

**South Carolina Commission on Higher Education**

# **A CLOSER LOOK AT PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN SOUTH CAROLINA**

**Institutional Effectiveness, Accountability, and Performance**

**JANUARY 2009**



1333 Main Street, Suite 200  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201  
Tel: 803-737-2260 <http://www.che.sc.gov>





## South Carolina Commission on Higher Education

Mr. Kenneth B. Wingate, Chair  
Dr. Bettie Rose Horne, Vice Chair  
Douglas R. Forbes, D.M.D.  
Mr. Kenneth W. Jackson  
Dr. Raghu Korrapati  
Dr. Louis B. Lynn  
Ms. Cynthia C. Mosteller  
Mr. James R. Sanders  
Mr. Y. W. Scarborough, III  
Mr. Charles L. Talbert, III, CPA  
Mr. Hood Temple  
Mr. Neal J. Workman, Jr.  
Dr. Mitchell Zais

Dr. Garrison Walters, Executive Director

January 14, 2009

Dear Governor Sanford and Members of the General Assembly:

As South Carolina's only source of comprehensive comparative data on institutional performance on legislated institutional effectiveness measures, *A Closer Look at Public Higher Education in South Carolina: Institutional Effectiveness, Accountability, and Performance* provides a unique view of the state's public higher education system. The inclusion of historical data on institutional performance, also unique to this document, allows for the evaluation of current performance and change in the context of past performance. In addition to the data contained within this document, links are provided to the institutions' mission statements, institutional effectiveness reports, Title II Teacher Education data reports, and Performance Funding ratings. These data and the linked documents are provided to help inform your deliberations as you consider higher education issues from the state perspective.

In taking this "Closer Look" at higher education, the Commission furthers its primary goal of supporting and coordinating efforts to meet the educational and workforce demands of the people of South Carolina. In compliance with Section 59-101-350 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, as amended, I respectfully submit the following report to the members of the General Assembly.

Sincerely,

Garrison Walters, Ph.D.  
Executive Director



**A CLOSER LOOK AT PUBLIC  
HIGHER EDUCATION IN SOUTH CAROLINA  
Institutional Effectiveness, Accountability, and Performance**

*A Publication of the*  
**South Carolina Commission on Higher Education**  
Division of Academic Affairs & Licensing  
Gail Morrison, Director

Garrison Walters  
Executive Director  
South Carolina Commission on Higher Education

**T. Michael Raley, Editor**

1333 Main St., Suite 200  
Columbia, SC 29201  
803.737.2260 Phone  
803.737.2297 Fax  
<http://www.che.sc.gov>

(blank page)



# South Carolina Commission on Higher Education

Mr. Kenneth B. Wingate, Chair  
Dr. Bettie Rose Horne, Vice Chair  
Douglas R. Forbes, D.M.D.  
Mr. Kenneth W. Jackson  
Dr. Raghu Korrapati  
Dr. Louis B. Lynn  
Ms. Cynthia C. Mosteller  
Mr. James R. Sanders  
Mr. Y. W. Scarborough, III  
Mr. Charles L. Talbert, III, CPA  
Mr. Hood Temple  
Mr. Neal J. Workman, Jr.  
Dr. Mitchell Zais

Dr. Garrison Walters, Executive Director

**Kenneth B. Wingate, Chair**  
Governor's Appointment at Large

**Douglas R. Forbes**  
Governor's Appointment At Large

**James R. Sanders**  
5<sup>th</sup> Congressional District Representative

**Bettie Rose Horne**  
3<sup>rd</sup> Congressional District Representative

**Y. W. Scarborough**  
1<sup>st</sup> Congressional District Representative

**Kenneth W. Jackson**  
*Governor's Appointment Ex-Officio Institutional*

**Charles L. Talbert**  
4<sup>th</sup> Congressional District Representative

**Raghu Korrapati**  
2<sup>nd</sup> Congressional District Representative

**Hood Temple**  
6<sup>th</sup> Congressional District Representative

**Louis B. Lynn**  
Governor's Appointment Ex-Officio Institutional

**J. Neal Workman**  
Governor's Appointment Ex-Officio Institutional

**Cynthia C. Mosteller**  
Governor's Appointment at Large

**Mitchell Zais**  
Governor's Appointment Ex-Officio without vote  
Private Sector President

### *Acknowledgement*

The South Carolina Commission on Higher Education extends its sincere gratitude to the institutional representatives who played an essential role in the publication of this report.

