

# **PERFORMANCE FUNDING PLAN**

**AS RECOMMENDED BY THE  
STEERING COMMITTEE  
TO THE  
COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION**

To be voted on May 1, 1997  
by the Commission on Higher Education

**Determination of Performance Score (Please refer to attached table)**

- Institutions will report current status and propose annual institutional benchmarks
- Commission will develop sector averages/benchmarks and approve institutional benchmarks
- At end of the assessment period, institutions will report actual results
- Commission will evaluate results (range of 0 - 5) considering achievement of institutional benchmarks, comparison to other institutions' performance, and sector average and benchmark
- Indicator evaluations are totaled and divided by the maximum potential score (# of indicators x 5) to yield a performance percentage

### Institution A - Illustration

(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
<b>1. Mission Focus</b>								
C.	Approval of a mission statement	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes		5
<b>2. Quality of faculty</b>								
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$42,695	\$48,166	\$43,500	\$45,000	\$46,765		5
<b>3. Instructional Quality</b>								
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios							
A. 1.	Average class size	35	25	38	30	33	3	2.5
A. 2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	19 : 1	18 : 1	19 : 1	18 : 1	19 : 1	2	
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty							
B. 1.	Hours taught per f-t teaching faculty	10	12	9	12	11	3	3
B. 2.	Hours taught per FTE teaching faculty	11	12	10	12	11	3	
C.	Ratio of f-t faculty as compared to other f-t employees (expressed as a % of total)	40%	45%	36%	38%	38%		4
D.	Accreditation of degree granting programs	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%		5
<b>5. Administrative Efficiency</b>								
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs	23% : 46%	20% : 50%	30% : 45%	25% : 48%	27% : 47%		3
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$3,000	\$2,500	\$2,700	\$2,500	\$2,350		6
<b>6. Entrance Requirements</b>								
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	10%	20%	5%	12%	15%		5
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	85%	80%	70%	75%	73%		3
<b>7. Graduates' Achievements</b>								
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests							
D. 1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	80%	90%	85%	90%	90%	4	4
D. 2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	Not Avail.	Not Avail.	Not Avail.	Not Avail.	Not Avail.		
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates (required : earned)	130 : 140	130 : 135	135 : 145	133 : 140	135 : 142		3
<b>8. User-Friendliness of Institution</b>								
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State							
C. a.	Percentage of Other Race students	20%	30%	15%	20%	20%	4	4.7
C. b.	Total credit hours generated off-campus in counties with no comparable program	Not Avail.	Not Avail.	Not Avail.	Not Avail.	Not Avail.		
C. c.	Number of Distance Education credit hours	2,000	4,000	500	1,000	1,300	5	
C. d.	Tuition is not more than XX% of S. C. personal per capita income	3,197	3,200	3,112	3,190	3,125	5	
<b>9. Research Funding</b>								
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	114%	115%	105%	110%	105%		2
Total Rating								55.2
Maximum Potential Rating								70
Performance Percentage								79%

# Performance Rating Criteria

<u>Score</u>	<u>Description</u>
6	<b>Exemplary Performance.</b> Performance substantially exceeds institutional and sector benchmarks and represents extraordinary effort. (This is a "bonus" rating beyond the five point scale)
5	<b>Exceeds goals:</b> Performance is above institutional benchmarks.
4	<b>Meets Goals:</b> Performance meets institutional benchmarks
3	<b>Satisfactory progress:</b> Performance falls below institutional benchmarks, but represents progress towards goals.
2	<b>Needs improvement:</b> Performance falls below institutional benchmarks
1	<b>Non-compliance:</b> Performance falls substantially below institutional benchmarks
0	<b>Non-compliance following a probationary period</b> during which the institution continues to show no effort to improve. (This rating is below the five point scale)

**Determination of Allocation** (Please refer to attached Resource Allocation Plan package)

- Commission will calculate need based on a Mission Resource Requirements model which will consider mission, program mix, and size of respective institutions
- The Commission will create a pool of funds (up to a maximum of \$5 million) to be allocated for performance improvement projects.
- Actual appropriations are first divided by sector, based on sector share of total determined requirement
- Performance percentage is applied to institution's determined requirement, to yield an allocation amount

# Resource Allocation Plan

## "RAP" for FY 1997-98

**\*\*\* All numbers on this page are fictitious and are provided  
for the purpose of illustrating the process only. \*\*\***

