Agenda Item 3.05 (A)
CHE Meeting
October 1, 1998

Consideration of Proposed Revised Institutional Benchmarks for Year 3

The Planning and Assessment Committee approved the following changes to benchmarks for year three and recommends that the Commission approve the requested changes as well. Detailed recommendations approved by the Committee are attached. The changes requested were due to historical inaccuracies or errors in calculation that resulted in setting benchmarks at inappropriate levels.

Institution	Indicator	Change Benchmark to	Change Target 1 to	Change Target 2
MUSC	1A	7.0%	7.5%	7.5%
	3A1, upper	28	27	27
	5A	5.8%	5.7%	5.7%
	5D	$6,100	$6,300	$6,500
USC – Aiken	7A	32%	32.5%	33%
USC Spartanburg	7A	32.5%	32.8%	33.1%
Central Carolina Tech	1A	55.0%	55.1%	55.2%
	5A, academic	69.6%	69.7%	69.8%
	5A, admin	13.5%	13.5%	13.8%
Denmark Tech	5A	18.0%	No Change	No Change
	5D	$999	No Change	No Change
	7D	90%	86.3%	86.5%
Florence-Darlington Tech	3B	233	234	235
Greenville Tech	3B	236	237	238
	8Ca	16.2%	16.2%	16.2%
Horry-Georgetown Tech	3D	66.7% (*)	No Change	No Change
Piedmont Tech	8Ca	32.0%	No Change	No Change
Trident Technical College	3D	80% (*)	No Change	No Change

(*) *With understanding*, see detailed recommendation for explanation

Technical Corrections for Recommended for Deferred Benchmarks: The Planning and Assessment Committee also approved staff's recommendation to approve the following technical corrections to approved benchmarks for deferred indicators.

Institution	Indicator	Corrected Data and proposed benchmark due to miscalculation
USC – Sumter	2-E1*	98% historical 98% benchmark
Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College	2-A2	51% historical 51% benchmark

ATT IV

Attachment 2
P&A Committee
September 15, 1998

Requests for Revised Benchmarks for Year 3

The institutions listed below responded to the Commission's offer of a limited opportunity for correction in year 3 benchmarks. (The institutions are listed in alphabetical order by sector.) The Commission requested that institutions submit corrected benchmarks if they could document that an error or inaccuracy in historical data or calculations had resulted in setting year 3 benchmarks at the wrong level. The Commission requested that institutions also document the resulting impact on the benchmark. The deferred benchmarks submitted in July 1998 were not subject to possible revision.

Summary of Requests:

9	Institutions requested benchmark revisions for one or more indicators.
22	Total revisions requested
14	Recommended for Approval
6	Recommended for Disapproval because the requests did not meet guidelines
2	Recommendation deferred pending collection of additional staff research

---

RESEARCH SECTOR

Medical University of SC (Changes requested for 1A, 3A1, 5A, 5D)

1.) Requests change to Indicator 1A, Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission

	FROM	TO
Proposed Benchmark	7.4%	7.0%
Target 1	7.4%	7.5%
Target 2	7.5%	7.5%

2.) Requests change to Indicator 3A1, Average class size – upper division

	FROM	TO
Proposed Benchmark	16	28
Target 1	16	27
Target 2	16	27

3.) Requests change to Indicator 5A, Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs - Administrative

	FROM	TO
Proposed Benchmark	6.4%	5.8%
Target 1	6.4%	5.7%
Target 2	6.4%	5.7%

4.) **Requests change to Indicator 5D, Amount of general overhead costs**

	FROM	TO
Proposed Benchmark	$5,340	$6,100
Target 1	$5,340	$6,300
Target 2	$5,340	$6,500

Rationale: Revised benchmarks for 1A and 3A1 were submitted due to data retrieval difficulty. Revised benchmarks were submitted for 5A and 5D due to errors in finance data which resulted in improper benchmarking for these indicators.

Staff Recommendation: Approve. Changes requested resulted from inaccuracies in historic data that had been previously identified by MUSC.

