April 21, 1997

THE FACULTY MINUTES

The second regular meeting of the Faculty of the College of Charleston for the academic year 1996-97 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Monday, April 21 in the Recital Hall of the Albert Simons Center for the Arts, Speaker of the Faculty Robert Mignone presiding. Susan Morrison served as Parliamentarian. Minutes of the previous meeting (September 9, 1996) were approved as circulated.

Speaker’s Report

Mr. Mignone reported that Senate actions of the current academic year and enrollment plans will be included in the next Faculty Newsletter and expressed his pleasure in representing the faculty. He then asked for a motion to suspend the rules requiring one week notice for motions presented to the faculty for a vote so that a resolution concerning a recent action could come before the faculty. Charles Kaiser so moved, and Jack Parson read the following resolution:

Be it resolved, the College of Charleston faculty condemns the recent action of the Francis Marion Board of Trustees which “sets aside the present Constitution of the Faculty and Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, making them null and void.”

When asked what prompted the actions requiring the resolution, Mr. Parson said that Board of Trustees at Francis Marion University acted in response to what they implied from recommendations in a SACS review. Although Mr. Parson agreed that the Board has the power to declare null and void structures for faculty governance, it does not, he believes, have the right to do so. He added that all colleges and universities around the state should be challenged not to let the Board’s actions go unnoticed and without comment. On a voice vote, the resolution passed.

Election of Faculty Committees

For the Committee on Nominations and Elections the Speaker asked for and received by voice vote an affirmation of all committees with full slates. The following three committees that received additional nominations—Academic Standards, Curriculum, and Library—were elected by written ballot:
ACADEMIC STANDARDS
7 faculty members

Bakanic, Von
Martinez, Elizabeth
McCandless, Amy
Miller, Deborah
Scholtens, Brian
Simonian, Susan J.
Skinner, Michael

Sociology
Spanish/Italian
History
Physical Education/Health
Biology
Psychology
Educational Foundations/Specializations

CURRICULUM
9 faculty members

Abate, Christopher
Farrell, Susan
Friedman, Doug
de Godev, Concepcion
Hough, Sheridan
Lindner, Lee
Packer, Lindsay
Powell, Phillip
Waggener, Green

Geology
English/Communication
Political Science
Spanish/Italian
 Philosophy
Physics/Astronomy
Mathematics
Library
Physical Education/Health

LIBRARY
7 faculty members

Anderson, Robert
Drago, Lee
Hall, David
Johnston-Thom, Katherine
Nichols, Shaun
Toris, Carol
Wiseman, Reid

Management/Marketing
History
Physics/Astronomy
Mathematics
Philosophy
Psychology
Biology

[Note: A full list of committee members and chairs will be circulated soon.]

Approval of Degree Candidates

Provost Conrad Festa requested and received by voice vote approval of degree candidates pending completion of all requirements.
Awards

Dean Gordon Jones presented the Distinguished Achievement Award for the School of Science and Mathematics to Kristen Krantzman, Assistant Professor of Chemistry.

Provost Festa expressed his appreciation to all members of the faculty for their hard work and dedication during the 1996-97 academic year and then presented the following awards:

• Distinguished Research Award to Lee Irwin, Associate Professor of Religious Studies
• Distinguished Service Award to Fred Watts, Professor of Physics
• Distinguished Professor Emeritus rank to Maggie Pennington, Professor of Biology

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary
March 11, 1997

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The seventh regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston convened at 5:05 p.m. on Tuesday, March 11 in Room 100 of Maybank Hall, Speaker of the Faculty Robert Mignone presiding. Thirty-eight senators attended. Minutes of the February 4 meeting were approved.

Reports

Mr. Mignone noted that a draft copy of Policy #11 of the Academic Affairs General Policy Manual had been included in the senators’ packets for review. This policy is intended to clarify the reporting lines, responsibilities, and evaluation of Academic Program Directors. [A copy of the policy is attached to the Secretary’s minutes.]

Turning to Performance Funding, Mr. Mignone praised CHE’s decision to abandon all work on weights done by the four sector committees when it became clear that the committees had developed four very different philosophies. What will eventually emerge, he thinks, will be a fair approach to base funding that will use national and not regional standards. The benchmarks recommended by the sector committees are being reviewed.

New Business

* Lee Lindner introduced nine motions from the Curriculum Committee. All nine motions passed.

ACCOUNTING AND LEGAL STUDIES

- Change to major: BADM 315 (Microcomputers in Finance) and BADM 429 (Commercial Law) to serve as an Accounting Elective for the Accounting major

BIOLOGY

- Course changes (prerequisites): BIOL (501 Biology of the Crustacea), BIOL 502 (Special Topics in Marine Biology), and BIOL 503 (Special Topics in Ecology) will all have the following prerequisite: Open to students with junior or senior standing who have completed at least 15 semester hours in Biology and have a GPA of at least a 3.0 in all biology courses. Students not meeting these requirements may enroll with permission of the instructor and department chair.
GEOLOGY

- New course: GEOL 107 Introduction to Coastal and Marine Geology (3)
- Course change (prerequisites and catalog description) for GEOL 207: Add GEOL 102 and GEOL 102L to GEOL 101 and GEOL 101L as prerequisites. Add following statement to course description: “This course is intended for geology majors. Non-majors should enroll in GEOL 107 (Introduction to Coastal and Marine Geology). A student may not receive credit for both GEOL 107 and GEOL 207.”

MANAGEMENT AND MARKETING

- Course change (number): Change BADM 440 Seminar in Entrepreneurship to BADM 445.

PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY

- New course: PHYS 203 Physics and Medicine (3)
- New course: PHYS 457 Satellite Meteorology (3)

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES

- For Information: Special Topics Courses

* The Committee on Nominations and Elections recommended Marcie DesRochers (Psychology) for the Sexual Harassment Education Steering Committee.

Constituents’ Concerns

Rob Dillon described the current system under which instructors are promoted to senior instructor as inflexible and hasty. He asked that the By-Laws Committee consider removing the “up or out” component of the evaluation. Bishop Hunt said that the change would be a policy change, not a phrasing change, so the issue should be sent to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Speaker will refer the matter to the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Martin Jones asked that the By-Laws Committee provide clearer phrasing in the Faculty/Administration Manual about how faculty members on sabbatical leave or leave of absence can participate in promotion and tenure decisions. That, too, Mr. Hunt said, is a policy matter, and the Speaker referred the issue to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. To Phil Dustan’s question about how much control the faculty has over the Faculty/Administration Manual, Mr. Hunt answered that the faculty can only recommend changes.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Haney, Faculty Secretary
February 4, 1997

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The sixth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston convened at 5:05 p.m. on Tuesday, February 4 in Room 100 of Maybank Hall, Speaker of the Faculty Robert Mignone presiding. Forty-four senators attended. Minutes of the January 14 meeting were approved.

Reports

Mr. Mignone thanked the Senate and the Faculty for their support and expressions of sympathy. There are, he said, no new developments in performance funding since Jack Parson’s report at the January meeting. CHE is currently studying weights, benchmarks, and base funding. [Note: In the January issue of The Faculty Newsletter the Speaker discusses reasons for the delay in the Steering Committee’s forwarding recommendations for weights and benchmarks to CHE.]

Skip Godow reported that the North Area campus, which opened in the fall of 1990 with 38 students, grew by the fall of 1996 to 485 students, most of whom are juniors and 90% of whom intend to complete a degree at the College. Plans are to expand both course offerings and student services. In answer to senators’ questions, Mr. Godow made the following statements:

- The 19 faculty currently teaching at the North Area Campus (3 roster, 16 adjunct) are chosen by department chairs.
- FTE allocations for students enrolled in courses in the North Area are similar to those for honors courses.
- Eventually offering a four-year program (not including science labs) at the North Area campus is a desirable goal because there is a population currently not being served by times and location of courses on the main campus.
- The North Area campus is self-sustaining and profitable.

Sue Sommer-Kresse added that the North Area campus helps the College by increasing revenues without adding more students to the main campus and by meeting the needs of students, especially adult students.
New Business

Lee Lindner introduced five motions from the Curriculum Committee. All five motions passed.

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
* Course change (title, catalog description, prerequisite): BADM 350 from Tourism to Hospitality and Tourism Marketing (Add BADM 350 to BADM 210 as prerequisite)
* Course change (title and catalog description): BADM 210 from Introduction to the Hospitality Industry to Principles and Practices in Hospitality and Tourism

EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS AND SPECIALIZATIONS
* Course change: (Credit hours) EDFS 470 Independent Study from three (3) semester hours to variable credit (1-3 semester hours)

ELEMENTARY AND EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
* New Course: EDEE 433 Early Adolescent Students and Their Teachers (3)

POLITICAL SCIENCE
* New course: POLS 405 Capstone Seminar (3)

Constituents’ Concerns

Michael Finefrock brought to the Senate a matter he thought had not been satisfactorily resolved by the Faculty Welfare Committee: Dean Lindstrom changed a grade from a WA to a W. Although the Faculty Welfare Committee ruled that only a faculty member has the right to change a grade, the committee referred Mr. Finefrock’s case to the Hearing Committee. Because there was no specific denial of his academic freedom, Mr. Finefrock does not think his case falls under the purview of the Hearing Committee. Mr. Lindstrom replied that he disagrees with Mr. Finefrock on the case, that he was never called to appear before the Faculty Welfare Committee, and that he is ready to defend himself in a proper forum.

Deanna Caveny pointed out that there is a conflict between students’ rights in the Student Handbook and faculty rights in the Faculty/Administration Manual as they pertain to W and WA grades. This ambiguity, Bill Anderson added, needs to be addressed.

Joe Benich remarked that it would be unwise for the Senate to set a precedent in dealing with an individual case; there is, he said a committee structure to deal with such cases. Although Mr. Finefrock emphasized that his case had already gone to a committee, following recommendations from Hugh Wilder, Ken Bower, and Caroline Hunt, the Speaker referred the matter of the W and WA grades to the Academic Standards Committee and Mr. Finefrock’s specific case to the Grievance Committee.
Speaking for the Academic Planning Committee, Fran Courson asked Bill Anderson to update the Senate on new technology. The Cougar Trail, he said, is improving, and this spring mid-term grades will be available on-line in time for advising.

Debbie Miller announced that the fall course schedule includes the new acronym for Health courses—HEAL, not PEHD—to distinguish them from activity courses, only four of which can count toward graduation. She also brought up a concern from her department about inequity in summer school pay. Professors who teach four-credit science courses with a lab are paid at 15% while those teaching four-credit PEHD courses with a lab receive only 10%.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The fifth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston convened at 5:05 p.m. on Tuesday, January 14 in Room 100 of Maybank Hall, Speaker Pro Tempore Amy McCandless presiding. Forty-four senators attended. Minutes of the December 3 meeting were approved.

Reports

In Speaker Bob Mignone’s absence, Jack Parson updated the Senate on Performance Funding. Mr. Parson began by commending Mr. Mignone for the hard work he has done and the very important role he has played in this process. On January 9, CHE approved the report on Performance Funding, which was then sent to the General Assembly. The report includes definitions to be used with the 37 performance indicators. [A copy of the report is attached to the Secretary’s minutes.] The performance indicators will be phased-in over a three year period from 1997 to 2000 beginning with 14 of the indicators in 1997-98. Mr. Parson said that 25% of any new money in next year’s budget would be allocated according to these 14 indicators.

During the next three months, CHE will seek additional comments and viewpoints as it builds on the work of the sector committees and task forces to complete plans for performance funding and to develop formulas for allocating funds to higher education institutions. Mr. Parson strongly urged faculty members to be sure their voices are heard.

New Business

- The Committee on Nominations and Elections conducted an election to fill two vacancies in at-large Senate seats. Phillip Dustan (Biology) and Deanna McBroom (Music) were elected.

Caroline Hunt announced that the Ad-Hoc Advisory Group on Space Allocation selected by the committee would meet with Ray Huff and Design Works followed by an open meeting for all members of the College community interested in space allocation for the Bishop England, BellSouth, and Sears buildings. [Note: Since the Senate meeting, the open forum has been rescheduled for Tuesday, January 28 at 3:00 p.m. in Room 228 of the Lightsey Conference Center.]
• Lee Lindner introduced five motions from the Curriculum Committee and an additional item for information. All motions passed.

**BIOLOGY**
* Course change (add description to catalog): BIOL 452 Seminar

**BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**
* New Course: BADM 440 Seminar in Entrepreneurship (1)

**COMPUTER SCIENCE**
* New Course: CSCI 104 Telecommunications and the Internet (3)

**HISTORY**
* New Course: HIST 236 Minoan Civilization (3)
* For information: Special Topics course

**THEATRE**
* Theatre for Youth concentration

• Charles Biernbaum for the Committee on Graduate and Continuing Education asked the Senate to reconsider its vote at the December 3 meeting not to change INTR 602 (Legal Processes in the American Legal System) to INTR 504 (Law and the Legal System of the United States.) The Parliamentarian ruled that a motion to reconsider could be made only by a Senator who had voted with the majority (i.e. against the change) at the December 3 meeting. No motion to reconsider was made.

**Constituents’ Concerns**

William Gudger voiced concerns that the North Area campus is having a negative effect on course scheduling at the main campus. David Cohen pointed out that the North Area campus has a separate budget, which does not impinge on the budget for the main campus. The Speaker said that she would ask Skip Godow to report to the Senate about the North Area campus at the February meeting.