Illustration of Weighting Approach with Performance Indicators Score ranging  
from a 85% to 95%

Line #	Institution	"\$984.8 million	Fictional	25% of Excess			
		Allocation	Scores for	Dollars for	Excess	Final	
		Based on all	illustration	Improvement	Dollars (\$)	Allocation	
		institutions	purposes	in	Above		
		receiving 100%	only	Performance	Indicators		
		Preliminary	Perf.	(Not to	& after		
		Allocation	Indicators	Exceed	Improvement		
		(1)	Score	\$5 million)	(6)	(7)	
			(2)	(3)			
			(Column 1	(4)		(Column 3	
			times 2)			plus 6)	
<b>Research Sector</b>							
1	Clemson Univ.	\$147,275,256	90%	\$132,547,730		\$144,632,673	
2	U.S.C. - Columbia	244,565,968	95%	232,337,670		253,520,889	
3	Medical Univ. of S. C.	<u>124,749,369</u>	85%	<u>106,036,964</u>		<u>115,704,808</u>	
4	Subtotal	516,590,593	90%	470,922,364	2,732,223	513,858,370	
<b>Teaching University Sector</b>							
5	The Citadel	23,139,091	85%	19,668,227		21,463,707	
6	Coastal Carolina Univ.	19,598,983	90%	17,639,085		19,249,328	
7	College of Charleston	53,202,320	95%	50,542,204		55,156,118	
8	Francis Marion Univ.	20,877,847	95%	19,833,955		21,644,564	
9	Lander Univ.	14,352,936	90%	12,917,642		14,096,872	
10	S. C. State Univ.	32,641,087	90%	29,376,978		32,058,753	
11	U.S.C. - Aiken	16,405,136	85%	13,944,366		15,217,324	
12	U.S.C. - Spartanburg	19,598,983	95%	18,619,034		20,318,735	
13	Winthrop Univ.	<u>27,660,564</u>	90%	<u>24,894,508</u>		<u>27,167,086</u>	
14	Subtotal	227,476,947	91%	207,435,998	1,104,462	226,372,487	
<b>Regional Campuses Sector</b>							
15	U.S.C. - Beaufort	2,881,742	90%	2,593,568		2,864,229	
16	U.S.C. - Lancaster	3,184,873	95%	3,025,629		3,341,380	
17	U.S.C. - Salkehatchie	2,464,817	85%	2,095,094		2,313,736	
18	U.S.C. - Sumter	4,634,126	90%	4,170,713		4,605,963	
19	U.S.C. - Union	<u>864,313</u>	85%	<u>734,666</u>		<u>811,335</u>	
20	Subtotal	14,029,871	89%	12,619,671	93,229	13,936,643	
<b>Technical Colleges Sector</b>							
21	SBTCE	238,556,133	90%	214,700,520	1,070,086	237,486,047	
22	Grand Totals	<u>\$996,653,544</u>		<u>\$905,678,553</u>	<u>\$5,000,000</u>	<u>\$991,653,547</u>	

### Notes:

- (1) Institutional needs illustration is based on national data.
- (2) All funds allocated to a particular sector remains within that sector.

# Commission on Higher Education

## Mission Resource Requirement Model

	ALL INSTITUTIONS*
Student Credit Hours & FTE Divisors (Undergraduate: 30, Masters: 24, Doctoral: 18, Law: 28)	5,913,158
Total FTE Students	124,188
Total FTE Faculty	13,350
Average National Faculty Salaries, By Sector	
Instructional Support Percentage, By Sector	
Employers Contribution as a % of Salaries	
<hr/>	
Step 1 Instruction	\$613,145,410
Steps 2 - 7 (Unrestricted E & G Expenditures Per FTE by Sector, using Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System - IPEDS)	
2 Research	46,287,785
3 Public Service	35,605,306
4 Libraries	39,018,637
5 Student Services	78,082,319
6 Administration	237,582,295
7 Physical Plant	<u>95,329,639</u>
Step 8 TOTAL Educ. & General Cost (Lines 1-7)	\$1,145,051,391
Step 9 Revenue Deduction (Student Portion)	<u>(307,064,484)</u>
Step 10 State Support Needs Amount (Line 8 & 9)	<u><u>\$837,986,907</u></u>
Medical Entities (Estimated Formula)	158,666,637
Grand Total	<u><u>\$996,653,544</u></u>

\*Excludes AHEC