

Consideration of staff recommendations to address unresolved measurement issues and select standards for implementation in the upcoming performance year, Performance Year 2001-02 to impact FY 2003-03 (Year 6)

Explanation: On April 5, 2001, the Commission adopted the Committee's recommendations for implementing the revisions of indicators measured and scored for annual performance assessment for the upcoming performance year as necessitated by the Commission's approval on February 1 of a reduced set of indicators for scoring purposes. In adopting the proposal for implementation, the Commission recognized that for some indicators additional recommendations would need to be considered by the Committee and Commission in July in order to fully implement the revisions in Year 6. On the following pages, staff outlines its recommendations resolving remaining issues as we enter into the new fiscal year.

Staff's recommendations to resolve issues are presented by indicator and include:

- ☐ Indicator 1D/E: Selection by institutions of 1 of their 2 approved goals for continuation in Year 6 in order to implement revisions to Indicators 1D and 1E. (Presented within these recommendations as information.)
- ☐ Indicator 2A: Proposed clarification to the measure related to the treatment of faculty with first professional degrees and recommended standards to be applied beginning in Year 6. The recommendations apply to the measure as defined for research and teaching institutions and regional campuses.
- ☐ Indicator 2D: Recommended performance standards to be applied in Year 6.
- ☐ Indicator 6A/B: Recommended performance standards to be applied in Year 6 for Clemson, USC Columbia, teaching institutions, and regional campuses; and for MUSC, the proposed comparable indicator and treatment of the proposed indicator in Year 6.
- ☐ Indicator 7A: Recommended treatment of this indicator for regional campuses and technical colleges in Year 6; and for MUSC, the proposed comparable indicator and treatment of the proposed indicator in Year 6.
- ☐ Indicator 7B: Recommended treatment of this indicator in Year 6 as applicable to Technical Colleges.
- ☐ Indicator 7C: Recommended treatment of this indicator in Year 6 as applicable to Technical Colleges.
- ☐ Indicator 7E: Recommended treatment of this indicator in Year 6 as applicable to Regional Campuses.
- ☐ Indicator 9A: Recommended treatment of this indicator in Year 6 as applicable to MUSC.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Committee consider and approve the recommendations as provided on the following pages for implementation in the 2001-02 Performance Year. The recommendations address unresolved measurement issues for indicators to be assessed in the upcoming performance year.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO ADDRESS UNRESOLVED MEASUREMENT ISSUES
FOR THE 2001-02 PERFORMANCE YEAR FOR CONSIDERATION JULY 12, 2001

EXPLANATION

The recommendations presented below are offered to resolve measurement issues left unresolved to date for the upcoming performance year, 2001-02 to impact FY 2002-03 allocations. The issues addressed are those the Commission recognized in accepting recommendations in February and April for revisions to the system for implementation in the 2001-02 Performance Year that needed additional consideration prior to adopting recommendations.

Staff would like to express its thanks to institutional representatives who worked with staff in shaping these recommendations. To develop the final recommendations, staff provided institutions with initial draft recommendations via electronic distribution on June 14. Institutional representatives provided feedback on the draft, and staff considered the feedback and made changes to the draft recommendations. A revised draft was distributed to representatives on June 21 with the request that additional feedback be provided to staff. Based on the type feedback received, staff and institutional representatives did not find a need to hold sector meetings in order to resolve issues related to the recommendations. Below staff presents its recommendations culminating from the work with institutional representatives. Upon adoption by the Committee, the information below or as amended by Committee/Commission action will be incorporated into revised workbook pages for the affected indicators.

ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION - STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Indicator 1D/E, Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement and attainment of goals of the strategic plan

Issue: For this indicator for Year 6, institutions are to select one of the two already approved goals for continuation and scoring in Year 6.

Staff Recommendation: Institutions have provided staff with their selection. Selected goals are presented here as information to the Committee. See Attachment 2a, electronic file PA071201.Att2a.1DEgoals, for additional explanation and a listing of the goals selected by institutions.

Indicator 2A, Academic and other credentials of professors and instructors for Research, Teaching and Regional Campuses Sectors

Issue A: For this indicator, it was requested that staff review and provide clarification regarding the treatment of terminal degrees for full-time faculty holding first professional degrees.