David Hall asked for confirmation that a resolution of sympathy mentioned earlier in the meeting would be sent to Bob Mignone on the death of his brother.

**Adjournment**

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary
SECTOR COMMITTEE
SUMMARY REPORT

A COMPARISON OF THE BENCHMARKS, WEIGHTS, AND CONCERNS DEVELOPED BY THE SECTOR COMMITTEES

SC COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
REVISED DECEMBER 17, 1996 **

** The Research Sector Committee made revisions to its final report at its meeting on December 11, 1996.
**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:** (1) Mission Focus

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR:** (A) Expenditure of funds to achieve mission

**MEASURE:** 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&G) expenditures (excluding funds transfer).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ratio of instruction expenditures (as defined above) to total E&amp;G expenditures must be within one standard deviation of the average of the comparable ratios for the aspirational peers.</td>
<td>The total weight for this indicator is divided into two parts. Part A generates a maximum of 4.5 points which are based on an institution's ratio of expenditures for instruction plus academic support plus student services to total educational and general expenditures; and Part B generates a maximum of .5 points which are based on an institution's ratio of expenditures for research plus public service to total educational and general expenditures. Part A: 1. Institutional ratio equal to or greater than the sector average=4.5 points 2. Institutional ratio between the sector average and one standard deviation below the mean=4.0 points 3. Institutional ratio below one standard deviation below the mean=3.5 points Part B: 1. Institutional ratio equal to or greater than the sector average to receive=.5 points 2. Institutional ratio between the sector average and one standard deviation below the mean=.4 points 3. Institutional ratio below one standard deviation below the mean=.3 points</td>
<td>An institution will receive 100% of funding if it is within a +/-5% range of the sector's three-year average for each category; it will receive only 80% of the possible funding for the indicator if it has an institutional score outside that range.</td>
<td>100% funding equals no State funds allocated for activities outside of the mission statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>.182%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5% **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/ Suggested Modifications</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Regional Campuses</td>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Committee determined that this indicator is one of several which are not measurable, or not important, or for which what is &quot;good&quot; cannot be defined.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Sector Committee recommends that this indicator be implemented as soon as standardization of reporting can be accomplished.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLEASE NOTE:** Although weights are presented in the following tables, the Technical Colleges Sector Committee recommends that the weighting of the indicators be carried out as follows:

**Year 1 (1997-1998)** 100% of the 25% of new money should be based on the formulation of a mission statement which reflects the institution's commitment to providing education of quality.

**Year 2 (1998-1999)** 100% of funding should be based on the adoption of a strategic plan which supports the mission statement.

**Year 3 (1999-2000)** SBTCE and CHE should use the percentages presented in these charts as a foundation on which to base weights. The Committee understands that much of the data necessary to determine weighting is not currently available. Therefore, the weightings of individual indicators for Year 3 may be greater or lesser than those presented here.
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (1) Mission Focus

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (B) Curricula to achieve mission

MEASURE: 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 enrollment, degrees awarded, and student placements; e) have achieved a recognized standard of excellence as denoted through instruments such as CHE Commendations of Excellence; ratings and rankings recognized by 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The institution must achieve 97% of this indicator to meet this standard.</td>
<td>Using a matrix for each institution which includes a “check-off” for each of the “CHE approved” degree programs for parts a. through f. of the indicator, institutions would receive credit on a percentage basis for the actual number of “checks” received for each part of the indicator. Parts a. through d. are assigned a maximum value of 1.1 points each. For part e., an institution will earn .1 points if 10% of the programs meet the criteria; .2 points if 20% of the programs meet the criteria; and .3 points if 30% of the programs meet the criteria. No points are assigned to part f.</td>
<td>An institution will be funded 100% for the indicator if it receives a “yes” in columns a, b, c, and d; it will receive a 25% deduction from full funding for each of these same four columns in which it receives a “no.” (The Sector Committee decided that measures e and f will not apply for this Sector for funding decisions.)</td>
<td>100% funding equals no State funds allocated for curricula not offered to achieve the mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measure e. was determined not to be applicable to this sector, and measure f. was determined to be unmeasurable.
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (1) Mission Focus

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (C) Approval of mission statement

MEASURE: Mission statement with defined characteristics will be approved by Commission on Higher Education on a five year cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% Yes, 0% No</td>
<td>Institutions with an approved mission statement= 2.8 points Institution without an approved mission statement=0 points</td>
<td>100% for yes, 0% for no</td>
<td>No state funds shall be allocated for activities outside the mission statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/ Suggested Modifications</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Regional Campuses</td>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Committee wishes to express its concern pertaining to the mission of the regional campuses as expressed in Act 359. While the institutions in the legislation are identified as &quot;two-year institutions--branches of U.S.C.,&quot; the institutions regard their mission as encompassing the offering of the associate degree but also of offering coursework beyond the associate degree toward the baccalaureate degree. The Committee specifically requests that the mission for the regional campuses be changed to reflect more accurately their mission as stated in the University of South Carolina 1995-1996 Fact Book as follows:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The regional campuses in Beaufort, Lancaster, Allendale (Salkehatchie), Sumter, and Union principally provide the first two years of undergraduate education, including selected associate degree programs mainly for their locale. The regional campuses also provide for the completion of bachelor degrees by offering selected upper-division coursework in conjunction with Aiken, Columbia and Spartanburg campuses as well as some graduate education through the University's Graduate Regional Studies program. In addition to providing these programs, the regional campuses bring the resources of the entire University system to citizens throughout the state.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Committee weighted and benchmarked the indicators in accord with its understanding that the mission as stated in Act 359 is consistent with the established mission of the regional campuses as summarized above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (1) Mission Focus

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (D) Adoption of strategic plan to support the mission

MEASURE: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% Yes, 0% No</td>
<td>Institution meeting the criteria receive 4.4 points; Institutions which do not meet the criteria receive 0 points</td>
<td>100% for yes, 0% for no</td>
<td>No state funds shall be allocated if the strategic plan does not support the mission statement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/ Suggested Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (1) Mission Focus

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (E) Attainment of goals of the strategic plan

MEASURE: Annual progress report on strategic plan analyzed and assessed by the Commission on Higher Education and rated on a scale based on progress of meeting the goals and the resources required to do so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A five-point evaluation scale as follows: excellent=100%, good=75%, acceptable=50%, marginal=25%, unacceptable=0%</td>
<td>Institutions achieving 90% or more of goals=4.4 points Institutions achieving 80-89% of goals=3.5 points Institutions achieving 70-79% of goals=2.0 points Institutions achieving less than 70% of goals=1.0 points</td>
<td>An institution will receive 100% of funding if it receives an “excellent” rating; 90% of funding if it receives a “good” rating; 75% of funding if it receives an “acceptable” rating; and 40% of funding if it receives a “marginal” rating. An institution will receive no funding if it receives an “unacceptable” rating.</td>
<td>Funding is based on a four point scale: 1. Did not meet goal; 2. Did not meet goal with justification; 3. Met goal; 4. Exceeded goal. 100% funding given for levels 3 and 4 at third year evaluation of an annual review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/Suggested Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (2) Quality of Faculty

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (A) Academic and other credentials of professors and instructors

MEASURE: The quality of the faculty as represented by the academic and other credentials of professors and instructors is to be measured as:

a) the percent of all headcount faculty who meet the criteria for faculty credentials of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); and

b) the percent of all headcount faculty who exceed the criteria for faculty credentials for SACS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.A(a)0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.A(b) is 100% funding for attaining 80% of aspirational peer group credentials for the initial year. For each subsequent year, the institution must gain two percentage points to receive 100% funding. If two point progress is not attained, the institution receives only the percentage attained that year, i.e., 80% funding for 80% of aspirational peer group credentials. Academic and other credentials of faculty will be evaluated during regular CHE program reviews by reviewers (selected from aspirational peer group). Generally, CHE review 20% of programs on an annual basis. Assessment will be based on 10 criteria which are listed below. Part a. has been assigned a value of 2.5 points. The number of points an institution can receive for part a. is based upon the percent of faculty meeting the criteria in part a. For example, if 100% of the faculty meet the criteria, an institution would receive 2.5 points; if 90% of the faculty meet the criteria, an institution would receive 90% of the 2.5 points; and so on. Part b. has been assigned values based on a graduated scale using the sector average as follows: Institutions with percentages at or above the sector mean=2.0 points Institutions within one standard deviation below the mean=1.0 points Institutions below one standard deviation below the mean=0 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure a. 100% of all headcount faculty meet criteria for faculty credentials of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) (80% of total indicator weighting).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure b. 30% of all headcount faculty who exceed the criteria for faculty credentials for SACS (20% of total indicator weighting).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% of funding for this indicator if 100% of all headcount faculty meet SACS criteria at the time of the annual fall semester reporting date.

The committee assigns 0% funding to subcomponent b.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments/ Suggested Modifications</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure (b) above is further defined to include a specific review of credentials as part of the CIHE program review process to include the following items: 1. Referred articles, books, technical reports 2. Performance and artistic works 3. Presentations in national and international forums 4. Service on national review panels, editorial boards, advisory boards 5. Number of doctoral students advised 6. Number of masters students advised 7. Number of patents, copyrights, licenses 8. National awards 9. Documented instructional achievement 10. Other appropriate indicators of high quality as defined by the peer review team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Committee noted that none of the performance indicators pertain to the diversity of institutional faculty with respect to minorities and women. The Committee agreed that the diversity of faculty represents one ingredient of instructional quality and recommended that this deficiency be brought to the attention of the Steering Committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (2) Quality of Faculty

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (B) Performance review for faculty to include student and peer evaluations

MEASURE: The extent to which the 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A five point evaluation scale as follows: excellent=100% good=75%, acceptable=50%, marginal=25%, unacceptable=0%</td>
<td>An equal portion of the total 4.8 points has been assigned to each of the eleven factors contained in the “Best Practices” document. Institutions will receive the total points generated by the factors met.</td>
<td>Each “best practice” criterion will receive equal weight (9.09% each); CHE will rank order each institution relative to its ability to meet the 11 “best practices” criteria.</td>
<td>100% of performance against all “Best Practices” with the exception of 8.c. and 8.d. which are appropriate to senior college faculty but not technical college faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/ Suggested Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (2) Quality of Faculty

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (C) Post-tenure review for tenured faculty

MEASURE: The extent to which the 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments/Suggested Modifications:

A five point evaluation scale as follows: excellent=100%, good=75%, acceptable=50%, marginal=25%, unacceptable=0%.

An equal portion of the total 4.4 points has been assigned to each of the twelve factors contained in the “Best Practices” document. Institutions will receive the total points generated by the factors met.

Each “best practice” criterion will receive equal weight (8.33% each); CHE will rank order each institution relative to its ability to meet the 12 “best practices” criteria.

Not applicable to this sector.
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (2) Quality of Faculty

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (D) Compensation of faculty

MEASURE: The average deviation (expressed in standardized units) of faculty salaries by rank, discipline, and type of institution from national averages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research universities will achieve the average compensation of their respective aspirational peer groups. The percentage of funding received will be identical to the ratio (expressed as a percentage) of the average compensation at the institution to the average compensation for the respective aspirational peer group. Average Institutional Compensation / Average of Averages for Compensation of Aspirational Peer Group = % of funding</td>
<td>The ratio of the institution’s actual salary profile to the national salary profile for that institution, plus the number of phase-in points added per year, beginning with ten points in year one and decreasing by one point each year over a ten-year period, capped at 100%. The institution will receive funding based on its ratio (including phase-in points) multiplied by the total points for the indicator. The formula for the benchmark is as follows: [(Weighted Actual Average / Weighted National Average) + Phase-in Points] x 4.4 indicator points. Phase-in points would be assigned inversely for ten years beginning with ten points in year one and decreasing by one point per year for the ten-year phase-in. For example, Year 1 = 10 points would be added to an institution’s percentage difference, Year 2 = 9 points, Year 3 = 8 points, etc.</td>
<td>5% above the current individual institution average salary level by rank and discipline toward a nationally computed salary average by rank and discipline for comparable branch campus systems; institutions will receive a percentage award for movement toward the 5% benchmark in the amount of the percent faculty salary increase above their individual institutional average (i.e., 2% for a 2% percent increase, etc.).</td>
<td>100% funding if, based upon appropriate level of State funding, faculty compensation is 100% of national averages reported in appropriate publications pertaining to technical / community colleges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments/ Suggested Modifications</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Committee is concerned that this indicator may perpetuate faculty salary problems at some institutions in this sector given the fact that resources may remain too limited to correct deficiencies. In addition, the Committee requests that the Steering Committee approve elimination of the portion of the measure for this indicator which calculates compensation by discipline. This is not judged to be appropriate for the regional campuses and data is not thought to be available by discipline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (2) Quality of Faculty

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (E) Availability of faculty to students outside of the classroom

MEASURE: a. The 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) the 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.E(a) On a four-point scale, 85% of faculty must receive a rating of 3 (satisfactory) or higher</td>
<td>Parts a and b are assigned a total of 2.4 points each for this indicator. Funding is based on an institution’s compliance with attaining a mean of “satisfied” as follows: Compliance with Part a 90% or better=2.4 points 80-89%=2.0 points 70-79%=1.5 points 60-69%=1.0 points Less than 60%=0 points</td>
<td>Measure a: 80% of faculty who receive a 3 or above (satisfactory or above) on the standardized student evaluation question</td>
<td>To receive 100% funding on this indicator, 85% of instructional faculty must receive a satisfactory or above on student satisfaction on the prescribed question of availability of faculty. In addition, 85% of the students will indicate being satisfied or very satisfied with academic advising on the prescribed question on academic advising.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.E(b) On a four-point scale, 85% of students must report a rating of 3 (satisfactory) or higher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance with Part b 90% or better=2.4 points 80-89%=2.0 points 70-79%=1.5 points 60-69%=1.0 points Less than 60%=0 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2% divided equally between a and b</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Common protocol must be developed by CHE.</td>
<td>Common protocol must be developed by CHE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (2) Quality of Faculty