(blank page)



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b><u>Index of Charts and Tables</u></b>	<b>iii</b>
<b><u>Introduction</u></b>	<b>1</b>
Institutional Effectiveness Reporting	2
South Carolina Performance Funding System for Higher Education	3
Strategic Plan for Higher Education in South Carolina	5
<b><u>Section 1      Mission Focus</u></b>	<b>7</b>
Review of Programs	9
Curricula Offered at Institutions	12
Institutional Mission Statements	12
Academic Programs to Provide a Technologically Skilled Workforce	14
<b><u>Section 2      Quality of Faculty</u></b>	<b>15</b>
Academic and Other Credentials of Professors and Instructors	17
Compensation of Faculty	20
<b><u>Section 3      Classroom Quality</u></b>	<b>25</b>
Courses Taught by Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty and by Graduate Assistants	28
Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs	30
Student Performance on Teacher Education Exams	33
Teacher Education Graduates in Critical Shortage Areas	34
Teacher Education Graduates who are Minority	34
Assessment Information for the Institution's Title II of the Federal Higher Education Act of 1998 Report	35
Graduates' Satisfaction – Alumni Surveys	35
<b><u>Section 4      Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration</u></b>	<b>37</b>
<b><u>Section 5      Administrative Efficiency</u></b>	<b>41</b>

**TABLE OF CONTENTS, *continued***

<b><u>Section 6</u></b>	<b><u>Entrance Requirements</u></b>	<b>45</b>
	Qualifications of Entering Freshmen	48
	Sources of First-Time Degrees for Graduate Students	49
	Admission Standards	51
<b><u>Section 7</u></b>	<b><u>Graduates' Achievements</u></b>	<b>55</b>
	Performance Funding Graduation Rates	57
	Southern Regional Education Board Graduation Rates	61
	Student Performance on Professional Examinations	63
	National and South Carolina Pass Rates on Professional Examinations	69
	Overall Pass Rates on Professional Examinations for SC's Public Institutions	71
	Scores of Graduates on Post-Undergraduate Professional, Graduate, or Employment-Related Examinations and Certification Tests	72
	Number of Graduates Who Continued Their Education	74
<b><u>Section 8</u></b>	<b><u>User-Friendliness of the Institution</u></b>	<b>75</b>
	Undergraduate Transfers	78
	Enrollment by Race	79
	Accessibility to the Institution of All Citizens of the State	80
<b><u>Section 9</u></b>	<b><u>Research Funding</u></b>	<b>89</b>
	Student Involvement in Research	92
	Financial Support for Teacher Education	95
<b><u>Section 10</u></b>	<b><u>Campus-Based Assessment</u></b>	<b>97</b>
	2007 Summary Reports on Institutional Websites	99
<b><u>Section 11</u></b>	<b><u>Institutional Performance Ratings</u></b>	<b>101</b>
	Institutional Ratings for 2006-2007 Performance Year	103

# Index of Charts and Tables

<b>Section 1</b>	<b>Mission Focus</b>	
<a href="#">Table 1.1</a>	Programs Reviewed During the Academic Year	10
<a href="#">Table 1.2</a>	Program Status at Technical Colleges	11
<b>Section 2</b>	<b>Quality of Faculty</b>	
<a href="#">Figure 2.1</a>	Percentage of Full-Time Faculty with Terminal Degrees in the Primary Teaching Area	17
<a href="#">Figure 2.2</a>	Percentage Teaching in the Fall Who Meet Minimum SACS Degree Criteria for Credentials	19
<a href="#">Figure 2.3</a>	Compensation of Faculty	20
<b>Section 3</b>	<b>Classroom Quality</b>	
<a href="#">Table 3.1</a>	Courses Taught by Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty and by Graduate Assistants	29
<a href="#">Figure 3.1</a>	Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs	30
<a href="#">Table 3.2</a>	Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs	32
<a href="#">Figure 3.2</a>	Percentage of Students Passing the PRAXIS Specialty Area Exam	33
<a href="#">Table 3.3</a>	Graduates' Satisfaction – Alumni Survey	35
<b>Section 6</b>	<b>Entrance Requirements</b>	
<a href="#">Figure 6.1</a>	SAT/ACT Scores and High School Rank and GPA of Student Body	48
<a href="#">Table 6.1</a>	Sources of First-Time Degrees for Graduate Students	49
<a href="#">Table 6.2</a>	Applications and Admission Offers, SC Senior Public Institutions	51
<a href="#">Figure 6.2</a>	Percentage of Applicants Offered Admission who Accepted and Enrolled	52
<a href="#">Figure 6.3</a>	Average SAT/ACT Combined Scores of all First-Time Entering Freshmen	52
<b>Section 7</b>	<b>Graduates' Achievements</b>	
<a href="#">Figure 7.1</a>	Graduation and Success Rates (Performance Funding)	58
<a href="#">Figure 7.2</a>	Graduation Within 150% of Program Time (GRS Rate), Regional Campuses and Technical Colleges	60
<a href="#">Table 7.1</a>	Southern Regional Education Board States Compared to South Carolina	61
<a href="#">Table 7.2</a>	Student Performance on Professional Examinations	63

**Index of Charts and Tables, *continued***

<a href="#">Table 7.3</a>	National and South Carolina Pass Rates on Professional Examinations	69
<a href="#">Table 7.4</a>	Percentage of Students Who Pass Certification Examinations	70
<a href="#">Figure 7.3</a>	Results of Professional Examinations (Performance Funding)	71
<a href="#">Figure 7.4</a>	Number of Graduates Who Continued Their Education	73
<b>Section 8</b>	<b>User-Friendliness of the Institution</b>	
<a href="#">Table 8.1</a>	First-Time, Full-Time Undergraduate Transfers	78
<a href="#">Table 8.2</a>	Percentage Change in Minority Enrollment, Fall 2001 to Fall 2006	79
<a href="#">Figure 8.1</a>	Percentage of Headcount Undergraduate Students who are Citizens of South Carolina who are Minority	80
<a href="#">Figure 8.2</a>	Retention of Minorities who are South Carolina Citizens and Identified as Degree-Seeking Undergraduate Students	82
<a href="#">Figure 8.3</a>	Percentage of Headcount Graduate Students Enrolled at the Institution who are Minority	85
<a href="#">Figure 8.4</a>	Percentage of Headcount Teaching Faculty who are Minority	86
<b>Section 9</b>	<b>Research Funding</b>	
<a href="#">Table 9.1</a>	Student Involvement in Research - Graduate Students	92
<a href="#">Table 9.2</a>	Student Involvement in Research - Undergraduate Students	93

