

**Attachment 2A
P & A Committee
September 15, 1998**

Technical Corrections for Deferred Benchmarks

Following the Commission's approval of proposed benchmarks on September 3, 1998 for the year 3 deferred indicators. Two institutions discovered that historical data was not calculated according to approved definitions. As a result the inaccurate historical data led to benchmarks being set at the wrong level. Under the guidelines submitted to institutions, the recommended benchmark for the deferred indicators was the actual historical data.

Institution	Indicator	Data approved by the Commission 9/3/98 *	Corrected Data and proposed benchmark due to miscalculation	Institution Rationale for correction and Staff Recommendation
USC – Sumter	2-E1*	90% Historical 90% Benchmark	98% 98%	In calculating the percent of faculty who receive a mean rating of satisfied on the standardized question, USC-Sumter used an incorrect denominator which resulted in a reduced percentage for 2-E1. The requested benchmark of 98% equals the corrected historic data. Therefore, staff recommends that the technical correction be allowed.
Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College	2-A2	10% Historical 10% Benchmark	51% 51%	In calculating 2-A2, the percentage of faculty who exceed SACs criteria, only faculty teaching in AA/AS programs were considered. All faculty should have been considered in the calculations. The requested benchmark of 51% equals the corrected historic data. Therefore, staff recommends that the technical correction be allowed.

* Approval of proposed benchmarks for 2-E1 were deferred for further consideration by the Committee and therefore were not submitted for approval at the September 3, 1998, Commission meeting.

FILE ✓

Consideration of Sector Benchmarks 2E1, 2E2, and 3E3a

1.) Planning and Assessment Committee Recommendation: The Committee recommends that the Commission approve the following sector benchmarks for Indicators 2E1 and 2E2.

Sector Benchmark	Rating
90%-100%	5
80% - 89%	4
70% - 79%	3
60% - 69%	2
59% or lower	1

2.) Planning and Assessment Committee Recommendation: The Committee recommends that the Commission defer approval of any sector benchmark for Indicator 3E3a pending further research regarding this issue.

Proposed Sector Benchmarks for Indicators 2E1 and 2E2

Discussion: These two indicators use the same instrument administered in the same fashion across institutions and sectors. Therefore, it seems appropriate to use a common scale in relation to scores for these indicators rather than having institutions propose individual institutional benchmarks. Using the benchmarks in relation to ratings has three other advantages:

- it eases the pressure on institutions which are performing relatively well to continue to achieve at higher levels each year;
- it eliminates the time consuming process of benchmarks proposal and evaluation;
- it allows institutions to have a constant set of parameters for these indicators with known scoring results based on performance level.

Staff Recommendation: Establish the following sector benchmarks for indicators 2E1 and 2E2 in relation to ratings:

<u>Sector Benchmark</u>	<u>Rating</u>
90% - 100%	5
80% - 89%	4
70% - 79%	3
60% - 60%	2
59% or lower	1

Proposed Sector Benchmark for Indicator 3E3a

Discussion: Experience with the indicators and measures suggests that it is helpful to have sector benchmarks. They create a zone of high level performance that yields a rating of "5" without the need for an institution that is already performing well to continue to show improvement. The problem is determining the level at which the sector benchmark should be set. This recommendation comes from analysis of the actual performance data on this indicator for one historical year. It sets a sector benchmark at a level that is higher than the performance of most institutions with teacher education programs, yet within reach of institutions which have programs in critical shortage areas. (Any institution, regardless of where the sector benchmark is set, can receive a score of "5" by exceeding its institutional benchmark.) This proposed sector benchmark can, of course, be reconsidered in future years as we have more experience with the data.

Staff Recommendation: Set the sector benchmark on this indicator at 25%.