Columbia Notebook

For the past several weeks I have had an opportunity to witness how decisions are made at a high level within our state. The three Task Force Committees charged with defining the measures for the thirty-seven performance indicators have completed their tasks on schedule. Jack Parson and I attended as many of the committee meetings as possible without attending so many that we would become examples of egregious failures of some of those same performance indicators.

Decision making is the essence of power. In the movie Brazil its world was a decisionless society: government made it so that no decisions were necessary because there were no choices (The song “Brazil” played on all stations at all times.) and being decisive and competent was subversive. Our world is nothing like “Brazil”. Choices abound. Competence exists. In fact, in my home in order to deal with a multitude of decisions we have a division of labor. My wife Stephanie, who is both decisive and competent, makes the minor decisions, such as: where we will live, where the kids will go to school and how to plan our finances; while I make the major decisions, like whether or not to bomb Iraq, whether to make China a most favored trading partner or what the size of the naval fleet should ultimately be. This works out fine.

In Columbia over the past month, despite my skepticism, important decisions have been made in the relatively short time allotted to the Task Forces. And, despite my skepticism, there have been individuals involved in the process of defining the performance indicator measures who have demonstrated extraordinary competence and genuine concern for higher education. So there is hope after all.

Upcoming Meetings

Fall Senate Meetings
(100 Maybank Hall, 5 p.m.)
- Tuesday, October 1
- Tuesday, November 5
- Tuesday, November 26
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Announcements and Letters

The following announcement was submitted by Dr. Jeri Cabot, Associate Dean of Students

The Office of Student Affairs would like to open a dialogue with the faculty about the honor code and its vitality at the College.

The dialogue could start at many different points, but perhaps it is best to commence with the procedural side of the code.

What does the code say and what should faculty members do if they suspect that a student has committed an academically dishonest act?

We all share responsibility for encouraging academic honesty and under the College of Charleston Honor Code, "faculty members are
equally required to report violations of the Honor Code. "Let me be more precise, all acts or attempted acts of alleged academic dishonesty must be reported to the Dean of Students. The Honor Code specifically forbids: lying, cheating, attempted cheating, stealing, attempted stealing and plagiarism.

If you suspect a violation has occurred (we can share tips about dealing with in-progress cheating later) collect and review all available evidence. You may wish to approach the student with your suspicions. If the student is unable to explain satisfactorily the discrepancies, make photocopies of the materials for the Office of Student Affairs and keep all originals. The Office of Student Affairs is available to consult with faculty members on aspects of evidence. Along with the relevant materials send a written report addressed to the Dean of Students containing: the name of the student(s); all details of the suspected violation; and names of potential witnesses. The Office will contact the student and any witnesses and discuss the alleged violation. The Office will inform the faculty member whether there is a reasonable basis for the allegation and of the steps to follow.

Let me quote from the Student Handbook at this point: "When the allegation is some form of academic dishonesty, the professor of the course in which the violation is alleged to have occurred normally will be listed as a witness in the notice, in that it is anticipated that the expertise and judgment of that professor will be relevant and important to the consideration of the case (p. 25)." Faculty should expect to be called for testimony before a Honor Board (six students, one faculty, and one staff) if the student contests. Student Affairs gladly will give faculty a description of the hearing procedures and standards of evidence employed by the Board.

It is contrary to the spirit of the Honor Code for an instructor to assign a disciplinary grade such as an "F" or zero to an assignment, test, exam or other course work for admitted or suspected academic dishonesty in lieu of formally charging the student with academic dishonesty under the Code. Such an independent action violates the student's guaranteed legal right to due process and leaves the instructor vulnerable to a student grievance.*
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In the case of alleged academic dishonesty and the student elects to go before a Board, the student's grade in the assignment and/or course will be carried as an 'incomplete' until the charges are resolved (Student Handbook, p. 25). After the Board delivers a decision, "the professor will award an appropriate grade based on the decision... (p. 25)." The Board cannot include as part of its sanction recommendation a specific grade to be assigned by the professor.

Most of the students that are notified to come to Student Affairs because of a suspected violation quickly admit that they committed the act. They can have a sanction set by either the Dean of Students, a Honor Board, or a Disciplinary Panel (two students and one faculty).

