

**Agenda Item 3.05 C: Consideration of Recommendations for the Monitoring of Non-Scored Indicators**

**Explanation:** Presented here are the recommendations of the Committee for Commission consideration for the process and policies related to the monitoring of non-scored indicators. The recommendations were considered by the Committee on December 13, 2001, and approved without amendment. The recommendation results from staff analysis and consideration of feedback on this issue received from institutional representatives throughout the year following the Commission's adoption of a reduced the number of scored indicators to provide better focus on sector missions. At the Committee's meeting on September 6, 2001, members received a draft version of this plan along with a staff briefing as to its status. Following the meeting, staff redistributed the draft plan to determine whether representatives desired to meet with staff to review the plan and to provide an additional opportunity for comment. On October 4, 2001, staff informed representatives that feedback received did not indicate a need for a meeting and that the plan as provided to the Committee in September for information would be recommended for approval. That plan, with editorial changes to the draft for readability, is presented on the pages that follow.

**Summary of Guidance for Monitoring**

The attached guidance provides the rationale and general structure for continued monitoring of indicators that were identified in legislation but no longer contribute to an institution's numerical score for performance funding. All indicators that are not a part of the scoring process for any of the sectors are addressed. Identified in the guidance are two different types of non-scored indicators categorized in terms of recommended monitoring.

The first type includes indicators 1A, 2E, 2F, 3C, 5B, 5C, 5D, and 8B where the remaining scored indicators and other activities of the Commission will serve in lieu of these indicators as defined for performance funding purposes. (See guidance for indicator titles). For these indicators, the definition that has been developed is not in effect and therefore no additional reports or unique data collection is required.

The second category includes non-scored indicators 2B, 2C, 6C, 6D, 8A, 3A, 3B, and 7F. These will be monitored directly on a cyclical three-year basis. (See guidance for indicator titles.) For most of these indicators (6D, 3A, 3B, 7F, 8A), the Commission will rely on data that must be reported to the Commission in order that the Commission may carry out its responsibilities or on data that must be reported for the purpose of complying with federal reporting requirements. For the others that involve institutional policies (2B, 2C, 6C), the Commission will request only that institutions indicate whether policies remain in place to address the relevant best practices and report on any changes to those policies.

Monitoring for the second category will entail staff review of the area of concern utilizing existing data and institutional reports on policies followed by a report to the Committee regarding the state of affairs related to the indicators reviewed. The report will contain a recommendation for continuing the indicator as a monitored indicator or, if warranted, a recommendation to reinstate the indicator as a scored indicator for all institutions to follow a timetable that will provide the Commission and institutions time to prepare. If an indicator is reinstated it would remain in the scored set until reviewed again at the next scheduled date, unless otherwise determined by the Committee. Any subsequent data verification would entail verifying that institutional policies are in effect and that data for directly monitored indicators are reported accurately to CHE.

**Recommendation:** The Committee recommends that the Commission approve the plan presented on the following pages as initially recommended to the Committee for monitoring the non-scored indicators.

## **GUIDANCE FOR MONITORING NON-SCORED INDICATORS**

### **BACKGROUND**

In February 2001, the Commission approved recommendations to limit the number of indicators used in deriving overall institutional performance ratings with the caveat that "non-scored" indicators for which relevant performance areas were not assessed directly or indirectly through chosen scored indicators would continue to be monitored. For areas in which data being monitored indicate issues of concern, the Commission desired to reserve the right to re-introduce scored indicators in the performance funding process in order to provide a focus to address issues in those areas. Guidance for accomplishing the monitoring of indicators that are no longer scored was developed in keeping with the Commission's desire to accomplish monitoring in such a way as to reduce the administrative burden on institutions while at the same time assessing relevant performance areas.

Indicators for which monitoring is applicable are those listed below. Only indicators not scored for any sector are included.

