

**Agenda Item 2, Consideration of Staff Recommendations Regarding Performance Indicator Standards for Years after Year 7, 2002-03**

Memorandum

To: CAPA Representatives  
From: Dr. Lovely Ulmer-Sottong  
Director, Division of Planning, Assessment and Performance Funding  
Date: January 30, 2003  
Re: Performance Funding Standards

The majority of the current performance funding standards were identified for use in Performance Years 5 (2000-01), 6 (2001-02) and 7 (2002-03). During the current year, standards are to be reviewed and a recommendation made to the Commission regarding any change in standards for the upcoming three-year period. As you are aware, we have set a schedule such that a recommendation regarding the standards will come before the Planning and Assessment Committee at the March 6<sup>th</sup> meeting. Prior to a recommendation going before the Committee, the staff will receive advisory information from CAPA and work with representatives to resolve any issues. We hope to do so by the March meeting if possible.

In summary, staff has made limited recommendations for change. All but one of the standards (see summary chart on page 32) are recommended to continue at the current levels. A few indicators (2D and the indicators that have been reliant on financial reporting, 5A and 9B) will require consideration to be postponed until late spring or early summer. We look forward to discussing the data and standards with you on Thursday. Please note that USC Beaufort is not included in the recommendations here as it will follow the plan approved by the Commission in November. We encourage you to share any concerns, alternative recommendations or suggestions for additional data sources that you might have in advance of the meeting. You may address your suggestions to me ([lulmersottong@che400.state.sc.us](mailto:lulmersottong@che400.state.sc.us)), my staff, Julie Wahl ([jwahl@che400.state.sc.us](mailto:jwahl@che400.state.sc.us)) or Mike Raley ([mraley@che400.state.sc.us](mailto:mraley@che400.state.sc.us)), or post them to the CAPA list-serve.

The materials for the discussion of standards with CAPA follow. The information in this memo provides a summary of the status each scored indicator and staff's recommendation regarding the standards or other issues that may need to be addressed. The last page is a one page summary chart of staff's recommendations. Relevant data are either presented here along with the indicator or provided as referenced.

Staff has compiled performance funding data by indicator into a single reference source. The performance funding data will be posted in an excel file containing worksheets for each indicator. These data will include performance results, the current standards, "numerator and denominator" information as available, and staff calculations related to trend and are being posted in Excel format for easy access. A link to the information will be emailed to CAPA representatives and performance funding contacts when the information is posted (by Friday afternoon barring any internet problems.) Additionally, representatives will be provided with a link to a file containing peer information. Those desiring additional information on peer data or the performance funding information that is posted should contact Julie Wahl ([jwahl@che400.state.sc.us](mailto:jwahl@che400.state.sc.us) or (803) 737-2292.)

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS BY CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR BY INDICATOR  
CONSIDERATIONS OF PERFORMANCE STANDARDS  
RECOMMENDATION FOR DISCUSSION FEBRUARY 6, 2003

\*USC Beaufort is not included in the recommendations below. USC Beaufort is following a transition plan approved by the Commission in November 2002. A copy of that plan appears in the November 2002 workbook on pages II.195-II.200.

CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR 1, MISSION FOCUS

1B

INDICATOR 1B, CURRICULA OFFERED TO ACHIEVE MISSION

What: A measure of programs that are appropriate per Act 359 of 1996 to the degree-level of the institution, appropriate per the institution's mission statement, and are in full-approval status as of the most recent CHE review.

Applies to: **Research** and **Teaching** sectors as a scored indicator. **Regional Campuses** and **Technical Colleges** as a "compliance" indicator since the third condition is not applicable to these sectors.

Crafted by: CHE with institutions. Unchanged since Year 4 (1999-00).

Data Source: CHE reviews programs on the Academic Inventory to determine if conditions are met and provides a report to institutions.

Standard: In effect since Year 5, 2000-01. For Research and Teaching, the level for "achieves" is 95.0% to 99.0% or all but one program if less than 95%. An improvement factor does not apply. For Regional Campuses and Technical Colleges, compliance is expected and non-compliances yields a score of "1".

STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)		
Indicator	Applies to	Consideration
1B	Research Institutions Teaching Institutions	Staff suggests continuing the standard of 95%-99% or not more than one.  Other: This indicator was discussed with the Provost/IR group. It was determined that any changes were premature at this point. Staff has no additional recommendations for this indicator at this time.
1B	Regional Campuses Technical Colleges	Staff suggests continuing the standard of "compliance"  Staff has no additional recommendations for this indicator at this time.

**INDICATOR 1C, APPROVAL OF A MISSION STATEMENT**

What: Requires that institutions have a CHE approved mission statement

Applies to: **All Institutions** as a “compliance” indicator.

Crafted by: CHE in consultation with institutions. Unchanged since Year 1 (1996-97).

Data Source: By 1998, all institutions had submitted statements that were approved. Institutions report to CHE “Yes” or “No” as to changes. Any changes are reviewed and approved by CHE.

Standard: In effect since Year 1 (1996-97). For All Institutions, compliance is expected and non-compliances yields a score of “1”

<b>STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Applies to</b>	<b>Consideration</b>
1C	<b>Research Institutions Teaching Institutions Regional Campuses Technical Colleges</b>	<p><b>Staff suggests continuing the standard of “compliance”</b></p> <p>Staff reviewed this indicator with CAPA representatives in September 2002 in terms of current SACS guidelines regarding mission statements.</p> <p><b>Other Considerations:</b></p> <p><b>Staff does suggest amending the measurement definition to revise the five-year approval cycle to better reflect the current operation of the measure.</b></p> <p><u>Explanation:</u> All mission statements have been approved by the CHE initially and are re-considered when institutions have changes and report those to CHE. Because institutions submit any revisions for consideration at least annually, a five-year review of all mission statements is not needed.</p> <p><u>Staff suggests the following change:</u></p> <p><i>Current Measure Statement:</i> Mission statement with defined characteristics will be approved by the Commission on a five-year cycle.</p> <p><i>Suggested Revised Measure Statement:</i> Mission statement with defined characteristic will be submitted for approval of the Commission within three months of any changes receiving local board approval.</p>

**INDICATOR 1D/E, COMBINATION OF INDICATORS 1D (ADOPTION OF A STRATEGIC PLAN TO SUPPORT THE MISSION STATEMENT) AND 1E (ATTAINMENT OF GOALS OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN) TO PROVIDE FOR A CAMPUS-SPECIFIC INDICATOR RELATED TO EACH INSTITUTION’S STRATEGIC PLAN)**

What: An indicator that measures success on an institutional goal and annual targets over three years as identified by the institution and approved by CHE.

Applies to: **All Institutions** as a “scored” indicator defined specific to each institution.

Crafted by: CHE with institutions defining their goal. Measure defined effective in Year 5 (2000-01) and was changed from 2 goals to 1 as of Year 6 (2001-02).

Data Source: Institution report to CHE relative to performance on selected goal.

Standard: Standards are individualized to each institution dependent on institutional goals selected for measurement. Score of “1”, “2”, or “3” are possible. An improvement factor does not apply.

<b>STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Applies to</b>	<b>Consideration</b>
<b>1D/E</b>	<b>Research Institutions Teaching Institutions Regional Campuses Technical Colleges</b>	<b>Staff suggests no changes at this time.</b>
		Institutions are in the process of identifying a goal and targets for the next three-year period with performance to be measured in Years 9, 10, and 11.

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR 2, QUALITY OF FACULTY**

**2A**

**Indicator 2A, Academic and Other Credentials of Professors and Instructors**

What: A measure of the academic credentials of faculty.

For Research, Teaching, and Regional Campuses, the percent of full-time faculty with terminal degree in primary teaching area is measured.

For Technical Colleges, the percent of faculty teaching in the fall who meet minimum SACS criteria for credentials.

Applies to: **All Institutions** as a “scored” indicator with differences in definitions across sectors.

Crafted by: CHE with institutions. Unchanged since Year 6 (2001-02).

Data Source: CHE calculates from data reported on CHEMIS.

Standard: For Research Institutions, the standard in effect since Year 6, 2001-02, for the level of “achieves” is 75.0% to 84.0%. For Teaching Sector institutions, the standard in effect since Year 6, for the level of “achieves” is 70.0% to 84.0%. For Regional Campuses, the standard in effect since Year 6, for the level of “achieves” is 60.0% to 74.0%. An improvement factor of 3% applies to these three sectors. For Technical Colleges, the standard in effect since Year 5, 2000-01, for the level of “achieves” is 98.0% to 99.9% or all but one if less than 98%, and an improvement factor does not apply.