Maintaining our environment of academic integrity is a joint responsibility. I hope the above descriptive information is a helpful first step in talking about our commitment to teaching about honesty in academic work.

Student members of the Honor Board are available and prepared to make brief class presentations about the Code, the Honor Board and the vocabulary needed to confront dishonest peers. Student Affairs has this year's Student Handbook ready for distribution.

The following announcement was submitted by Jayne Rugg, Director of Academic Advising

ADJUNCT ADVISING PILOT PROJECT

The Advising Center has had funds allocated for a pilot that would pay adjunct faculty for advising undeclared students through the Advising Center for Fall 1996 and Spring 1997 semesters. The funds for this pilot will provide adjunct advising for approximately 1/3 of the undeclared students. Roster Faculty will be
encouraged to participate in the advising of the remaining students. We are anticipating needing approximately 1,200 advising hours each semester from Roster Faculty.

For further questions, please call the Advising Center at 953-5981.

The following letter was submitted on September 6, 1996, by Dr. Dinesh G. Sarvate, Professor of Mathematics.

To
Professor Robert Mignone,
Speaker of the Faculty,
College of Charleston

Dear Professor Mignone,

I was on half pay sabbatical last year so I don't know much about the events at the College, in particular the exact event which prompted the Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review to express its concern (Minutes of the Faculty Senate April 16, 1996 (Second Session)), and then AAUP chapter to pass a resolution which received unanimous support from responding faculty. (see Faculty Minutes, April 22, 1996)

It seems that in the past, in the education institutions and may be in our college, some people were promoted without due process ("The practice of making tenure and promotion decisions outside the provisions of the Manual, though valid de facto in cases already past, should now be discontinued." Minutes of the Faculty Senate April 16, 1996 (Second Session)), on the other hand this time the administration initiated the process for some of us.

I feel that the committee must have worked in the best interest of the faculty as a whole, but I would like to bring up another point of view.

There must have been some very real and serious circumstances why those people did not come up for promotion in the usual fashion and the administration initiated their cause. Right now we have no way to promote people who are the victims of the circumstances. These people may have worked selflessly for the benefit of all of us and not just keeping in mind what should be done for their own promotions. These may be the people who went out of their way to get better standards pass through the faculty and hired so many of the strong faculty. If bringing up their names for promotion by the administration is considered as the fault of the administration then I would like to differ with the committee and the AAUP chapter and congratulate the President and the administration that they tried to undo the injustice and they tried to take care of faculty members in the most human and just fashion. Unfortunately, I think that either their message was not understood by the committee and the Senate that the committee was just not interested in taking care of unusual cases in unusual fashion and wanted to follow just the rules.

I feel that there are people in the college and in particular in my department/school who are far superior than, say me, in service and in teaching and in helping the students, the faculty and the college and the society, that I will be uncomfortable to come up for my own promotion before they are promoted.

It is very easy for a college president to give a hefty raise to someone without giving a promotion and most of us will not even know about it and most of us will not be able to do anything even if we come to know about it. I think there are situations where a president should have the right to bring to the attention of the committee somebody who is of exceptional quality in certain areas and it makes more sense that the committee then thinks above and beyond the manual rules, where those special cases are not treated or taken into consideration.

I think the President/administration did a wonderful and gracious thing by bringing to the attention of the committee some cases and I once again want to congratulate the President/administration for doing so. Particularly when, as I understand, certain people may have got tenure and/or promotion in the past without the committee's knowledge and/or outside the criteria and standards of the Manual.

At times I feel that following only the present criteria and standards of the Manual may lead to promotion and tenure of average people like myself but may hurt exceptionally good people in say, two out of the three areas.
I understand that the issue of promotion outside the criteria and standards of the Manual is very delicate and therefore if the administration brings up the exceptional cases to the committee and then committee decides about the cases, we will have a very wise and fair procedure.

Dinesh G. Sarvate, Mathematics
Senator (at large)

Progress report on Performance Funding

On September 24, 1996 the Steering Committee for Performance Funding, a committee composed of a subset of Commission on Higher Education members, met to consider the reports from the three Task Force Committees: Academics, Planning/Institutional Effectiveness and Administrative Management. The Steering Committee voted to accept, with minor revisions, the measures of the 37 performance indicators. A summary of those recommendations is attached to this Newsletter.