- ☐ 1A, Expenditure of Funds to Achieve Institutional Mission (Applies to all)
- ☐ 2B, Performance Review System for Faculty to include Student and Peer Evaluation (Applies to all)
- ☐ 2C, Post Tenure Review for Tenured Faculty (Applies to all but Tech)
- ☐ 2E, Availability of Faculty to Students Outside The Classroom (Applies to all)
- ☐ 2F, Community and Public Service Activities of Faculty For Which No Extra Compensation is Paid (Applies to all as part of 2B)
- ☐ 3A, Class Size and Student/Teacher Ratios (Applies to all with applicability of subparts varying)
- ☐ 3B, Number of Credit Hours Taught by Faculty (Applies to all)
- ☐ 3C, Ratio of Full-time Faculty as Compared to other Full-time Employees (Applies to all)
- ☐ 5B, Use of Best Management Practices (Applies to all)
- ☐ 5C, Elimination of Unjustified Duplication of and Waste in Administrative and Academic Programs (Applies to all)
- ☐ 5D, Amount of General Overhead Costs (Applies to all)
- ☐ 6C, Post-Secondary Non-Academic Achievements of the Student Body (Applies to all, but MUSC)
- ☐ 6D, Priority on Enrolling In-State Residents (Applies to Research and Teaching)
- ☐ 7F, Credit Hours Earned of Graduates (Applies to 4-yr except MUSC)
- ☐ 8A, Transferability of Credits to and from the Institution (Applies to all)
- ☐ 8B, Continuing Education Programs for Graduates and Others (Applies to Tech)

To understand better the guidance set forth for monitoring indicators no longer scored, it is helpful to review the rationale used in deriving the reduced set of indicators being continued in the annual scoring process. In reducing the number of indicators contributing to the overall institutional score, the Commission worked to identify those that would reduce duplication across indicators contributing to an institution's score and best focus on sector missions. The aim was to provide a measurement system that would enable institutions to focus more clearly on performance areas addressed in Act 359 of 1996. To that end, the Commission sought to identify those indicators that were the most representative of each critical success factor, keeping in mind the sector missions. Cases were recognized where single indicators could best

address multiple areas represented across the 9 critical success factors and 37 indicators. Additionally, the Commission recognized areas where year-to-year measurement has demonstrated performance to be fairly stable with all institutions' performance in-compliance with requirements and expectations. In the end, either 13 or 14 indicators, depending on the sector, were identified for use in deriving the overall annual ratings. For the indicators not selected, the Commission desired to develop a process to provide for continued assurance that institutions would maintain high standards of performance.

### **DESCRIPTION OF THE MONITORING PROCESS**

#### **General Policy Principles**

**Purpose of Monitoring:** To identify potential issues and/or problems with performance in areas addressed by indicators no longer scored and to determine whether a staff recommendation that the relevant indicator(s) be put back in place for scoring purposes for one or more sectors to address any identified issues and/or problems or to ensure that further consideration be given by the Commission.

#### **Principles:**

- ❑ Monitoring should be based on data already available to the Commission and not limited to that data collected for use in deriving performance funding indicators in order to reduce and/or eliminate any special reports required by measures for indicators as defined in past years.
- ❑ Monitoring should occur on a cycle in order to provide a balance between the need to limit reporting requirements and the need to review performance in areas no longer directly scored to ensure continued compliance and to identify any deficiencies that should be addressed.
- ❑ In the event that reviews conducted for the purpose of monitoring indicate concerns and/or problems that must be addressed, institutions would have a sufficient time period to prepare for indicators being returned to the scoring process.
- ❑ Indicators returned to the scoring process to address identified problems and/or issues would apply to applicable sector(s) rather than to individual institutions at which problems have been identified.