STANDARDS CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)																						
Indicator	Applies to	Consideration																				
2A	Research Institutions Teaching Institutions	<p><b>For both sectors, this measure excludes instructors beginning with Year 7, 2002-03.</b></p> <p><b>Staff suggests for the measure continuing the measure with instructors removed.</b></p> <p><b>Staff suggests no changes to the standards for either the Research Institutions or Teaching Sector Institutions.</b></p> <p>Review:</p> <p>For Research Institutions, the current standard of 75.0% to 84.0% with a 3% improvement factor was approved in Year 6 and has applied again in Year 7. The standard was determined by reviewing, in Year 5, SC institutional data that included instructors.</p> <p>For Teaching Institutions, the current standard of 70.0% to 84.0% with a 3% improvement factor of 3% was also approved in Year 6 and has applied again in Year 7. The standard was determined by reviewing, in Year 5, SC institutional data that included instructors.</p> <p>Available Data:</p> <p>See file with performance funding data for currently available SC data. (Worksheet "2A Res Teach Reg")</p> <p>No other data consistent with the indicator measure have been identified. Data from the NCES survey of postsecondary faculty (NSOPF) are under review although these data do not directly relate.</p> <p>Data from the NSOPF:99 survey are shown below for information and were taken from the report "Teaching Undergraduates in US Postsecondary Institution: Fall 1998". The report provides data on the percentage of those teaching by highest degree. A break-out by rank or principal teaching area is not given.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Fall 1998</th> <th colspan="3" style="text-align: center;"><u>Overall</u></th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>FT</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>PT</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Total All</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>% with Doctorate</td> <td style="text-align: center;">67.0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">26.9</td> <td style="text-align: center;">49.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% with Masters</td> <td style="text-align: center;">27.8</td> <td style="text-align: center;">54.1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">39.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% with Bacc or less</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5.2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">19.0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">11.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>See above for reference. Data are in this chart are based on those surveyed in Fall 1998 (NSOPF:99 data)</i></p> <p>No other data are available. Staff may have additional data from the NPSOF99 survey in time for the meeting.</p>	Fall 1998	<u>Overall</u>				<u>FT</u>	<u>PT</u>	<u>Total All</u>	% with Doctorate	67.0	26.9	49.9	% with Masters	27.8	54.1	39.0	% with Bacc or less	5.2	19.0	11.1
Fall 1998	<u>Overall</u>																					
	<u>FT</u>	<u>PT</u>	<u>Total All</u>																			
% with Doctorate	67.0	26.9	49.9																			
% with Masters	27.8	54.1	39.0																			
% with Bacc or less	5.2	19.0	11.1																			

STANDARDS CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)		
Indicator	Applies to	Consideration
2A	Regional Campuses	<p><b>For Regional Campuses, this measure includes instructors beginning with Year 7, 2002-03.</b></p> <p><b>Staff suggests for the measure, continuing the measure with instructors included.</b></p> <p><b>For Regional Campus standards, staff suggests no changes.</b></p> <p>Review:</p> <p>For Regional Campuses, the current standard of 60.0% to 74.0% with a 3% improvement factor of 3% was approved in Year 6 and has applied again in Year 7. The standard was determined by reviewing, in Year 5, SC institutional data that included instructors. The indicator for Regional Campuses continues to include instructors.</p> <p>Available Data:</p> <p>See file with performance funding data for currently available SC data. (Worksheet "2A Res Teach Reg")</p> <p>See above under considerations for research institutions details regarding a related but not comparable data source (i.e., NPSOF99)</p>
2A	Technical Colleges	<p><b>Staff suggests no changes at this time.</b></p> <p>Continue standard of 98.0% to 99.9% or all but one faculty member if less than 98%.</p>

#### INDICATOR 2D, COMPENSATION OF FACULTY

What: Measure of average faculty salary.

For Research and Teaching, average by rank, excluding Instructors, is considered.

For Regional Campuses and Technical Colleges, average faculty salary is considered.

Applies to: **All Institutions** as a "scored" indicator with differences in definitions applying across sectors.

Crafted by: CHE with institutions. Unchanged since Year 4 (1999-00).

Data Source: CHE calculates from CHEMIS data required for federal reporting.

Standard: For Current standards for 2D and subparts, as applicable, see materials presented in the Performance Funding Workbook, November 2002, pages II.47 through II.51

<b>STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Applies to</b>	<b>Consideration</b>
<b>2D</b>	<b>Research Institutions</b>  Clemson USC Columbia MUSC	<p><b>Staff has recommended a review in the methodology for setting standards for 2D. CHE staff is in the process of surveying institutions to update peer salary data for purposes of the MRR. Considerations regarding this indicator will be postponed until those data are collected and analyzed which will be later this spring or summer.</b></p> <p>Note: The current methodology includes using most recent peer average by rank for each, inflating it to the current year by the state mandated pay increases and using 80-94.9% of the number identified for the range of "Achieves." Improvement factor has been calculated as the state mandated pay increase +1%. Improvement over past year only is considered. Standards from Year 6 and a 1% improvement factor are currently in place.</p>
<b>2D</b>	<b>Teaching Institutions</b>	<p><b>Staff has recommended a review in the methodology for setting standards for 2D to be postponed until additional information is available late spring/early summer. See 2D Research Sector.</b></p> <p>Note: Current methodology includes using most recent AAUP reported national average for public comprehensive 4-year institutions by rank, inflating it to the current year by the state mandated pay increases and using 80-94.9% of the number identified for the range of "Achieves." The improvement factor has been calculated as the state mandated pay increase +1%. Improvement over past year only is considered. Standards from Year 6 and a 1% improvement factor are currently in place.</p>
<b>2D</b>	<b>Regional Campuses</b>	<p><b>Staff has recommended a review in the methodology for setting standards for 2D to be postponed until additional information is available late spring/early summer. See 2D Research Sector.</b></p> <p>Note: Current methodology includes using most recent AAUP reported national average for Two-year public institutions with academic rank, inflating it to the current year by the state mandated pay increases and using 75-94.9% of the number identified for the range of "Achieves." The improvement factor has been calculated as the state mandated pay increase +1%. Improvement over past year only is considered. Standards from Year 6 and a 1% improvement factor are currently in place.</p>

STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)		
Indicator	Applies to	Consideration
2D	Technical Colleges	<p>Staff has recommended a review in the methodology for setting standards for 2D to be postponed until additional information is available late spring/early summer. See 2D Research Sector.</p> <p>Note: Current methodology includes using most recent AAUP reported national average for Two-year public institutions without academic rank, inflating it to the current year by the state mandated pay increases and using 75-94.9% of the number identified for the range of "Achieves." The improvement factor has been calculated as the state mandated pay increase +1%. Improvement over past year only is considered. Standards from Year 6 and a 1% improvement factor are currently in place.</p>

CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR 3, CLASSROOM QUALITY

3D

INDICATOR 3D, ACCREDITATION OF DEGREE-GRANTING PROGRAMS

What: A measure of the percent of accredited programs.

Applies to: **All Institutions with eligible programs\*** as a "scored" indicator.

Crafted by: CHE with institutions. Unchanged since Year 1 (1996-97).

Data Source: Institutions report information to CHE for Institutional Effectiveness Reporting to meet legislative mandates. Reporting involves completing a checklist (provided by CHE) as to the status of accreditations.

Standard: A standard of 90.0% to 99.0% or all but one program accredited for a score of "achieves" has applied for all institutions since Year 5, 2000-01. An improvement factor does not apply.

*Note: Eligible programs\* are those accreditable by a CHE approved accrediting agency.*

(3D Continued)

STANDARDS CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)		
Indicator	Applies to *	Consideration
3D	<p>Research Institutions Teaching Institutions Regional Campuses Technical Colleges</p> <p>*those institutions that have programs falling under the auspices of one of the CHE approved accrediting agencies</p>	<p>Staff suggests no changes to the measure or standards. Staff will discuss related issues with CAPA members and provide additional information on Thursday.</p> <p>This indicator has been discussed by the provosts /IR group that has been reviewing academic indicators. There were no specific suggestions regarding changing from the current methodology for determining the percentage of accredited programs. It is noted that there is currently a process handled by the Academic Affairs Committee for consideration of agencies on the approved Commission list.</p>

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR 3, CLASSROOM QUALITY**

**3E**

**INDICATOR 3E, INSTITUTIONAL EMPHASIS ON QUALITY TEACHER EDUCATION AND REFORM**

What: A three-part measure related to teacher education considering:

- 1) NCATE accreditation status
- 2) Student performance on professional knowledge and specialty area certification examinations
- 3) Teacher education graduates filling critical needs areas including critical shortage teaching areas and minority teachers.

Applies to: **Teaching** Sector Institutions as a “scored” indicator.

Crafted by: CHE with institutions. Unchanged since Year 3 except for a change to part three in Year 4 (1999-2000) to include all minority categories.

Data Source: Institutions report examination pass rates and accreditation information to CHE for Institutional Effectiveness Reporting to meet legislative mandates. Data on graduates in critical needs areas are reported to CHE by institutions. The latter have been reported recently through CHEMIS, and it is expected in future years that CHE will use these data.

Standards: For part 1, a standard of compliance applies and non-compliance yields a score of “1”. For part 2, scoring of performance on professional knowledge examinations has been deferred. Past standards are described in the information below. For part 2, scoring of performance on specialty area exams, a standard of 75% to 89% for a score of “achieves” and an improvement factor of 3% has applied. For part 3, measuring graduates in critical shortage subject areas, a standard of 20% to 34% for an “achieves” and an improvement factor of 5% currently applies. For part 3, measuring minority teacher education graduates, a standard of 20% to 24% for an “achieves” and an improvement factor of 5% applies.