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (F) Community and public service activities of faculty for which no extra compensation is paid

MEASURE: 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 the region or the State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of faculty at an institution will have participated in such activities.</td>
<td>An institution will receive points based on the percent of faculty who report being engaged in service to the community using professional skills/knowledge base, etc., as follows:</td>
<td>50% 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 the region or the State.</td>
<td>100% funding if the public service component is a part of faculty job descriptions and a regular part of faculty evaluation and compensation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Faculty</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% or better</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%-74.9%</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%-69.9%</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%-64.9%</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 60%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>.182%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments/Suggested Modifications: The Committee has determined that this indicator is one of several which are not measurable, or not important, or for which what is "good" cannot be defined.
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (3) Instructional Quality

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (A) Class size and student/teacher ratios

MEASURE: 1) the 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.A(1) This indicator is not applicable to research sector because the database for comparison is not statistically significant (only three institutions)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutions with student/faculty ratios below the sector mean, or institutions with student/faculty ratios at or within 5 standard deviation (STD) above the sector mean = 2.6 points; Institutions with ratios between 5 and 1 STD above the sector mean = 2.3 points; Institutions with student/faculty ratios greater than 1 STD above the sector mean = 2.0 points.</td>
<td>Measure 1: 100% of funding if no more or less than 25% of an institution's total class offerings exceed the average class size within the two-year branch sector for each discipline, level, and mode of delivery; a sliding scale will apply for percentages greater than 25% as follows: 90% funding if 30% of an institution's total class offerings exceed the state average; 80% if 35%, etc. Measure 2: Institutions that meet a student to faculty ratio of 130% of the sector average or below will receive 100% funding for this indicator; institutions that exceed the 130% mark will receive 75% funding.</td>
<td>50% = Class size: Average class size data by discipline with Academic Discipline Data for FY Formula will be used initially. One hundred percent funding of this subcomponent to be given if no more than 25% of the classes by discipline are outside of the range of the formula ratio. Ninety percent funding of this subcomponent to be given if no more than 30% of the classes by discipline are outside of the range of the formula ratio. Eighty percent funding of this subcomponent to be given if no more than 35% of the classes by discipline are outside of the range of the formula ratio. Individual institutions may make quality arguments for class size ratios that deviate from the TECH System Academic Discipline Data for FY Formula. 50% = Student/Teacher Ratios: Student/teacher ratios will be determined using the TECH System Academic Discipline Formula as a base with the TECH System class size averages as the benchmark.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments/Suggested Modifications</th>
<th>Research Weight</th>
<th>Teaching Weight</th>
<th>Regional Campuses Weight</th>
<th>Technical Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Committee has determined that this indicator is one of several which are not measurable, or not important, or for which what is “good” cannot be defined.</td>
<td>.182%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>15% divided equally between measures 1 and 2</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sector Committee believes that an institution’s student/faculty ratio is the most appropriate measure for this indicator. The Committee also believes that the complexity of the calculations for Part 1 in relation to the value of the information obtained did not warrant the additional analysis. Therefore, all of the points in this indicator have been assigned to Part 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (3) Instructional Quality

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (B) Number of credit hours taught by faculty

MEASURE: 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 public institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tentatively set at 90% of the sector average for credit hours taught but may be revisited once appropriate data is obtained.</td>
<td>Part 1 - 2.2 points Institutions with an average within 1.5 hours above or below the sector average = 2.2 points; Institutions with an average between 1.51 to 2.0 hours above or below the sector average = 1.1 points; Institutions with an average greater than 2.0 hours above the sector average = 0 points.</td>
<td>Measure a: Institutions that meet 90% or above of the sector average for the average number of credit and/or contact hours taught by full-time teaching faculty will receive 100% funding for this indicator; institutions that fall below the 90% mark will receive 75% funding. (50% of the total weight for this indicator).</td>
<td>100% if ninety percent of full-time teaching faculty and FTE teaching faculty teach within the prescribed SBTCE teaching faculty load policy range for fall and spring semesters: 15-18 semester credit hours or 20-24 instructor classroom/lab contact hours or calculated credit equivalent combination of credit and contact hours. Hours reimbursed with extra pay as overload hours taught by individual faculty members would be eliminated from all faculty load calculations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part 2 - 2.2 points Institutions with an average within 1.5 hours above or below the sector average = 2.2 points; Institutions with an average between 1.51 to 2.0 hours above or below the sector average = 1.1 points; Institutions with an average greater than 2.0 hours above the sector average = 0 points.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure b: Institutions that meet 90% or above of the sector average by level for the number of FTE teaching faculty will receive 100% of the funding for this indicator; institutions that fall below the 90% mark will receive 75% funding. (50% of the total weight for this indicator).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weight | .182% | 4.4% | 10% | 2% |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments/ Suggested Modifications</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Committee has determined that this indicator is one of several which are not measurable, or not important, or for which what is “good” cannot be defined. Common definition of FTE faculty must be adopted.</td>
<td>*Full-time equivalent faculty has not previously been defined by the Commission on Higher Education. All institutions in each sector defined in Act 359 should be required to adopt a common definition for that sector.</td>
<td>A common definition for FTE faculty by sector will need to be adopted.</td>
<td>* Full time equivalent faculty has not previously been defined by the Commission on Higher Education. The staff believes that all institutions in each sector defined in Act 359 should be required to adopt a common definition for that sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (3) Instructional Quality

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (C) Ratio of full-time faculty as compared to other full-time employees

MEASURE: The 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institutional ratio of full-time faculty as compared to other full-time employees must be within one standard deviation of the aspirational peer average for comparable ratios to meet the standard.</td>
<td>This benchmark is intended to reward institutions which have a larger percentage of full-time faculty when compared to other full-time employees: Institutions with a ratio above the sector mean, or institutions with a ratio of full-time faculty compared to full-time employees at or within .5 STD below the sector mean = 2.6 points; Institutions with a faculty ratio between .51 and 1 STD below the mean = 2.3 points; Institutions with a faculty ratio greater than 1 STD below the mean = 2.0 points.</td>
<td>Institutions that meet 90% or above of the full-time faculty to other full-time employee average for the sector will receive 100% of the funding for this indicator; institutions that fall below the 90% mark will receive 75% funding.</td>
<td>100% of funding if ratio of full-time faculty to other full-time employees is .6/1 or greater.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>.182%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/Suggested Modifications</td>
<td>The Committee has determined that this indicator is one of several which are not measurable, or not important, or for which what is &quot;good&quot; cannot be defined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:** (3) Instructional Quality

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR:** (D) Accreditation of degree-granting programs

**MEASURE:** 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of programs for which accreditation is available must hold accreditation.</td>
<td>Institutions will receive points based upon the percentage of eligible programs accredited, as follows:</td>
<td>% Programs Accredited</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85% or better</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75% to 84.9%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60% to 74.9%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50% to 59.9%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/ Suggested Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (3) Instructional Quality

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (E) Institutional emphasis on quality teacher education and reform

MEASURE: The extent to which the criteria stipulated in the “Best Practices for Quality Teacher Education and Reform” document are incorporated into the institutions own teacher education program and the relative ranking of each institution to others in its sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A five point evaluation scale as follows: excellent=100%, good=75%, acceptable=50%, marginal=25%, unacceptable=0%</td>
<td>Each factor included in the measure was assigned an equal portion (0.55) of the maximum 4.4 points for the indicator. All of the factors are treated as thresholds, i.e., an institution must meet the criterion for that part to receive points for that part. An institution will receive the total points generated by the factors met. The criteria for meeting this indicator are as follows:</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Not applicable to this sector.</td>
<td>Not applicable to this sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. If Yes</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 75% or better</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 60% or better</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 95% of NAT. Pass Rate, or better</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If Yes (requires action in three of the four areas)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 75% or better (applies only to Education-related faculty)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If Yes (activity generated)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. If Yes (activity generated)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/ Suggested Modifications</td>
<td>This indicator pertains to Clemson and USC but not to MUSC which has no teacher education programs.</td>
<td>With regard to part 8, the Sector Committee asked that the Commission review the decision that the “PDS” model be the only model used for measuring this part of the indicator for all institutions in this sector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:** (4) Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR:** (A) Sharing and use of technology, programs, equipment, supplies, and source matter experts within the institution and with other institutions

**MEASURE:** The total number of cooperative/collaborative projects, partners, people served, and the total financial impact of the cooperative/collaborative projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% Yes, 0% No</td>
<td>Institutions may submit and describe up to six cooperative/collaborative projects to receive .6 point each, up to a maximum of .6 for the indicator. The project description must include, where appropriate, the number of people served and the financial impact of the project.</td>
<td>An institution will receive 100% of funding if it meets its own most recent three-year average, as evaluated by CHE. If it does not meet the three-year average, it will receive no funding.</td>
<td>100% funding of the weight if, as part of the strategic plan, there is submission of an annual report detailing the sharing and use of technology, programs, equipment, supplies, and source matter experts within the institution and with other institutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Weight | .182% | 0.6% | 1% | 5% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments/Suggested Modifications</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Committee has determined that this indicator is one of several which are not measurable, or not important, or for which what is &quot;good&quot; cannot be defined. Each institution will develop and use a sample survey to estimate the number of activities, people served, and financial impact. Each institution will submit to the Commission this estimate, along with a written analysis of the institution's best practices in meeting this standard and an evaluation of improvements made. The Commission will determine if the institution is meeting this indicator from the data and analysis presented and award a yes or no for meeting the standard.</td>
<td>[and with the Business Community] is moved to and considered in 4(B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (4) Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (B) Cooperation and collaboration with private industry, the business community, and government

MEASURE: The total number of cooperative/collaborative projects, partners, people served, and the total financial impact of the cooperative/collaborative projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% Yes, 0% No</td>
<td>Institutions may submit and describe up to six cooperative/collaborative projects to receive .1 point each, up to a maximum of .6 for the indicator. The project description must include, where appropriate, the number of people served and the financial impact of the project.</td>
<td>An institution will receive 100% of funding if it meets its own most recent three-year average, as evaluated by CHE. If it does not meet the three-year average, it will receive no funding.</td>
<td>100% funding of the weight if, as part of the strategic plan, there is submission of an annual report detailing cooperation and collaboration with private industry, the business community, and government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Weight | .182% | 0.6% | 1% | 5% |

Comments/Suggested Modifications: The Committee has determined that this indicator is one of several which are not measurable, or not important, or for which what is “good” cannot be defined. See suggested modifications for 4(A).
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (5) Administrative Efficiency

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (A) Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs

MEASURE: Academic costs as a percentage of total E&G expenditures compared to administrative costs (institutional support) as a percentage of total E&G expenditures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ratios must be within one standard deviation of the aspirational peer average for comparable ratios to meet the standard. This benchmark is tentative until data from aspirational peers is collected and analyzed.</td>
<td>An institution will receive points based on the ratio of academic costs (as a percent of total E&amp;G) to administrative costs (as a percent of total E&amp;G) as follows:</td>
<td>An institution will receive 100% of funding for the indicator if it attains an institutional score within +/-5% of the three-year average for the sector; it will receive 80% of funding for the indicator if it attains a score outside this range.</td>
<td>The percentage of administrative costs should not exceed 20%. The percentage of academic costs should not be less than 60%. An equal weight (50%) is assigned to each percentage (academic and administrative). Compliance with neither factor equals 0% funding. Compliance with only one factor equals 50% funding. Compliance with both categories would equal 100% funding on this indicator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 or better</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 to 4.49</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 to 3.49</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weight 1% 2.7% 2% 1%

Comments/ Suggested Modifications

The Sector Committee believes that student services and student development expenditures are basic services of this sector and should be included in the calculation of academic costs and expenditures for this indicator.
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (5) Administrative Efficiency

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (B) Use of best management practices

MEASURE: The evaluation by CHE of each institution's best management practices based on a CHE approved list of criteria, reported by the institutions, and evaluated by CHE annually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A five point evaluation scale as follows: excellent=100%, good=75%, acceptable=50%, marginal=25%, unacceptable=0%</td>
<td>An equal portion of the 2.9 points has been assigned to each of the 13 factors contained in the checklist. Institutions will receive the total points generated by the factors met</td>
<td>An institution will receive 100% of funding for this indicator if it meets each of the thirteen criteria listed for the indicator. Of the thirteen criteria, all will receive seven points each except for &quot;Preventive and Deferred Maintenance,&quot; which will receive 16 points.</td>
<td>100% of funding on this indicator if 75% of CHE approved &quot;Use of Best Management Practices&quot; criteria are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/ Suggested Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (5) Administrative Efficiency

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (C) Elimination of unjustified duplication of and waste in administrative and academic programs