#### **Procedures for Monitoring Indicators Not Otherwise Monitored or Reviewed**

**Monitored Indicators:** The indicators that are no longer being scored as a result of the Commission's action in February of 2001 can be categorized one of two ways: 1) indicators no longer scored for which scored indicators or other on-going activities of the Commission are sufficient to address the indicated performance area and 2) indicators no longer scored that must be directly monitored. The former category would not require a separate and unique monitoring process although the latter would. For this latter category, a process for accomplishing monitoring of performance is described below, followed by the identification of indicators by the two categories. Suggested assessment details for those that must be directly monitored are described.

**Guidelines:** Beginning in 2003-04, a review of directly monitored indicators will occur on a three-year cycle. Data used in the review will rely as much as possible on data available to the Commission. Such data might include data collected through CHEMIS, data collected to meet national reporting requirements or data collected to carry out other duties and responsibilities of the Commission. The data review conducted will take into account current and past data, standards, trends, or activity. A report detailing the status of performance in the area related to

the indicator and including a staff recommendation will be provided to the Committee for its consideration. The recommendation will address whether or not the indicator should be called back as a scored indicator or remain as a non-scored indicator. If it is called back as a scored indicator, it would not be in effect until the second complete scoring cycle after action by the Commission to re-instate the indicator as a scored indicator. If an indicator is re-instated, it would apply to an entire sector, not just a single institution. The detailed process and data used to review performance on such indicators are to be defined by indicator with the schedule and general outline of data reviews defined across the indicators.

**Suggested Review Cycle:** Identified indicators to be monitored on a 3-year basis. Staff recommendations made and approved by the Planning and Assessment Committee and Commission to re-introduce an indicator into the scoring process in order to address problems would be implemented following two scoring cycles as outlined in the following table:

Action	Time Table	Example
Indicator reviewed	Summer following scoring	PF Yr 2003-04 Ratings Review monitored indicators Summer 2004
Report based on review considered by Committee and Commission after institutional review of report	Late Fall following the review	Staff Report and recommendations brought to Committee and Commission in Fall 2004
Indicator re-instated as a scored indicator	Performance data collected but not scored in the year immediately following report and approval of recommendations	Re-instatement/No scoring in 2005-06
Re-instated indicator is scored	Performance data collected and scored for 3-years	Re-instated indicator scored for PF Yr 2006-07 Re-instated indicator scored for PF Yr 2007-08 Re-instated indicator scored PF Yr 2008-09
Re-instated Indicator Reviewed: Recommendation would be made to continue scoring the indicator or remove it as a scored indicator in the current performance year, placing it back on the monitoring review cycle.	Summer following 3 <sup>rd</sup> year of scoring with recommendations brought to Committee and Commission in early fall.	Re-instated indicator reviewed in Summer 2009 with recommendations considered and implemented in Fall 2009

*Note: Possible exceptions may occur resulting in an amended schedule approved by the Planning and Assessment Committee and Commission to re-instate indicators as scored. For example, other work of the Commission or legislated policy mandating action in an area addressed by indicators may result in the need to re-instate a particular indicator. In such cases, the expectation would be for the Commission to develop recommendations providing a reasonable timetable and appropriate assessment details.*

### **Detailed Guidance for Non-Scored Indicators By Type of Monitoring Activities**

The following outlines by category the type monitoring recommended. Only indicators applicable in the past but no longer scored indicators for any institution are considered. A summary table of indicators by recommended monitoring is presented on the last page.

#### **CATEGORY I: INDIRECT MONITORING**

##### **INDICATORS MONITORED INDIRECTLY THROUGH OTHER INDICATORS AND/OR ON-GOING CHE ACTIVITIES**

**The expectation is that no additional data would be required of institutions and that the**

indicators listed below will not be individually assessed as defined in Year 5. It is the understanding that for this category of indicators requirements of other indicators and/or current activities of the Commission can be used in reviewing/monitoring areas implicit in the indicator as titled in legislation. Listed below are the indicators included and a summary of the performance indicator and/or other Commission process that also provides an avenue for monitoring of performance areas indicated by the non-scored indicator.

