

Consideration of Peers for the Research Sector for Purposes of Establishing Standards for the 2000-01 Performance Year (Year 5)

Explanation: At the June 20th meeting, the Planning and Assessment Committee approved recommended standards for performance funding for all sectors, but deferred consideration of the peers to be used by each of the three research institutions for the purposes of determining standards for performance funding. For all sectors, the peers were used in determining the numeric standards for indicators 1A ("expenditure of funds"), 3C ("ratio of faculty to employees"), 5A ("administrative to academic costs"), 5D ("general overhead per FTE student"), 7A1a ("graduation rate"), and 9B ("research expenditures) as applicable to the sectors. Additionally, standards for indicator 2D, ("average salary of faculty by rank), for the research sector are to be based on identified peers.

Following the meeting research institutions submitted proposed peers for consideration. All peers submitted were selected from among those identified in 1998 for use in performance funding and by those identified this past year for purposes of conducting the study by MGT on the needs model (MRR). Staff have reviewed the peers submitted and have calculated standards based on the peers proposed. Relevant data files were shared with institutions and feedback from institutions was requested. Staff met with MUSC to discuss issues related to academic medical centers and interpretation of IPEDS reporting. MUSC is in the process of meeting with its identified peers to review data issues and determine consistency in reporting. Staff recognizes that such meetings may result in identifying additional issues related to the data that may result in the need for reconsideration. However, staff in concurrence with officials at MUSC find that data derived at this date is the best available source and is recommended for use this year. Clemson and USC Columbia were also provided with an opportunity to express concerns or feedback to staff. Staff did not receive any negative comments from these institutions.

The proposed peers for each institution and the resulting standards for those indicators upon which the peers are to be used in identifying the numeric standards are displayed on pages 2 to 4 of this attachment. It is noted that salary data for the peers is being requested and was not available for review in time for this meeting. Staff will, hopefully, have that data available at the October meeting of the Committee. The complete data set upon which the standards displayed in the table on pages 3 and 4 are based and as provided to the research institutions for their review is available upon request.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Planning and Assessment Committee adopt the peers proposed by the Research Institutions. Additionally, relevant data derived from the IPEDS reporting and from Oklahoma/CUPA reporting for salary be used for these peers in conjunction with the scales approved by CHE on July 6, 2000, for setting the numeric standards for indicators 1A, 2D, 3C, 5A, 5D, 7A1a, and 9B, as applicable. The indicated standards from this data are displayed on the following pages.

South Carolina Commission on Higher Education
1333 Main Street, Suite 200
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Agenda
Planning and Assessment Committee
September 7, 2000
8:30 a.m.
Clemson University—Madren Center

1. Election of the Chair (No Attachment)
2. Consideration of the Minutes of the June 20, 2000, Meeting (Attachment 2)
3. Consideration of Peer's for Research Sector (Attachment 3)
4. Consideration of Expenditure Categories for Indicator 1A (Attachment 4)
5. Consideration of Implementation of Indicator 1D and 1E (Attachment 5)
6. Consideration of Performance Funding Calendar for 2000-2001 (Attachment 6)
7. Consideration of Recommendation for Performance Improvement Funding (Attachment 7)
8. Consideration of Data Verification Reports (Attachment 8)

Teaching University

Coastal Carolina University
South Carolina State University

Technical College

Central Carolina Technical College
Horry-Georgetown Technical College
Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College
Spartanburg Technical College
Trident Technical College
York Technical College

Research Institutions

Peers identified for use in developing standards for performance funding;

217882 CLEMSON UNIVERSITY proposes the following peers	
100858	AUBURN UNIVERSITY MAIN CAMPUS
139755	GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY-MAIN CAMPUS
153603	IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
171100	MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
176080	MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY
181464	UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT LINCOLN
199193	NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY AT RALEIGH
228723	TEXAS A & M UNIVERSITY
233921	VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIV
243780	PURDUE UNIVERSITY-MAIN CAMPUS

(Count = 10)

218663 USC COLUMBIA proposes the following peers:	
145600	UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO
153658	UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
157085	UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
178396	UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA
187985	UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO-MAIN CAMPUS
196088	SUNY AT BUFFALO
199120	UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL
201885	UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI-MAIN CAMPUS
215293	UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH-MAIN CAMPUS
234076	UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA-MAIN CAMPUS

(Count = 10)

218335 MUSC proposes the following peers:	
126571	UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER
140401	MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA
159373	LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY-MEDICAL CENTER
176026	UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI MEDICAL CENTER
181394	UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA
207342	UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER
209490	OREGON HEALTH SCIENCES UNIVERSITY
221704	UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE-MEMPHIS

(Count = 8)

Based on the peers indicated on the preceding page the following performance standards are recommended. All other standards for indicators are as approved by the CHE on July 6, 2000.

Indicator	Scale Adopted by CHE on July 6, 2000	Standard Range Recommended to Achieve (score 2) based on Peers (1)		
		Clemson	USC Cola	MUSC
1A Expenditure of Funds, Categories of :				
BASE: Instruction, Academic Support & Research	3 = At or above the 75 th percentile of peers 2 =40 th percentile up to 75 th percentile of peers 1 =Below 40 th percentile of peers	63.0% to 66.0%	65.0% to 68.0%	66.0% to 78.0%
BASE + Public Service		77.0% to 78.0%	75.0% to 78.0%	82.0% to 85.0%
BASE + Student Service		66.0% to 68.0%	68.0% to 72.0%	67.0% to 78.0%
BASE + Scholarships and Fellowships		70.0% to 71.0%	72.0% to 75.0%	71.0% to 79.0%
2D Average Salary of Faculty by Rank	For all ranks: 3 =At or above 95% of the peer average salary 2 = 80.0% to 94.9% of peer average salary 1 = Below 80% of peer average salary	Data unavailable at this time		
3C Ratio of Faculty to Employees	3 = At or above the 75 th percentile of peers 2 =40 th percentile up to 75 th percentile of peers 1 =Below 40 th percentile of peers	24.0% to 25.0%	23.0% to 32.0%	19.0% to 31.0%
5A, Administrative to academic costs	3 = At or below the 25 th percentile of peers 2 =60 th percentile down to 25 th percentile of peers 1 =Above 60 th percentile of peers	11.0% to 9.0%	9.0% to 7.0%	14.0% to 11.0%

Indicator	Scale Adopted by CHE on July 6, 2000	Standard Range Recommended to Achieve (score 2) based on Peers (1)		
		Clemson	USC Cola	MUSC
5D, General overhead per FTE student	3 = At or below the 25 th percentile of peers 2 =60 th percentile down to 25 th percentile of peers 1 =Above 60 th percentile of peers	\$1,551 to \$1,253	\$1,848 to \$1,188	\$13,461 to \$5,295
7A1a, Graduation rate	3 = At or above the 75 th percentile of peers 2 =40 th percentile up to 75 th percentile of peers 1 =Below 40 th percentile of peers	64.0% to 67.0%	53.0% to 61.0%	Not Applicable
9B, Research Expenditures	3 = At or above the 75 th percentile of peers 2 =40 th percentile up to 75 th percentile of peers 1 =Below 40 th percentile of peers	104.0% to 110.0%	110.0% to 114.0%	114.0% to 128.0%

(1) Indicators 1A, 2D, 3C, 7A1a, and 9B have upward expected trends – performance above the high end of the range will result in a score of 3 and performance below the low end will result in a score of 2. Indicators 5A and 5D have downward expected trends – performance below the low end of the range will result in a score of 3 and performance above the high end will result in a score of 2.