TEACHING COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

USC – Aiken (Changes Requested for 7A)

Requests change to Indicator 7A, Graduation Rate

	FROM	TO
Historical Year 4 (F88 cohort)	28.9%	29.1%
Historical Year 3 (F89 cohort)	30.0%	31.0%
Historical Year 2 (F90 cohort)	31.6%	30.2%
Historical Year 1 (F91 cohort)	31.6%	31.6%
Proposed Benchmark	32.5%	32.0%
Target 1	33.5%	32.5%
Target 2	34.5%	33.0%

Rationale: Changes requested due to inaccuracies in calculating graduation rates and differences between system-wide and institutional graduation rates. USC-Aiken provided corrected historical data and revisions based on the corrected data as calculated by USC Columbia in accordance with GRS.

Staff Recommendation: **Approve.** Request conforms to guidelines as historical data for graduation rates used in proposing a benchmark were inaccurate and resulted in setting an inaccurate benchmark.

USC – Spartanburg (Change requested for 7A)

Requests change to Indicator 7A, Graduation Rate

	FROM	TO
Historical Year 3 (F 89 cohort)	*35.0%	*Historical data corrections
Historical Year 2 (F 90 cohort)	*31.9%	had already been made,
Historical Year 1 (F91 cohort)	*32.3%	and no change is necessary.
Proposed Benchmark	38.0%	32.5%
Target 1	39.0%	32.8%
Target 2	40.0%	33.1%

Rationale: Changes requested due to inaccuracies in calculating graduation rates and differences between system-wide and institutional graduation rates. USC-Spartanburg provided corrected historical data and revisions based on the corrected data as calculated by USC Columbia in accordance with GRS.

Staff Recommendation: Approve. Request conforms to guidelines as historical data for graduation rates used in proposing a benchmark were inaccurate and resulted in setting an inaccurate benchmark.

TECHNICAL COLLEGES

Central Carolina Technical College (Changes requested for 1A and 5D)

1.) Requests change to Indicator 1A, Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission

	FROM	TO
Proposed Benchmark	57.0%	55.0%
Target 1	57.0%	55.1%
Target 2	57.0%	55.2%

2.) Requests change to Indicator 5A, Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs

	FROM	TO
Academic		
Proposed Benchmark	72.0%	69.6%
Target 1	72.0%	69.7%
Target 2	72.0%	69.8%
Administrative		
Proposed Benchmark	12.5%	13.5%
Target 1	12.5%	13.5%
Target 2	12.5%	13.8%

Rationale: Corrections resulted from miscalculations of instructional expenditures for FY 1997 and FY 1998.

Staff Recommendation: Approve.

Denmark Technical College (Changes requested for 5A, 5D, and 7D)

1.) Requests change to Indicator 5A, Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs - Administrative

	FROM	TO
Proposed Benchmark	14.4%	18.0%

Rationale: Miscalculation of assignment of Title III funds has resulted in a revised benchmark.

Staff Recommendation: Approve

2.) Requests change to Indicator 5D, Amount of general overhead costs

	FROM	TO
Proposed Benchmark	$869	$999

Rationale: Miscalculation of assignment of Title III funds has resulted in a revised benchmark.

Staff Recommendation: Approve

3.) Requests change to Indicator 7D, Scores of graduates on professional exams

	FROM	TO
Historical Year 2 (1996)	90%	90%
Historical Year 1 (1997)	90.3%	86.3%
Proposed Benchmark	95%	86.5%

Rationale: Data was not available from the Cosmetology Board at the time benchmarks were set, resulting in a miscalculation of the historical data. Request is made to change benchmark in line with actual data that was not known at the time of the original submission.

Staff Recommendation: Approve

Florence-Darlington Technical College (Changes requested for 3B)

Requests change to Indicator 3B, Number of credit hours taught by faculty

	FROM	TO
Proposed Benchmark	250	233
Target 1	253	234
Target 2	255	235

Rationale: Data was miscalculated based on a misunderstanding of the data to be used in calculating this indicator. The revised benchmark proposed is an attempt to realign FDTC with historical data.

Staff Recommendation: Approve.

Greenville Technical College (Changes requested for 3B and 8Ca)

1.) Requests for change to Indicator 3B, Number of credit hours taught by faculty

	FROM	TO
Proposed Benchmark	240	236
Target 1	242	237
Target 2	244	238

Rationale: Data used in determining benchmark was not opening data as required by the definitions for this indicator.