The next phase of the process will be for the sector committees to recommend what the benchmarks and weights should be for the 37 performance indicators relative to a given sector (research, four year liberal arts, two year liberal arts, two year technical), institution within a given sector and current performance of a given institution.

Robert Mignone
Speaker of the Faculty
MignoneR@CofC.edu
(803)953-5740
### STATUS ON TASK FORCE ACTIVITY - UPDATED 9/20/96

#### MISSION FOCUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE INDICATOR</th>
<th>TASK FORCE</th>
<th>APPROVED MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(A) Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission</td>
<td>Administrative Management</td>
<td>Percent of instruction, research, public service, academic support, student services, institutional support, operation and maintenance of plant, scholarships and fellowships expenditures compared to total educational and general (E&amp;G) expenditures (excluding funds transfers)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1(B) Curricula offered to achieve mission | Academics | Percentage and number of degree programs and other curricular offerings as defined by CHE; which:
- a. Are appropriate to the degree-level authorized for the institution in Act 359 of 1996;
- b. Support the institution’s goal, purpose, and objectives as defined in its approved mission statement;
- c. Meet baseline CHE-approved productivity standards with respect to student enrollment, degrees awarded, and student placements;
- d. Represent a reasonable investment of resources as measured against actual student enrollments, degrees awarded, and student placements;
- e. Have achieved a recognized standard of excellence as denoted through instruments such as CHE Commendations of Excellence; ratings or rankings by recognized discipline-based groups; other awards and honors which testify to the program’s regional and national reputation which can be quantified; and
- f. Are not offered, but ought to be offered in support of that mission |
| 1(C) Approval of mission statement | Planning/Institutional Effectiveness | Mission statement with defined characteristics will be approved by Commission on Higher Education on a five year cycle. (The Task Force sees this measure as a Yes/No evaluation.) |
| 1(D) Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement | Planning/Institutional Effectiveness | Strategic plan with defined characteristics will be approved by the Commission on Higher Education based on (1) whether or not it addresses the required elements and (2) whether or not it supports the mission statement (The Task Force sees this as a Yes/No measure with evaluative commentary.) |
| 1(E) Attainment of goals of the strategic plan | Planning/Institutional Effectiveness | Annual progress report on strategic plan analyzed and assessed by the Commission on Higher Education and rated on a scale based on progress on meeting the goals and the resources required to do so |

**QUALITY OF FACULTY**

| 2(A) Academic and other credentials of professors and instructors | Academics | A) Percent of all headcount faculty who meet the criteria for faculty credentials of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); and B) Percent of all headcount faculty who exceed the criteria for faculty credentials for SACS |
| 2(B) Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations | Academics | The extent to which criteria stipulated in the “Best Practices for a Performance Review System for Faculty” document are incorporated into the institution’s own performance review system and the relative ranking of each institution as compared to others in its sector |
| 2(C) Post-tenure review for tenured faculty | Academics | The extent to which criteria stipulated in the “Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review” document are incorporated into the institution’s own performance review system and the relative ranking of each institution as compared to others in its sector |
| 2(D) Compensation of faculty | Academics | Average deviation (expressed in standardized units) of faculty salaries by rank, discipline, and type of institution from national averages |
| 2(E) Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom | Academics | A) Percent of instructional faculty who receive a mean rating of “satisfied” or above on a standardized question using a standardized scale administered in a prescribed manner on anonymous student evaluations which are submitted for all courses; and
B) Percent of students who report satisfaction with the availability of academic advisors outside the classroom as shown by a mean rating of “satisfied” or above on an anonymous evaluation instrument completed at a minimum during the fall term by a representative sample of freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors. |
| 2(F) Community or public service activities of faculty for which no extra compensation is paid | Academics | Percent of full-time faculty participating in service to the community or public using professional skills/knowledge base with emphasis on service to the economic and community development of region or the State |