## INTRODUCTION

“A Closer Look at Public Higher Education in South Carolina” provides an annual overview of data reported by South Carolina's public institutions of higher education as part of institutional effectiveness reporting and as part of the process of performance funding. Prior to the January 2000 edition, this document was entitled "Minding Our P's and Q's: Indications of Productivity and Quality in South Carolina Public Colleges and Universities." In January 2000, the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education (CHE) substantially revised this publication in efforts to provide a source guide integrating data reported by the state's public colleges and universities in fulfillment of legislative requirements.

The CHE integrated institutional effectiveness data reporting with performance data measured pursuant to Section 59-103-30 and Section 59-103-45 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, as amended, to determine institutional funding levels. Data related to the funding process reflect the 2006-2007 performance year. Historical performance data are displayed if available. Detailed information related to the performance funding process in South Carolina is available on the CHE's website at <http://www.che.sc.gov>.

Throughout this publication, data are displayed on the 33 public institutions of higher education within groupings of institutions or sectors that have common missions as identified in Act 359 of 1996. However, due to the uniqueness in mission of each individual institution, the reader is cautioned against drawing conclusions and making comparisons solely based on the figures and tables found in this report.

### **What will you find in this report?**

#### **Eleven sections highlight various aspects of higher education.**

**Sections 1 - 9** reflect the nine "critical success factors" identified by the General Assembly for South Carolina's public colleges and universities (Section 59-103-30). Data from both institutional effectiveness and performance funding reporting are combined in these sections. Often the data is presented by type of institution or sector, as identified in the legislation. The four sectors of institutions as defined in legislation are:

Research Universities,  
Four-Year Colleges and Universities,  
Two-Year Institutions-Branches of the University of South Carolina, and  
State Technical and Comprehensive Education System.

The CHE maintains historical data on institutions and when appropriate, three years of data are presented for comparison.

Section 10, "Campus-Based Assessment," includes a summary of other institutional effectiveness reporting and the web addresses where detailed institutional reports are located.

Section 11 provides links to institutions' performance ratings.

### **Institutional Effectiveness Reporting**

Pursuant to Section 59-101-350 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, as amended, the CHE is required to report specific higher education data "in a readable format so as to easily compare with peer institutions in South Carolina." This report must be submitted to the Governor and the General Assembly prior to January 15th of each year. This information is included throughout the publication and integrated with performance funding measures when applicable.

The information regarding institutional effectiveness reporting required by Section 59-101-350 is found below.

#### **Four-Year Institutions**

- The number and percentage of accredited programs and the number and percentage of programs eligible for accreditation;
- The number and percentage of undergraduate and graduate students who completed their degree program;
- The percent of lower division instructional courses taught by full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and graduate assistants;
- The percent and number of students enrolled in remedial courses and the number of students exiting remedial courses and successfully completing entry-level curriculum courses;
- The percent of graduate and upper division undergraduate students participating in sponsored research programs;
- Placement data on graduates;
- The percent change in the enrollment rate of students from minority groups and the change in the total number of minority students enrolled over the past five years;
- The percent of graduate students who received undergraduate degrees at the institution, within the State, within the United States, and from other nations;
- The number of full-time students who have transferred from a two-year, post-secondary institution and the number of full-time students who have transferred to two-year, post-secondary institutions;
- Student scores on professional examinations with detailed information on state and national means, passing scores, and pass rates, as available, and with information on such scores over time, and the number of students taking each exam;
- Assessment information for the institution's Title II of the Federal Higher Education Act of 1998 report that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications and the performance of the candidates and graduates;
- Appropriate information relating to each institution's role and mission to include policies and procedures to ensure that academic programs support the economic development needs in the State by providing a technologically skilled workforce;
- Any information required by the commission in order for it to measure and determine the institution's standard of achievement in regard to the performance indicators for quality academic success enumerated in Section 59-103-30.

#### **Two-Year Institutions**

- The number and percentage of accredited programs and the number and percentage of programs eligible for accreditation;
- The number and percentage of undergraduate students who completed their degree program;
- The percent of courses taught by full-time faculty members, part-time faculty, and graduate assistants;
- Placement rate on graduates;
- The percent change in the enrollment rate of students from minority groups, the number of minority students enrolled and the change in the total number of minority students enrolled over the past five years;
- The number of students who have transferred into a four-year, post-secondary institution and the number of students who have transferred from four-year, post-secondary institutions;
- Appropriate information relating to the institution's role and mission to include policies and procedures to ensure that academic programs support the economic development needs in the State by providing a technologically skilled workforce;
- Any information required by the commission in order for it to measure and determine the

institution's standard of achievement in regard to the performance indicators for quality academic success enumerated in Section 59-103-30.