Staff Recommendation: Approve

2.) Requests for change to indicator 8Ca, Percentage of other race students

	FROM	TO
Proposed Benchmark	16.4%	16.2%
Target 1	16.5%	16.2%
Target 2	16.5%	16.2%

Rationale: Data has been changed due to the establishment of the sector benchmark for the college.

Staff Recommendation: Defer. This request, rather than being the result of miscalculation, reflects the service area percentage of other race. CHE staff and SBTCE will collect and publish other race data by service area before this request is considered further. ***CHE staff will, however, also recommend freezing the service population data area used in determining ratings for a three-year period. Data used for rating would, as a result, be used for a three-year period and then recalculated for the next three-year period.***

Piedmont Technical College (Changes requested for 1A, 3A1, 5D, 7A, 7D1, & 8Ca)

Changes Requested for 1A, 3A1, 5D, 7A, and 7D1: Requested changes did not conform to the Commission's guidelines for requesting changes. The changes requested were not due to inaccuracies in data calculation. ***Therefore, staff recommends that the requests for these indicators be denied. Changes requested should be made more appropriately when benchmarks are requested for Year 4.***

Requests change for Indicator 8Ca, Percentage of Minority Enrollment

	FROM	TO
Proposed Benchmark	34.0%	32.0%

Rationale: Original benchmark was based on all age groups and not the 18-60 year olds only. The college requests a revision in order to restructure its benchmark to conform to its historical data.

Staff Recommendation: Defer. This request, rather than being the result of miscalculation, may reflect the service area percentage of other race as is the case with Greenville Technical College. CHE staff and SBTCE will collect and publish other race data by service area before this request is considered further. ***CHE staff will, however, also recommend freezing the service population data area used in determining ratings for a three-year period. Data used for rating would, as a result, be used for a three-year period and then recalculated for the next three-year period***

Trident Technical College (Changes requested for 3D and 8A)

1.) Requests change to Indicator 3D, Accreditation of Degree Granting Programs

	FROM	TO
Proposed Benchmark	86%	80%

Rationale: Trident Tech had anticipated accreditation of its practical nursing program. However, due to organizational changes of the accreditation body, the visit has been postponed. As a result, Trident Tech request a benchmark for year three equal to year to performance level of 80%.

Staff Recommendation: Approve with the understanding that if the program in question is accredited within the timeframe of the Commission's review for determining performance for year 3 of performance funding, Trident Tech may not include this approval in performance data submitted for consideration.

2.) Request change to Indicator 8A, Transferability of credits to and from the Institution

	FROM	TO
Proposed Benchmark	100%	90%

Rationale: Trident Tech had received no historical data on which to base benchmarks for this indicator when the benchmark was submitted on March 25, 1998. Reports from CHE for Fall 1997 and Fall 1996 were received in April. Trident Tech applied transfer data from data sets provided by SBTCE which led Trident to overestimate the Year 3 benchmark by 10%. Trident requests that the Year 3 benchmark be reset at year 2 actual performance of 90%.

Staff Recommendation: Disapprove. Rating for this indicator is based on compliance with policy and as a result the data problem reported is not relevant for rating in year 3. All institutions, therefore, have benchmarks set at 100% and staff recommend that Trident's benchmark remain at 100%.

ATT 4

Supplement to Attachment 2
P&A Committee Meeting
September 22, 1998

Horry-Georgetown Technical College (Change requested for 3D)

1.) Requests change to Indicator 3D, Accreditation of Degree Granting Programs

	FROM	TO
Proposed Benchmark	83%	66.7%

Rationale: Horry-Georgetown Tech had anticipated accreditation of its practical nursing diploma program. However, the site visit was set for February 1999, and due to the census date set by CHE for this indicator, Horry-Georgetown will not know whether the program received accreditation. As a result, Horry Georgetown, requests a benchmark for year three equal to year to performance level of 66.7%.

Staff Recommendation: Approve with the understanding that if the program in question is accredited within the timeframe of the Commission's review for determining performance for year 3 of performance funding, Horry-Georgetown may not include this approval in performance data submitted for consideration.