<b>STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Applies to</b>	<b>Consideration</b>
<b>3E1,</b> <u>NCATE accreditation</u>	<b>Teaching Institutions</b>	<b>Staff suggests no revisions at this time to this measurement subpart. The current standard is “compliance” as to whether or not NCATE accreditation is held.</b>
<b>3E2a,</b> <u>Percent passing the teacher education professional knowledge portion</u>	<b>Teaching Institutions</b>	<p><b>Staff suggests no changes to 3E2a at this time. It is noted agenda item 4 for CAPA’s consideration has implications for this measure. Staff will address the issues that may be raised in that item related to this indicator with the affected sectors.</b></p> <p>This part has been deferred at present due to changes in licensing requirements affecting reported examination data.</p> <p>Licensure exams were reviewed with the Provosts/IR group in January. The group did not recommend any specific changes.</p> <p>Past standards have been based on SC institutional data. This subpart was last measured in PF Year 5 (2000-01) and the standard used that year was 90% to 94% with an improvement factor of 3%.</p> <p>See file with performance funding data for currently available SC data. (Worksheet “3E2a”)</p>
<b>3E2b</b>	<b>Teaching Institutions</b>	<p><b>Staff suggests no changes to standards for indicator 3E2b at this time. It is noted agenda item 4 for CAPA’s consideration has implications for data collected for this measure. Staff will address the issues that may be raised in that item related to this indicator with the affected sectors.</b></p> <p>Licensure exams were reviewed with the Provosts/IR group in January. The group did not recommend any specific changes.</p> <p>Past standards have been based on SC institutional data. The standard that has applied since Year 6 (2001-02) is 75% to 89% with an improvement factor of 3%. In Year 5, 80-89% with an improvement factor of 3% applied.</p> <p>See file with performance funding data for currently available SC data. (Worksheet “3E2b”)</p>

**STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)**

Indicator	Applies to	Consideration
<u>3E3a,</u> <u>Teacher</u> <u>Education</u> <u>Graduates</u> <u>in critical</u> <u>shortage</u> <u>areas</u>	<b>Teaching Institutions</b>	<b>Staff suggests consideration of the following issues:</b>  <b>1) Review of critical shortage areas:</b> In Year 5, the criteria for adding new areas was the condition that the area had to be on either the State Board's list or the Teacher Loan Program list for at least 3 years. <b>Staff has reviewed SDE Information and recommends no changes to the areas considered for purposes of this indicator.</b> See data in the following chart following the current areas and areas identified by year by SDE.

The data below are found on the student loan website [www.slc.sc.edu](http://www.slc.sc.edu) and select "Teacher Loans" and then scroll down near the bottom and select "SC Teacher Loan Program Cancellation Information" and select "Critical Subject Areas" A pull down menu allows access by year going back 12+ years.

Critical Shortage Subject Areas				
Critical Areas Identified and used during Performance Years 5-7 *	2000-2001	2001-02	2002-2003	2003-2004
Art	Art	Art	Art	Art
Business Education				
English/Language Arts				
Family Consumer Sciences (Home Economics)				
Foreign Languages incl:				
French	French	French	French	French
German	X	German	German	German
Spanish	Spanish	Spanish	Spanish	Spanish
Latin	Latin	Latin	Latin	Latin
Library Science	Library Science (Media Specialist)	Library Science (Media Specialist)	Media Specialist (Library Science)	Media Specialist (Library Science)
Industrial Technology				
Mathematics	Mathematics	Mathematics	Mathematics	Mathematics
Music Choral	X	Music	Music	Music
Science (All Areas)				
Special Education (All Areas including speech pathology, occupational and physical therapy)	Special Education (All Areas including speech pathology, occupational and physical therapy)	Special Education (All Areas including speech pathology, occupational and physical therapy)	Special Education (All Areas including speech pathology, occupational and physical therapy)	Special Education (All Areas including speech pathology, occupational and physical therapy)
X	Early Childhood Education	Early Childhood Education	X	X
X	Elementary Education	Elementary Education	X	X
X	X	Guidance Counselor	Guidance Counselor	X
X	X	X	X	Health

\* 1999-00 areas (note that music doesn't appear on the teacher loan list provided on the student loan website as of 1/15/03 but was used in 5-7 as a critical shortage area)

STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)		
Indicator	Applies to	Consideration
		<p><b>2) Staff suggests consideration of using CHEMIS information to calculate these data rather than separate institutional reports.</b></p> <p><i>Staff will discuss this issue with teaching sector representatives. Data calculated will be made available to teaching sector representatives and discussed in regard to the current measure and standards.</i></p> <p>Staff would like to discuss the following with representatives: In reviewing definitions, there were a few items that requiring additional discussion including: <b>(a)</b> timeframe (clarification in workbook. Fiscal Year not Academic Year is considered. The dates are specified as July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2002. The information under "Timeframe" should state "... most recent ended fiscal year." (See p II.73) and <b>(b)</b> clarification regarding the students and programs considered.</p> <p><b>4) Standards: Because staff is suggesting the use of CHEMIS data, the standards discussion will be postponed until the issues indicated above are discussed.</b></p> <p>Note that past standards have been based on SC institutional data and K-12 data related to shortage areas. The standard that has applied since Year 5 (2000-01) is 20% to 34% with an improvement factor of 5%. See file with performance funding data for currently available SC data. (Worksheet "3E3a")</p>
<b>3E3b,</b> <u>Teacher</u> <u>Education</u> <u>Graduates</u> <u>who are</u> <u>Minority</u>	Teaching Institutions	<p><b>Staff suggests consideration of the following issues:</b></p> <p><b>1) Staff suggests consideration of using CHEMIS information to calculate these data rather than separate institutional reports. See 3E2a item 2 for additional related issues to discuss.</b></p> <p><b>2) Standards Because staff is suggesting the use of CHEMIS data, the standards discussion will be postponed until the issues indicated above are discussed.</b></p> <p>The standard that has applied since Year 5 (2000-01) is 10% to 20% with an improvement factor of 5%. See file with performance funding data for</p>

STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)		
Indicator	Applies to	Consideration
		currently available SC data. (Worksheet "3E3b")  Past standards have been based on SC institutional data and K-12 data related to minority teachers. See next page for additional data.

3E3b: Standard developed in reviewing state performance data and data on minority teachers - 16% of teachers were minority in Fall 1998. See the chart below for more recent data. Additionally, the number of minorities earning initial certification in FY99 was considered and that percentage was 18.4%. More recent data are not available at

Data from SDE on Minority Teachers  
Sources : SDE Quick Facts 1998-99 (July 2000 report); SDE Quick Facts, 1999-00  
Numbers on 2001-02 provided by Yvonne Gladman, SDE, 1/7/03

**Teacher Profile:**

(data by FTE)	Fall 1999	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	%	
				Change Fall 1999 to 2000	% Change Fall 2000 to 2001
<b>Total</b>	<b>44,449</b>	<b>46,295</b>	<b>46,087</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>-0.4%</b>
African American	6,985	7,561	7,678	8.2%	1.5%
American Indian	29	30	32	3.4%	6.3%
Asian	78	107	117	37.2%	9.2%
Hispanic	153	231	263	51.0%	14.0%
<b>Subtotal Minority</b>	<b>7,245</b>	<b>7,929</b>	<b>8,090</b>	<b>9.4%</b>	<b>2.0%</b>
White	33,768	35,351	35,053	4.7%	-0.8%
Not Reported	3,436	3,015	2,945	-12.3%	-2.3%

  

<b>% by Ethnicity</b>	<b>Fall 1999</b>	<b>Fall 2000</b>	<b>Fall 2001</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
African American	15.7%	16.3%	16.7%
American Indian	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Asian	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%
Hispanic	0.3%	0.5%	0.6%
<b>Subtotal Minority</b>	<b>16.3%</b>	<b>17.1%</b>	<b>17.6%</b>
White	76.0%	76.4%	76.1%
Not Reported	7.7%	6.5%	6.4%

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR 4, INSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION AND COLLABORATION 4A/B**

**INDICATOR 4A/B, COMBINATION OF INDICATORS 4A (SHARING AND USE OF TECHNOLOGY, PROGRAMS, EQUIPMENT, AND SOURCE MATTER EXPERTS WITHIN THE INSTITUTION, WITH OTHER INSTITUTIONS, AND WITH THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY) AND 4B (COOPERATION AND COLLABORATION WITH PRIVATE INDUSTRY, DEFINED TAILORED TO EACH SECTOR)**

What: A measure individually tailored to each sector that provides a 3- to 5-year focus on an area of cooperation and collaboration selected by the sector.

Applies to: **All Institutions** as a “scored” indicator with differences in definitions across sectors.

Crafted by: Current measures were defined by institutions in consultation with CHE. As of November 2002, each sector measure to be considered over the next 4-5 years has been approved by CHE.

Data Source: Institutions provide a report for measuring performance to CHE as determined by the sector for its focus.

Standard: The standards in place vary by sector. Please refer to the Performance Funding Workbook, November 2002, for additional details – Research measure pages II.85 to II.90; Teaching measure pages II.91 to II.98; Regional Campuses measure pages II.92 to II.104 and Technical Colleges measure pages II.105 to II.113.