**INSTRUCTIONAL QUALITY**

| 3(A) Class sizes and student/teacher ratios | Planning/Institutional Effectiveness | (1) Average class size by sector, discipline, level, and mode of delivery compared to the average in South Carolina’s public institutions, and
(2) Ratio of FTE students to FTE teaching faculty compared to the average in South Carolina’s public institutions |
| 3(B) Number of credit hours taught by faculty | Planning/Institutional Effectiveness | Average number of credit hours taught by (1) full time teaching faculty and (2) FTE teaching faculty, by level and sector compared to the average in South Carolina’s public institutions |
| 3(C) Ratio of full-time faculty as compared to other full-time employees | Academics | Total number of all full-time faculty members paid from unrestricted Educational and General Funds as a percent of the total number of all full-time employees paid from unrestricted Educational and General Funds |
| 3(D) Accreditation of degree-granting programs | Academics | Number of programs listed in the Inventory of Academic Degree Programs holding accreditation from a recognized accrediting agency as a percent of the total number of programs listed in the Inventory of Academic Degree Programs for which accreditation is available |
| 3(E) Institutional emphasis on quality teacher education and reform | Academics | The extent to which the criteria stipulated in the “Best Practices for Quality Teacher Education and Reform” document are incorporated into the institution’s own teacher education program and the relative ranking of each institution to others in its sector |

**INSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION AND COLLABORATION**

| 4(A) Sharing and use of technology, programs, equipment, supplies, and source matter experts within the institution, with other institutions, and the business community | Administrative Management | The total number of cooperative/collaborative projects, partners, people served, and the total financial impact of the cooperative/collaborative projects |
| 4(B) Cooperation and collaboration with private industry, the business community, and government | Administrative Management | The total number of cooperative/collaborative projects, partners, or people served, and the total financial impact of the cooperative/collaborative projects |

* Considered in 4(B)
** Moved from part (A)
### ADMINISTRATIVE EFFICIENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5(A) Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs</th>
<th>Administrative Management</th>
<th>Academic costs as a percentage of total Education &amp; General expenditures compared to administrative costs (institutional support) as a percentage of total E&amp;G expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5(B) Use of best management practices</td>
<td>Administrative Management</td>
<td>The evaluation by the Commission on Higher Education of each institution’s best management practices based on a CHE approved list of criteria, reported by the institutions, and evaluated by CHE annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(C) Elimination of unjustified duplication of and waste in administrative and academic programs</td>
<td>Administrative Management</td>
<td>Percent of administrative and academic costs saved by the identification of and elimination of unjustified duplication and waste in administrative and academic programs as identified and reported by the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(D) Amount of general overhead costs</td>
<td>Administrative Management</td>
<td>General overhead cost per FTE student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6(A) SAT and ACT scores of student body</th>
<th>Administrative Management</th>
<th>Percent of first-time entering freshmen who meet or exceed the benchmark SAT or ACT score for the sector within the state (This measure is not applicable to the technical colleges)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6(B) High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body</td>
<td>Administrative Management</td>
<td>Percent of first-time entering freshmen with a high school GPA equal to or greater than X (This measure is not applicable to the technical colleges)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Task Force on Administrative Management believes this indicator is not relevant to entrance requirements and requests that the Steering Committee reassign this indicator to a more appropriate category and task force.

Ratio of enrolled in-state undergraduate students to total undergraduate students