### **South Carolina's Performance Funding System for Higher Education**

Act 359 of 1996, commonly referred to as the "Performance Funding Legislation," dramatically changed the responsibilities of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education (CHE) concerning how public institutions of higher education are funded. The legislation required that the CHE allocate state appropriations to South Carolina's public institutions of higher education based on their performance in nine areas or "critical success factors." The General Assembly identified several performance indicators that could be used, if applicable to a particular type of institution, in assessing institutions' successes in achieving performance in each of the areas. In all, 37 performance indicators spread across the nine critical success factors are specified. The CHE was assigned the responsibility of developing and implementing a system for basing funding on institutional performance and for defining how each of the specified indicators would be measured. The General Assembly provided for a 3-year phase-in period for implementing a system to provide for available state funding to be allocated based on institutional performance.

In compliance with its legislative mandate, the CHE, in cooperation with South Carolina's higher education institutions and other stakeholders in the state's public higher education system, developed a system for determining institutions' funding based on performance across the nine critical success factors using the 37 performance indicators as applicable.

The system for determining funding has two major components: 1) a determination of financial needs for the institution and 2) a process for rating the institution based on performance across the indicators.

The first component, the determination of need (Mission Resource Requirement), identifies the total amount of money an institution should receive based on nationally and regionally comparable costs for institutions of similar mission, size and complexity of programs and by the prior year's level of appropriation.

The second component, the performance rating, is determined by assessing whether or not the institution meets, exceeds, or falls short of standards for each indicator. Standards are set either for the individual institution or for institutions within the same sector and are approved annually by the CHE. Each year, the institution is rated on its success in meeting the standards on each of the indicators. These ratings are totaled and expressed as an average score for the institution. Higher scoring institutions will receive a proportionally greater share of available state funding.

The performance funding model is in its twelfth year of implementation and is continually being refined to improve the performance measurement of South Carolina's public higher education institutions. As might be expected, in the twelve years since the passage of Act 359 of 1996, the CHE has made revisions and refinements to the overall system as well as to various measures as strengths and weaknesses have been identified. Details related to scoring and measurement of indicators have varied each year, making comparisons across performance rating years difficult.

Performance Year 6 (2001-2002) saw the most extensive changes to date in the measurement of the nine Critical Success Factors designated in Act 359. The changes, approved by the CHE in February, 2001, were based on three general experience-based lessons:

- There is a common core of critical indicators which is applicable to all sectors. Indicators in this core are measured every year for all institutions.
- There are indicators which are mission-specific to the different sectors defined by the Legislature. Sector specific measures have been defined for these indicators.

- Some indicators were either duplicate measures of similar data; measures of indicators that, once achieved, were unlikely to change on a year-to-year basis; or measures that would be more effective if they were combined.

The CHE publishes a Performance Funding Workbook that outlines, in detail, all of the performance indicators, how they have been defined, and to whom they apply. The workbook is provided as a guide to be used by institutions. It is also useful to others interested in the performance funding system in South Carolina as it details the measurement and rating system in its entirety. The workbook is available on the CHE website ([www.che.sc.gov](http://www.che.sc.gov)).

### **Development of Standards**

In Performance Year 5 (2000-01 to impact FY 2001-02 state allocations) the CHE approved sector specific common standards that the CHE staff together with institutional representatives had developed. A range of acceptable performance was determined for each indicator. Institutions performing within the range earn a rating of "Achieves," equal to a numerical score of "2." Performance that is above the range earns a rating of "Exceeds," equal to a numerical score of "3," and performance below the range earns a rating of "Does Not Achieve," equal to a numerical score of "1." The standards allow for a broad range of performance to achieve the standard and a demanding level of performance to exceed the standard.

The scoring standards are based, where possible, on peer data. When peer data is not available, standards have been based on the best available data, including national and state data. If directly comparable data were unavailable at the time standards were developed, estimated data based on sources that may not be directly comparable were considered. When applicable, figures and tables in this document state the standard necessary for an institution to receive a score of "Achieves."

### **Strategic Plan for Higher Education in South Carolina**

In the spring of 2001, the Commission initiated the process of revising the South Carolina's strategic plan for public higher education. Through a series of meetings of the Planning Advisory Council, and with input from all areas of higher education, the Council of Presidents and the Commission, a plan was developed and refined. The text of the approved plan follows. *Please note that the "Introduction" and the "Environmental Factors" sections of the plan are not included in this document. The complete plan can be found on the Commission website at <http://www.che.sc.gov>.*

### **Vision**

South Carolina's system of public and private higher education will address the needs of the state by

- Creating a well-educated citizenry,
- Raising the standard of living of South Carolinians,
- Improving the quality of life,
- Meeting changing work force needs,
- Creating economic development opportunities,
- Positioning the state to be competitive in a global economy, and
- Fashioning a new generation of public sector and private sector leaders.



## **Strategic Goals**

To meet the challenges to higher education in South Carolina, the state's public and private colleges and universities and the Commission on Higher Education need to join forces to advance a common agenda. The needs of the state will not be met by fragmented or redundant efforts.