MEASURE: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A five point evaluation scale as follows:</td>
<td>An institution will receive points based on administrative costs saved plus academic costs saved as a percent of total administrative and academic costs, as follows:</td>
<td>An institution will receive full funding under this indicator for no change at all over a previous year. For every 1% of funding saved by the elimination of waste/duplication of effort over the previous year, the institution will receive 1% as an incentive. Incentive funding shall apply equally divided between academic and administrative changes.</td>
<td>100% of funding on this indicator if all State dollars spent in the areas of academics and administration are subject to annual review and audit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>excellent=100%, good=75%, acceptable=50%, marginal=25%, unacceptable=0%</td>
<td>% Saved</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>% Saved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1% or better</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1% or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than .1%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Less than .1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/Suggested Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:** (5) Administrative Efficiency

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR:** (D) Amount of general overhead costs

**MEASURE:** General overhead cost per FTE student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tentatively the ratio of general overhead costs must be within one standard deviation of the aspirational peer average to meet the standard.</td>
<td>Institutions with general overhead costs below one STD below the sector mean = 2.5 points; Institutions with general overhead costs between the sector mean and one STD below the mean = 2.0 points; Institutions with general overhead costs between the sector mean and one STD above the mean = 1.5 points; Institutions with general overhead costs above one STD above the sector mean = 1.0 points.</td>
<td>An institution will receive 100% of funding if it does not exceed the past three-year average rate or the best available data for the measure. This benchmark is first to be adjusted for inflation, the bringing on-line of additional facilities, renovations, emergencies and acts of God, and unavoidable repairs. Each institution is to be benchmarked separately and the student FTE for this indicator and sector is to include all students enrolled at the institutional site for credit hour production at either the undergraduate or graduate level.</td>
<td>100% funding for this indicator if, as established annually by the SBTCE and subject to CHE approval, the annual general overhead costs of each institution do not exceed the calculation of the system annual general overhead cost per aggregate student FTE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>2.5%</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments/ Suggested Modifications</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:** (6) Entrance Requirements

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR:** (A) SAT and ACT scores of student body

**MEASURE:** Percent of first-time entering freshmen who meet or exceed the benchmark SAT or ACT score for the sector within the state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Based on the recentered scale, institutions will receive points for average SAT scores as follows:</td>
<td>An institution will receive 100% funding for the indicator if it reaches or exceeds in a given year the most recent three-year average of its own institutional SAT score for the baccalaureate-ready student cohort.</td>
<td>Not applicable to this sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average SAT Score</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1000 or better</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>950-999</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>900-949</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>875-899</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>850-874</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>800-849</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>750-799</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>749 or less</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midpoint range for institution</td>
<td>= % of Funding</td>
<td>Average midpoint range score for peers</td>
<td>Midpoint range for institution</td>
<td>= % of Funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| For MUSC, the difference between the average score on the GRE, PCAT, MCAT, and DAT examinations for the institution and the average score on the GRE, PCAT, MCAT and DAT examinations for the aspirational peer institutions will be determined. Each test is to be weighted as 25%. The institution will have ten years to eliminate this gap. Funding will be at 100% if the institution meets the minimum amount per year as determined by dividing the gap in the scores by ten years (i.e., if the differential is 120 points then the annual gain must be 12 points). The aspirational peer group average will change annually; thus, the gap will be adjusted annually. However, if the planned annual increase is not met the benchmark becomes:

Midpoint range for institution = % of Funding

Average midpoint range score for peers

An institution would be eligible for .4 additional points (not to exceed the maximum of 2.4 points for the measure) for an increase of 20 points in one year; or .2 additional points for an increase of 10 points in one year (not to exceed the maximum of 2.4 points for the measure). Institutions which do not improve their average over the previous year are not eligible for the additional points.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/Suggested Modifications</td>
<td>A new measure is proposed for MUSC since SAT/ACT scores cannot be applied in the same way given the absence of first-time entering freshmen.</td>
<td>The Sector Committee recommends that the definition for total first-time entering freshmen include only those first-time entering freshmen who presented SAT and ACT scores.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (6) Entrance Requirements

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (B) High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of the student body

MEASURE: The percent of first-time entering freshmen with a high school GPA equal to or greater than X.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80% of first-time entering freshmen will have a high school GPA at or above the average GPA of all first-time entering students at all four-year institutions in the State</td>
<td>Institutions will receive points based on the percentage of entering freshmen who have a high school GPA of 2.5, or better, on a 4.0 scale as follows:</td>
<td>An institution will receive 100% funding for this indicator if it enrolls at least 50% of its students with a high school GPA of at least 2.0, and the institution shall receive a 1% bonus of funding for every 1% additional of the student body beyond 50% who have at least a high school GPA of 2.0.</td>
<td>Not applicable to this sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Freshman Class</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% at or above 2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65% to 74.9% at or above 2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% to 64.9% at or above 2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% to 59.9% at or above 2.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% to 49.9% at or above 2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 40%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>.182%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The determination as to whether GPA will apply to all courses taken in high school or only core courses (college prerequisite courses) will be made by the CHEMIS Primary Contacts Committee.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments/ Suggested Modifications</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Committee has determined that this indicator is one of several which are not measurable, or not important, or for which what is “good” cannot be defined.</td>
<td>The Committee has determined that this indicator is one of several which are not measurable, or not important, or for which what is “good” cannot be defined.</td>
<td>The Sector Committee recommends that the definition for total first-time entering freshmen include only those first-time entering freshmen who presented high school GPAs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (6) Entrance Requirements

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (C) Post-secondary non-academic achievement of student body

MEASURE: Approval by the institution of a policy for non-traditional students that provides for consideration of work and/or public service experience in the admissions process and in the awarding of prerequisite credit and course credit, consistent with the following principles: 1) the institution's approval should include the appropriate decision making body(ies) at the institution, 2) consideration for admission purposes should be based on substantive work and/or public service experience that demonstrates proficiencies comparable to academic proficiencies usually required for admissions, 3) consideration for awarding credit should be based on substantive work and/or public service experience that demonstrates proficiencies comparable to academic proficiencies and skill levels in the college level courses for which prerequisite credit or course credit is awarded, 4) the policy for awarding credit should include an overall maximum number of hours of credit that can be awarded for work and/or public service experience for any one student, 5) the policy should establish a definition for the non-traditional students to whom it applies, including minimum age, minimum length of time not enrolled in school prior to enrolling or resuming education at the institution, and minimum number of years of work or public service experience required before credit is awarded, and 6) the policy should be consistent with other institutional policies such as those for the awarding of credit by examination (CLEP) examination or institutional challenge examinations).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable to this sector</td>
<td>Institutions with a documented policy as outlined above = .6 points; Institutions without such a policy = 0 points.</td>
<td>An institution will receive 100% of funding for this indicator if it has a policy in place which addresses the stipulated criteria.</td>
<td>100% of funding for this indicator if each technical college has in place an appropriate process to measure postsecondary non-academic achievement of the student body.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/ Suggested Modifications</td>
<td>The Committee has determined that this indicator is one of several which are not measurable, or not important, or for which what is &quot;good&quot; cannot be defined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (6) Entrance Requirements

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (D) Priority on enrolling in-state students

MEASURE: The ratio of enrolled in-state undergraduate students to total undergraduate students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of enrolled in-state undergraduate students should be equal to or exceed the ratio adopted by the institution's Board of Trustees in the appropriate institutional policy statement.</td>
<td>Institutions will receive points based on the percentage of in-state students as follows:</td>
<td>An institution will receive 100% of funding for this indicator, if it enrolls 80% or above of in-state students. It will receive no funding for this indicator, if it fails to enroll at least 80% of in-state students.</td>
<td>100% of funding for this indicator if at least 90% of enrolled students are in-state undergraduate students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Regional Campuses</td>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% In-State Students Points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% to 79.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% to 74.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/ Suggested Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sector Committee believes that it would be inappropriate to imply that institutions which do not meet these percentages are not putting emphasis on recruiting in-state students. Institutions with unique programs, such as The Citadel, may be unable to expand in-state enrollment significantly beyond current levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (7) Graduates' Achievements

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (A) Graduation rates

MEASURE: Requires three rates (including numbers) to be published and calculated. All numbers and rates are calculated using 150% of program time. Rate 1: First time student graduation number and rate: the number and rate at which first time, full time, degree seeking students graduate. Rate 2: Transfer-out number and rate: the number and rate at which first time, full time, degree seeking students transfer out of the institution. Rate 3: Transfer-in graduation number and rate: the number and rate at which first time, full time, degree seeking students who transfer into an institution graduate. All three rates with numbers will be disclosed and combined for the following funding rate:

Initial cohort graduates + transfer in graduates
(First time, full time cohort + students transferring in with full time status) - (Students from the cohort who transfer out + students from the cohort who are otherwise disqualified according to Student Right to Know Act, e.g. died, joined military, totally disabled, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ratio of the institution's graduation rate to the aspirational peer group mean graduation rate (expressed as a percentage) equals the percentage of performance funding to be awarded for this indicator.</td>
<td>Institutions receive points based on their graduation rate as follows:</td>
<td>An institution will receive 100% of funding if the institutional rate for Rate 1 is below or at the most recent three-year rolling average for the institution. If the institutional rate for Rate 1 is above the most recent three-year rolling average the institution shall receive a bonus of 1% more funding for every 1% above the three-year average. (Once data become available for Rate 2 and Rate 3, this benchmark may need to be refined.)</td>
<td>100% funding if graduation rate is 20% or higher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% or better</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% to 59.9%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% to 49.9%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 40%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Regional Campuses</td>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/ Suggested Modifications</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Regional Campuses</td>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Committee recommends disregarding the “transfer-in” and “transfer-out” components of the measure unless comparable data is available from aspirational peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (7) Graduates' Achievements

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (B) Employment rate for graduates

MEASURE: Percentage of graduates from undergraduate programs in an institution who are employed within a time frame determined by sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For students for whom data is available, the percentage of graduating students who can be surveyed and who do not pursue graduate studies or find work will be no greater than the unemployment rate of the State in order to receive 100% of available funding for this indicator.</td>
<td>The percentage of graduates from undergraduate programs in an institution who are employed within 12 months after graduation, based on a three-year rolling average (or the latest available data) that are: above the sector average or within 1 STD below the sector average = 2.5 points; below 1 STD below the average = 1 point</td>
<td>An institution will receive 100% of funding for the indicator if the employment rate of its associate degree recipients for the past one year (for whom data are available) achieve an employment rate below or equal to the previous three-year rolling average, for every 1% increment over the three-year average that an institution might achieve, it will receive a 1% bonus.</td>
<td>90% for reaching minimum standard; 100% for exceeding standard. The standard is that already used for review of technical college programs by mutual agreement of SBTCE and CHE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/</td>
<td>The Committee expressed concern that there are persons who do not choose to work or who make career choices over which the institution has no control.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modificaticns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (7) Graduates' Achievements

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (C) Employer feedback on graduates who were employed and not employed

MEASURE: The level of satisfaction with the graduates of the institution, on a statewide survey, reported on a scale of satisfaction, by institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional survey of employers should show a satisfaction rate with respect to graduates of 75% or higher in order to receive 100% of funding.</td>
<td>Institutions that receive a level of satisfaction of 50% or better = 1.0 points; Institutions that receive a level of satisfaction below 50% = 0 points.</td>
<td>An institution will receive 100% funding if a statewide survey is returned showing satisfaction with 75% or more of the employed graduates on those surveys returned.</td>
<td>100% funding on this indicator if 80% of the surveys returned by employers rate graduates' performance satisfactory or above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>.182%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/ Suggested Modifications</td>
<td>The Committee has determined that this indicator is one of several which are not measurable, or not important, or for which what is &quot;good&quot; cannot be defined.</td>
<td>The Sector Committee recommends that CHE take measures to ensure that the statewide survey is statistically valid for each institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (7) Graduates' Achievements

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (D) Scores of graduates on post-undergraduate professional, graduate, or employment-related examinations and certification tests

MEASURE: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In order to achieve 100% of available funding for this indicator, the average institutional pass rate must be equal to or greater than 90%, weighted by the number of students taking the examinations and the number of tests taken.</td>
<td>The total pass-rate for institutions including those individuals who pass on the first attempt plus those who pass on subsequent attempts divided by the total number of students who took the exam. The institution would receive points as follows:</td>
<td>An institution will receive 100% of funding for this indicator if it achieves a passing rate of 90% or higher for its graduates on the first attempt and 95% on the second attempt.</td>
<td>100% funding on this indicator if the pass rate is within 80% of the national pass rate for 2 out of the last 3 years reported on both the first-time pass rate and the subsequent pass rate for each graduating class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-rate</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 85%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/Suggested Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (7) Graduates’ Achievements

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (E) Number of graduates that continue their education

MEASURE: Percentage of graduates who continue their education in a more advanced program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For students for whom data is available, the percentage of graduating students who can be surveyed and who do not pursue graduate studies or find work will be no greater than the unemployment rate of the State in order to receive 100% of available funding for this indicator.</td>
<td>Institutions with students graduating from a baccalaureate program and who continue their education by taking one or more courses at a more advanced level within three years after graduation will receive points as follows:</td>
<td>An institution will receive 100% of funding if its graduates in a given year are below or meet a three-year institutional rolling average; and if the institution exceeds the three-year institutional rolling average, it will receive 1% bonus funding for every 1% it exceeds the average.</td>
<td>100% funding on this indicator if the number of the AA/AS degree graduates that continue their education is equal to or better than the percentage established as the year one (arithmetic average) benchmark for the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark</td>
<td></td>
<td>% of Students</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/ Suggested Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (7) Graduates' Achievements

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (F) Credit hours earned of graduates

