibiting "extraordinary effort." In order to screen for possible ratings of 6, the staff needed a consistent definition, while recognizing that one definition might not apply to all indicators.

Staff recommendation: A range of 20% was applied to the institution's benchmark and to its prior year's performance to produce this definition. If an institution's actual performance exceeded its institutional benchmark by 20% or more and its prior year's performance by 20% or more, then the staff recommended a score of 6. The exceptions were indicators 3d, Accreditation; 6A, SAT Scores; and 8C, Accessibility.

4) Situations that might have warranted a score of 1 for "non-compliance" and for falling "substantially below institutional benchmarks." There was no clear and consistent definition to use in screening for possible ratings of 1.

Staff recommendation: The staff reviewed all ratings of 2 in order to identify examples of performance that was "substantially below institutional benchmarks" and after review determined not to recommend any scores of 1 for the current year. The staff will recommend a consistent definition for use in year three ratings.

5) Situations that involved circumstances unique to a single institution that caused inequities. The staff screened all indicators for all institutions to identify anomalies in the scoring and identified a limited number of circumstances in which the staff recommendations were adjusted. These are outlined below:

Indicator 7A. Graduation Rates, for one institution

Situation: Exceptionally high performance in graduation rate, but failed to meet institutional benchmark. No sector benchmark. This resulted in a potential score of 2, although the graduation rate was extremely high in comparison to other institutions in the state and nation.

Staff recommendation: Recommend a score of 4 since the institution, although it did not meet its benchmark, performed at a high level which was consistent with its historical performance over the previous three years.

Indicator 3B. Credit Hours Taught by Faculty, for one institution

Situation: Very high performance in credit hour production, but failed to meet institutional benchmark. No sector benchmark. This resulted in a potential score of 2, although the credit hour production was exceptionally high.

Staff recommendation: Recommend a score of 4 since the institution, although it did not meet its benchmark, performed at an exceptionally high level in comparison with previous performance and the performance of other institutions.

Indicator 2D, 3A1, 5A, and 5D, for one institution

Situation: One institution experienced difficulty with data and consistent reporting of data, resulting in clear errors in bench marking on indicators 2D and 3A1. Also, clear errors in IPEDS reporting were found in indicators 5A and 5D. If the rating process were applied without exception, scores of 2 would be recommended on each of these indicators. Had these errors not been made, higher scores would have been possible.

Staff recommendation: The staff has explored these problems in detail with the institution and believes that these problems have been resolved going forward. In applying the rating scale for the current year, the staff recommends awarding a score of 3, rather than 2, for indicators 2D and 3A1, and a score of 4 rather than a 2 for indicators 5A and 5D, pending the resubmission of IPEDS data.

6) Situations involving technical corrections of data. There were a limited number of situations in which data errors were identified and corrections made.