The following three strategic initiatives-to increase access to higher education, to develop a nationally competitive research agenda, and to create collaborative partnerships-provide common ground upon which the state's colleges and universities can address the state's needs.

### **1. Expand Educational Opportunities for South Carolina Citizens**

As South Carolina takes steps to increase the number high school graduates who are prepared for college, the higher education community needs to develop strategies to accommodate an increased number of students. Particular emphasis should be placed on meeting the needs of traditionally underserved populations including first generation college students, minorities, students from low-income families, and adult learners. Students who have not traditionally thought of attending college should be encouraged to do so. All qualified students should feel empowered to enroll in college, to upgrade their skills and increase their knowledge, to progress from two-year colleges to four-year colleges and universities if they have the ability and desire, and to access continuing educational opportunities throughout their lives. The following goals are identified to provide increased educational opportunities for South Carolina's citizens:

- A. Expand services and promote innovative approaches to reach traditionally underserved populations, including adult learners and minority students;
- B. Promote development of distance education courses and programs and virtual library resources to reach students who may not be able to access traditional educational programs;
- C. Increase need-based grants and other scholarship resources to provide increased opportunities for lower income students; and
- D. Improve articulation of two-year and four-year programs to facilitate transfer of students and increase access to baccalaureate programs.

### **2. Invest in Research for Economic Development and a Better Quality of Life**

A cornerstone of economic development is high-level, globally competitive research. Investments in cutting edge research in engineering, health sciences, physical sciences, information systems, environmental sciences, and similar fields yield dividends many times over. Top quality research activity attracts top caliber faculty, who in turn attract funded support from federal agencies such as the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation as well as private research support from industries ranging from pharmaceuticals to software and e-business firms to state-of-the-art manufacturing. New and expanding industries locate in states where research is taking place, creating jobs and stimulating higher educational levels in the population. Much as the Research Triangle has stimulated economic development in North Carolina, so too can research investment in South Carolina spur greater economic growth and benefit the people of the state. Such development takes conscious planning and strategic implementation and should be reflected in the state's strategic plan for higher education.

It also takes a commitment to invest the state's resources in ways that will benefit the state exponentially in years to come. The following strategic goals are identified to strengthen the state's investment in higher education research for economic development and a better quality of life:

- A. Create a state incentive system to encourage institutions to recruit nationally recognized faculty who can develop and/or strengthen graduate research programs.
- B. Designate focus areas for research and graduate program excellence and provide funding incentives for them to attain national and international standing.
- C. Support and develop research directed at the economic, social and educational infrastructure of the state drawing from shared data sources and collaborative efforts with other state agencies and private entities.
- D. Create programs to strengthen the quality of teaching and learning as the foundation for the state's future scholars and researchers.

### **3. Increase Cooperation and Collaboration for Efficiency and Quality**

At one time higher education might have taken place in an "ivory tower" divorced from other institutions and other concerns. That clearly is no longer the case. In an age of rapidly increasing needs for a more highly educated citizenry, and in an age, too, when there are strong competing demands for the state's resources and real limits on available state funding, it is incumbent on higher education to seek and to expand cooperative relationships. Greater cooperation and coordination between preK-12 education and higher education can lead to shared use of resources, more closely meshed educational planning, better trained teachers and administrators, more closely linked academic programs, better prepared students entering colleges, and the development of effective data bases to track student progress and assess the effectiveness of education in meeting the state's needs. Likewise, enhanced collaboration with business and industry can insure that economic development needs are met, that educational programs remain on the cutting edge of technological advances, and that education is grounded in real world experiences for students and faculty. Finally, increased cooperation among colleges, universities, state agencies, and non-profit entities can result in demonstrable efficiencies and increased quality. The following strategic goals provide an agenda of increased collaborative activity for higher education in South Carolina:

- A. Develop collaborative programs with the business community, state agencies, and non-profit corporations to enhance economic development and the quality of life.
- B. Increase both the use of and the technology for sharing data and systems among higher education institutions and with other state agencies and the private sector.
- C. Form partnerships with school districts and state agencies to enhance the preparation and continuing training of teachers, the quality of education in the state's public schools, the preparation for school of the state's children, and the support available to students while they are in K-12 schools.
- D. Collaborate with local communities and state and local governments to improve the training of health and social service professionals and the delivery of public health and welfare programs.

# Section 1 Mission Focus



*(blank page)*

## **MISSION FOCUS**

The first critical success factor listed in Act 359 of 1996 is “Mission Focus.” The relevant performance funding indicators for this critical success factor are:

- 1B - Curricula Offered to Achieve Mission;
- 1C - Approval of Mission Statement;
- 1D/E - Adoption of a Strategic Plan to Support the Mission Statement;  
Attainment of Goals of the Strategic Plan

The General Assembly in Act 359 of 1996 has determined the following missions for each sector:

### **Research institutions**

- college-level baccalaureate education, master's, professional, and doctor of philosophy degrees which lead to continued education or employment;
- research through the use of government, corporate, nonprofit-organization grants, or state resources, or both;
- public service to the State and the local community;

### **Four-year colleges and universities**

- college-level baccalaureate education and selected master's degrees which lead to employment or continued education, or both, except for doctoral degrees currently being offered;
- limited and specialized research;
- public service to the State and the local community;