<b>STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Applies to</b>	<b>Consideration</b>
<b>4A/B</b>	<b>Research Institutions Teaching Institutions Regional Campuses Technical Colleges</b>	<b>Staff recommends no change at this time.</b>  As of Year 7, 2002-03, all sectors have identified measures and goals for the upcoming 3 or 4 years. Data of last performance measurement for the current sector measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Research: Year 10, 2005-06</li> <li>▪ Teaching: Year 10, 2005-06</li> <li>▪ Regional: Year 9, 2004-05</li> <li>▪ Technical: Year 9, 2004-05</li> </ul>

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR 5, ADMINISTRATIVE EFFICIENCY**

**5A**

**Indicator 5A, Ratio of Administrative Costs as Compared to Academic Costs**

What: In past years, a measure of the ratio administrative costs (fund expenditure categories of institutional support) to academic costs (fund expenditure categories of instruction, research, academic support, and scholarships/fellowships).

Applies to: This indicator is deferred in Year 7 (2002-03) so that it can be re-aligned with new federal financial reporting standards. In the past, it has applied to **All Institutions** as a “scored” indicator with differences related to the inclusion of unrestricted funds applying across sectors.

Crafted by: CHE with institutions. Unchanged since Year 4 (1999-2000), but deferred in the current year due to changes in financial reporting.

Data Source: Computed by CHE using data required for federal reports.

Standards: This indicator has been deferred from scoring in the current year. For information on the measure and standards as applied in past years, please refer to the Year 5, 2000-01, and Year 6, 2002-03, Performance Funding Workbooks. Copies are available on CHE's website.

<b>STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Applies to</b>	<b>Consideration</b>
<b>5A</b>	<b>Research Institutions</b> <b>Teaching Institutions</b> <b>Regional Campuses</b> <b>Technical Colleges</b>	<b>Measure deferred in the current year due to changes in reporting of financial information. The indicator needs to be re-aligned with the new financial data. Reporting for IPEDS using the new data will occur in late spring 2003. Consultation with Finance warranted.</b>  Past standards have relied on IPEDS data calculated such that an "achieves" was identified as the 25 <sup>th</sup> to 60 <sup>th</sup> percentiles of peer institutions (FY98 data). An improvement factor of 3% has applied. Complete IPEDS peer data will not be available for some time given the allowed three-year phase-in under federal guidelines.

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR 6, ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS**

**6A/B**

**Indicator 6A/B, Combination of Indicators 6A (SAT and ACT Scores of Student Body) and 6B (High School Class Standing, Grade Point Averages and Activities of Student Body)**

What: A measure assessing entrance credentials including SAT/ACT scores and high school GPA and class standing.

A comparable measure applies to MUSC that considers entering credentials of graduate and first professional students.

Applies to: **Research, Teaching, and Regional Campuses** as a "scored" indicator with differences in definitions applied to MUSC.

Crafted by: CHE with institutions. Unchanged since Year 6 (2001-02).

Data Source: CHE computes data from information reported on CHEMIS. The data on SAT/ACT scores and high school standing are used for multiple reporting reasons other than performance funding. MUSC currently provides a separate report to CHE, but it is expected that data will be computed from CHEMIS data in future years.

Standard: Effective in Year 6, standards were adopted for the combined indicator for USC Columbia, Clemson, Teaching Sector institutions and Regional Campuses. The standard for an "achieves" is 75.0% to 89.9% for Clemson and USC Columbia; 50.0% to 79.9% for Teaching

Institutions and 20.0% to 49.9% for regional Campuses. For USC Beaufort, regional campus standards apply in Year 7. An improvement factor of 5% applies for these sectors. For MUSC, a standard for “achieves” of 70% to 85% and an improvement factor of 5% were approved effective with Year 6, 2001-02.

<b>STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Applies to</b>	<b>Consideration</b>
<b>6A/B</b>	<b>Research Institutions Teaching Institutions Regional Campuses</b>	<p>Staff has reviewed two issues regarding this indicator and makes the following suggestions:</p> <p><b>1) Staff suggests no revision to target SAT, ACT, High School GPA, or High School Class rank based on a review of relevant data:</b></p> <p>The combined indicator was adopted effective with Year 6. Since Year 1, the current target scores for the SAT (1000), ACT (21) have applied and since Year 2, the high school GPA (3.0 of 4.0) and high school class standing (within top 30%) have applied. Data reviewed follow:</p>

Current target scores used for determining the percent of students include

	<u>Current Target</u>	<u>Established based on:</u>
SAT Average Score	>= 1000	based on approximate national average at the time Indicator 6A was initially defined in 1996-97
ACT Average Score	>= 21	based on approximate national average at the time Indicator 6A was initially defined in 1996-97
High School GPA	>=3.0	determined by Commission in defining the measure for 6B
High School Rank	top 30%	as it was initially defined

**College Graduates**

	<u>South Carolina</u>		<u>National</u>	
	Composite	Number	Composite	Number
2001-02	19.2	11,978	20.8	1,116,082
2000-01	19.3	10,797	21.0	1,069,772
1999-2000	19.3	9,051	21.0	1,065,138
1998-99	19.1	6,766	21.0	1,019,053
1997-98	19.0	5,385	21.0	995,039

\* source of ACT data - The High School Profile Report: Normative Data, A Description of the Academic Abilities and Nonacademic Characteristics of Your ACT Tested 2002 Graduates

**College-bound Seniors**

	<u>South Carolina</u>				<u>National</u>			
	V	M	Composite	Number	V	M	Composite	Number
2001-02	488	493	981	22,363	504	516	1020	1,327,831
2000-01	486	488	974	22,009	506	514	1020	1,276,320
1999-2000	484	482	966	22,679	505	514	1019	1,260,278
1998-99	479	475	954	23,090	505	511	1016	1,220,130
1997-98	478	473	951	22,973	505	512	1017	1,172,779

**\*\* STUDENTS (FROM ANY STATE) SENDING SCORE REPORTS TO SC INSTITUTIONS**

**SAT scores of 2002 college-bound seniors who sent score reports to SC Senior Institutions and Regional Campuses**

	V	M	Composite	Number
2002 Seniors	514	525	1039	40,252

**SAT scores of 2002 college-bound seniors who sent score reports to SC Technical Colleges**

	V	M	Composite	Number
2002 Seniors	446	449	895	3,172

\*\* source of data for SAT tables are background on the 1,327,831 SAT Takers in the Class of 2002, Special Report for State Education Officials and Secondary School Administrators and past reports including 2000-01 and 1999-2000 reports. (Seniors who took the exam any time during high school through March 2002 are included and only the most recent score is used. Students are included only once regardless of the number of times they took the test.)

STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)		
Indicator	Applies to	Consideration
		<p><b>2) Staff suggests no revision to the standards at this time.</b> Current standard adopted in light of SC institutional performance and a review of SAT/ACT national data. The current standards include an improvement factor of 5% and the following for each sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Clemson, USC C 75-89.9%</li> <li>▪ Teaching 50-79.9%</li> <li>▪ Regional Campuses 20%-49.9%</li> </ul> <p>Staff reviewed data available on SAT and ACT performance on IPEDS for institutional peers. Data on 25<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentile are available from the institutional characteristic survey.</p>
6A/B MUSC	MUSC	<p><b>Measure and standards adopted effective with Year 6. No need for revision to measure or standard at this time. Staff recommends no changes at this time.</b></p> <p>See workbook p. II.125 for credentials and targets used.</p> <p>Current standard is 70%-85% with a 5% improvement factor.</p>

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR 7, GRADUATES' ACHIEVEMENTS**

**7A**

**INDICATOR 7A, GRADUATION RATE**

What: A measure of student performance defined differently across sectors and institutions as indicated below:

For Clemson, USC Columbia and Teaching Sector Institutions, a cohort-based measure of graduation within 150% of normal program time applies.

For MUSC, a comparable cohort-based measure of completion of degree programs by graduate students (excluding PhD candidates) and first professional students applies.

For Regional Campuses and Technical Colleges, a cohort-based measure of graduation within 150% of normal program time, transfer-out within 150% of normal program time or continued enrollment following the 150% of program time applies.

Applies to: **All Institutions** as a "scored" indicator with differences in definitions for MUSC and across sectors.

Crafted by: CHE with institutions. Unchanged for Clemson, USC Columbia and Teaching Sector Institutions since Year 4 (1999-2000). MUSC's measure became effective in Year 6

(2001-02). The Regional Campuses and Technical Colleges measure is effective with current year, Year 7 (2002-03).

Data Source: CHE computes report from CHEMIS data, except for MUSC. MUSC currently provides a separate report to CHE, but it is expected that data will be computed from CHEMIS data in future years. For all but MUSC, graduation rate data are used in required federal and state reporting. The revised measure for Regional Campuses and Technical Colleges was designed in keeping with federal requirements as appropriate.