Staff Recommendation to address Issue A: To address issues and concerns raised regarding the treatment of faculty with first professional degrees, staff recommends for purposes of this indicator that first professional degrees may be counted as terminal degrees only under the circumstances outlined below. *(For the revised definition for this indicator, please see materials considered by the Committee at its February meeting and by the Commission at its April meeting. For additional information regarding the treatment of terminal degrees for purposes of deriving performance, see pages 84-88 of the September 2000 workbook.)*

- Full-time faculty who hold a law degree (Juris Doctorate or equivalent): Staff proposes that, for purposes of this indicator, institutions may count as holding a terminal degree faculty who hold a law degree (Juris Doctorate or equivalent) and whose primary teaching area is law (i.e., law school faculty) AND faculty whose primary area is business who hold a Juris Doctorate or equivalent degree and whose primary responsibility within the business program is teaching law courses such as business law or legal environment of business.
- Faculty who hold a first professional degree of MD, DMD or PharmD or the equivalent level degree for each of these designated first professional degrees: Staff proposes that, for purposes of this indicator, institutions may count as holding a terminal degree faculty who hold a first professional degree of MD, DMD or PharmD or the equivalent level degree for each of these designated first professional degrees and whose primary area is in teaching in colleges of medicine, dentistry, or pharmacy. For other faculty, current definitions for the indicator for determining terminal degree would apply. (See page 85 of the Year 5 Workbook).

Issue B: Standard for use beginning in Year 6: As of the April meeting of the Commission, the Committee recommended using the standard for indicator 2A2b as defined in Year 5 for purposes of the revised indicator unless additional review of data and refinement of definitions determined otherwise.

Staff Recommendation to Address Issue B: After further study, staff recommends revised standards be adopted to provide increased flexibility for acceptable performance given the expansion of measurement to full-time faculty and staff's review of related concerns. The standards as follows are recommended:

Research Sector: Increasing the range for "Achieves" from 80%-84% to 75%-84%
Teaching Sector: Increasing the range for "Achieves" from 80%-84% to 70%-84%
Regional Campuses: Increasing the range for "Achieves" from 70%-74% to 60%-74%

Additionally, to address related concerns here regarding institutions with nursing faculty, staff also recommends imposing, for this indicator only, a five-year moratorium on including nursing faculty (individuals whose primary teaching area is nursing) in the numerator or denominator. *Explanation: Staff's recommendation that these individuals be excluded for five years is to take into account the limited supply of PhD nursing faculty at this time given the relative "newness" of the PhD degree as the terminal degree for nursing faculty. Staff plans to re-visit the issue during the timeframe, possibly requesting data (if not available on the CHEMIS system) annually from institutions with nursing programs as to the numbers of nursing faculty and their credentials. If needed data is not available from CHEMIS, staff plans to request in the near future such data from institutions to establish a baseline regarding full-time nursing faculty and credentials in order to monitor this issue. Staff finds too that the revised standard proposed above should allow more flexibility in providing for differences in mix of programs that may affect the percentages of full-time faculty holding terminal degrees.*

Indicator 2D, Compensation of Faculty

Issue: For this indicator, standards are revised annually based on updated average salary information, if available, and inflation to current year based on approved legislated pay increases for unclassified employees.

Staff Recommendation: Staff has updated current standards based on revised average salary data and the adopted legislated pay increase for FY 2001-02. For additional details

and a listing of the resulting recommended standards, see Attachment 2b, electronic file PA071201.Att2b.2DstandardsYr6. Staff recommends that the standards as recommended in Attachment 2b be adopted for use in assessing Year 6 performance.

Indicator 6A/B, SAT and ACT Scores of the student body and high school standing, grade point averages and activities of the student body.

Issue A: Standards for this revised indicator as applied to Clemson, the University of SC Columbia and the Teaching and Regional Campus sectors have not yet been set for the upcoming performance year. Staff has now reviewed 4 years of data for the revised indicator. This data for Fall 1997 through Fall 2000 was posted on the website for institutional review.

