

## NOTE

**THIS IS A FIVE-PAGE DOCUMENT, INCLUDING THIS COVER PAGE.**

**The four pages that follow describe CHE's requirements for the format and contents of the mission statements of institutions under its authority, and the standards and processes by which the mission statements are evaluated.**

**These pages are extracted directly from the**

***Performance Funding Workbook*, 3rd edition (September 2000) published by the Division of Planning, Assessment, and Performance Funding of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education, 1333 Main Street, Suite 200, Columbia, SC 29201.**

**They appear as pages 73-75 in the original document, which may be accessed online at the following web address:**

[http://www.che400.state.sc.us/web/Perform/Workbook\\_3rd\\_ed/PFCHE Yr5 Workbook Rev\\_092701.pdf](http://www.che400.state.sc.us/web/Perform/Workbook_3rd_ed/PFCHE_Yr5_Workbook_Rev_092701.pdf)

**II. Indicator Guide**  
**Indicator 1B**

**Mission Focus,**

(1) MISSION FOCUS

**(1C) APPROVAL OF A MISSION STATEMENT**

**MEASURE**

Mission statement with defined characteristics will be approved by the Commission on Higher Education on a five-year cycle.

*(Mission statements were initially approved in 1998 for all institutions and will be reconsidered for all institutions again in 2003. For the defined characteristics, see below.)*

**APPLICABILITY**

All Four Sectors, all institutions

**MEASUREMENT INFORMATION**

<b>General Data Source:</b>	Institutions submit mission statements to the CHE for approval every five years with interim reports on the status of the institution's mission statements. Changes are subject to approval by the CHE.
<b>Timeframe:</b>	Complete statements submitted every 5 years. First statements were approved in 1998. Interim reports are requested in early spring term (Jan/Feb). The next full approval process of mission statements will occur in 2003. For Year 5, an interim report is due.
<b>Cycle:</b>	Rated annually.
<b>Display:</b>	Designation of "Complied" for compliance with requirements or "Fails to Comply" for non-compliance with requirements.
<b>Rounding:</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Expected Trend:</b>	Institutions are expected to meet all requirements as evidenced by CHE approval of institutional mission statements and revisions.
<b>Type Standard:</b>	Compliance
<b>Improvement Factor:</b>	Not Applicable

**CALCULATION, DEFINITIONS and EXPLANATORY NOTES**

Determining Compliance: Compliance will be determined by CHE staff early in the spring semester (Jan/Feb) and will be dependent on an institution having CHE approval for its mission statement and for any changes to approved mission statements adopted by institutions and approved by CHE in 1998.

PLEASE NOTE: If an institution received an "approval" for their mission statement in February, 1998, it need not apply for re-approval during the five (5) year cycle UNLESS it has changed its mission statement since that time. If there are changes, a new mission statement with the changes noted must be submitted to the Commission. CHE staff will request annually from institutions a report on the status of the approved mission statement. In order to be found in compliance during ratings, changes or revisions must be approved by the CHE. Institutions that have made changes and wish consideration by the Commission prior to the rating period may submit such a request prior to the required status report that will be requested in Jan/Feb. Institutions are encouraged to submit changes as soon as possible in order to provide time to resolve any issues that may arise in the process of CHE review and approval prior to final ratings for a year.

**In order to receive CHE approval, mission statements must have the characteristics listed below as well as conform to the CHE's guiding principle for evaluation of mission statements, also listed below:**

The **DEFINED CHARACTERISTICS OF A MISSION STATEMENT** were taken from the SACS Criteria for what is suggested for inclusion in an institutional mission statement and are as follows:

- 1) Must relate the mission of the institution to the state and sector missions as stated in Act 359 of 1996 (§59-103-15, SC Code of Laws, 1976, as amended);

Must address, as appropriate, the major functions of teaching, scholarship/research and service (*with service is defined as (a) service to the public including community service, (b) service to other institutions, (c) service to the discipline, and (d) service to the institution*).