Standard: The measure is defined differently across sectors. The standards that apply are as follows. **Clemson, USC Columbia and Teaching Institutions:** Current standards were adopted in Year 5. An improvement factor of 3% applies for Clemson, USC Columbia, and Teaching Sector Institutions. A standard for “achieves” of 64.0% to 67.0% applies to Clemson; 53.0% to 61.0% applies to USC Columbia and 36.0% to 49.0% applies to Teaching Sector Institutions. **MUSC:** A standard of 80% to 89% for “achieves” and a 3% improvement factor applies. **For Two Year Institutions:** Current standards include a 3% improvement factor and the following for achieves, 50.0%-65.0% for Regional Campuses and 30.0%-45.0% for Technical Colleges.

<b>STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Applies to</b>	<b>Consideration</b>
<b>7A</b>  <b>(Measure based on GRS 150% graduation rate)</b>	<b>Clemson</b> <b>USC Columbia</b> <b>Teaching Institutions</b>	<b>Staff suggests no changes at this time.</b>  Review:  Current standards adopted in light of peer data from IPEDS. An “achieves” was identified as 40 <sup>th</sup> to 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile of peer performance based on FY98 survey data. The current standards include an improvement factor of 3% and the following for each sector:  Clemson      64-67% USC C        53-61% Teaching     36-49%  Performance Funding Data are found in the attached excel file. See worksheet “7A 4yr”  For other data reviewed, see next page:

The following data were calculated from peer data pulled from the IPEDS system. Average data are calculated based on the subtotals for the peer groupings shown – and not an average of the percents for each institution in the grouping. Percentile data for peer groupings or groupings of SC institutions shows the percentile specified for the particular grouping of institutions.

Table 1 displays the Average, 25<sup>th</sup> percentile, 40<sup>th</sup> percentile, and 75<sup>th</sup> percentile by SC institutions and peer groupings for the 1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000 graduation rate surveys

**NOTE: data for 2 year institutions are displayed although these institutions are not measured on the GRS 150% rate. See 7A for 2 years for the current graduation rate measure.**

<b>Average, except Clemson &amp; USC C, SC Institution and Peer Performance and Percentiles</b>								
	<b>Average Graduation Rate</b>				<b>25th percentile</b>			
	<b>GRS 97</b>	<b>GRS 98</b>	<b>GRS 99</b>	<b>GRS 00</b>	<b>GRS 97</b>	<b>GRS 98</b>	<b>GRS 99</b>	<b>GRS 00</b>
Clemson	69.6%	72.4%	71.8%	71.5%	-	-	-	-
PF/MRR Peers (# with data)	64.0%	64.2%	63.9%	64.4%	61.0%	61.3%	61.3%	60.5%
	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
USC Columbia	56.2%	55.7%	60.2%	55.0%	-	-	-	-
PF/MRR Peers (# with data)	58.1%	55.1%	58.6%	59.2%	42.6%	40.7%	39.7%	39.5%
	10	9	9	9	10	9	9	9
* Teaching (# with data)	46.6%	45.4%	45.5%	45.1%	34.2%	33.8%	33.9%	33.9%
	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
* Teaching Peers (# with data)	43.2%	42.9%	43.1%	43.3%	30.0%	29.8%	30.2%	30.9%
	106	109	108	106	106	109	108	106
** Regional Campuses (# with data)	23.1%	24.5%	22.8%	27.6%	20.8%	19.9%	21.4%	23.2%
	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
** Regional Peers (# with data)	25.5%	24.9%	25.0%	23.7%	11.8%	10.9%	14.6%	12.1%
	39	39	38	39	39	39	38	39
** Technical Colleges (# with data)	21.9%	14.7%	14.4%	13.5%	15.2%	12.7%	11.4%	10.8%
	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
** Tech All Peers (# with data)	21.9%	21.6%	22.1%	20.0%	12.2%	13.1%	13.3%	12.3%
	54	54	68	62	54	54	68	62

	<b>40th percentile</b>				<b>75th percentile</b>			
	<b>GRS 97</b>	<b>GRS 98</b>	<b>GRS 99</b>	<b>GRS 00</b>	<b>GRS 97</b>	<b>GRS 98</b>	<b>GRS 99</b>	<b>GRS 00</b>
Clemson	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PF/MRR Peers (# with data)	64.2%	64.0%	64.1%	64.2%	67.4%	68.2%	68.4%	68.3%
	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
USC Columbia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PF/MRR Peers (# with data)	53.9%	51.2%	54.5%	56.3%	61.7%	62.7%	62.7%	63.1%
	10	9	9	9	10	9	9	9
* Teaching (# with data)	38.0%	36.9%	36.3%	36.0%	51.2%	51.8%	57.8%	52.6%
	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
* Teaching Peers (# with data)	36.4%	36.5%	36.5%	37.0%	49.6%	50.5%	49.9%	48.2%
	106	109	108	106	106	109	108	106
** Regional Campuses (# with data)	21.6%	20.7%	21.9%	26.3%	24.2%	25.0%	23.6%	30.2%
	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
** Regional Peers (# with data)	16.9%	22.0%	19.0%	17.1%	34.0%	32.3%	39.9%	34.1%
	39	39	38	39	39	39	38	39
** Technical Colleges (# with data)	17.5%	13.8%	15.1%	11.4%	20.6%	19.8%	20.7%	19.1%
	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
** Tech All Peers (# with data)	18.7%	18.6%	18.2%	16.5%	32.4%	31.9%	31.4%	26.8%
	54	54	68	62	54	54	68	62

\* data do not include USC B or its peers

Total Number of Peers: Clemson 10 PF/MRR, 19 MGT; USC 10 PF/MRR, 20 MGT; Teaching 118 PR/MRR; Regional 43 PF/MRR; Technical All 70 and Technical <1000 FTE 13.

\*\* indicator does not apply to these institutions, USCB not included in regionals

NOTE: calculated average using summed data of sector/peers and not averages of calculated percents (the calculated variables used include total, count, 25th percentile, 75th percentile, 40th percentile)

STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)						
Indicator	Applies to	Consideration				
7A MUSC	MUSC	<p>Measure and standard adopted effective with Year 6. No need for revision to measure or standard at this time. Staff recommends no changes at this time.</p> <p>See workbook p. II.125 for credentials and targets used.</p> <p>Current standard is 80%-89.9% with a 3% improvement factor.</p>				
7A	Regional Campuses Technical Colleges	<p>Measure and standard adopted effective in Year 6 with scoring effective in Year 7. Staff suggests no changes to the standards at this time.</p> <p>See workbook p. II.141-II.145.</p> <p>Current standards include a 3% improvement factor and the following for achieves:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Regional Campuses</td> <td>50.0%-65.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Technical Colleges</td> <td>30.0%-45.0%</td> </tr> </table> <p>The standards were considered in light of reviewing three years of SC performance data for these sectors. See file worksheet "7A 2yr" for performance data. See above data for GRS 150% peer information.</p>	Regional Campuses	50.0%-65.0%	Technical Colleges	30.0%-45.0%
Regional Campuses	50.0%-65.0%					
Technical Colleges	30.0%-45.0%					

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR 7, GRADUATES' ACHIEVEMENTS**

**7B**

**INDICATOR 7B, EMPLOYMENT RATE FOR GRADUATES**

What: Measurement definition under review at present. A measure utilizing a survey of graduates and possible employment rate data from a third party, the Employment Security Commission (ESC), is under discussion and is expected to be piloted during the current year.

Applies to: **Technical Colleges**

Crafted by: CHE and Technical Colleges are working collaboratively on the measure.

Data Source: Under consideration at present.

STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)		
Indicator	Applies to	Consideration
7B	Technical Colleges	Measure has not been implemented to date.

CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR 7, GRADUATES' ACHIEVEMENTS

7C

**Indicator 7C, Employer Feedback on Graduates Who Were Employed or Not Employed**

What: Measurement definition under review at present. A measure utilizing a third party (ESC) to survey employers of technical college graduates is under discussion and is expected to be piloted during the current year.

Applies to: **Technical Colleges**

Crafted by: CHE and Technical Colleges are working collaboratively on the measure.

Data Source: Under consideration at present.

STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)		
Indicator	Applies to	Consideration
7C	Technical Colleges	Measure has not been implemented to date.

CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR 7, GRADUATES' ACHIEVEMENTS

7D

**INDICATOR 7D, SCORES OF GRADUATES ON POST-UNDERGRADUATE PROFESSIONAL, GRADUATE, OR EMPLOYMENT-RELATED EXAMINATIONS AND CERTIFICATION TESTS**

What: A measure of the percent of graduates taking examinations who pass the examinations.

Applies to: **All Institutions that have programs for which there is an identified exam** as a "scored" indicator.

Crafted by: CHE with institutions. Unchanged since Year 1 (1996-97).

Data Source: Institutions report information to CHE for Institutional Effectiveness Reporting to meet legislative mandates. Reporting involves providing pass rate information using a list of examinations provided by CHE.

STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)		
Indicator	Applies to*	Consideration
7D	<b>Research Institutions</b> <b>Teaching Institutions</b> <b>Regional Campuses</b> <b>Technical Colleges</b>  *those institutions that have students enrolled in programs for which there is an identified exam. Note that at present USC Beauf, USC Sumter, USC Salk and USC Union do not have any exams reported	<b>Staff suggests no changes to the standards at this time.</b>  The discussion of measurement issues related to Indicator 7D will be taken up as part of agenda item 4. Please refer to agenda item 4 for considerations and related materials.

