

CONSIDERATION OF REVISED STANDARDS FOR MUSC FOR INDICATORS 1A, 3C, 5A, 5D, AND 9B FOR PERFORMANCE FUNDING YEAR 2000-01 (YEAR 5)

Explanation: On September 7, the Planning and Assessment Committee recommended and the Commission approved for Research Sector institutions peers for use in performance funding and standards calculated based on those peers according to methodology approved in July. Since that meeting, it was determined that one of MUSC's peers had been incorrectly identified in material approved by the Commission and resulted in one of MUSC's peers being inadvertently omitted in calculating standards in lieu of data from another institution. Staff have recalculated MUSC's standards to correct the identified error and have reviewed the information with MUSC institutional representatives. The corrected peer list and resulting standards are displayed below and on the following page.

Committee Recommendation: The Committee recommends that the Commission approve the revised peer listing and calculation of standards for MUSC for indicators 1A, 3C, 5A, 5D, and 9B as displayed below to correct the error in information approved previously by the Commission.

REVISED STANDARDS BASED ON CORRECTION NOTED IN MUSC'S PEER LIST
 (~~INDICATES MATTER STRICKEN~~; INDICATES MATTER CORRECTED)

MUSC Corrected Peer List * :

218335	MUSC 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
181428	UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA MEDICAL CENTER - OMAHA
207342	UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER
209490	OREGON HEALTH SCIENCES UNIVERSITY
221704	UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE-MEMPHIS

(Count = 8)

*Revise p A.1 of September 2000 Workbook to reflect the correction above

MUSC Corrected Standards:

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>Scale Adopted by CHE on July 6, 2000</u>	<u>MUSC</u>	
		<u>Standard Range Recommended to Achieve (score 2) based on Peers (1)</u>	<u>Workbook page to be revised accordingly</u>
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	66.0% to 78.0% 71.0% - 79.0%	Page 66
BASE + Public Service		82.0% to 85.0% 82.0% - 85.0%	Page 66
BASE + Student Service		67.0% to 78.0% 72.0% - 80.0%	Page 66
BASE + Scholarships and Fellowships		71.0% to 79.0% 72.0% - 81.0%	Page 66
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	19.0% to 31.0% 16.0% - 28.0%	Page 118
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	14.0% to 11.0% 12.0% - 11.0%	Page 134
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	\$13,461 to \$5,295 \$13,462 - \$6,190	Page 144
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	114.0% to 128.0% 114.0% - 122.0%	Page 184

(1) Indicators 1A, 3C, 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.