MEASURE: The total number of hours required to graduate by sector, discipline/degree, and by institution compared to the total number of hours earned by graduates upon graduation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In order to receive 100% of available funding for this indicator, the total number of credit hours earned must be no greater than 115% of credit hours required for graduation.</td>
<td>A ratio of 1/1 indicates that the number of credit hours required equals the number of credit hours taken by the student. Institutions will receive points based on the average ratio of credit hours required to the number of credit hours taken by the student (excluding transfer students) at graduation, as follows:</td>
<td>An institution will receive 100% of funding if it does not exceed an average of 125% of the total number of semester hours required for each degree program for its graduates for coursework delivered at the public institutions in the State</td>
<td>100% of funding if the quantification of semester hours earned including non-remedial, non-transfer, applicable credit hours earned by graduates does not exceed 125% of credit hours required for the credential plus any specialty coursework related to the credential.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>.182%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>.05%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/ Suggested Modifications</td>
<td>The Committee has determined that this indicator is one of several which are not measurable, or not important, or for which what is “good” cannot be defined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (8) User-Friendliness of Institution

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (A) Transferability of credits to and from the institution

MEASURE: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A five point evaluation scale as follows: excellent=100%, good=75%, acceptable=50%, marginal=25%, unacceptable=0%</td>
<td>The degree to which an institution complies with the total number of factors in the &quot;Policy and Procedures for Transferability of Credits&quot; document which have been approved by CHE and implemented on an approved schedule. Institutions will receive points as follows.</td>
<td>Award 100% of funding for this indicator to institution(s) that ranks first among institutions in the sector in achieving all 12 components applicable to the sector in the &quot;Policy and Procedures&quot; document; award 5% less for each descending rank (e.g., 95% for rank 2, 90% for rank 3, etc.).</td>
<td>100% of funding on this indicator if the criteria stipulated in the &quot;Policy and Procedures for Transferability of Credits&quot; document are achieved by the institution as determined by the SBTCE, subject to CHE approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Compliance</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All factors</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All, minus one</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All, minus two</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All, minus three</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minus four or more</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weight: 1% 3.1% 4.5% 1%

Comments/Suggested Modifications
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (8) User-Friendliness of Institution

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (B) Continuing education programs for graduates and others

MEASURE: Number of non-credit continuing education student contact hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In order to receive 100% of available funding for this indicator, the number of non-credit continuing education contact hours shall be within 95% of the prior year's.</td>
<td>Institutions must report the number of non-credit continuing education contact hours, based on a three-year rolling average. Institutions with current year's reported activity 95%, or better, than the average of the previous three years (or most recent) data = .6 points; Institutions with current year's reported activity below 95% of the average of the previous three years (or most recent data) = 0 points</td>
<td>An institution will be funded at 80% of funding available under this indicator if it attains a level of offering at least 4000 contact hours of Continuing Education in a given year; it will also receive an additional 20% if its Continuing Education offerings in the most recent year exceed by at least 4% the institutional most recent prior three-year average of Continuing Education hours.</td>
<td>100% of funding on this indicator if the Tech System maintains a rolling three year average of three million non-credit continuing education student contact hours.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>.182%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/ Suggested Modifications</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Regional Campuses</td>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Committee has determined that this indicator is one of several which are not measurable, or not important, or for which what is &quot;good&quot; cannot be defined. The Committee wishes to recommend that the Steering Committee accept a revision to its measure for Indicator 8.B Continuing Education Program for Graduates and Others by adding to professional and occupational needs the term &quot;societal needs&quot; which would then encompass a variety of continuing education offerings that serve the needs of such groups as retired citizens.</td>
<td>The Sector Committee recommends that the definition of &quot;continuing education&quot; be expanded beyond occupational and professional to include enrichment, but excluding frivolous programs.</td>
<td>The Committee wishes to recommend that the Steering Committee accept a revision to its measure for Indicator 8.B Continuing Education Program for Graduates and Others by adding to professional and occupational needs the term &quot;societal needs&quot; which would then encompass a variety of continuing education offerings that serve the needs of such groups as retired citizens.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (8) User-Friendliness of Institution

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (C) Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State

MEASURE: the ratio of an institution’s accumulated points for accessibility to maximum points allowed for measure. Accessibility points:
A. The percent of other race undergraduate students enrolled at an institution = X points
B. The total number of credit hours generated off-campus in counties where no comparable program is offered by a public institution = X points
C. The 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 = X points
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Other race (undergraduate enrollment)=25 points</td>
<td>The Committee weighted parts A, B, C, and D as follows:</td>
<td>Measure a: (Worth 5 of 10 total points for indicator). A 1% increase in other-race students above a three-year average for each institution; institutions will receive 1 point for each .2% increase.</td>
<td>Percentage of funding is a ratio based on the Tech System's accumulated points for accessibility (A+B+C+D) to the 100 points allowed for this measure. The benchmarks for accessibility points are: A. 60 points if the percent of other race students enrolled in the current system exceeds the current system average as determined by SBTCE, with CHE approval. B. 5 points if the total number of credit hours generated off-campus in counties where no comparable program is offered by a public institution equals or exceeds the current system average as determined by SBTCE, with CHE approval. C. 5 points if the total number of credit hours generated off-campus in counties where no comparable program is offered by a public institution equals or exceeds the current system average as determined by SBTCE, with CHE approval. D. 30 points if in-state, undergraduate tuition and required fees are not more than 10% of S.C. personal per capita income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Each point is equivalent to one percentage point of minority enrollment 1% for each increase. The points for this indicator may exceed 25.</td>
<td>Part A = 3.0 points; Part B = .5 points; Part C = 5 points; and Part D = 7 points.</td>
<td>Measure b: (Worth 1 of 10 total points for indicator). Institutions will receive 1 point for a 1% increase in the number of credit hours generated by an institution above a three-year average for each institution.</td>
<td>Measure c: (Worth 0 of 10 total points for indicator). Not applicable to this sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Off-campus (total number of credit hours generated off-campus where no comparable program is offered = 25 points See c. below and</td>
<td>Institutions attaining their goal for percent of other-race students enrolled (as stated in their strategic plan as approved by CHE) = 3.0 points;</td>
<td>Measure d: (Worth 4 of 10 total points for indicator). An institution will receive 100% of funding for this part of the indicator if it is at or under a ratio of 1/2 of its average personal income for the same year. It will receive no funding if it is above 12%.</td>
<td>Measure d: (Worth 4 of 10 total points for indicator). An institution will receive 100% of funding for this part of the indicator if it is at or under a ratio of 1/2 of its average personal income for the same year. It will receive no funding if it is above 12%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Distance education (Number of credit hours generated in-state through distance education) 25 points</td>
<td>Institutions making progress toward their goal by increasing &quot;other-race&quot; enrollment by 50% or more = 3.0 points;</td>
<td>Measure c: (Worth 0 of 10 total points for indicator). Not applicable to this sector.</td>
<td>Measure d: (Worth 4 of 10 total points for indicator). An institution will receive 100% of funding for this part of the indicator if it is at or under a ratio of 1/2 of its average personal income for the same year. It will receive no funding if it is above 12%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These measures are to be evaluated on a five point scale: 5: excellent, 4: good, 3: acceptable, 2: marginal, 1: unacceptable.</td>
<td>Institutions which have not met their goal but have progressed toward that goal by .25% to 49% = 0 points;</td>
<td>Measure c: (Worth 0 of 10 total points for indicator). Not applicable to this sector.</td>
<td>Measure d: (Worth 4 of 10 total points for indicator). An institution will receive 100% of funding for this part of the indicator if it is at or under a ratio of 1/2 of its average personal income for the same year. It will receive no funding if it is above 12%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For b and c, multiply the scaled score received by 5 to determine the number of points awarded. Thus, for each of these 5 maximum of 25 points is available.</td>
<td>Institutions which have not met their goal but have progressed up to 249% toward their goal = 10 points;</td>
<td>Measure c: (Worth 0 of 10 total points for indicator). Not applicable to this sector.</td>
<td>Measure d: (Worth 4 of 10 total points for indicator). An institution will receive 100% of funding for this part of the indicator if it is at or under a ratio of 1/2 of its average personal income for the same year. It will receive no funding if it is above 12%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) In-state undergraduate, tuition and required fees = not more than XX% of personal per capita income. For every percentage point (up or down) the institution up to 20% the institution gains or loses a point.</td>
<td>Institutions experiencing no improvement or a decrease = 0 points.</td>
<td>Measure c: (Worth 0 of 10 total points for indicator). Not applicable to this sector.</td>
<td>Measure d: (Worth 4 of 10 total points for indicator). An institution will receive 100% of funding for this part of the indicator if it is at or under a ratio of 1/2 of its average personal income for the same year. It will receive no funding if it is above 12%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuition and fees as a percentage of per capita income should not exceed 20 percent. A total of 25 points are awarded for percentages at or below 20 percent. For every percentage below 20 percent, a point is added, for every percentage point above 20 percent, a point is subtracted (i.e. lower percentage is better). The points for this indicator may exceed 25.</td>
<td>Part B: Institutions offering off-campus courses meeting the criteria in the indicator - .5 points;</td>
<td>Measure d: (Worth 4 of 10 total points for indicator). An institution will receive 100% of funding for this part of the indicator if it is at or under a ratio of 1/2 of its average personal income for the same year. It will receive no funding if it is above 12%.</td>
<td>Measure d: (Worth 4 of 10 total points for indicator). An institution will receive 100% of funding for this part of the indicator if it is at or under a ratio of 1/2 of its average personal income for the same year. It will receive no funding if it is above 12%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Committee weighted parts A, B, C, and D as follows:
- Part A = 3.0 points; Part B = .5 points; Part C = 5 points; and Part D = 7 points.
- Part A: Institutional progress is based on a three-year rolling average of the most recent data.
- Institutions attaining their goal for percent of other-race students enrolled (as stated in their strategic plan as approved by CHE) = 3.0 points.
- Institutions making progress toward their goal by increasing "other-race" enrollment by 50% or more = 3.0 points.
- Institutions which have not met their goal but have progressed toward that goal by .25% to 49% = 0 points.
- Institutions which have not met their goal but have progressed up to 249% toward their goal = 10 points.
- Institutions experiencing no improvement or a decrease = 0 points.

For b and c, multiply the scaled score received by 5 to determine the number of points awarded. Thus, for each of these 5 maximum of 25 points is available.

In-state undergraduate, tuition and required fees = not more than XX% of personal per capita income. For every percentage point (up or down) the institution up to 20% the institution gains or loses a point.

Tuition and fees as a percentage of per capita income should not exceed 20 percent. A total of 25 points are awarded for percentages at or below 20 percent. For every percentage below 20 percent, a point is added, for every percentage point above 20 percent, a point is subtracted (i.e. lower percentage is better). The points for this indicator may exceed 25.
**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR:** (9) Research Funding

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR:** (A) Financial support for reform in teacher education

**MEASURE:** The 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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on a 100% scale, the institution will receive funding based on the percentage of funding which supports reform in teacher education, i.e., 50% for 50% support; 62% for 62% support, etc.</td>
<td>The goal is to reward institutions with ratios closer to 1/1 for this measure. Data used in the calculation is based on a three-year rolling average. In order to receive the maximum number of points for this measure, the ratio of an institution's private and public research grants and E&amp;G costs dedicated to teacher education programs, to the ratio of total E&amp;G costs and public and private research grants by the institution, 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) should be as follows:</td>
<td>Based on a 100% scale, the institution will receive funding based on the percentage of funding which supports reform in teacher education, i.e., 50% for 50% support; 62% for 62% support, etc.</td>
<td>Not applicable to this sector.</td>
<td>Not applicable to this sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Weight | 1% | 0.5% | 0% | 0% |

| Comments/ Suggested Modifications | | | | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.6 or better</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5-.59</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4-.49</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3-.39</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2-.29</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than .2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR: (9) Research Funding

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: (B) Amount of public and private sector grants

MEASURE: 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 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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The institution will receive 25 cents for each dollar generated in public and private sector grants for research.</td>
<td>In order to receive the maximum number of points for this indicator, an institution’s current year grant ratio (calculated as stated above) must be as follows:</td>
<td>An institution will receive 25 cents from performance funding for each dollar it produces from public and private grants which it manages to secure.</td>
<td>Not applicable to this sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.9 to 1.0</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8 to .89</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5 to .79</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than .5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments/Suggested Modifications
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November 12, 1996

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The third regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 12 in Room 100 of Maybank Hall, Speaker of the Faculty Robert Mignone presiding. Forty-eight senators attended. Minutes of the October 1 meeting were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker’s Report included three handouts. The first, a Report on the College of Charleston Mail Service, noted that reducing the number of student workers from eight to two resulted in vacancies that are just now being filled. Within the next few weeks the entire campus will be back to twice-a day mail deliveries. Further information in the report addressed bulk mail and commercial mail deliveries. Because bulk mail coming into or leaving the College is given a low priority, an additional several days or a week can be added to the ten days the US Postal Service allows for bulk mail. Items from commercial delivery services like Federal Express are accepted by the Mail Service and are delivered during the next regularly scheduled mail drop. Since this can add a day for the item to reach its destination (longer before weekends and holidays), the quickest way to receive items from commercial services is to provide a precise address including street, building, and office number where the item is to be delivered.

Mr. Mignone also included in his report a Summary of Senate Votes 1995-96 and the following Status Report on Motions Passed by the Faculty Senate 1995-96.