**GRADUATES' ACHIEVEMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7(A) Graduation rate</th>
<th>Planning/Institutional Effectiveness</th>
<th>Percentage of first time, full time students who graduate within 150% of the normal program time from the same institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7(B) Employment rate for graduates</td>
<td>Planning/Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>Percentage of graduates from undergraduate programs in an institution who are employed within a time frame determined by sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7(C) Employer feedback on graduates who were employed or not employed</td>
<td>Planning/Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>Level of satisfaction with the graduates of an institution, on a statewide survey, reported on a scale of satisfaction, by institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7(D) Scores of graduates on postgraduate professional, graduate or employment-related examinations who continue their education</td>
<td>Planning/Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>(1) Percentage of total students taking certification examinations who pass the examination on the first attempt, and (2) percentage of the total students who pass the examination on subsequent attempts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7(E) Number of graduates who continue their education</td>
<td>Planning/Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>Percentage of graduates who continue their education in a more advanced program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7(F) Credit hours earned of graduates</td>
<td>Planning/Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>Total number of hours required to graduate by sector, discipline/degree, and by institution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### USER-FRIENDLINESS OF INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8(A) Transferability of credits to and from the institution</th>
<th>Academics</th>
<th>The extent to which the criteria stipulated in the “Policy and Procedures for Transferability of Credits” document are achieved by the institution and the relative ranking of each institution to others in its sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8(B) Continuing education programs for graduates and others</td>
<td>Planning/Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>Number of non-credit continuing education student contact hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8(C) Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State</td>
<td>Administrative Management</td>
<td>Ratio of an institution’s accumulated points for accessibility to maximum points allowed for measure. Accessibility points: A) Percent of other-race students enrolled at an institution = X points B) Total number of credit hours generated off-campus in counties where no comparable program is offered by a public institution = X points C) Total number of credit hours generated in-state through distance education = X points D) In-state, undergraduate, tuition and required fees are not more than .XX% of S.C. personal per capita income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESEARCH FUNDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9(A) Financial support for reform in teacher education</th>
<th>Academics</th>
<th>Percentage of an institution’s private and public research grants and Educational and General costs dedicated to teacher education programs as measured against the total Educational and General costs and public and private grants allocated to research for the institutions, weighted by total FTE enrollment in teacher education programs (graduate and undergraduate) as related to the enrollment in all other degree programs (graduate and undergraduate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9(B) Amount of public and private sector grants</td>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>The current year's grants (i.e., the total dollars received from public and private sector grants expended in State fiscal year for research, including federal and state grants, private gifts and grants, and local support, and excluding monies for financial aid, student scholarships and loans) divided by the weighted average of grant funding from the prior three years (weighted at 60%, 30% and 10% from most recent year to least recent year respectively)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BEST PRACTICES FOR A PERFORMANCE REVIEW SYSTEM FOR FACULTY

1. The performance review system must meet the "Criteria and Procedures for Evaluation" (4.8.10) of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools which stipulate that: (1) an institution must conduct periodic evaluations of the performance of individual faculty members; (2) the evaluation must include a statement of the criteria against which the performance of each faculty member will be measured; (3) the criteria must be consistent with the purpose and goals of the institution and be made known to all concerned; and (4) the institution must demonstrate that it uses the results of this evaluation for improvement of the faculty and its educational program.

2. The performance review system should be both formative (designed to be a supportive process that promotes self-improvement) and summative (assesses and judges performance).

3. The performance review system process and criteria should be explained to new hires.

4. All faculty, including tenured faculty at all ranks, are reviewed annually and receive a written performance evaluation. In this way, for those institutions with a tenure system, the performance review system should not pose a threat to the tenure system but extends and enlarges it.

5. The performance review system should have been developed jointly by the faculty and administrators of an institution.

6. The performance review system should allow for discipline-specific components.

7. The performance review system should provide opportunities for reflection, feedback, and professional growth whose goal is to enhance instruction at the institution.

8. The performance review system should include written performance evaluation data from four sources:
   a. Annually, instruction and course evaluation forms completed anonymously by students through a standardized institutional process and submitted for each course (not section) taught;
   b. Annually, administrative evaluation which includes assessments from the department chair and/or dean;
   c. Annually for untenured faculty and at least every three years for tenured faculty, internal peer evaluations, i.e., evaluation of faculty by their peers within the institution of higher education;
   d. At least every six years, input from peers external to the department and/or institution as appropriate to the role and function of each faculty member. External evaluators to the institution include national peers from the same field of expertise from other institutions of higher education, professional organizations and societies, federal agencies, etc. Specialized national accreditations and the CHE program reviews, which include external reviewers' assessments, could be incorporated into the external peer review component, where appropriate.

9. At an institutional level, the performance review system must include the following criteria as appropriate to the institution's mission:
   - instruction/teaching
   - advisement and mentoring of students
   - graduate student supervision
   - supervision of other students (teaching assistants, independent study students)
   - course/curriculum development
research/creative activities
activities which support the economic development of the region or the State
publications
service to department
service to institution
service to community
participation in professional organizations/associations
honors, awards, and recognitions
self-evaluation
participation in faculty development activities/programs activities which actively support the economic development of the region or the State

10. The results of each performance review, including post-tenure review, must be used by the institution as part of its faculty reward system and faculty development system, and the system should include a plan for development when deficiencies are indicated in the review. Specifically:

a. when an instructor (in the Tech system) or untenured faculty member receives an overall rating of unsatisfactory on the annual performance review, the faculty member may be subject to nonreappointment;

b. when an instructor (in the Tech system) or tenured faculty member receives an overall rating of unsatisfactory on the annual performance review, the faculty member is immediately subject to a development process, developed by the specific unit, whose goal is to restore satisfactory performance. The development process will include a written plan with performance goals in deficient areas, with appropriate student and peer evaluation of performance.

c. when an instructor (in the Tech system) or a tenured faculty member fails to make substantial progress towards the performance goals at the time of the next annual review or fails to meet the performance goals specified in the development plan within a specified period, that faculty member will be subject to dismissal (in the Tech system) or revocation of tenure for habitual neglect of duty under the terms of the senior institution's faculty manual.

