

GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT FUNDING YEAR THREE, 1999-2000

The Commission on Higher Education awards Performance Improvement Funding to institutions or groups of institutions annually, funding permitting, for the purposes of providing additional support for improving performance on performance funding indicators. Funds are awarded in response to proposals submitted by institutions. Proposals may be funded in whole or in part. Funding awarded in July 1999 will be for the period July 1999 through August 2000.

General Guidelines

1. Institutions that score in the "Achieve," "Does Not Achieve," or "Substantially Does Not Achieve" categories are eligible to apply.
2. Proposals must address one or more specific indicators on which the institution's performance was rated "Does Not Achieve." (Exceptions may be considered if the institution produces a compelling rationale concerning need on an indicator on which it was rated "Achieve.")
3. Since performance improvement funding is awarded for one year, the activity must either be completed within the allocated time frame or the institution must commit to continue the activity through its own funds.
4. Proposals may be from one institution or from two or more institutions in a joint project. (The fiscal agent for joint projects must be identified in the proposal.)
5. Proposals must include a budget page and a detailed description of how the success of the activity will be measured.

Preferences

1. Preference may be given to institutions with lower overall numeric score within their sector.
2. Preference will be given to proposals that address one or more indicators on which the institution has received a score of "1."
3. Preference will be given to proposals which have not previously been funded through performance improvement funding, although exceptions may be considered if a specific justification for continued funding is provided and an evaluation of the success of the previously funded activities accompanies the proposal.

4. Preference will be given to proposals that indicate the institution's commitment through matching funds and other resources, to contribute to the proposed activities and to sustain them beyond the life of the performance improvement funding.
5. Performance Improvement Funding will not be awarded for faculty salaries, overhead costs, or activities which the institution has been funded from other sources.

Procedures

1. Proposals are limited to one per institution.
2. Proposals should be submitted with a cover page, a 50 word summary, a narrative of no more than 1,000 words, and a budget page which indicates expenditures from performance improvement funding and from matching funding from the institution.
3. Proposals should specifically indicate the action the institution plans to take with the support of performance improvement funding and the intended measurable outcomes of those actions.
4. Proposals should indicate how the success of the proposed activities will be evaluated. (Evaluation reports will be submitted to the Commission on Higher Education at the end of the funded activities.)

Deadlines

1. Proposals should be received by the Commission on Higher Education, no later than the end of the day on May 19, 1999. The following address and fax number should be used in submitting proposals:

**Performance Improvement Funding
S. C. Commission on Higher Education
1333 Main Street, Suite 200
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
FAX: (803) 737-2297**

2. The Planning and Assessment Committee will consider proposals on June 22, 1999; the Commission on July 8, 1999 will consider the Committee's recommendations.
3. Following action by the Commission, funds will be available to those institutions whose proposals have been approved in response to requests from those institutions. Requests for transfer of funds should be addressed as indicated in Item 1 above.

PERFORMANCE FUNDING CALENDAR 1999-2000	
1999	Events/Tasks
JULY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CHE Meeting July 8: Consideration of benchmarks and performance improvement funding
AUGUST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional Effectiveness Reports due August 1 • Schedule developed for discussions of measures for possible revision for Year 5
SEPTEMBER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CHE Meeting September 2 • Focus groups on possible modifications to measures for Year 5
OCTOBER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CHE Meeting October 7, 10:00 a.m. at Lander University • Institution's final reports for 1998-99 on Indicator 1E- Attainment of Goals of the Strategic Plan, due October 1. • Focus groups continue on possible modifications for Year 5
NOVEMBER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CHE Meeting November 4 • Planning and Assessment Committee Meeting November 16: Consideration of Reports of Act 255 of 1992, Act 359 of 1996, and Act 629 of 1988;; consideration of staff recommendations for Indicator 1E- Attainment of Goals of the Strategic Plan; and consideration of revisions in measures for year 5
DECEMBER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CHE Meeting December 2: Consideration of Reports on Act 255 of 1992, Act 359 of 1996, and Act 629 of 1988; consideration of recommendations on Indicator 1E; consideration of revisions in measures for year 5

2000	Events/Tasks
JANUARY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CHE Meeting January 6
FEBRUARY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CHE Meeting February 3 • Planning and Assessment Committee Meeting February 22: Consideration of additional modifications to measure's; rating process year 4; and guidelines for performance improvement funding
MARCH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CHE Meeting March: Consideration of Planning and Assessment Committee Recommendations
APRIL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CHE Meeting April 6 • Planning and Assessment Committee Meeting April 25: Consideration of Ratings for Year 4
MAY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CHE Meeting May 4: Consideration of Planning and Assessment Committee Recommendations on Ratings for Year 4
JUNE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CHE Meeting June 1 • Planning and Assessment Committee Meeting June 20: Consideration of Benchmarks for Year 5 and Performance Improvement Funding for 2000-2001 Fiscal Year
JULY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CHE Meeting July 13: Consideration of Planning and Assessment Committee Recommendations on Benchmarks and Performance Improvement Funding

Schedule for Indicators

Staff Recommendation:

The following measures are recommended to be evaluated either every two years or every three years, as indicated below and on "Attachment 3: Summary of Recommended Revisions to Indicators," distributed with the mail-out for the last meeting of the Planning and Assessment Committee.