Status Report On Motions Passed by the Faculty Senate 1995-96
(Most curriculum and program changes are not included.)

October 3, 1995

By-Laws change regulating the composition and election of senators
Passed/ APPROVED

A recommendation was made by the Senate Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual to approve a change in the by-Laws regulating the “Composition and Election of Senators” Article IV, Section 2A: Faculty members on leave are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators.”
November 7, 1995

1) By-Laws change adding language to Article IV, Section 2C Passed/ APPROVED

2C6: A candidate for the position of Speaker cannot be a candidate for an at-large senate seat in the same election. In the event that a candidate for Speaker in the middle of a term as an at-large senator and wins the election for Speaker, of those unsuccessful in the election for at-large senate seats, the person obtaining the most votes will complete the second year of the Speaker-elect’s term.

2) In the Manual, under Senior Instructor on page 18, delete the following: Passed/ APPROVED

Promotion to senior instructor will occur only upon the positive recommendations of the department tenure and promotion panel.

3) In the Manual, under Instructor on page 17, add (as amended) the following: Passed/ APPROVED

Instructors and senior instructors will be granted full privileges in all matters of faculty governance, except that departments may restrict voting privileges in personnel matters.

January 16, 1996

Minimum number credit hours taken at the College for a minor: Passed/ APPROVED

A motion from the Academic Standards Committee was proposed, changing the requirements in the Undergraduate Bulletin for earning a minor at the College by requiring that “At least 9 hours in the minor at the 200 level or above must be earned at the College of Charleston.”

March 12, 1996

1) By-Laws change appending Article IV, Section 2F regulating the replacement of at-large senators Passed/ APPROVED

If an at-large Senator needs to be replaced in the second year of a term, the Senate will elect the replacement by written ballot. The Committee on Nominations will provide a slate of at least two candidates circulated to the faculty at least two weeks before the Senate meeting. Additional nominations from the faculty may be
sent to the Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections at least ten days before the Senate meeting.

2) Creation of an Ad Hoc Committee on General Education: Passed/APPROVED

A motion was made Dr. Lynn Ford, Assistant Professor of Political Science, to create an “Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Current State of General Education at the College of Charleston”

April 2, 1996

1) Credit for course work taken as part of an external pre-approved program: Passed/ APPROVED

The Academic Standards Committee made a motion to have included in the Policy and Procedures Manual of Student Records the following policy: “All course work taken as part of an external pre-approved program (specifically the International Student Exchange Program, the National Student Exchange Program, and the Bilateral Exchange Program) be considered for credit and academic enrollment status the same as if it were completed at the College of Charleston. The Senior Year Residency requirement is not altered in any way by this policy.”

2) Bicycle and vehicular safety around campus: Passed/LIMBO

The Welfare Committee made a motion involving two proposals for bicycle and vehicular safety around campus.

Proposal #1
a) bicycle rules are given to students and staff upon the registration of bicycles,
b) rules are printed in the student newspaper and posted in prominent locations around campus,
c) bicycle racks are repositioned to perimeter entrances of pedestrian area and additional bicycle parking space provided,
d) bicycle rules are enforced.

Proposal #2: Representatives of The College of Charleston who have necessary authority should meet with City of Charleston officials to develop strategies to improve bicycle, pedestrian,
and vehicular safety in and around campus. These should include but are not limited to:

a) establishing designated bicycle lanes on streets bounding and intersecting the campus,

b) adding a crosswalk on St. Phillip Street at Liberty Street,

c) slowing traffic during peak school hours on Calhoun, Coming, St. Phillip, and Wentworth;

d) closing George Street (between St. Phillip and Coming) between 7:30 and 4:30.

April 16, 1996 (The Second Session of the April meeting of the Faculty Senate)

Allowing students to “walk” at Graduation Passed/ APPROVED

The Academic Standards Committee introduced the following motion: A student may participate in the commencement ceremony at the end of any given semester if he or she either has completed all graduation requirements or satisfies all of the following three criteria:

1) At the beginning of the semester immediately preceding the commencement ceremony, the student has a cumulative GPA of 2.0 or better, as well as a GPA in the student’s major of 2.0 or better.

2) After the final withdrawal date in the semester immediately preceding the commencement ceremony, the student is registered in all courses required for the completion of his or her degree, but is not registered in more than 18 hours of courses.

3) The student has received a failing or incomplete grade in no more than 4 hours of course work taken during the semester immediately preceding the commencement ceremony.

*Senate Action/Administrative Action

[The Speaker’s Report is attached to the Secretary’s copy of the minutes.]
New Business

• Lee Lindner introduced twelve motions from the Curriculum Committee and an additional item for information. Some questions were raised about PHYS 456 carrying four credits without a lab. All of the proposals passed as circulated. [Original documents pertaining to curriculum proposals are attached to the Secretary’s copy of the minutes.]

CHEMISTRY AND BIOCHEMISTRY
* A change in the requirements for a BS in Biochemistry will mandate BIOL 312 and 312L (Molecular Biology and Molecular Biology Lab) as required courses for the major.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND HEALTH
* New Course: PEHD 103 Martial Arts (2)
* New Course: PEHD 139 African Dance (3)
* New Course: PEHD 245L Basic Athletic Training Lab (1)
* Course Change (title): PEHD 250 from Rhythms and Gymnastics to Dance and Rhythms
* New Course: PEHD 323 Women’s Health Issues (3)
* New Course: PEHD 345L Advanced Athletic Training Lab (1)
* Course Change (title): PEHD 430 from Sport Science and Rehabilitation to Therapeutic Exercise
* New Course: PEHD 437 Therapeutic Modalities (3)
* New Course: PEHD 440 Biomechanics (3)

PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY
* New Course: PHYS 456 Air Pollution Meteorology (4)

PSYCHOLOGY
* Course Change (title and catalogue description): PSYC 394 from Systems of Psychology to History and Systems of Psychology

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES
* For information: Special Topics courses

• Fran Courson then made the following motion for a Senate Resolution from the Academic Planning Committee:

*Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate expresses its displeasure and concern that the advising process is no longer required for preregistration.*
Ms. Courson called on Vice President for Enrollment Management Sue Sommer-Kresse, who agreed with the resolution and rationale presented by the Academic Planning Committee and asked the Senate to consider the larger question of how to advise. In the past, she said, sometimes faculty were not available to sign course request sheets. She is especially concerned about the advising of undeclared majors. Registrar Bill Anderson said that he wants advising to have a prominent place in the registration process. To his comment that word about the new system didn’t get from the Registration Task Force to the faculty, Hugh Wilder and Susan Morrison, both members of the Task Force, stated that they were unaware that advisors’ signatures would not be required with the new system.

Although Jayne Rugg, Director of Advising, said that the Advising Center had an increase in the number of undeclared majors coming for advise during the recent registration period, both Virginia Benmaman (Spanish) and Charles Kaiser (Psychology) reported that their departments had a notable drop in the number of majors seeking advice. Dean Bill Lindstrom mentioned the new On-Course system that enables students to monitor their own program and call up a degree audit at any time.

Two approaches to incorporate advising with the new technology were suggested: faculty-issued PIN’s and registration holds. Much discussion followed about the benefits of advising and about how to implement a system of advising that would ensure departmental cooperation in the advising of undeclared majors.

After a call for the question, the resolution passed. Later in the meeting, the Speaker asked the Academic Planning Committee to consider methods of including advising in the registration process and report back to the Senate.

- Next, Walter Pharr brought three motions to the Senate from the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid:

1. That the last sentence in the paragraph about attendance on p. 43 of the Undergraduate Catalog be replaced with the following:

   As a student approaches the maximum allowable absences, the professor will notify the student that exceeding the limit will result in a grade of WA. If the student then misses more than the permissible number, the professor may instruct the Registrar to record a grade of WA.

When Jim Carew said that he thinks no warning is necessary and wants a college-wide attendance policy, Caroline Hunt asked how such a policy could be enforced. Hugh Wilder then offered a friendly amendment to drop the first sentence of the motion. The following amended motion passed:

"If the student misses more than the permissible number of absences, the professor may instruct the Registrar to record a grade of WA for the student."
2. Be it resolved that the faculty Senate of the College of Charleston recognizes the first
day of class to be a full and important teaching day; the first day of class sets the tone
for the remainder of the semester. To that end, all faculty will make certain that the
first day of class is a meaningful teaching day. If the faculty member has an
attendance policy, then the student will be counted absent if s/he misses the first day
unless prior arrangements have been made with the professor. Students will be held
accountable for all material covered on the first day of class. The faculty encourages
all administrative departments and offices to support these efforts by minimizing
conflicting activities and providing adequate space where learning is to take place.

After some discussion about the difficulty of enforcing such a resolution, the motion
failed.

3. That Russia, France, and Germany be considered a single region, Europe, for the
purpose of fulfilling the “Alternative Courses to the Foreign Language Requirement.”

Doug Friedman commented that the entire Language Alternative program was remanded
to the Academic Standards Committee for review last year and suggested that much more
information is necessary before any vote. John Creed remarked that the proposed change
would eliminate the little coherence currently in the Language Alternative program.
The motion failed.

**Constituents’ Concerns**

Mary Beth Heston, Dana Cope, and Virginia Benmaman all voiced concerns about a
College of Charleston program being offered in conjunction with Coker College for a
1997 spring semester in Trujillo, Spain, particularly about the Art History and Sociology
courses included in the program. The Speaker charged the Academic Standards
Committee with examining this program as well as other travel courses.

Finally, other concerns were addressed to the Registrar about transfer credits.

**Adjournment**

With the hour getting late and with no further business, the meeting adjourned at
6:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary
SPEAKER'S REPORT

NOVEMBER 12, 1996
Report on the College of Charleston Mail Service

In response to several inquiries from faculty regarding the College of Charleston Mail Service, interviews were conducted with Fred Daniels, Senior Vice President for Executive Administration, Andy Abrams, Senior Vice President for Institutional Research and Lamont Meyers, Director of the Mail Service. The focus of the interviews was to address concerns expressed by some of the faculty, determine the causes of recent reductions in mail service and understand what is currently underway to improve the service.

Last spring there were reports of thefts from items handled by the Mail Service and an investigation was conducted by Public Safety. The investigation resulted in an indictment. The charges were eventually dropped, however the incident brought to the surface concerns regarding the use of part-time workers by the Mail Service. In particular, there was some dissatisfaction and awkwardness surrounding the Mail Service's heavy reliance on student workers. At that time, there were eight student workers posting mail. It was decided that the use of student workers should be limited in both number and duties and that the policies and procedures of the Mail Service should be reviewed.

This fall only two student workers were hired. This left a deficit of workers, which is the primary reason that mail service was reduced over late summer and early fall. Over the last few months, one person was hired into a new position, another person was hired to fill a vacancy in an existing position and a second new position is expected to be filled within the next few weeks.

Filling the first two vacancies brought the delivery schedule of campus mail close to the frequency of last spring. Currently, eighty percent of the campus is receiving mail twice a day, and the number should be one hundred percent when the third new hire arrives on campus in the next few weeks.

Two current policies related to faculty concerns are those regarding a) bulk mail and b) commercial delivery services such as Federal Express. Bulk mail coming into the College or leaving the College is given a low priority for handling. It is basically set aside and dealt with last. This can mean an addition of several days to a week added to the delivery time of the US Postal Services handling of bulk mail. The US Postal Service allows up to ten days to deliver bulk mail. This means bulk mail coming into or leaving the College can take almost three weeks from the sender's to the receiver's hand. I was assured that bulk mail seen sitting in canvas mail service wagons in the basement of the old Sears building has not been permanently abandoned.

*Items dropped off at the College of Charleston Mail Service by commercial delivery services are accepted by CofC Mail Service,* and they are delivered during the next regularly scheduled mail service drop. This can add up to a day for the item to reach its destination, or longer if it arrives the day before a weekend or holiday break. The quickest way to receive Federal Express or other commercial delivery service items is to provide a precise address including street, building and office numbers where the item is to be delivered. This makes it more likely that items will be received in the most timely way.

In order to develop policies and procedures which will improve service and prevent recurrence of previously experienced difficulties, Mr. Meyers is seeking information and advice from the College and University Mail Services Association. This is a national organization which shares information concerning changes in policies and procedures of the US Postal Service. There is a great deal of accumulated experience among its members; the hope is that this can be shared in the form of recommendations for the operating procedures of the College of Charleston Mail Service.
Summary of Senate Votes 1995-96

October 3, 1995
  By-Laws change regulating the composition and election of senators Passed/
  APPROVED*

November 7, 1995
  1) By-Laws change adding language to Article IV, Section 2C Passed/
     APPROVED
  2) In the Manual, under Senior Instructor on page 18, delete
     Passed/APPROVED
  3) In the Manual, under Instructor on page 17, add (as amended) the following:
     Passed/APPROVED

January 16, 1996
  Minimum number credit hours taken at the College for a minor:
  Passed/APPROVED

March 12, 1996
  1) By-Laws change appending Article IV, Section 2F regulating the
     replacement of at-large senators Passed/ APPROVED
  2) Creation of an Ad Hoc Committee on General Education:
     Passed/APPROVED

April 2, 1996
  1) Credit for course work taken as part of an external pre-approved
     program: Passed/APPROVED
  2) Bicycle and vehicular safety around campus: Passed/LIMBO

April 16, 1996 (The Second Session of the April meeting of the Faculty Senate)
  Allowing students to “walk” at Graduation Passed/APPROVED

*Senate Action/Administrative Action
Status Report On Motions Passed by the Faculty Senate 1995-96
(Most curriculum and program changes are not included.)