11. The institution should develop an appeals procedure for those faculty who do not agree with the results of the performance evaluation and/or the resulting recommendations or requirements for improvement.
BEST PRACTICES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW

1. A post-tenure review system should incorporate all the indicators identified in the "Best Practices for a Performance Review System for Faculty" document.

2. The post-tenure review should be as rigorous and comprehensive in scope as an initial tenure review.

3. The post-tenure review should incorporate annual performance reviews accumulated since the initial tenure review or since the last post-tenure review.

4. Whereas the focus of an initial tenure review tends to be on past performance, equal emphasis should be given to future development and potential contributions in the post-tenure review.

5. Statewide, each tenured faculty member will have a post-tenure review conducted at pre-established, published intervals of no more than six years, unless the faculty member is participating in a development/improvement process in which case the review may be conducted more frequently.

6. If reviews for promotion (e.g., a tenured associate professor is reviewed for promotion to tenured full professor) fall within the appropriate time interval and encompass all the indicators in this document and in the "Best Practices for a Performance Review System for Faculty" document, they may constitute a post-tenure review.

7. The post-tenure review must include evaluations from peers external to the department and/or institution as appropriate to the role and function of each faculty member (usually to evaluate the quality of research), as well as internal peer evaluations, student evaluations, and administrative evaluations.

8. The post-tenure review must provide detailed information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the six-year post-tenure review period.

9. The institution must identify the means by which the post-tenure review is linked with faculty reward systems, including merit raises and promotion.

10. The institution must display a commitment to provide funds to reward high achievers on post-tenure reviews as well as to provide assistance to faculty members needing improvement.

11. If a faculty member receives an unfavorable post-tenure review, the faculty member is immediately subject to a development process as described in the "Best Practices for a Performance Review System for Faculty," as outlined in 10(b) and 10(c) of that document.

12. The institution should develop an appeals procedure for those faculty who do not agree with the results of the post-tenure review evaluation and/or the resulting recommendations or requirements for improvement.
2E. **Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom**

With regard to satisfaction of students with the availability of course instructors, the following question is suggested for inclusion in a course evaluation.

*Please indicate your satisfaction with the availability of the instructor outside the classroom by choosing one response from the scale below. (In selecting your rating, consider the instructor's availability via established office hours, appointments, and other opportunities for face-to-face interaction as well as via telephone, e-mail, fax and other means.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION OF THE EVALUATION**

1. All faculty are required to administer the evaluation instrument in all courses except those in which the faculty-student ratio is one-to-one.
2. In team-taught courses the evaluation shall be administered for each faculty member.
3. Guidelines for administration are as follows:
   - Administer during class time
   - Read standardized written instructions to the students. Instructions should include a statement as to how the results of the evaluation will be used.
   - The professor leaves the room while the students complete the evaluation.
   - A designated student hands out forms, collects forms, and delivers the completed forms to the appropriate designated location (not the instructor).
   - Evaluations are completed anonymously.
   - Professors will not receive the feedback until grades have been turned in to the Registrar.
   - Students should have a mechanism to confidentially inform administrators of instructors who fail to follow procedures.
   - The administration should take steps to address and deal with the problem of some professors not administering the evaluation instrument.
With regard to the availability of academic advisors, the following question is suggested:

Please indicate your satisfaction with the availability of your academic advisor by choosing one response from the scale below. (In selecting your rating, consider the advisor’s availability via office hours, appointments, and other opportunities for face-to-face interaction as well as via telephone, e-mail, and other means.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION OF THE EVALUATION