Indicator	Title (abbrev.)	Frequency	Beginning Performance Year
2B	Faculty Performance Review System	3	1999-2000
2C	Post-Tenure Review	3	1998-99
2E1	Percent of Faculty Available	2	1998-99
2E2	Percent Satisfied with Advisor Availability	2	1998-99
4A	Sharing and Use of Technology...	3	2000-2001
4B	Cooperation and Collaboration ...	3	2000-2001
5B	Use of Best Management Practices	2	1998-99
5C	Elimination of Unjustified Duplication...	3	2001-2002
7B	Employment Rate for Graduates	2	1999-2000
7C	Employer Feedback on Graduates	2	1999-2000

Discussion:

Certain indicators lend themselves to measurement at intervals other than annually. For example, the existence at the institution of a performance review system and a post-tenure review system can be evaluated periodically to determine the extent of compliance without measuring this each year. As the chart above indicates, the staff recommends that these two indicators be evaluated every three years. Likewise, the "demonstration" indicators (4A, 4B, and 5C), which relate to cooperation and collaboration, could more effectively be evaluated on a three-year cycle so that some of these indicators would be evaluated each year. Other indicators, such as 2E, Availability of Faculty; 7B, Employment Rate for Graduates; and 7C, Employer Feedback on Graduates - all of which involve surveys - would be more appropriate on a two-year cycle. This would provide sufficient frequency to reflect significant changes in performance while reducing the costs of annual surveys. Overall, the recommended schedule maintains a relatively even number of indicators measured in any given year as can be seen in the chart below.

Frequency of Measure Across Years

Indicator	Frequency	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
2B	3	X	X			X
2C	3	X			X	
2E1	2	X		X		X
4A	3	X		X		
4B	3	X		X		
5B	2	X		X		X
5C	3	X			X	
7B	2	X	X		X	
7C	2	X	X		X	



*Correction To
3.15.99*

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

1333 MAIN STREET

SUITE 200

COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201

March 31, 1999

RAYBURN BARTON
Executive Director

TELEPHONE
803/737-2260

FAX NUMBER
803/737-2297

MEMORANDUM

To: Members, Planning and Assessment Committee
From: ^{MS} Michael Smith, Director
Planning and Assessment and Performance Funding

Schedule of Measures

At the last meeting of the Planning and Assessment Committee, institutional representatives raised some questions concerning the schedule of indicators that the staff had recommended. It was agreed that the staff would reexamine its recommendation in the light of the discussion. The staff has done so and presents the same recommendation to the committee for consideration at its April 1, 1999, meeting with the exception of two changes. These changes are:

- 1) Have indicators 2B (Performance Review System for Faculty) and 2C (Post Tenure Review) coincide in the same evaluation year since they are closely linked;
- 2) Change the evaluation years for indicator 5C to maintain the distribution of indicators across years.

The full schedule, with this revision, is attached.

Additional discussion:

Consideration was given to measuring 2E2, Availability of Advisors, every three years, separating it from the measure for 2E1, Percent Faculty Rated Satisfied on Availability. However, the evaluation of 2E2 needs to coincide with 2E1 since they are subparts of the same indicator.

Consideration was given to changing the year for indicators 7B and 7C. However, the schedule as presented corresponds with the Employment Security Commission data and also the existing schedule for alumni surveys.

Attachment

cc: Members, Commission on Higher Education
Mrs. Inez Tenenbaum
Presidents, Public Colleges and Universities
Institutional Representatives

Schedule of Measures

Staff Recommendation:

The following measures are recommended to be evaluated either every two years or every three years, as indicated below and on "Attachment 3: Summary of Recommended Revisions to Indicators," distributed with the mail-out for the last meeting of the Planning and Assessment Committee.

Indicator	Title (abbrev.)	Frequency	Beginning Performance Year
2B	Faculty Performance Review System	3	1998-99
2C	Post-Tenure Review	3	1998-99
2E1	Percent Faculty Rated Satisfied on Availability	2	1998-99
2E2	Percent Students Satisfied with Advisor Availability	2	1998-99
4A	Sharing and Use of Technology...	3	2000-2001
4B	Cooperation and Collaboration ...	3	2000-2001
5B	Use of Best Management Practices	2	1998-99
5C	Elimination of Unjustified Duplication...	3	1999-2000
7B	Employment Rate for Graduates	2	1999-2000
7C	Employer Feedback on Graduates	2	1999-2000

Discussion:

Certain indicators lend themselves to measurement at intervals other than annually. For example, the existence at the institution of a performance review system and a post-tenure review system can be evaluated periodically to determine the extent of compliance without measuring this each year. As the chart above indicates, the staff recommends that these two indicators be evaluated every three years. Likewise, the "demonstration" indicators (4A, 4B, and 5C), which relate to cooperation and collaboration, could more effectively be evaluated on a three-year cycle so that some of these indicators would be evaluated each year. Other indicators, such as 2E, Availability of Faculty; 7B, Employment Rate for Graduates; and 7C, Employer Feedback on Graduates – all of which involve surveys – would be more appropriate on a two-year cycle. This would provide sufficient frequency to reflect significant changes in performance while reducing the costs of annual surveys. Overall, the recommended schedule maintains a relatively even number of indicators measured in any given year as can be seen in the chart below.

Frequency of Measure Across Years

Indicator	Frequency	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
2B	3	X			X	
2C	3	X			X	
2E1	2	X		X		X
2E2	2	X		X		X
4A	3	X		X		
4B	3	X		X		
5B	2	X		X		X
5C	3	X	X			X
7B	2	X	X		X	
7C	2	X	X		X	