



South Carolina Commission on Higher Education

Brig Gen John L. Finan, USAF (Ret.), Chair
Dr. Bettie Rose Horne, Vice Chair
Mr. Paul O. Batson, III
Mr. Tim M. Hofferth
Ms. Dianne C. Kuhl
Ms. Allison Dean Love
Dr. Louis B. Lynn
Vice Admiral Charles Munns, USN (ret.)
Mr. Clark B. Parker
Mr. Kim F. Phillips
Ms. Terrye C. Seckinger
Dr. Jennifer B. Settlemyer
Mr. Hood Temple
Dr. Evans Whitaker

Dr. Richard C. Sutton
Executive Director

CAAL
4/8/2015
Agenda Item 4

April 8, 2015

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Bettie Rose Horne, Chair, and Members, Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing
FROM: MaryAnn Janosik, Ph.D., Director, Academic Affairs

Developing More Robust Metrics to Monitor Academic Degree Programs

Background and Introduction

At its November 6, 2014 CHE meeting, Commissioners asked the Academic Affairs staff to prepare information for presentation at the January 8, 2015 Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing (CAAL) meeting that would assist CAAL members in determining future recommendations to the Commission regarding some of the action items included in the Commission's 2014-15 Strategic Agenda. Specifically, issues raised by the Commission reference action items included in four of the targeted strategic objectives.

In January 2015, CHE staff reviewed current practices for program evaluation and demonstrated how modifying some of the current criteria, specifically, changing enrollment and completion benchmarks, might affect the outcome of biennial program productivity review. CAAL members concurred that assessment of academic programming at both public and non-public institutions should be the main priority. They added that CHE should have a higher level of assessment which includes programs at both public and non-public licensed institutions and that the assessment should go beyond the current program productivity report, but emphasized that criteria metrics could be culled from existing or past initiatives (i.e., performance funding).

Dr. Janosik indicated that staff could begin work on this type of assessment and develop a draft template, and staff would also continue to explore multiple options for developing more robust productivity metrics. CAAL members reiterated that assessment criteria should apply to both public and non-public licensed institutions.

Information presented at the January CAAL meeting can be accessed via this link:

http://www.che.sc.gov/CHE_Docs/academicaffairs/CAAL/CAAL_Jan08_2015/3.pdf

The Division of Academic Affairs continues to update the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing (CAAL) on various strategies to strengthen the Commission's monitoring of new and existing academic programs. Since the January CAAL meeting, Academic Affairs staff has spoken with higher education agency counterparts in at least seven other states, met with the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs (ACAP) to discuss possible review options (February 2015), and met with CHE's data management staff. These discussions have helped confirm the following:

- the variety of data collected already
- the criteria and means most helpful for reporting program productivity
- the benefits both other states and in-state institutions have reaped as a result of such reporting

As a result of these findings, Academic Affairs is recommending the following general revisions to improve its monitoring of program productivity:

- Maintain the current biennial program productivity review and report of *all* academic programs, but increase the base line numbers for enrollment and completion.
- Include a third category, "licensure passage rate," for those programs (e.g., nursing, teacher preparation, etc.), that require passage of an exam to receive licensure.
- Introduce program-specific reviews *three years* after institutions have implemented new academic programs. A template for that review is included.

In addition, Academic Affairs has identified other, more specific, options for consideration:

Changes to Current Program Productivity Review

Improvements to the biennial productivity review could include the following:

- 1) Increase the "satisfactory" threshold for program completers from five to seven or eight.
- 2) Change the criterion for satisfactory program productivity from meeting *either* enrollment *or* completion thresholds to the new standard of meeting *both* enrollment *and* completion benchmarks
- 3) Add the monitoring of licensure and/or certification pass rates for applicable programs (e.g., nursing, education, engineering, etc.)