Staff Recommendation for Issue A: Based on a review of the institutional data and past standards and data for indicators 6A and 6B, staff proposes that the standards for this indicator as defined for Clemson, USC Columbia, Teaching Sector Institutions and Regional Campuses be set as follows:

<u>Sector</u>	<u>For a score of "3"</u>	<u>For a score of "2"</u>	<u>For a score of "1"</u>
Research Clemson & USC C	>= 90.0%	75.0% to 89.9%	< 75.0%
Teaching Institutions	>= 80.0%	50.0% to 79.9%	< 50.0%
Regional Campuses	>= 50.0%	20.0% to 49.9%	< 20.0%
<u>Improvement Factor:</u> Staff recommends an improvement factor of 5% of the past three-year average for this indicator. This is the same factor as was applied to 6A and 6B in Year 5.			

Staff notes that based on consideration of the concerns indicated by institutions and study of available data, staff found that the recommended broader range for "achieving" is appropriate in order to address the range of institutional differences in student populations across the campuses and to better reflect the dual role of the institutions in the USC system.

Issue B: For this indicator a comparable measure is to be applied to MUSC. At issue is the treatment of this new measure in the scoring process. Staff is currently working with MUSC to finalize a measure along the lines of that outlined in materials considered by the Commission in April.

Staff Recommendation Issue B: Staff is at present working with MUSC to finalize the measure and determine appropriate standards for use in scoring. Staff finds that work to finalize details and propose standards will be completed shortly. Staff will bring to the Committee the measure and standards developed at the September meeting for consideration for approval. Staff recommends based on progress to date that indicator 6A/B for MUSC be applied as a scored indicator in Year 6.

Indicator 7A, Graduation Rate

Issue: For indicator 7A, revisions to the current indicator for the Regional Campuses and Technical Colleges and the adoption of a comparable measure for MUSC were approved. At issue is the treatment of scoring this indicator for these institutions in Year 6 in light of the revisions.

Staff Recommendation:

For Regional Campuses and Technical Colleges: Staff finds that the revised measure cannot be fully implemented until Year 7 due to needed resolution of measurement issues and collection of baseline data for use in determining standards. As a result, staff recommends that for Regional Campuses and Technical Colleges Indicator 7A including the measure and standards as applied in Year 5 be continued for scoring purposes in Year 6 with implementation of the revised measure as a scored indicator in Year 7. (See the September 2000 Workbook, pages 155 to 157 for the measure and standards as applied in Year 5.)

For MUSC: Staff is at present working with MUSC to finalize the measure and determine appropriate standards for use in scoring. Staff finds that work to finalize details and propose standards will be completed shortly. Staff will bring to the Committee the measure and standards developed at the September meeting for consideration for approval. Staff recommends based on progress to date that indicator 7A for MUSC be applied as a scored indicator in Year 6.

Indicator 7B, Employment rate for graduates

Issue: Indicator 7B is being developed as scored indicators applicable to the technical college sector only. At issue is the treatment of this indicator for scoring purposes in Year 6.

Staff Recommendation: Staff proposes that indicator 7B be treated as a "Compliance" indicator in Year 6 with this indicator becoming scored in years thereafter. At present, staff and technical colleges are working to finalize this measure, collect baseline data and develop standards for use in Year 7 and afterwards.

Indicator 7C, Employer feedback on graduates who were or were not employed

Issue: Indicator 7C is being developed as scored indicators applicable to the technical college sector only. At issue is the treatment of this indicator for scoring purposes in Year 6.

Staff Recommendation: Staff proposes that indicator 7C be treated as a "Compliance" indicator in Year 6 with this indicator becoming scored in years thereafter. At present, staff and technical colleges are working to finalize this measure, collect baseline data and develop standards for use in Year 7 and afterwards.

Indicator 7E, Number of graduates who continued their education

Issue: Indicator 7E is being developed as a scored indicator applicable to the regional campuses. At issue is the treatment of this indicator for scoring purposes in Year 6.

Staff Recommendation: Staff proposes that indicator 7E for the Regional Campuses be treated as a "Compliance" indicator in Year 6 with this indicator becoming a scored indicator in years thereafter. At present, staff and the Regional Campuses are working to finalize this measure, collect baseline data and develop standards for use in Year 7 and afterwards.