1A, Expenditure of Funds to Achieve Institutional Mission (Applies to all)

Financial indicator considered to be monitored by scored indicator 5A, Percentage of Administrative Costs as Compared to Academic Costs. Data used for 5A is that required of NCES IPEDS Finance Survey reporting. Additionally, other on-going activities of the Commission including program evaluation/review activities and monitoring of financial data for purposes of the MRR as well as State audit provisions provide a means of continued assessment of these issues.

2E, Availability of Faculty to Students Outside The Classroom (Applies to all)

Indicator considered to be monitored through the use of the non-scored indicator 2B, Performance Review System for Faculty to Include Student and Peer Evaluations.

2F, Community and Public Service Activities of Faculty For Which No Extra Compensation is Paid (Applies to all as part of 2B)

Indicator considered to be monitored through the use of the non-scored indicator 2B, Performance Review System for Faculty to Include Student and Peer Evaluations.

3C, Ratio of Full-time Faculty as Compared to other Full-time Employees (Applies to all)

Indicator considered to be monitored by scored indicator 5A, Percentage of Administrative Costs as Compared to Academic Costs. Additionally, data for this indicator as defined in Year 5 and prior years is part of NCES IPEDS Fall Staff Survey and can be reviewed in addition to 5A data for more direct assessment of faculty to staff ratios if needed.

5B, Use of Best Management Practices (Applies to all)

Financial indicator monitored as described for indicator 1A above.

5C, Elimination of Unjustified Duplication of and Waste in Administrative and Academic Programs (Applies to all)

Financial indicator monitored as described for indicator 1A above.

5D, Amount of General Overhead Costs (Applies to all)

Financial indicator monitored as described for indicator 1A above.

8B, Continuing Education Programs for Graduates and Others (Applies to Tech)

Indicator considered to be monitored by Commission activities related to the Mission Resource Requirement and by State Tech Board processes regarding continuing education programs and enrollment.

**CATEGORY II: DIRECT MONITORING**

**INDICATORS MONITORED ON AN ON-GOING 3-YEAR REVIEW CYCLE**

Included in this category are indicators that must be monitored directly through the use of existing data in order to ensure continued good performance in the areas implicit in the indicators. Below, each of these indicators is listed along with expectations regarding the suggested review cycle, the type data to be reviewed and other parameters guiding the assessment. The indicators have been grouped for purposes of identifying the review cycle based on the type indicator and performance area with natural clustering by related topic area.

**CYCLE 1 INDICATORS: Review to occur in Summer '04 following Performance Year 2003-04**

**2B, Performance Review System for Faculty to include Student and Peer Evaluation (Applies to all):**

Institutions are expected to comply with best practices guidance identified for this indicator as detailed on pages 89-92 of the September 2000 Workbook. A "check-off" compliance report with updates regarding any policy revisions will be required for purposes of review each three years. It is expected that institutions will continue to comply with their institutional policies. Data verification for this indicator would involve assurance that institutions have policies in place and mechanisms to ensure they are adhered to.

It is reiterated here that indicator 2E, Availability of Faculty, is no longer scored and is considered to be subsumed by 2B. As such, the administration and monitoring of Indicator 2B will govern the type of data collected. The institution has discretion in terms of how it assesses faculty on part nine of 2B, the second item, which calls for a performance review system for faculty that includes criteria related to "advisement and mentoring of students." Indicator 2B does not require a survey question on availability of faculty or advisors *per se*. Institutions are free to continue their existing practices regarding 2E but are not required to do so, so long as the provisions of 2B are met. It is also possible to include question(s) related to advisement on the student evaluation of instructor and course, although that is not required and individual institutional policies will govern how advising is assessed by the institution provided that the institution complies with the provisions of indicator 2B and institutional effectiveness reporting. The expectation regarding Indicator 2F is similar to that described here for Indicator 2E. Indicator 2F has been considered a part of 2B since the 1999-00 performance year.