### **Two-year institutions - branches of the University of South Carolina**

- college-level pre-baccalaureate education necessary to confer associates' degrees which lead to continued education at a four-year or research institution;
- public service to the State and the local community;

### **State technical and comprehensive education system**

- all post-secondary vocational, technical, and occupational diploma and associate degree programs leading directly to employment or maintenance of employment and associate degree programs which enable students to gain access to other post-secondary education;
- up-to-date and appropriate occupational and technical training for adults;
- special school programs that provide training for prospective employees for prospective and existing industry in order to enhance the economic development of South Carolina;
- public service to the State and the local community;
- continue to remain technical, vocational, or occupational colleges with a mission as stated above and primarily focused on technical education and the economic development of the State.

## **Review of Programs**

The Commission on Higher Education (CHE), through its Division of Academic Affairs, has reviewed existing academic programs to ensure the quality and integrity of degree-granting programs in the public higher education sector. In its broadest context, program review serves as an instrument for gauging the health of the state's academic programs as well as a strategic planning device for determining the present and future needs of specific discipline areas (i.e., new program development)

throughout South Carolina. Program review was incorporated into performance funding for the first time during the 1999-2000 performance year as part of Indicator 1B – Curricula Offered to Achieve Mission, which is detailed following the discussion regarding program review.

### Program Review of Senior-Level Institutions

Prior to 2001, the CHE reviewed programs at the senior institutions on eight-year cycles. The cycles were developed in consultation with the chief academic officers of the colleges and universities and are categorized using broad descriptors (e.g., English, Life Sciences, and Physical Sciences). Measuring the success of academic programs is a complex and multifaceted task which requires funding support. Due to budget constraints, program review other than of teacher education programs has not been conducted since 2000- 2001. Teacher education programs are reviewed through the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education accreditation process in a five-year cycle.

The following table outlines the review schedule for the senior institutions over the last 5 years.

**Table 1.1 Schedule and Status for SC Public 4-Year Education Programs Reviewed as Part of the NCATE Program Review and Accreditation Process**  
Source: CHE Academic Affairs Division

<u>Academic Year</u>	<u>Classification</u>	<u>SC Public 4-Year Institutions with NCATE-accredited Programs</u>
2003-2004	Continuing	USC Columbia, USC Upstate, Winthrop, Coastal Carolina, SC State, USC Aiken
2004-2005	Continuing	Clemson, College of Charleston , Francis Marion, Lander, The Citadel
2006-2007	Focus Visit	Coastal Carolina
2007-2008	Focus Visit	The Citadel
2008-2009	Initial Visit	USC-Beaufort
2009-2010	Focus Visit	USC-Beaufort
	Continuing	USC-Columbia

### **Program Review of the USC Regional Campuses and the Technical College System**

This review begins with associate degree programs found in the University of South Carolina’s regional campuses and then proceeds to the much larger and more varied set of associate degree programs offered in the State’s 16 technical colleges. The procedures for this annual review require each program’s productivity to be evaluated in terms of enrollment, number of graduates, and percent of graduates placed in a related job or continuing their studies full-time. The purpose is twofold: 1) to ensure that programs to be continued are responsive to employment trends and meet minimum standards; and 2) to identify programs which need to be strengthened.

### **Two-Year Institutions-Regional Campuses of USC**

All of the 4 two-year regional campuses of USC offer the Associate of Arts/Associate of Science degree programs. Each of the AA/AS programs at these campuses is enrolling and graduating students in satisfactory numbers. Based on the CHE’s “Annual Evaluation of Associate Degree Programs Report,” FY 2007-2008, the number of degree completers in these programs is satisfactory.

Of the two-year regional campuses of USC, only USC Lancaster offers applied two-year technical degrees. USC Lancaster offers nursing, criminal justice, and business. All of these programs meet the criterion for “good” for both enrollments and graduation rates.

### **State Technical and Comprehensive Education System**

This review is administered and reported to the CHE by the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education each year. All of the institutions’ associate degree programs are rated and placed in a category, as shown below, based on enrollment, number of graduates, and percentage of graduates placed in a related job or continuing their studies full-time. The following criteria apply:

- 1) Each program must produce at least 6 graduates during the evaluation year or an average of at least 6 graduates over the most recent 3-year period;
- 2) At the most recent Fall term, each program must enroll at least 16 students who generate 12 full-time equivalents; and
- 3) At least 50% of the graduates available for job placement must be placed in a job related to their education or continue their education on a full-time basis.

Programs that fail to meet the above criteria must be canceled, suspended, or put on probation unless their continuation is justified to the CHE.