1. Surveys should be conducted on an annual basis.
2. Surveys should be conducted during the Spring semester, in order to allow freshmen students to have enough experience with their advisors to be able to reliably evaluate the item.
3. Surveys should allow the student to remain anonymous.
4. Surveys should be conducted in one of the two following manners, as deemed appropriate by the institution:
   - Survey of all students
   - Survey of a statistically valid, representative sample which samples freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors.
5. Results of the item should be reported by total group and by class-level.
BEST PRACTICES FOR QUALITY TEACHER EDUCATION AND REFORM

Quality and Reform Principles

1. Promotion and enhancement of rigorous learning in the academic discipline for both pre-service and in-service teachers as a means of ensuring that teachers possess an in-depth knowledge of the subject matter content critical for successful student performance;

2. In-depth understanding and widespread use of instructional technologies and other pedagogical innovations among pre-service and in-service teachers as a means of ensuring familiarity with the most effective formats for disseminating critical knowledge to students;

3. Increased exposure to observational classroom experience, clinical experiences, and quality student teaching as a means of ensuring a strong experiential base in instructional methods and classroom management prior to full-time employment as a teacher;

4. Demonstrated collaboration between higher education and the PK-12 sector in the training of pre-service teachers and in the development of continuous improvement processes for in-service teachers; this collaboration should strive to bring state-of-the-art pedagogical and content knowledge to schools and to ensure that teacher education faculty maintain a first-hand knowledge of the needs of teachers in the classroom environment; and

5. Demonstrated commitment to enrollment and graduation of minority teachers as a means of motivating and understanding as well as role modeling for minority students in the classroom.

Measurement Criteria

1. Attainment of successful initial accreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and continued success in maintaining NCATE accreditation, benchmarked in accord with the number of unmet standards identified for the unit;

2. Percentage of eligible programs approved by the specialized professional associations through the NCATE folio review process;

3. Percentage of school-based supervisors reporting satisfaction with school personnel prepared by the institution; with professional development programs; and with other services offered by the institution in the school districts, etc. as obtained under (7) Graduates Achievements (c) Employer feedback on graduates (Planning/Institutional Effectiveness Task Force);

4. The deviation, expressed in standard units, from a student pass rate of 100% on a) the professional knowledge exam of the National Teachers Examination (NTE) and b) the specialty area exams of the NTE (see data collected under (7) Graduates Achievements (D) Scores of graduates on post-undergraduate professional, graduate, or employment-related examinations and certification tests);

5. The extent to which the teacher education program is responsive to State needs as measured by a) the increase in the number of students who graduate from teacher education programs designated as subject matter "critical shortage" areas as these are defined by the State Board of Education, calculated from a baseline year; b) the decrease in the number of students (excluding minority students) who graduate from teacher education programs designated as subject matter oversupply areas as these are defined by the State Board of Education, calculated from a baseline year; c) the percentage of minority students enrolled in the institution's teacher education programs, benchmarked against an appropriate percentage; d) the number of teacher education programs that fulfill "special needs" directly linked to institutional mission and to State needs not covered by a), b) and c) above.
6. The percent of institutional faculty in education-related disciplines participating in structured activities (e.g., as with Professional Development Schools) other than regularly taught courses with PK-12 for the primary purpose of improved quality of education and related services at the PK-12 level.

7. The number credit hours generated in institutionally-sponsored activities and/or courses designed to improve quality of education and related services at the PK-12 level.

8. The number of teacher education students receiving the clinical field-based components of their program in Professional Development Schools (PDS) as these are defined in the existing CHE-PDS criteria.
**PROPOSED CHECKLIST FOR DETERMINING HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS' USE OF "BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES"**

**Purpose of Form:** This form is intended to measure an institution's application of "best management practices," as required by Critical Success Factor Category (5) Administrative Efficiency, Performance Indicator (B). Each institution shall provide narrative and other substantiation that explain its efforts in each of the following areas during the past three years. The Commission on Higher Education will determine whether each institution has applied each management practice consistently during the past three years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application of Management Practice</th>
<th>Management Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integration of Planning and Budgeting:</strong> The institution has employed a multi-year strategic planning process that links the planning process with the annual budget review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Audit:</strong> The institution has utilized an active internal audit process that includes: (a) programmatic reviews along with fiscal reviews; (b) consistent follow-up on audit findings; and (c) reporting of the internal audit function to the institutional head or to the governing board. (NOTE: The smaller institution that cannot afford a separate internal audit staff should demonstrate internal reviews in place that serve the same function as an internal auditor.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration and Partnerships:</strong> The institution has demonstrated financially beneficial collaborative efforts with other public entities in performance of business functions including, but not limited to, financial management, energy production and management, printing and publications, mail service, procurement, warehousing, public safety, food service, space utilization, and parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Outsourcing and Privatization:** The institution has examined opportunities for contracting out various business functions, has performed cost analyses, and has implemented, where economically feasible, cost saving contracts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Process Analysis:** The institution has made a critical examination of its business processes in an effort to increase productivity, reduce waste and duplication, and improve the quality of services provided to its internal customers.