**2C, Post Tenure Review for Tenured Faculty (Applies to all but Technical Colleges)**

Institutions are expected to comply with best practices guidance identified for this indicator as detailed on pages 93-96 of the September 2000 Workbook. A "check-off" compliance report with updates regarding any policy revisions will be required for purposes of review each three years. As with 2B, any data verification for this indicator would involve assurance that institutions have policies in place and mechanisms to ensure they are adhered to.

**CYCLE 2 INDICATORS: Review to occur in Summer '05 following Performance Year 2004-05**

**6C, Post-Secondary Non-Academic Achievements of the Student Body (Applies to all, but MUSC)**

Institutions are expected to comply with the indicator measure requirements identified on page 161 of the September 2000 Workbook. A "check-off" compliance report with updates regarding any policy revisions will be required for purposes of review each three years. Any data verification of this information would involve assurance that institutions have policies in place and mechanisms to ensure that they are adhered to.

**6D, Priority on Enrolling In-State Residents (Applies to Research and Teaching)**

Data relevant to this indicator are collected as part of annual CHEMIS reporting requirements. Staff finds that a review of this information for the period covered by the cycle would be possible. The review would involve using the data available at the Commission, calculating performance as defined on pages 153-154 of the September 2000 Workbook and assessing the data in light of overall and institutional trends and comparability to standards set as of Year 5 to ensure continued good performance regarding priority on enrolling SC residents.

**8A, Transferability of Credits to and from the Institution (Applies to all)**

Institutions are expected to comply with the indicator best practices identified on pages 171 and 172 of the September 2000 Workbook. A "check-off" compliance report with updates regarding any policy revisions will be required for purposes of review each three years. Any data verification of this information would involve assurance that institutions have policies in place and mechanisms to ensure that they are adhered to.

**CYCLE 3 INDICATORS: Review to occur in Summer '06 following Performance Year 2005-06**

**3A, Class Size and Student/Teacher Ratios (Applies to all with applicability of subparts varying)**

Data relevant to this indicator are collected as part of annual CHEMIS reporting requirements. Staff finds that a review of this information for the period covered by the cycle would be possible. The review would involve using the data available at the Commission, calculating performance as defined on pages 109-113 of the September 2000 Workbook and assessing the data in light of overall and institutional trends and comparability to standards set as of Year 5 to ensure continued good performance regarding class size and student teacher ratios.

**3B, Number of Credit Hours Taught by Faculty (Applies to all)**

Data relevant to this indicator are collected as part of annual CHEMIS reporting requirements. Staff finds that a review of this information for the period covered by the cycle would be possible. The review would involve using the data available at the Commission, calculating performance as defined on pages 115-116 of the September 2000 Workbook and assessing the data in light of overall and institutional trends and comparability to past historical trends to ensure continued good performance regarding credit hours taught by faculty.

**7F, Credit Hours Earned of Graduates (Applies to 4-yr except MUSC)**

Data relevant to this indicator are collected as part of annual CHEMIS reporting requirements. However, available data could not be used to calculate the indicator as defined on pages 167-168 of the September 2000 Workbook. Staff finds that a review of available CHEMIS information as well as data provided as part of NCES IPEDS completions reporting could be used to study trends and provide an assessment regarding credit hours earned of graduates to ensure continued good performance in this area.

**SUMMARY TABLE**

**NON-SCORED INDICATORS BY TYPE OF MONITORING**

Category I Indicators: Indirect Monitoring	Category II Indicators: Direct Monitoring		
	Cycle I (1 <sup>st</sup> Review, Summer '04)	Cycle 2 (1 <sup>st</sup> Review, Summer '05)	Cycle 3 (1 <sup>st</sup> Review, Summer '06)
1A	2B	6C	3A
2E	2C	6D	3B
2F		8A	7F
3C			
5B			
5C			
5D			
8B			