October 3, 1995

By-Laws change regulating the composition and election of senators
Passed/ APPROVED
A recommendation was made by the Senate Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual to approve a change in the By-Laws regulating the “Composition and Election of Senators.”
Article IV, Section 2A: Faculty members on leave are not eligible to serve as Faculty Senators.”

November 7, 1995

1) By-Laws change adding language to Article IV, Section 2C Passed/ APPROVED

2C6: A candidate for the position of Speaker cannot be a candidate for an at-large senate seat in the same election. In the event that a candidate for Speaker in the middle of a term as an at-large senator and wins the election for Speaker, of those unsuccessful in the election for at-large senate seats, the person obtaining the most votes will complete the second year of the Speaker-elect’s term.

2) In the Manual, under Senior Instructor on page 18, delete the following: Passed/ APPROVED

Promotion to senior instructor will occur only upon the positive recommendations of the department tenure and promotion panel.

3) In the Manual, under Instructor on page 17, add (as amended) the following: Passed/ APPROVED

Instructors and senior instructors will be granted full privileges in all matters of faculty governance, except that departments may restrict voting privileges in personnel matters.

January 16, 1996

Minimum number credit hours taken at the College for a minor:
Passed/ APPROVED

A motion from the Academic Standards Committee was proposed, changing the requirements in the Undergraduate Bulletin for earning a minor at the College by requiring that “At least 9 hours in the minor at the 200 level or above must be earned at the College of Charleston.”

March 12, 1996

1) By-Laws change appending Article IV, Section 2F regulating the replacement of at-large senators Passed/ APPROVED
If an at-large Senator needs to be replaced in the second year of a term, the Senate will elect the replacement by written ballot. The Committee on Nominations will provide a slate of at least two candidates circulated to the faculty at least two weeks before the Senate meeting. Additional nominations from the faculty may be sent to the Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections at least ten days before the Senate meeting.

2) Creation of an Ad Hoc Committee on General Education: Passed/PROVED

A motion was made Dr. Lynn Ford, Assistant Professor of Political Science, to create an "Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Current State of General Education at the College of Charleston"

April 2, 1996

1) Credit for course work taken as part of an external pre-approved program: Passed/ APPROVED

The Academic Standards Committee made a motion to have included in the Policy and Procedures Manual of Student Records the following policy: "All course work taken as part of an external pre-approved program (specifically the International Student Exchange Program, the National Student Exchange Program, and the Bilateral Exchange Program) be considered for credit and academic enrollment status the same as if it were completed at the College of Charleston. The Senior Year Residency requirement is not altered in any way by this policy."

2) Bicycle and vehicular safety around campus: Passed/LIMBO

The Welfare Committee made a motion involving two proposals for bicycle and vehicular safety around campus.

Proposal #1
a) bicycle rules are given to students and staff upon the registration of bicycles,
b) rules are printed in the student newspaper and posted in prominent locations around campus,
c) bicycle racks are repositioned to perimeter entrances of pedestrian area and additional bicycle parking space provided,
d) bicycle rules are enforced.

Proposal #2: Representatives of The College of Charleston who have necessary authority should meet with City of Charleston officials to develop strategies to improve bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicular safety in and around campus. These should include but are not limited to:
a) establishing designated bicycle lanes on streets bounding and intersecting the campus,
b) adding a crosswalk on St. Phillip Street at Liberty Street,
c) slowing traffic during peak school hours on Calhoun, Coming, St. Phillip, and Wentworth;
d) closing George Street (between St. Phillip and Coming) between 7:30 and 4:30.

April 16, 1996 (The Second Session of the April meeting of the Faculty Senate)

Allowing students to "walk" at Graduation Passed/ APPROVED

The Academic Standards Committee introduced the following motion: A student may participate in the commencement ceremony at the end of any given semester if he or she either has completed all graduation requirements or satisfies all of the following three criteria:

1) At the beginning of the semester immediately preceding the commencement ceremony, the student has a cumulative GPA of 2.0 or better, as well as a GPA in the student's major of 2.0 or better.

2) After the final withdrawal date in the semester immediately preceding the commencement ceremony, the student is registered in all courses required for the completion of his or her degree, but is not registered in more than 18 hours of courses.

3) The student has received a failing or incomplete grade in no more than 4 hours of course work taken during the semester immediately preceding the commencement ceremony.

*Senate Action/Administrative Action
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The second regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 1 in Room 100 of Maybank Hall, Speaker of the Faculty Robert Mignone presiding. Forty-four senators attended. Minutes of the September 3 meeting were approved.

Reports

The Speaker

Responding to a question raised at the September 3 meeting, Mr. Mignone reported that faculty members have general tort liability coverage up to one million dollars.

The Speaker then turned to Performance Funding and reported that measures for the 37 performance indicators have now been established and accepted by the Steering Committee for Performance Funding. Mr. Mignone focused particularly on the "Post-tenure review for tenured faculty" indicator and the "Best Practices" document that is to be used in designing these reviews. This document specifies that post-tenure reviews are to be conducted at intervals of no more than six years and that each institution must link favorable reviews to a system of faculty rewards. Also, a development process and an appeals procedure must be in place for those who receive an unsatisfactory review.

When asked how this new post-tenure review differs from the current annual evaluation, Mr. Mignone pointed out that, unlike the current one-on-one annual evaluation with the department chair, the post-tenure review will be institution-wide and will require external evaluations. He stressed the fact that individual institutions, not CHE, will set the guidelines for the reviews. Also, because our current promotion procedures satisfy the "Best Practices" document, an evaluation for promotion to associate or full professor can count as a post-tenure review. In effect, then, with the new system faculty members might have only two additional reviews during their time at the College.

Mr. Mignone suggested that some of the performance indicators can be beneficial to the us and pointed as an example to the "Compensation of faculty indicator," which is to be measured by national, not regional standards.
The Speaker closed his report by noting that the next step in the process is establishing weights and benchmarks for each of the performance indicators and urge faculty and administrators to become involved in that process.

New Business

* The Committee on Nominations and Elections conducted two elections with the following results:
  - At-Large Senators: Jim Smiley and Mary Beth Heston
  - Faculty Advisory Committee to the President: John Fauth

* Lee Lindner introduced six motions from the Curriculum Committee, all of which passed as circulated.

1. THEATRE
   - Course Change: Change in course title of THTR 231 from “Children’s Theatre” to “Theatre for Youth”

2. CHEMISTRY AND BIOCHEMISTRY
   - Course Change: CHEM 491 Chemistry Seminar. New course description allows a student to repeat the course once for credit and changes the prerequisite to either junior or senior status

3. PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY
   - Minor in Meteorology
   - Concentration in Meteorology for physics and astronomy majors

4. GEOLOGY
   - New Course: GEOL 206 Planetary Geology (3)

5. PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND HEALTH
   - New Course: PEHD 133 Intermediate Horseback Riding (3)

Constituents’ Concerns

Hugh Haynsworth announced that copies of the SACS Report are available in the faculty lounge and that Maggie Pennington has agreed to chair the Self-Study Implementation Committee. All comments about the SACS and Self-Study Reports should be sent to her.

William Gudger and Andy Lewis pointed out that all Music and PEHD courses (and some Math courses) were mistakenly omitted from the Schedule of Courses for spring
semester. [Note: A three-page addendum listing all of the missing courses is being circulated with the course schedule.] Bishop Hunt wanted to know what steps are being taken to ensure that such an error does not recur.

Ken Bower asked why our raises do not go into effect until October when our contracts begin in August.

Dinesh Sarvate cited some cases of mathematical illiteracy he sees in his 100-level math courses and expressed concern about the preparation of our students for college-level work, especially now that the College can no longer offer remedial courses.

Bill Olejniczak asked about the Provost’s request for help with tenure and promotion reviews. The Speaker said that the matter has been referred to the Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will make recommendations in the spring.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary
September 9, 1996

THE FACULTY MINUTES

The first regular meeting of the Faculty of the College of Charleston for the academic year 1996-97 convened at 5:00 p.m. on Monday, September 9 in the recital hall of the Albert Simons Center for the Arts, Speaker of the Faculty Robert Mignone presiding. Susan Morrison served as Parliamentarian. Minutes of the previous meeting (April 22, 1996) were approved as circulated.

President’s Report

President Alexander M. Sanders, Jr. welcomed the faculty to the start of a new year and reported that enrollment is higher than expected, even though the target was static or reduced enrollment. We admitted 125 fewer students than we did for the fall 1995 semester, but the combination of a larger number of students deciding to attend the College and significantly improved retention rates pushed the figure higher than the target. The addition of the Bell South building with its 100,000 sq. ft. and 14 new classrooms has helped to alleviate space problems, and improvements to that building (access, elevators, heating/air conditioning) are being made as quickly as possible. Acquisition of the Bishop England property in the summer of 1998 should eliminate problems with overcrowding.

The rest of Mr. Sanders’ report concerned CHE’s move to performance funding for higher education and some of the problems with that plan. One “performance indicator,” for example, is compensation of faculty (II,D). Although increasing salaries of the faculty is his highest priority, Mr. Sanders said, our salaries still remain below average. In spite of this, we recruited new faculty this year from prestigious institutions around the country. With the obvious quality of our underpaid faculty, he questioned how compensation can be a valid “quality indicator.”

Some of the other 37 “performance indicators,” he noted, are in conflict with each other. He cited, for example, ACT and SAT scores (VI,A) and priority on enrolling in-state students (VI,D). Even though the combined SAT scores (1120) of our entering freshmen are some of the highest among state institutions, we provisionally admit a number of students whose SAT scores are 100 points below the cutoff and give them a chance to prove themselves. These students, most of them in-state and many of them minority students, have a higher success rate than regularly-admitted students, plus we benefit from the diversity they bring to the campus. We seek out these students for our sake, not theirs, he said. Mr. Sanders will not abandon his commitment to Affirmative Action, which he defines as acting affirmatively to assure equal opportunity and accessibility.
Another example of conflicting performance indicators is graduation rate (VII,A) and mission focus (I,A-E). As a municipal college, we have a large population of non-traditional students who work, many full-time, while pursuing their degrees. Since these students often take longer than usual to complete their coursework, our graduation rate cannot be compared fairly with that of other institutions. We could, he noted in jest, significantly improve our graduation rate by eliminating the language requirement.

As a final example of problems with the indicators as well as with allocations for higher education in the past, Mr. Sanders pointed to class size and student/teacher ratios (III,A) and percentage of administrative costs compared to academic costs (V,A). Even though our funding from the state at $13,500 for every degree awarded remains well below the state average of $28,000 (a decrease of 42% in the past ten years), we maintain an 18:1 student/teacher ratio (with regular faculty, not graduate students) and spend two-thirds of our budget on academic programs.

In spite of problems that may lie ahead, Mr. Sanders pointed to recent survey results showing that 93% of alumni reported satisfaction with the quality of education at the College and that 94% of our graduates were employed within six months of graduation, and he assured the faculty that the College will continue to be the outstanding institution it has been for the past 225 years. [Note: Parenthetical reference to performance indicators were taken from CHE’s Special Report No. 1, July 1996, Performance Funding.]

Provost’s Report

Provost Conrad Festa introduced two new chairs—Michael Auerbach in Biology and Deanna Caveny in Mathematics—and then asked chairs of departments with new members to introduce them to the faculty; all were welcomed with warm applause.

Below is a list of all chairs and deans followed by a list of new faculty. (For convenience, the names of new faculty have been arranged alphabetically.)