Indicator 9A as applied to MUSC, Financial support for reform: "Improving Child and Adolescent Health (Pre-K through Grade 12 aged children)"

Issue: For this indicator a comparable measure to 9A as defined for Clemson, USC Columbia and Teaching Sector institutions is to be applied to MUSC. Staff is currently

working with MUSC to finalize a measure along the lines of that outlined in materials considered by the Commission in April. At issue is the treatment of this indicator in the upcoming year for MUSC.

Staff Recommendation: Staff is at present working with MUSC to finalize the measure and determine appropriate standards for use in scoring. Given the work currently underway, staff finds that additional work to collect baseline data and refine the measure will be needed in Year 6 before the measure and standard can be recommended for scoring purposes. As a result, staff recommends at this time that indicator 9A for MUSC be treated as a "Compliance" indicator in Year 6 while baseline data is collected with the expectation that it will become a scored in Year 7 and afterwards.

Scoring Scale:

Staff would like to note here for the Committee that as part of its review, staff reviewed and requested feedback regarding the scale used to assess overall performance. Staff considered and reviewed the overall scoring scale relative to the number of scored indicators and treatment of compliance indicators based on revisions adopted for implementation Year 6. Based on this review, staff suggested to institutional representatives changes to the overall scoring scale for the upcoming year were not warranted at this time. No additional feedback was received. Based on its analysis, staff makes no recommendation to change the scoring scale for the upcoming year. No action is required by the Committee or the Commission.

FOR A SUMMARY TABLE RE-CAPPING THE ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS, SEE NEXT PAGE

RECAP: Summary of Recommendations Proposed	
Issue Addressed	Recommendation
1D/E selection of 1 goal by each institution for continuation	Goals selected presented for information. See Attachment 2a
2A, as defined for Research, Teaching and Regional Campuses sectors, clarification of treatment of first professional degrees	Recommendations for counting as terminal degrees first professional degrees of JD, MD, DMD and PharmD (and equivalent for each) with an exception to include JD in business law are outlined.
2A, as defined for Research, Teaching and Regional Campuses sectors, recommended standards and exception regarding inclusion of nursing faculty.	Staff recommends revised standards for "Achieves" for each sector (Res =75% to 84%; Teach = 70%-84%; and Reg Camp = 60% to 74%) and proposes a moratorium on including nursing faculty from the numerator and denominator for this indicator for 5 years.
2D standards for Year 6	Recommended standards for use in Year 6 are detailed in Attachment 2b for each sector.
6A/B, as defined for Clemson, USC Columbia, Teaching Institutions, and Regional Campuses, standards for Year 6.	Staff recommends revised standards for "Achieves" for this indicator as revised for Year 6. (Res =75.0% to 89.9%; Teach = 50.0%-79.9%; and Reg Camp = 20.0% to 49.9%)
6A/B, as defined for MUSC, treatment in Year 6	Staff recommends that the indicator be scored in Year 6 with the final measure definitions and recommended standards being approved by the Committee at its September meeting.
7A, as defined for Regional Campuses and Technical Colleges, treatment in Year 6	Staff recommends that 7A as defined in Year 5 be continued and scored in Year 6 with the revised measure being implemented as a scored indicator in Year 7.
7A, as defined for MUSC, treatment in Year 6	Staff recommends that the indicator be scored in Year 6 with the final measure definitions and recommended standards being approved by the Committee at its September meeting.
7B, as defined for Technical Colleges, treatment in Year 6	Staff recommends that 7B be treated as a compliance indicator in Year 6 as work to define the indicator and collect baseline data is conducted with the resulting measure being implemented as a scored indicator in Year 7.
7C, as defined for Technical Colleges, treatment in Year 6	Staff recommends that 7C be treated as a compliance indicator in Year 6 as work to define the indicator and collect baseline data is conducted with the resulting measure being implemented as a scored indicator in Year 7.
7E, as defined for Regional Campuses, treatment in Year 6	Staff recommends that 7B be treated as a compliance indicator in Year 6 as work to define the indicator and collect baseline data is conducted with the resulting measure being implemented as a scored indicator in Year 7.
9A, as defined for MUSC, treatment in Year 6	Staff recommends that 7B be treated as a compliance indicator in Year 6 as work to define the indicator and collect baseline data is conducted with the resulting measure being implemented as a scored indicator in Year 7.
Overall Performance Scale	No changes are recommended for Year 6.