

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

Explanation: 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 for all scored performance indicators were reviewed for the upcoming period three-year period (2003-04, 2004-05 and 2005-06). Attached are staff's recommendations with indicators grouped according to the recommendation. For several indicators, staff has not made a recommendation and plans to make its recommendation at a later date. These indicators are listed in the attachment. Please note that USC Beaufort is not included in the recommendations here as USC Beaufort will follow the transition plan approved by the Commission in November.

After due consideration, staff is not recommending any changes to standards at this time for those indicators for which a recommendation is being brought forward. Staff has recommended a technical change to the measure for Indicator 1C, Approval of Mission Statement, to better reflect the current status of the measure. Staff's recommendations were discussed with the Committee to Advise Performance Funding and Assessment on February 6, 2003. In making its recommendations, staff reviewed data from a variety of sources including peer data available from the National Center for Educational Statistics. It is intended that the recommended standards will stay in place for another three-year period. However, staff notes that, as has been the case in the past, standards for any of the measures could be revisited during the three-year period should data or other issues arise.

The attached table displays the indicator and staff's recommendation. The recommendations are broken into three sections: Section 1 displays those indicators staff is recommending no changes to the measure or standards; Section 2 displays the indicator for which staff is recommending a measurement change but no standards change; and Section 3 indicates the indicators for which there is no recommendation at this time. Detailed data are not included and should Committee members have an interest in receiving additional details for any of the indicators, please contact staff.

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Committee recommend for approval by the Commission continuing the current standards for performance indicators listed in item one of the attached materials for the next three years (i.e., 2003-04, 2004-05, and 2005-06). Additionally, staff also recommends a technical amendment to the measurement statement for Indicator 1C, Approval of Mission Statements as indicated in item 2 of the attached information. For the remaining indicators as listed in item 3, staff will make its recommendation at a later time.

**PERFORMANCE INDICATORS BY CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR BY INDICATOR
RECOMMENDED PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR 2003-04, 2004-05, AND 2005-06**

*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.

1). NO CHANGE. For the following list of indicators, staff recommends no change to the current measures or standards.

Indicator 1B, Curricula Offered to Achieve Mission

Applies to Research and Teaching sectors as a scored indicator and applies to Regional Campuses and Technical Colleges as a “compliance” indicator.

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)

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

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

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

Indicator 3D, Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs

Applies to All Institutions with eligible programs as a “scored” indicator.

Indicator 3E, Institutional Emphasis on Quality Teacher Education and Reform,

Part 1, NCATE accreditation status

Part 2, Student performance on professional knowledge and specialty area certification examinations ***See explanation under Indicator 7D for additional information.**

(See Item 3 for recommendations for Part 3)

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

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)

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

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) [A comparable measure is defined for MUSC]

Applies to Research, Teaching, and Regional Campuses as a “scored” indicator with differences in definitions applied to MUSC.

Indicator 7A, Graduation Rate [A comparable measure is defined for MUSC]

Applies to All Institutions as a “scored” indicator with differences in definitions for MUSC and across sectors.

Indicator 7D, Scores of Graduates on Post-Undergraduate Professional, Graduate, or Employment-Related Examinations and Certification Tests

Applies to All Institutions that have programs for which there is an identified exam as a “scored” indicator.

Additional Explanation, Indicators 7D and 3E part 2: Examinations currently deferred continue to be deferred (i.e., DANB, PRAXIS professional knowledge and middle school pedagogy examinations). Staff is in the process of reviewing with institutions a process for clarifying examinations included in the results. A CAPA meeting is scheduled for April 2, 2003. Should the outcome result in recommended changes that affect the current measure and/or standards, staff will re-visit this recommendation and bring forward a second recommendation if warranted.

Indicator 7E, Number of Graduates Who Continued Their Education

Applies to Regional Campuses only as a scored indicator.

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

Part 1, The percent of undergraduates who are SC citizens who are minority

Part 2, Fall-to-fall retention of minority degree-seeking undergraduates who are SC citizens

(See Item 3 below for recommendations for Parts 3 & 4)

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.

Indicator 9A, Financial Support for Reform in Teacher Education [A comparable measure is defined for MUSC]

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

2). CHANGE TO MEASURE BUT NO CHANGE TO STANDARDS. For the following indicator staff recommends a change to the measure but no change to the current standards.

Indicator 1C, Approval of a Mission Statement

Applies All Institutions as a “compliance” indicator.

Explanation: Staff recommends a technical change to the measure statement in order to better reflect the indicator. The current measure statement of “Mission statement with defined characteristics will be approved by the Commission on a five-year cycle” is recommended to read “Mission statement with defined characteristics will be submitted for approval of the Commission within three months of any changes receiving local board approval.”

3). DEFER RECOMMENDATION. For the following list of indicators, staff does not have a recommendation at present and plans to make a recommendation at a later point.

Indicator 2D, Compensation of Faculty

Applies to All Institutions as a “scored” indicator with differences in definition applying across sectors.

Explanation: The methodology used for setting standards in past years is under review. Staff is in the process of updating peer salary data for purposes of the MRR. Considerations regarding the standards for this indicator will be postponed until those data are collected. Staff expects to re-visit this issue in late spring or summer 2003.

Indicator 3E, Institutional Emphasis on Quality Teacher Education and Reform

Part 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.

Explanation: At present, staff and institutions are working to convert the reporting methodology to rely on CHEMIS reports rather than institutional reports. Staff expects to have its recommendation on standards by the May meeting of the Planning and Assessment Committee.

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

Applies to All Institutions, but deferred from scoring in Year 7 (2002-03)

Explanation: This measure is being re-aligned with new federal financial reporting requirements. Staff expects to work with institutions later this spring and in the summer so that a recommendation may be brought forward in Fall 2003.

Indicator 7B, Employment Rate for Graduates

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

Apply to Technical Colleges

Explanation: These indicators are under development. A measure will be piloted this fall using a third-party survey to determine employer satisfaction. Staff expects to bring forward a more detailed recommendation to the Committee prior to that time.

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

Part 3, The percent of graduate students who are minority

Part 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.

Explanation: There is no staff recommendation at this time. Staff is reviewing issues raised at the last CAPA meeting and will continue discussions at the next meeting of CAPA on April 2. Staff plans to bring a recommendation forward to the May Committee meeting.

Indicator 9B, Amount of Public and Private Sector Grants

Applies to Research Sector Institutions, but deferred from scoring in Year 7 (2002-03)

Explanation: This measure is being re-aligned with new federal financial reporting requirements. Staff expects to work with institutions later this spring and in the summer so that a recommendation may be brought forward in Fall 2003.