### **Table 1.2 Program Status at Technical Colleges (Next page)**

Institution	Good			Good-Justified			Probation			Suspended			Canceled		
	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Aiken	12	11	13	-	-	-	-	1	1	3	2	1	-	1	1
Central Carolina	13	14	13	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1
Denmark	8	9	10	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Florence-Darlington	22	22	22	-	-	-	3	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Greenville	32	32	30	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	1	1	1	-	1
Horry-Georgetown	19	19	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Midlands	24	26	24	1	-	1	2	1	1	1	-	1	2	1	-
Northeastern	8	8	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Orangeburg-Calhoun	17	18	18	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Piedmont	21	21	22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Spartanburg	21	19	20	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	1	-
TCL	9	9	10	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	1	-	-	-
Tri-County	20	19	19	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trident	26	27	29	1	1	-	4	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Williamsburg	3	4	3	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
York	19	19	18	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>

## Curricula Offered at Institutions

**Performance Funding Indicator 1B – Curricula Offered to Achieve Mission** is based on the institution’s approved mission statement and measures as the percentage of “degree programs” which:

- 1) are appropriate to the degree-level authorized for the institution by the CHE and Act 359 of 1996
- 2) support the institutions’ goals, purpose, and objectives as defined in the approved mission statement; and
- 3) have received “full approval” in the most recent CHE review of that program.

Data for this indicator are reviewed and a report for the current year is not available. For previous performance data, see *A Closer Look at Public Higher Education in South Carolina – January 2005*.

## Indicator 1C – Mission Statements

Each institution currently has a Commission on Higher Education (CHE) approved mission statement, as required by **Indicator 1C – Approval of Mission Statement**. Revised statements are reviewed by the CHE for approval as they are submitted by the institutions. Each institution’s mission statement, as approved by the CHE, can be accessed through the web pages listed below or through the CHE’s web site at <http://www.che.sc.gov>.



## **Institutional Mission Statements**

### **Research Institutions**

Clemson University <http://www.clemson.edu/about/mission.html>  
 Medical University of South Carolina [http://www.edserv.musc.edu/musc\\_mission/](http://www.edserv.musc.edu/musc_mission/)  
 University of South Carolina-Columbia <http://kudzu.ipr.sc.edu/mission/>

### **Teaching Institutions**

The Citadel <http://citadel.edu/r3/about/values/mission.shtml>  
 Coastal Carolina University <http://www.coastal.edu/about/mission.html>  
 College of Charleston <http://www.cofc.edu/about/mission.html>  
 Francis Marion University <http://www.fmarion.edu/about/Mission>  
 Lander University <http://www.lander.edu/about/mission.html>  
 South Carolina State University <http://www.scsu.edu/about/mission.aspx>  
 USC-Aiken <http://www.usca.edu/chancellor/mission.html>  
 University of South Carolina-Beaufort  
[http://www.uscb.edu/a/About\\_USCB/Mission\\_of\\_USCB/?page\\_id=26](http://www.uscb.edu/a/About_USCB/Mission_of_USCB/?page_id=26)  
 University of South Carolina-Upstate  
[http://www.uscupstate.edu/about\\_upstate/faq/default.aspx?id=8416](http://www.uscupstate.edu/about_upstate/faq/default.aspx?id=8416)  
 Winthrop University <http://www.winthrop.edu/president/mission.htm>

### **USC-2 Year Regional Campuses**

All <http://kudzu.ipr.sc.edu/mission/>

### **Technical Colleges**

Aiken Technical College <http://www.atc.edu/p79.aspx>  
 Central Carolina Technical College <http://www.cctech.edu/about/170.htm>  
 Denmark Technical College <http://www.denmarktech.edu/missionstatement.html>  
 Florence-Darlington Technical College <http://www.fdtc.edu/AboutUs/mission/default.asp>  
 Greenville Technical College [http://www.gvltec.edu/about\\_greenvilletech/mission.html](http://www.gvltec.edu/about_greenvilletech/mission.html)  
 Horry-Georgetown Technical College [http://www.hgtc.edu/int\\_y.php?pageid=19](http://www.hgtc.edu/int_y.php?pageid=19)  
 Midlands Technical College <http://www.midlandstech.edu/mission.htm>  
 Northeastern Technical College <http://www.netc.edu/aboutus/index.html>  
 Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College <http://www.octech.edu/octech/aboutus/mission.asp>  
 Piedmont Technical College [http://www.ptc.edu/about\\_ptc/mission.htm](http://www.ptc.edu/about_ptc/mission.htm)  
 Spartanburg Community College <http://www.sccsc.edu/Mission.htm>  
 Technical College of the Lowcountry [http://www.tcl.edu/About\\_Us/mission.asp](http://www.tcl.edu/About_Us/mission.asp)  
 Tri-County Technical College  
[http://www.tctc.edu/visitors\\_media/college\\_information/mission.html](http://www.tctc.edu/visitors_media/college_information/mission.html)  
 Trident Technical College <http://www.tridenttech.edu/aboutttc.htm>  
 Williamsburg Technical College [http://www.wiltech.edu/General\\_College\\_Information/General\\_information\\_8.06.htm](http://www.wiltech.edu/General_College_Information/General_information_8.06.htm)  
 York Technical College <http://www.yorktech.com/ie/ytcMission.asp>

**Indicator 1D/E – Adoption of a Strategic Plan to Support the Mission Statement:  
Attainment of Goals of the Strategic Plan Performance Indicator**

This indicator is defined for each institution through the submission of individual goals by the institutions and their approval by the Commission. Previous goals have been completed and this indicator is in abeyance.

**Academic Programs to Provide a Technologically Skilled Workforce**

In 2001, the South Carolina Legislature amended Section 59-101-350 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, as amended, to include the following as an Institutional Effectiveness reporting requirement.