- 2) Must address the size of the institution in general terms, and
- 3) Must address the following:
  - a) pertinent description of information (e.g., public/private, two-year/four-year university, rural/suburban/urban, etc.);
  - b) delineation of the geographic region for which the institution intends to provide services;
  - c) description of types of students which the institution hopes to attract, accompanied by statements about the types of occupations or endeavors which graduates will be prepared to undertake;
  - d) statements expressing essential beliefs, values or intent of the institution;
  - e) outline of the major functions of the institution (e.g., general education, developmental education, vocational and technical education, professional education, student development, community or public service, research, continuing education, etc);

- f) general description of the skills, knowledge, experiences, and attitudes ideally to be acquired or developed by the institution's students; and
- g) be approved by appropriate bodies, (e.g., boards of trustees, state boards, etc.)

### THE GUIDING PRINCIPLE FOR THE CHE EVALUATION OF MISSION STATEMENTS

*An institutional mission statement should accurately reflect what the institution is authorized to do and should be specific enough so the general public can easily read and understand the differences among and between the institutions of higher education in the State even when the institutions might be from the same sector as defined by Act 359 of 1996.*

**GENERAL GUIDELINES AND EXPLANATION:** It is important to understand that enough specificity should be used to signify differences, but not so much specificity that an institution would have to change its mission statement on a yearly basis. Three general recommendations, accepted by the Commission on Higher Education in October, 1997, to assist the institutions in formulating a mission statement include:

**GENERAL RECOMMENDATION 1, SIZE OF INSTITUTION:** The institutional mission statement should explicitly state the approximate size of the institution i.e. the size of Performance University is approximately 10,000 - 15,000 FTE student (fall semester count). Saying that an institution is of "moderate size" or a "small size" was generally not believed to be specific enough for the general public to ascertain size. The institution should indicate whether its enrollment is FTE or headcount, annual or fall only.

**GENERAL RECOMMENDATION 2, MAJOR FUNCTION OF THE INSTITUTION:** More specificity was needed by many institutions regarding the type and level of degrees which the institution confers upon graduation. For example, it is not sufficient to state that an institution has undergraduate degrees since "undergraduate" by definition could or could not include an associate's degree. If an institution offers any degrees, it should specify the level of degree it confers, e.g., associate's degrees, certificates, and/or baccalaureate degrees. The same specificity is needed at the graduate level, e.g., a Performance University offers master degrees, first-professional degrees, and Ph.D. level degrees. This is critical since many of the teaching institutions offer some Ph.D. level degrees and many do not.

**GENERAL RECOMMENDATION 3, STYLE, GRAMMAR, AND READABILITY:** Although not a part of the direct evaluation, an institution's mission statement should be grammatically correct and highly readable in nature. An overall observation is that some institutions' mission statements had misspellings, subject/verb agreement problems or verb tense problems. In so far as the public nature of an institution's mission statement, an overall observation is that they should be carefully edited for typographical, grammar, and style errors.

### STANDARDS USED TO ASSESS PERFORMANCE

**II. Indicator Guide  
Indicator 1B**

**Mission Focus,**

**STANDARDS ADOPTED IN 2000 TO BE IN EFFECT FOR PERFORMANCE YEARS  
5 (2000-01), 6 (2001-02) AND 7 (2002-03)**

<b>Sector</b>	<b>COMPLIANCE INDICATOR</b>	
<b>All Four Sectors</b>	COMPLIANCE as indicated by the approval of institutional mission statements by the CHE.	Institutions are expected to be in compliance. For those performing as expected, the indicator is not factored in to the calculation of the overall performance score. For institutions failing to comply, a score of 1 is earned on this indicator and contributes to the overall performance score.

**Improvement Factor: Not Applicable**

**NOTES**

No Changes have been made to this indicator's measurement definitions since its implementation.