**Use of Automation and Technology:** The institution has developed a long range plan for improved use of technology to enhance student learning and business processes and has taken deliberate efforts to implement this technology within budget constraints.

**Energy and Other Resource Conservation and Management:** The institution has approved and implemented a plan to conserve energy and other resources and has demonstrated positive results from the plan.

**Preventive and Deferred Maintenance:** The institution has developed and implemented, subject to budget constraints, a regular program of preventive maintenance to preserve its physical assets and has developed a plan to address deferred (overdue) maintenance needs for its campus.

**Alternate Revenue Sources:** The institution has made substantial efforts to identify and secure alternate revenue sources (excluding categorical grants for specific functions) to supplement funds available from state appropriations and student fees.

**External Annual Financial Audit Findings:** The institution has minimized all management letter and single audit findings in the annual audit performed or supervised by the State Auditor, especially violations of state law, material weaknesses, and single audit "findings and questioned costs."

**External Review Findings:** The institution has minimized or avoid major non-compliance findings related to its business practices in external reviews and audits including, but not limited to, NCAA, accreditation, federal financial aid reviews, and direct federal audits.

**Long Range Capital Plan:** The institution has approved a long range (minimum three to five years) capital improvement plan for major capital requirements for its campus and has, subject to fund availability, begun implementation of the plan.

**Risk Management:** The institution has an active risk management program in place to minimize its losses.
POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR TRANSFERABILITY OF CREDITS CRITERIA

The user-friendliness of an institution, as represented by transferability of academic credits, will be measured as follows:

Two-year campuses of the University of South Carolina and technical colleges will:

a. increase or maintain an acceptable percentage of transfers from AA/AS degree programs.

b. increase or maintain an acceptable percentage of students completing statewide transfer blocks on an annual basis.

c. offer all coursework contained on all statewide transfer blocks at least once per academic year.

d. increase or maintain an acceptable percentage of transfer students admitted to senior institutions on an annual basis.

e. eliminate all challenges of coursework regarding effective preparation of students by accepting institutions.

Four-year institutions will:

f. accept all coursework on statewide transfer blocks toward baccalaureate degrees.

g. increase or maintain an acceptable percentage of transfer students who graduate with a baccalaureate degree in six years on an annual basis.

h. increase or maintain an acceptable percentage of AA/AS graduates admitted to senior institutions who are granted junior-level status upon transfer and who have 100% of all credits that 1) are taken from the Statewide Articulation Agreement and 2) fit the curriculum at the receiving institution accepted for degree credit on an annual basis.

i. report to the technical colleges and the two-year branch campuses of USC using established mechanisms data on the academic performance of transfer students on an annual basis.

j. eliminate all additional fees or encumbrances such as validation examinations, "placement examinations/instruments," or policies, procedures, or regulations that have artificially retarded transfer of coursework.

All two-year and four-year institutions will:

k. comply with the statewide articulation agreement.

l. fully implement a statewide course numbering, title, and description system for courses included on the statewide articulation agreement. (To be implemented)

m. develop and maintain the computerized interactive transfer course database for all majors. (To be implemented)
n. update transfer guides (both hard copy and website) by September 1 each year.

o. provide to CHE each year the number and scope of all articulation agreements in place with regionally accredited South Carolina institutions.

p. use SPEEDE/ExPRESS electronic transcript standard in all admission and registration activities. (To be implemented)

q. accept Advanced Placement (AP), College Level Examination Program (CLEP), Program on Non-Collegiate Sponsored Instruction (PONSI), and Technical Advanced Placement (TAP) credits in appropriate programs.

Definition:

A transfer student is a full-time, degree-seeking student entering an institution for the first time but known to have previously attended a postsecondary institution at the same level (i.e., undergraduate).