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR 7, GRADUATES' ACHIEVEMENTS**

**7E**

**INDICATOR 7E, NUMBER OF GRADUATES WHO CONTINUED THEIR EDUCATION**

What: A cohort-based measure of the percent of students who earn a baccalaureate degree within six years from a CHEMIS reporting institutions or from other institutions provided data are available sector-wide.

Applies to: **Regional Campuses** only as a scored indicator.

Crafted by: CHE with institutions. Measure defined effective with Year 7 (2002-03).

Data Source: CHE computes using available CHEMIS data. The measure was designed in keeping with federal graduation rate requirements as appropriate.

Standard: Effective this year, a standard of 25.0% to 40.0% with an improvement factor of 3% applies.

<b>STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Applies to</b>	<b>Consideration</b>
7E	Regional Campuses	<p><b>Measure and standard adopted effective in Year 6 with scoring effective in Year 7. Staff suggests no changes at this time.</b></p> <p>See workbook p. II.167-II.169.</p> <p>Current standards include a 3% improvement factor and the following for achieves: Regional Campuses 25.0%-40.0%</p> <p>The standards were considered in light of reviewing three years of SC performance data for this sector. See attached file for performance data – worksheet “7E”</p>

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR 8, USER-FRIENDLINESS OF THE INSTITUTION**

**8C**

**Indicator 8C, Accessibility to the Institution of All Citizens of the State**

What: A four part measure considering:

- 1) The percent of undergraduates who are SC citizens who are minority
- 2) Fall-to-fall retention of minority degree-seeking undergraduates who are SC citizens
- 3) The percent of graduate students who are minority
- 4) The percent of faculty teaching in the fall who are minority

Applies to: **All Institutions** as a “scored” indicator with the exception of the graduate student part that applies only to the Research and Teaching Sector institutions.

(8C Continued)

Crafted by: CHE with institutions. Unchanged (except 8C1 and 8C2) since Year 4 (1999-2000) at which time “minority” was defined as all minority categories rather than African American for white majority institutions and White for black majority institutions. 8C1 and 8C2 were changed effective Yr 5 to reflect SC citizens only.

Data Source: CHE computes from enrollment and faculty data reported on CHEMIS and provides institutions with a report.

Standard: The standards for each part have been in place since Year 5, 2000-01. See details below for each subpart for the standards that have applied.

<b>STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Applies to</b>	<b>Consideration</b>
<b>8C1</b> <u>Percent of</u> <u>UG</u> <u>headcount</u> <u>SC citizens</u> <u>who are</u> <u>minority</u>	<b>Research Institutions</b> <b>Teaching Institutions</b> <b>Regional Campuses</b> <b>Technical Colleges</b>	<p><b>Staff suggests no change to the standards.</b></p> <p>Review:</p> <p>Current standards were set based on being at or within 75% of the service area minority population, 18+ data using October 1998 Census estimates. The State served as service area for teaching and research and county service area data for the remaining sectors. Census data 2000 for 18+ nonwhite population if found on the following page.</p> <p>Since Year 5, an improvement factor of 5% has applied with the ranges for “achieves” as indicated below:</p> <p><b><u>Research and Teaching</u></b>  21%-28%</p> <p><b><u>Regional Campuses</u></b>  USC Lancaster      20.0%-27.0%  USC Salkehatchie   36.0%-48.0%  USC Sumter          32.0%-43.0%  USC Union           20.0%-26.0%</p> <p><b><u>Technical Colleges</u></b>  Aiken Tech          17.0%-23.0%  Central Carolina    32.0%-43.0%  Denmark             39.0%-52.0%  FDTC                 29.0%-39.0%  Greenville          13.0%-17.0%  Horry-Georgetown 16.0%-21.0%  Midlands            23.0%-30.0%  Northeastern       29.0%-39.0%  OCTC                 41.0%-55.0%  Piedmont            24.0%-31.0%  Spartanburg        16.0%-21.0%  TCL                    26.0%-35.0%  Tri-County          9.0%-12.0%  Trident               23.0%-30.0%  Williamsburg       45.0%-61.0%  York                   15.0%-20.0%</p>

<b>STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Applies to</b>	<b>Consideration</b>
		<p><u>IPEDS Enrollment Data</u>: Peer data for minority headcount enrollment for the past 5 years was reviewed. For SC and its peer institutions, trends in minority enrollment have remained relatively stable across the four-year institutions and have shown a slight increase across two-year institutions.</p> <p>Staff reviewed other Census information related to population trends such as educational attainment. See also indicator 8C3.</p> <p>Performance Funding Data are found in the excel file reference in the cover memo. See worksheet "8C1."</p>

**April 2000 Census Data by Designated Service Areas for SC Public Institutions**  
(For 1998 estimates used in to establish current standards, see Performance Funding Workbook, November 2002, p. II.178.)

**Minority Service Area Data Calculated from 2000 Census Numbers**

**% Nonwhite 18+ yrs old**

**April 1, 2000, Census Statistics.**

*Source: Data compiled by SC CHE Division of Planning, Assessment, & Performance Funding from April 2000 Census Data provided by SC B&C Board, Off. of Research & Statistics.*

Institution	Counties included in Service Area	18+ yrs old Nonwhite	18+ yrs old Total	18+ yrs old % Nonwhite
<b>Research Universities</b>	All, State Total	904,999	3,002,371	30.1%
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Univ.</b>	All, State Total	904,999	3,002,371	30.1%
<b>Regional Campuses</b>				
USC Beaufort	Beaufort, Jasper, Hampton	40,682	123,406	33.0%
USC Lancaster	Lancaster, Chester, Chesterfield, Kershaw, Fairfield, York	77,343	279,587	27.7%
USC Salkehatchie	Allendale, Barnwell, Bamberg, Colleton, Hampton	40,127	80,748	49.7%
USC Sumter	Sumter, Lee, Clarendon, Kershaw	67,657	153,188	44.2%
USC Union	Union, Laurens, Newberry, Cherokee, Fairfield, York, Chester	81,835	304,666	26.9%
<b>Technical Colleges</b>				
Aiken Tech	Aiken	27,604	105,204	26.2%
Central Carolina	Clarendon, Kershaw, Lee, Sumter	67,657	153,188	44.2%
Chesterfield-Marlboro	Chesterfield, Dillon, Marlboro	31,368	74,436	42.1%
Denmark Tech	Allendale, Bamberg, Barnwell	20,405	37,524	54.4%
Florence-Darlington	Darlington, Florence, Marion	69,374	168,517	41.2%
Greenville Tech	Greenville	58,902	286,232	20.6%
Horry-Georgetown	Georgetown, Horry	40,150	196,453	20.4%
Midlands Tech	Fairfield, Lexington, Richland	144,988	420,095	34.5%
Orangeburg-Calhoun	Calhoun, Orangeburg	46,109	79,194	58.2%
Piedmont Tech	Abbeville, Edgefield, Greenwood, Laurens, McCormick, Newberry, Saluda	60,524	189,411	32.0%
Spartanburg Tech	Cherokee, Spartanburg, Union	58,393	252,612	23.1%
Tech Coll of Lowcountry	Beaufort, Colleton, Hampton, Jasper	52,076	151,155	34.5%
Tri-County Tech	Anderson, Oconee, Pickens	33,850	262,116	12.9%
Trident Tech	Berkeley, Charleston, Dorchester	129,814	407,691	31.8%
Williamsburg Tech	Williamsburg	16,951	26,556	63.8%
York Tech	Chester, Lancaster, York	25,493	121,330	21.0%

<b>STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)</b>										
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Applies to</b>	<b>Consideration</b>								
<p><b>8C2</b> <u>Percent of degree-seeking UG SC citizens who are retained fall to fall</u></p>	<p><b>Research Institutions Teaching Institutions Regional Campuses Technical Colleges</b></p>	<p><b>Staff suggests no changes to the standards.</b></p> <p><u>Review:</u></p> <p>Current standards were set for each sector based on being within a certain percentage of overall student retention as evident from Fall 98 to Fall 99. For research - +/- 5% of median overall student retention for 4 year institutions. For teaching - +/- 5% of median overall student retention for teaching sector institutions. For regional campuses - +/- 10% of median overall student retention. For technical colleges, +/- 10% of median overall student retention of technical colleges.</p> <p>Staff has reviewed trends in performance funding data and finds that the median overall retention has been relatively stable over the past three years and is reflective of data used in setting standards in Year 5. Performance Funding Data are found in the excel file reference in the cover memo. See worksheet "8C2".</p> <p>No other data sources of comparable retention data were identified. As information, staff reviewed data available by state for 2- and 4-yr institutions at <a href="http://www.higheredinfo.org">www.higheredinfo.org</a> (i.e., site for Measuring Up data posted by NCHEMS.) Available retention data were for first-time, full-time freshmen returning the following fall. These data are limited to freshmen and include all institutions in SC. Data are posted for the nation and by state and include multiple year reports.</p> <p>Since Year 5, an improvement factor of 5% has applied with the ranges for "achieves" as indicated below:</p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td style="padding-right: 20px;">Research</td> <td>78.0% - 87.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Teaching</td> <td>74.0% - 82.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Regional</td> <td>47.0% - 57.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Technical</td> <td>49.0% - 60.0%</td> </tr> </table>	Research	78.0% - 87.0%	Teaching	74.0% - 82.0%	Regional	47.0% - 57.0%	Technical	49.0% - 60.0%
Research	78.0% - 87.0%									
Teaching	74.0% - 82.0%									
Regional	47.0% - 57.0%									
Technical	49.0% - 60.0%									
<p><b>8C3,</b> <u>Percent of graduate students who are minority</u></p>	<p><b>Research Institutions Teaching Institutions</b></p>	<p><b>Staff suggests an increase in the current standard for both Research Institutions and Teaching Sector Institutions.</b></p> <p><b>Since Year 5, an improvement factor of 5% has applied with the ranges for "achieves" of 10%-13% for both Research and</b></p>								