ACADEMIC DEANS/DEPARTMENT CHAIRS 1996-97

School of the Arts
Department of Art History
Department of Music
Department of Studio Art
Department of Theatre

Dr. Edward C. McGuire, Dean 953-5601
Dr. Diane C. Johnson 953-8286
Prof. Steve Rosenberg 953-5927
Prof. Michael Tyzack 953-8285
Prof. Allen Lyndrup 953-6306

School of Business and Economics
Department of Accounting and Legal Stud.
Department of Economics and Finance
Department of Management and Marketing

Dr. Howard Rudd, Dean 953-5627
Dr. Robert Rouse 953-5627
Dr. J. Michael Morgan 953-5627
Dr. Rhonda Mack 953-5627
NEW FACULTY 1996-97

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel Aina</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Elementary/Early Childhood Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Auerbach</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Biggs</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>English /Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Ray Boese</td>
<td>Visiting Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Breedlove</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Sociology/Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Bushnell</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annalisa Calini</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Campbell</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Elementary/Early Childhood Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nell Carson</td>
<td>Visiting Instructor</td>
<td>English /Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Chowning</td>
<td>Visiting Instructor</td>
<td>English /Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sam Cogdell
William Crooks
John Charles Croots
Diane Creitz Cudahy
William Francis Danaher
Thomas Darren Felty
Jonathan B. Fenno
Eric M. Fife
Marie Fitzwilliam
Katherine M. Fleming
James I. Gray
Antony S. Harold
Sheridan Hough
John R. Huddleston
Willem Hillenius
Catherine Holmes
Daniel Jacobson
Linda Jones
Dane P. Krogman
Maida Libkin
Hera Leighton
Brenton LeMesurier
Luis Linares-Ocanto
Simon Lewis
Toby Mapes
Ruth Mercado
Christine Moore
Jon Morter
Ruth Dentiste Mueller
Ralph C. Muldrow
James Neilson
Kumiko Okano
Scott Peeples
Ray A. Preston
Marc Regnier
Mary Runyon
Mary Sadler
Rodney D. Schluter
Brenda Still
Rhonda J. Swickert
Laura Turner
Susan Turner
Joy Vandervort-Cobb
Bertrand Van Ruymbeke
James Vance Waggener
Donna Weeks
E. Cameron Williams
Elizabeth Williams
James Williams
Suzanne Young
Visiting Asst. Prof.
Visiting Asst. Prof.
Visiting Assoc. Prof.
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Visiting Instructor
Visiting Asst. Prof.
Visiting Asst. Prof.
Instructor
Archivist
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Artist-in-Residence
Visiting Asst. Prof.
Visiting Asst. Prof.
Visiting Asst. Prof.
Assistant Professor
Instructor
Instructor
Instructor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Visiting Instructor
Instructor
Visiting Asst. Prof.
Visiting Instructor
Assistant Professor
Assistant Professor
Visiting Asst. Prof.
Visiting Instructor
Visiting Instructor
Professor
Asst. Reference Librarian
Librarian 1
Visiting Instructor
Spanish/Italian
Chemistry/Biochemistry
Management/Marketing
Ed. Foundations/Specializations
Sociology/Anthropology
English Communication
Classics/German
English/Communication
English/Communication
Library
Management/Marketing
Biology
Philosophy/Religious Studies
Philosophy/Religious Studies
Biology
English/Communication
Philosophy/Religious Studies
Physics/Astronomy
Theatre
Theatre
Classics/German
Mathematics
Spanish/Italian
English/Communication
Biology
Spanish/Italian
Computer Science
Sociology/Anthropology
Management/Marketing
Art History
English/Communication
Classics/German
English/Communication
Psychology
Music
Ed. Foundations/Specializations
English/Communication
Chemistry/Biochemistry
Sociology/Anthropology
Psychology
Theatre
Spanish/Italian
Theatre
History
Mathematics
Psychology
Management/Marketing
Library
Library
English/Communication
Speaker's Report

Mr. Mignone reported that efforts from colleges and universities around the state resulted in an amendment banning firearms from campuses being attached the recently-passed gun bill. He also said that he would keep the faculty informed about new developments in CHE’s plans for performance funding.

After some announcements “For the Good of the Order,” the meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary
September 3, 1996

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The first regular meeting of the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 3 in room 100 of Maybank Hall, Speaker of the Faculty Robert Mignone presiding. Fifty-one senators attended. The Speaker appointed Susan Morrison Parliamentarian. Minutes of the two sessions of the April meeting (April 2 and April 16) were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Provost

Mr. Festa welcomed the senators to what he thinks will be a good year for the College and singled out two issues of special importance to him:
1. Planning for new facilities. Campus Planners will meet with all departments while developing plans for the Sears, Bell, and Bishop England buildings.
2. The Ad Hoc Committee to Review General Education. Mr. Festa believes that the discussions of this committee are fundamental in assuring the quality of our curriculum and hopes that all faculty members will join one of the inquiry groups.

He is also interested in the new salary study that will replace the one conducted four years ago. In addition, he will be very involved in CHE's plans to move toward performance funding, and he commended Jack Parson and Bob Mignone for the statewide leadership role they have played in working with CHE on the new initiative.

Mr. Festa reported that the responsibility for adjuncts has been moved from his office to the deans. Finally, he asked for advice about the tenure and promotion procedure, especially in the use of peer review and refereed journals and in the evaluation of teaching, preferably with a better instrument than the one currently in use.

The Speaker

Mr. Mignone reported that the recently-passed gun bill includes an amendment banning firearms from college campuses. Secondly, he said that copies of the Freedom of Information Act will be sent to all committee chairs so that they can review the
requirements for announcing meetings and making minutes available. He also distributed a handout on Information Technology Planning describing a process that addresses recommendations of a technology consultant and SACS Recommendation #6. The plan includes an Information Technology Steering Committee, working groups to address specific areas, and planning and budgeting—annual and five-year as well as strategic. (The report is attached to the secretary’s copy of the minutes.)

Mr. Mignone then asked Jack Parson to update the Senate on CHE’s plans for performance funding. Mr. Parson said that by September 18 three task forces must develop “operational measures” of the thirty-seven “performance indicators,” and by January CHE will send an implementation plan to the General Assembly. Appropriations for FY 1997-98 and 1998-99 will be based on both the current formula and performance funding; by June 1999 allocations for higher education will be 100% performance-based. [Note: Copies of CHE’s July 1996 Report on Performance Funding were attached to the Summer 1996 issue of The Faculty Newsletter.] Mr. Parson pointed out that CHE has a home page and is posting minutes of all meetings. He closed his remarks by noting that other states which have moved to performance funding for higher education have found that such funding should account for no more than 10 to 15% of total allocations.

The Speaker finished his report by commending the Provost for the work he has done on the statewide Committee on Planning, on whose planning document CHE is beginning to rely during its discussions of performance funding.

New Business

* Amy McCandless was elected Speaker Pro Tempore of the Senate

* Jack Parson was elected representative to the Conference of South Carolina University Faculty Chairs

* Lee Lindner then introduced five motions from the Curriculum Committee, all of which passed as circulated.

1) BIOLOGY
   * Minor in Biology
   * New Course: BIOL 314 Immunology (3)

2) BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (Management and Marketing)
   * New Course: BADM 350 Tourism (3)

3) CLASSICS AND GERMAN
   * Course Change (number): LATN 374 Medieval Latin to LATN 305
   * Change in Prerequisite: LATN 301 or 305 is prerequisite for all other advanced level Latin courses
4) EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS AND SPECIALIZATIONS
- New Course: EDFS 105 Education in Contemporary Society (3)

Constituents' Concerns

Citing the case of a colleague on sick leave who was sued in connection with a publication and found that he was not covered by state insurance, Dana Cope asked that faculty be informed of specific liability coverage provided by the state. Susan Morrison inquired about library and gym privileges for full-time adjuncts and their dependents.

Jim Carew asked about the possibility of having a post office on campus and wanted to know if we could revisit the academic calendar for fall semester, specifically the one day of class following the Thanksgiving holiday and the placement of fall break. Hugh Haynsworth remarked that Dean Lindstrom is now in charge of the calendar and will consult with the Academic Standards and Academic Planning Committees when preparing future calendars.

After the new senators stood up to be recognized, Caroline Hunt reported that the Committee on Nominations and Elections will conduct an election to replace two at-large senators who resigned.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Haney
Faculty Secretary
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PLANNING

I. INTRODUCTION

In what has become known as the “Information Age,” virtually every aspect of life at institutions of higher education in general and the College of Charleston in particular is significantly impacted by the use of information technology. The increases in this usage at the College has been and continues to be both rapid and dramatic. Because of the dynamic and costly nature of these technological changes, effective institutional communication and planning for information technology is critically important.

Historically, planning, policies and procedures for the allocation and use of Information Technology (IT) at the College of Charleston have been decentralized and largely handled at the departmental level. Each year the College has submitted an IT Plan to the South Carolina Budget and Control Board, reflecting the non-prioritized goals of administrative areas and the IT resources required to accomplish these goals. This IT Plan has limited usefulness, however, because student, classroom and other academic functions are not included.

During the prior academic year (1995-96), the College retained a technology consultant to review information technology issues at the institution. This consultant noted a “lack of a campus-wide strategic plan” and “no clear framework for schools and departments to use while planning,” and therefore recommended the establishment of a broad-based information technology committee and a campus-wide strategic planning initiative for information technology.

The SACS Visitation team noted these deficiencies and recommended that “the institution develop and evaluate regularly policies for the allocation and use of information technology resources and that those policies be consistent with the institution’s stated purpose and goals.” (SACS Recommendation #6)

In order to address the SACS recommendation, the President of the College of Charleston formed an Ad Hoc Information Technology Committee and charged the Committee with establishing a process that assures the development, coordination, evaluation and review of College information technology (IT) issues and policies in a manner consistent with institutional mission and goals. This Committee reports to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Senior Vice President for Institutional Resources/Executive Administration.

The following sections include a description of the structure and process developed by the institution to meet SACS Recommendation #6 and, more importantly, to help ensure viable information technology resource planning, policies and allocation at the College of Charleston.
II. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STEERING COMMITTEE

An Information Technology Steering Committee, with membership from a broad cross section of the institution, coordinates the process and develops the structure for planning and meeting the information technology resource needs of the College. The Committee's membership includes the Director of Administrative Computing, the Director of Academic Computing, the Director of Administrative Services, the Dean of the Libraries, the Campus Network Manager, the Director of Media and Technology, the Dean of Graduate Studies/Vice President for Research, and the Speaker of the Faculty. Additionally, the Committee includes a representative from: Academic Affairs, currently represented by the Associate Provost; Enrollment Management, currently represented by the Director of Financial Aid; Student Affairs, currently represented by the Dean of Students; Council of Deans, currently represented by the Dean of the School of Science and Mathematics; Institutional Advancement; Business Affairs; the student body; each of the schools of the College. The Committee is co-chaired by the Senior Vice President for Institutional Research and Planning and the Faculty Director of the College's SACS Self-Study.

The President and the Senior Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and Institutional Resources will regularly review the charge of this committee and may change either the charge, composition or chairs as they deem appropriate.

The Committee will develop and recommend policies for the acquisition, allocation and use of information technology resources to the Senior Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and Institutional Resources. Additionally, the Committee will (1) annually evaluate these policies to assure their compatibility with the institutional mission and goals; (2) provide this evaluation to the President and Senior Vice Presidents; (3) recommend modifications, revisions and additions to existing policies, where appropriate; and (4) develop a strategic information technology initiative that will include a broad set of IT goals for the institution.

The Senior Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and Institutional Resources will review these evaluations and recommendations and make such recommendations to the President, as they deem appropriate. The President or the two Senior Vice Presidents will subsequently advise the Committee in a timely fashion of those recommendations that the President has approved for adoption and/or implementation by the Committee. The Committee will implement the policies and recommendations approved by the President and will disseminate these policies to the campus community.

III. WORKING GROUPS

The IT Steering Committee will establish “working groups” to address specific areas (e.g., campus e-mail, technology inventory and web pages) and issues of information technology deemed worthy of examination by the campus community, the Committee,
the Senior Vice Presidents, and the President. A member of the Steering Committee will serve on each working group, however, the composition of these working groups will come from the college community as a whole, based upon interest, impact and expertise. At the time of the formation of a working group, the Steering Committee will assure that there is adequate representation of key constituencies on that working group.

The working group will make recommendations to the Steering Committee, that will in turn make recommendations to the Senior Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and Institutional Resources. As noted above, the two Senior Vice Presidents will make such recommendations to the President as they deem appropriate. The two Senior Vice Presidents will inform the Steering Committee of their final decisions regarding these and other information technology policies or issues.

IV. PLANNING AND BUDGETING

A. Annual and Five Year Planning and Budgeting

As part of the College’s planning, budgeting and assessment process, each department will receive a separate form for information technology planning, which will be included in the currently distributed annual planning form packet. The information technology planning document will ask each department to (1) identify those goals and objectives within its annual and five year plans which require information technology to accomplish; (2) identify the anticipated time frame for accomplishing these goals and objectives; (3) identify the anticipated resources required to accomplish these IT goals and objectives; and (4) identify the costs and sources of funds required.

These IT planning/budgeting documents will be provided to the Steering Committee, so that the Committee can (1) assemble the multiple documents; (2) review these documents to assure compatibility with institutional mission and goals/objectives and IT policies; (3) review the documents to determine any duplication, available economies of scale or impact on other campus departments and constituencies; and (4) make recommendations to the Senior Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and Institutional Resources, where appropriate. In order to assure timely input, the Committee will complete this review and recommendation process prior to the Senior Vice Presidents’ scheduled submission of final planning/budgeting recommendations to the President, as provided under the current planning, budgeting and assessment process/calendar.

Upon final approval of the annual departmental plans by the President, the Senior Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and Institutional Resources will notify the Committee and provide the Committee with copies of these final approved plans. The Committee will assemble these final approved departmental plans into an institutional Annual IT Summary Report and disseminate the report to the campus community.
B. Strategic Planning

Recognizing the need for longer range planning and direction than is generally provided in the annual planning process, in Fall 1996 the Steering Committee will begin an Information Technology strategic planning initiative for the campus. This process will begin with a campus dialogue about the role that information technology plays in the ability of the institution to take advantage of opportunities; meet challenges; and accomplish both departmental and institutional goals, in a manner consistent with the institution’s mission. This will encourage longer range thinking about information technology issues for the campus; assist the departments in their annual IT planning, as outlined above; facilitate the development of institutional information technology goals and objectives; and provide primary IT providers (e.g., Academic Computing, Administrative Computing, Administrative Services, the Libraries and the Office of Media and Technology) with the information and support they require to achieve and to facilitate the achievement by others of the institution’s IT goals and objectives.

The cornerstone of this strategic planning will be the broad-based consultation with the campus community. The Steering Committee will develop a “strategic plan”* for information technology that addresses the impact of information technology on instruction and research, administration and community service at the College of Charleston. Ultimately, the strategic planning process should generate a set of broad IT goals for the campus and an institutional vision for information technology on campus.

As with all other information technology planning and recommendations, authority for final approval of any IT strategic plan lies with the Senior Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and Institutional Resources and, ultimately, the President of the College of Charleston.

* As compared to a “master plan” that potentially alters existing reporting lines or addresses the daily operations of the primary IT providers.