Third-Year Program-Specific Reviews

This new, second component of program productivity reviews is characterized as follows:

- 1) An assessment of new programs three years after implementation, specifically of programs approved beginning in 2015
- 2) Inclusion of additional criteria to compare with projections made during the application for program approval, including enrollment, faculty credentials, actual annual costs, additional funding sources (per program/per year), and graduate placement rates
- 3) Review of programmatic accreditation and/or licensure information

Next Steps

Upon recommendation from CAAL, Academic Affairs is prepared to move forward with its review of academic program monitoring metrics with the following:

- 1) Discussion with ACAP members (June 2015) to refine the list of viable benchmarks and the means for data collection
- 2) Exploring the means to procure software that connects higher education productivity with workforce data
- 3) Running test trials of the third-year review on recently approved programs to ascertain the effectiveness of new criteria and new data collected

Academic Affairs anticipates presenting a final recommendation to CAAL at its July 15, 2015 meeting.

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Program Productivity Case Study

Name of Institution / Degree Name and Level

Third Year Program Mock Review

MaryAnn Janosik, Ph.D. Director, Academic Affairs

3/25/2015

This *Third Year Program Review* is a **mock** assessment that compares a new, approved program's proposed productivity at the time of its application to its outcomes by the end of year three of implementation. The assessment requests data about program **personnel**, student **performance**, and **finances** to better assess and assure quality programmatic delivery to students.

General Instructions to Institutions

For the most recent three years, please provide institutional data about the following program features:

1. **Personnel** (Faculty Qualifications and FTE)
2. **Student Performance** (Graduation, Placement, and Retention)
3. **Finances** (Actual Costs, Sources of Financing, and Debt Load)

Specific instructions accompany each section.

Thank you for your participation in this mock study. The data requested was suggested by ACAP and CHE staff in data analysis and Academic Affairs. This review provides for Commissioners **an example only** of *possible* metrics for future program productivity assessment (i.e., programs approved in 2015 forward.) As such, **this current assessment is not official, and has no impact** on assessment or reporting of the present program. I am pleased to answer any questions.

Return address: mjanosik@che.sc.gov

Return date requested: **Wednesday, April 1, 2015**

THIRD YEAR PROGRAM REVIEW (TEST CASE ONLY – NOT FOR OFFICIAL REVIEW)

I. Personnel: B. Faculty and Staff FTE

Total annual FTE needed to support the proposed program (i.e., the total FTE devoted just to the program for all faculty, staff, and program administrators):

Category	FTE
Faculty	
Staff	
Administration	

II. Student Performance: A. Graduation and Placement

Please provide available information/data for graduate placement rates, including matriculation to graduate school, employment related to discipline, and employment not related to discipline.

Year	Total Number of Graduates	Graduates Employed in Positions Related to Discipline	Graduates Employed in Positions Not Related to Discipline	Graduates Matriculating to Graduate School
FY 2012-13				
FY 2013-14				
FY 2014-15 (Projected)				

II. Student Performance: B. Placement Rates and Year-to-Year Retention

Please provide any additional information about graduate placement rates, if applicable.

Empty response box for graduate placement rates information.

Please provide information/data about junior to senior retention rates, if available.

Empty response box for junior to senior retention rates information.

DRAFT

THIRD YEAR PROGRAM REVIEW (TEST CASE ONLY – NOT FOR OFFICIAL REVIEW)

III. Finances: A.1 Actual Costs and Sources of Finances

Provide information about program costs and sources of financing. *Specify costs and sources of financing on the next page.

Financial Support			
Actual Costs by Year			
Category	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Program Administration			
Faculty and Staff Salaries			
Graduate Assistants			
Equipment			
Facilities			
Supplies and Materials			
Library Resources			
Other*			
Total			
Sources of Financing			
Category	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Tuition Funding			
Program-Specific Fees			
State Funding (i.e., Special State Appropriation)*			
Reallocation of Existing Funds*			
Federal Funding*			
Other Funding*			
Total			
Net Total (i.e., Sources of Financing Minus Actual Costs)			

III. Finances: A.2. Explanation of Other Costs and Sources of Financing

Provide an explanation for other costs, state funding, any reallocation of existing funds, federal funding, and other funding identified in the Financial Support table.

[Empty response box for A.2. Explanation of Other Costs and Sources of Financing]

III. Finances: B. Student Debt Load

If available, state the average debt load of graduates of the program.

[Empty response box for B. Student Debt Load]

DRAFT