<b>STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Applies to</b>	<b>Consideration</b>
		<p><b>Teaching sector institutions.</b></p> <p><b>The standard suggested is 13% to 18% for an “achieves” with an improvement factor of 5% to be applied to both research and teaching institutions.</b> The standard is based on a review of the 2000 Census information that indicated a strong increase in minorities holding bachelors degrees and higher since the 1990 Census.</p> <p>Review:</p> <p>Current standards were set based on being within +/- 10% of US minority population with baccalaureate degrees as evident in 1990 census data for education attainment of persons 25 yrs and older.</p> <p>Staff has review 2000 Census Educational Attainment data for Persons 25 years and older by race. Those data are presented below and show a considerable increase in the percent of minorities with bachelor degrees and above. In 1990, Census data indicated that 12% of minorities in the United States had bachelors degrees and higher whereas 13.4% of South Carolinian minorities held bachelors degrees and higher. 2000 Census numbers showed that the minorities in the United States that had bachelor degrees and higher increased to 20.9% while the percentage of South Carolinian minorities holding bachelors degrees and higher reached 15.7%. It is noted that 1990 race/ethnicity data and 2000 Census race/ethnicity data may not be directly comparable due to changes in how these data were collected in 2000.</p> <p>1990 data and 2000 Census data are presented on the following page for review.</p> <p>Other data reviewed:</p> <p>Staff reviewed trends in graduate enrollment and data for SC and its peer institutions. A table showing SC institutions and the average minority headcount graduate enrollment of peer institutions for the past 5 years is displayed as well.</p> <p>Performance Funding Data are found in the excel file reference in the cover memo. See worksheet “8C3”.</p>

**Attachment 2  
CAPA Meeting  
February 6, 2003**

**Education Attainment of Persons 25 years and older, 2000 Census Supplemental Survey**

**SOUTH CAROLINA**

	Total	White (1)	% of Total	Black	% of Total	Other (2)	% of Total	Other + Black	% of Total
<b>Total:</b>	<b>2,596,010</b>	<b>1,844,670</b>	<b>71.1%</b>	<b>681,366</b>	<b>26.2%</b>	<b>69,974</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>751,340</b>	<b>28.9%</b>
Less than 9th grade	215,776	120,006	55.6%	84,690	39.2%	11,080	5.1%	95,770	44.4%
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	398,503	233,156	58.5%	154,354	38.7%	10,993	2.8%	165,347	41.5%
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	778,054	536,947	69.0%	225,509	29.0%	15,598	2.0%	241,107	31.0%
Some college, no degree	500,194	373,959	74.8%	114,274	22.8%	11,961	2.4%	126,235	25.2%
Associate degree	173,428	133,597	77.0%	35,320	20.4%	4,511	2.6%	39,831	23.0%
Bachelor's degree	351,526	296,500	84.3%	45,894	13.1%	9,132	2.6%	55,026	15.7%
Graduate or professional degree	178,529	150,505	84.3%	21,325	11.9%	6,699	3.8%	28,024	15.7%
<b>Total with Bachelors or Higher</b>	<b>530,055</b>	<b>447,005</b>	<b>84.3%</b>	<b>67,219</b>	<b>12.7%</b>	<b>15,831</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>83,050</b>	<b>15.7%</b>

**UNITED STATES**

	Total	White (1)	% of Total	Black	% of Total	Other (2)	% of Total	Other + Black	% of Total
<b>Total:</b>	<b>13,755,477</b>	<b>8,439,716</b>	<b>61.4%</b>	<b>1,575,555</b>	<b>11.5%</b>	<b>3,740,206</b>	<b>27.2%</b>	<b>5,315,761</b>	<b>38.6%</b>
Less than 9th grade	21,960,148	15,058,521	68.6%	3,932,139	17.9%	2,969,488	13.5%	6,901,627	31.4%
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	52,168,981	42,216,532	80.9%	5,909,783	11.3%	4,042,666	7.7%	9,952,449	19.1%
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	38,351,595	30,763,729	80.2%	4,464,348	11.6%	3,123,518	8.1%	7,587,866	19.8%
Some college, no degree	11,512,833	9,315,598	80.9%	1,145,001	9.9%	1,052,234	9.1%	2,197,235	19.1%
Associate degree	28,317,792	23,734,685	83.8%	1,877,471	6.6%	2,705,636	9.6%	4,583,107	16.2%
Bachelor's degree	16,144,813	13,556,878	84.0%	953,798	5.9%	1,634,137	10.1%	2,587,935	16.0%
Graduate or professional degree	95,133,953	74,462,873	78.3%	10,877,379	11.4%	9,793,701	10.3%	20,671,080	21.7%
<b>Total with Bachelors or Higher</b>	<b>111,278,766</b>	<b>4,325,906</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>832,854</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	<b>17,113,809</b>	<b>15.4%</b>	<b>23,259,015</b>	<b>20.9%</b>

(1) White alone population

(2) Other includes: American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Some other race alone, Two or more races,

Note - data may not directly compare to 1990 numbers. The race/ethnicity question was asked differently in the 2000 Census. Respondents were allowed to choose more than one race/ethnicity.

**Educational Attainment for Persons 25+ by Race  
1990 Census Tape STF3, Tables P57, P58**

*(calculations from data provided by Budget & Control Board, Office of Research & Statistics)*

<b>SOUTH CAROLINA</b>		Total	% of Total	White	% of Total	Black	% of Total	Other	% of Total	Black + Other	% of Total
<b>Total</b>		2,167,590	100%	1,581,298	73.0%	564,369	26.0%	21,923	1.0%	586,292	27.0%
< 9th grade		295,167	100%	169,253	57.3%	123,006	41.7%	2,908	1.0%	125,914	42.7%
9-12th grade, no diploma		392,093	100%	248,219	63.3%	140,640	35.9%	3,234	0.8%	143,874	36.7%
high school (includes equivalent)		639,358	100%	469,093	73.4%	164,854	25.8%	5,411	0.8%	170,265	26.6%
some college, no degree		342,965	100%	272,559	79.5%	67,095	19.6%	3,311	1.0%	70,406	20.5%
associate degree		137,174	100%	109,754	80.0%	25,822	18.8%	1,598	1.2%	27,420	20.0%
bachelors degree (1)		243,161	100%	210,311	86.5%	29,704	12.2%	3,146	1.3%	32,850	13.5%
grad/prof degree (2)		117,672	100%	102,109	86.8%	13,248	11.3%	2,315	2.0%	15,563	13.2%
<b>total w/ bachelors or higher (1) + (2)</b>		<b>360,833</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>312,420</b>	<b>86.6%</b>	<b>42,952</b>	<b>11.9%</b>	<b>5,461</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>48,413</b>	<b>13.4%</b>

  

<b>UNITED STATES</b>		Total	% of Total	White	% of Total	Black	% of Total	Other	% of Total	Black + Other	% of Total
<b>Total</b>		158,868,436	100%	132,023,308	83.1%	16,761,234	10.6%	10,083,894	6.3%	26,845,128	16.9%
< 9th grade		16,502,211	100%	11,806,669	71.5%	2,306,445	14.0%	2,389,097	14.5%	4,695,542	28.5%
9-12th grade, no diploma		22,841,507	100%	17,355,153	76.0%	3,881,407	17.0%	1,604,947	7.0%	5,486,354	24.0%
high school (includes equivalent)		47,642,763	100%	40,891,202	85.8%	4,680,594	9.8%	2,070,967	4.3%	6,751,561	14.2%
some college, no degree		29,779,777	100%	25,221,246	84.7%	3,101,292	10.4%	1,457,239	4.9%	4,558,531	15.3%
associate degree		9,791,925	100%	8,303,582	84.8%	886,118	9.0%	602,225	6.2%	1,488,343	15.2%
bachelors degree (1)		20,832,567	100%	18,337,917	88.0%	1,261,090	6.1%	1,233,560	5.9%	2,494,650	12.0%
grad/prof degree (2)		11,477,686	100%	10,107,539	88.1%	644,288	5.6%	725,859	6.3%	1,370,147	11.9%
<b>total w/ bachelors or higher (1) + (2)</b>		<b>32,310,253</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>28,445,456</b>	<b>88.0%</b>	<b>1,905,378</b>	<b>5.9%</b>	<b>1,959,419</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>3,864,797</b>	<b>12.0%</b>

**IPEDS PEER ENROLLMENT DATA**

The following data are for headcount graduate students enrolled fall term 97 through 01

<b>Percent Minority Graduate Students</b>					
	<b>Fall 97</b>	<b>Fall 98</b>	<b>Fall 99</b>	<b>Fall 00</b>	<b>Fall 01</b>
Clemson	7.7%	6.4%	6.6%	7.4%	7.2%
Clemson PF/MRR Peers	10.9%	11.1%	11.4%	10.9%	10.7%
USC	13.5%	13.5%	13.9%	14.6%	14.8%
USC PF/MRR Peers	14.4%	14.7%	14.8%	12.4%	13.7%
MUSC	14.1%	16.0%	17.0%	13.0%	14.2%
MUSC PF/MRR Peers	14.8%	15.4%	16.0%	13.1%	11.8%
Teaching Sector	23.0%	20.8%	22.8%	23.9%	23.8%
Teaching Sector Peers	17.4%	18.0%	18.8%	18.2%	18.4%

<b>STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Applies to</b>	<b>Consideration</b>
<p><b>8C4,</b> <u>Percent of faculty who are minority</u></p>	<p><b>Research Institutions Teaching Institutions Regional Campuses Technical Colleges</b></p>	<p><b>Staff suggests no changes to the present standards</b></p> <p>Review:</p> <p>Since Year 5, an improvement factor of 3% has applied with the ranges for “achieves” of 10%-13% for all sectors.</p> <p>Current standards were set for research, teaching, and regional based on being within +/- 10% of US minority population with graduate degrees as evident in 1990 census data for education attainment of persons 25 yrs and older. For technical colleges it was determined based on being within +/-10% of % of US minority population with baccalaureate degrees as evident in 1990 census data for education attainment of persons 25 yrs and older.</p> <p>See indicator 8C3 above for relevant Census data.</p> <p>Staff also reviewed IPEDS faculty data for SC and peer institutions. A table is follows for information.</p> <p>Performance Funding Data are found in the excel file reference in the cover memo. See worksheet “8C4”</p>

IPEDS Fall Staff Data

The following data are for headcount faculty data - fall term as indicated

	<b>Percent Minority Faculty Headcount</b>				
	<b>Fall 97</b>	<b>Fall 98</b>	<b>Fall 99</b>	<b>Fall 00</b>	<b>Fall 01</b>
Clemson	9.0%	9.8%	6.2%	6.6%	10.4%
Clemson PF/MRR Peers	10.4%	11.0%	10.6%	11.5%	11.7%
USC	8.8%	6.0%	6.5%	10.7%	11.5%
USC PF/MRR Peers	11.3%	12.6%	13.1%	13.5%	13.4%
MUSC	6.5%	4.1%	9.0%	12.2%	8.7%
MUSC PF/MRR Peers	9.5%	10.4%	10.3%	10.3%	11.8%
SC Teaching Sector	16.9%	16.5%	16.2%	16.1%	14.9%
Teaching Sector Peers	15.1%	15.9%	16.2%	16.8%	16.2%
USC Beaufort	8.0%	12.5%	14.3%	7.1%	6.4%
USC Beaufort MGT Peers	18.9%	17.0%	17.9%	16.0%	14.9%
SC Regional Campuses	7.8%	3.6%	3.6%	5.8%	11.3%
Regional Campus Peers	19.6%	18.4%	17.5%	16.3%	15.1%
SC Technical College Sector	14.1%	12.8%	11.9%	12.8%	14.8%
Technical College Peers	9.0%	9.0%	9.3%	9.9%	12.6%

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR 9, RESEARCH FUNDING**

**9A**

**INDICATOR 9A, FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR REFORM IN TEACHER EDUCATION**

What: For Clemson, USC Columbia and Teaching sector institutions, the measure applied is the ratio of expenditures of grants/awards to support teacher preparation or training to the expenditures of such grants/awards for the prior three years.

For MUSC, a comparable measure was developed effective in Year 6 (2001-02) that measures the ratio of expenditures of grants/awards to support the improvement in child and adolescent health to the expenditures of such grants/awards for the prior three years.

Applies to: **Research** and **Teaching** sector institutions as a “scored” indicator with differences in definitions applied to MUSC.

Crafted by: CHE with institutions. Unchanged since Year 4 (1999-2000). MUSC’s measure became effective with Year 6 (2001-02).

Data Source: Institutions report data on grant expenditures to CHE.

Standard: A standard of 80.0% to 119.0% applies for Research Institutions and Teaching Institutions. An improvement factor does not apply. The measure is defined differently for MUSC and a standard of 80.0% to 119.0% also applies.

<b>STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Applies to</b>	<b>Consideration</b>
<b>9A</b>	<b>Research Institutions Teaching Institutions</b>	<p><b>Staff suggests no changes at this time.</b></p> <p>Review: Current standard adopted in light of SC institutional performance reviewed in Year 5. The current standard for “achieves” that has applied since Year 5 is 80.0% to 119.0%. An improvement factor has not applied.</p>

		See attached file for 9A performance data. (worksheet "9A (except MUSC))
9A MUSC	MUSC	<p><b>Measure and standards adopted effective with Year 6. The measure is being phased-in such that the first year using 4 years of data (current and 3 past years) will occur in Year 9 (2004-05). There is no need for revision to either the measure or standard at this time. Staff suggests continuing the standards adopted effective with Year 6 until the indicator has been fully phased-in.</b></p> <p>See workbook p. II.183-II.187 for details.</p> <p>Current standard being used for the first time in Year 7 (2002-03) is 80.0% to 119% with no improvement factor.</p>

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR 9, RESEARCH FUNDING**

**9B**

**INDICATOR 9B, AMOUNT OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR GRANTS**

What: In the past, this measure has applied considering the ratio of the current year restricted research fund expenditures to the past three-year average.

Applies to: **Research** Sector Institutions. This indicator is being scored in Year 7 (2002-03) as an average of the scores earned for the past three years. The measure is deferred until it can be re-aligned with the new federal financial reporting standards.

Crafted by: CHE with institutions. Unchanged since Year 4 (1999-2000), but deferred in the current year due to changes in financial reporting.

Data Source: Computed by CHE using data reported by institutions required for federal reporting.

Standards: This indicator has been deferred from scoring in the current year. For information on the measure and standards as applied in past years, please refer to the Year 5, 2000-01, and Year 6, 2002-03, Performance Funding Workbooks. Copies are available on CHE's website.

STANDARD CONSIDERATIONS (Targeted Year 8, 2003-04, Implementation)		
Indicator	Applies to	Consideration
9B	Research Institutions	<p><b>Measure deferred in the current year due to changes in reporting of financial information. The indicator needs to be re-aligned with the new financial data. Reporting for IPEDS using the new data will occur in late spring 2003. Consultation with Finance warranted.</b></p> <p>Past standards have relied on IPEDS data calculated</p>

		<p>such that an “achieves” was identified as the 40<sup>th</sup> to 75<sup>th</sup> percentiles of peer institutions (FY98 data). An improvement factor has not applied. Complete IPEDS peer data will not be available for some time given the allowed three-year phase-in under federal guidelines.</p>
--	--	---

**SC PERFORMANCE FUNDING INDICATORS, STANDARDS ANALYSIS**

*(Gray shading indicates compliance indicators and blue indicates indicator considerations deferred until late spring/early summer.)*

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Applies To</b>	<b>Review Status</b>
1B	Research and Teaching Two-Year Institutions	No Change No Change
1C	All	No Change to standard. <b>Technical measure revision suggested</b>
1D/E	All	No Change
2A	Research, Teaching and Regional Campuses Technical Colleges	No Change No Change
2D	All	Defer consideration of standards revision until late spring/early summer.
3D	All (except those without programs for which there is an approved agency)	No Change
3E		
3E1	Teaching Sector	No Change
3E2a	Teaching Sector	No Change (see also 7D)
3E2b	Teaching Sector	No Change (see also 7D)
3E3a	Teaching Sector	<b>Staff suggests using CHEMIS data and reviewing standards in light of that data. Issues to be discussed with teaching sector representatives.</b>
3E3b	Teaching Sector	<b>Same as 3E3a above.</b>
4A/B	All	No Change
5A	All	Measure re-alignment needed. Consideration deferred until late spring/summer.
6A/B	Clemson & USC C, Teaching, and Regional Campuses	No Change
6A/B MUSC	MUSC	No Change
7A	Clemson USC C, and Teaching	No Change
7A MUSC	MUSC	No Change
7A 2-yr	Regional Campuses and Technical Colleges	No Change
7B	Technical Colleges	Measure development
7C	Technical Colleges	Measure development
7D	All (except those without programs for which there is an identified exam)	No change to standards; <b>Measurement issues to be discussed as part of agenda item 4.</b>
7E	Regional Campuses	No Change
8C		
8C1	All	No Change
8C2	All	No Change
8C3	Research and Teaching	<b>Revise standard for both sectors to 13% to 18% and retain 5% improvement factor</b>
8C4	All	No Change
9A	Clemson, USC C, & Teaching	No Change
9A MUSC	MUSC	No Change
9B	Research	Measure re-alignment. Consideration deferred until late spring/summer.