Appropriate information relating to the institution's role and mission to include policies and procedures to ensure that academic programs support the economic development needs in the State by providing a technologically skilled workforce. (Added text underlined.)

The institutions of the state have included a section relating to the above requirement in their Institutional Effectiveness Reports. Links to these reports are found in Section 10 of this document.

# Section 2

# Quality of Faculty



(blank page)

## QUALITY OF FACULTY

The second critical success factor in performance funding looks at the quality of faculty at South Carolina's public institutions. Indicators used to assess this factor in Year 10 are:

- 2A - Academic and Other Credentials of Professors and Instructors;
- 2D - Compensation of Faculty;


### Academic and Other Credentials of Professors and Instructors

**Indicator 2A - Academic and Other Credentials of Professors and Instructors** is a measure of the academic credentials of faculty. Research, Teaching, and Regional Campuses Sector Institutions are measured on the percentage of full-time faculty with a terminal degree in their primary teaching area. Technical Colleges are measured on the percentage of faculty teaching in the Fall who meet minimum SACS criteria for credentials. Standards of achievement vary across the sectors and are indicated in the charts below. Additional detail and definitions can be found in the Performance Funding Workbook, Revised October 2004:

[http://www.che.sc.gov/Finance/Perf\\_Fund/Yr9WorkBook\\_Rev.htm](http://www.che.sc.gov/Finance/Perf_Fund/Yr9WorkBook_Rev.htm).

**Figure 2.1 Percentage of Full-Time Faculty with Terminal Degrees in the Primary Teaching Area**

Source: CHEMIS and Institutional Reports to CHE




### Research Universities

**2A - Percentage of full-time** faculty with terminal degrees in the primary teaching area.

For Year 12 (2007-08), a standard of 75 - 84% earned a score of "Achieves" for 2A. This indicator does not include Instructors for the Research and Teaching sectors.


**Four-Year Colleges and Universities**

**2A** - Percentage of **full-time** faculty with terminal degrees in the primary teaching area. For Year 12 (2007-087), a standard of 70 - 84% earned a score of "Achieves" for 2A. This indicator does not include Instructors for the Research and Teaching sectors.



**Two-Year Institutions-Regional Campuses of USC**



**2A** - Percentage of **full-time** faculty, including Instructors, with terminal degrees in the primary teaching area. For Year 12 (2007-08), a standard of 60-74% earned a score of "Achieves."



**Technical College System**

**Figure 2.2 – Indicator 2A- Percentage Teaching in the Fall Who Meet Minimum SACS Degree Criteria for Credentials**

For Year 12 (2007-08), a standard of 98-99.9%, or all but one meeting criteria, earned a score of "Achieves"



**Compensation of Faculty**

**Indicator 2D – Compensation of Faculty as a measure of average faculty salaries.** For research and teaching sector institutions, the average by rank for the ranks of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor is measured. A score is earned for each rank average. These individual scores are averaged to produce the indicator score earned. Standards of achievement are listed in the figures below detailing the average by rank for research and teaching institutions. For the Two-Year Campuses of USC and for the Technical Colleges, the average faculty salary data are displayed.

Indicator 2D measures the average faculty salary for each two-year institution. The regional campuses of USC are assessed based on the overall average salary due to the low numbers of faculty at the various ranks. In the State Technical and Comprehensive Education System, faculty rank does not apply, so technical colleges are assessed on average faculty salary.

Full-time faculty includes those whose annual salary is not zero, who have an employment status of full-time and a primary responsibility of instruction (greater than 50% of assigned time). For medicine and dentistry, salaries less than or equal to \$40,000 are excluded.


For technical colleges, unclassified continuing education program coordinators are included.

Average salary is defined as nine to ten month salaries or eleven to twelve month salaries converted to nine-month salaries. Salaries for basic and clinical medicine are not converted.

For Year 12 (2007-08), Fall 2007 data were considered.

**Figure 2.3 Indicator 2D – Compensation of Faculty**  
**Source: IPEDS Salaries Survey (9-month contract basis)**

**Assistant Professors, Research Universities**




For Year 12 (2007-08) ratings, "Achieves" ranges were: \$42,773 - \$50,740 for Clemson, \$44,718 - \$53,047 for USC Columbia, and \$54,028 - \$ 64,091 for MUSC.




**Assistant Professors, Four-Year Colleges and Universities**

For Year 12 (2007-08) ratings, the "Achieves" range was \$36,840 - \$43,701 for Four-Year Colleges and Universities.




**Associate Professors, Research Universities**




For Year 12 (2007-08) ratings, "Achieves" ranges were: \$50,643- \$60,075 for Clemson, \$52,038 - \$61,730 for USC Columbia, and \$62,855 - \$74,562 for MUSC.

**Associate Professors, Four-Year Colleges and Universities**

For Year 12 (2007-08) ratings, the "Achieves" range was \$44,787 - \$53,129 for Four-Year Colleges and Universities




**Professors, Research Universities**



For Year 12 (2007-08) ratings, "Achieves" ranges were \$69,558 - \$82,514 for Clemson, \$71,798 - \$85,171 for USC Columbia, and \$79,965 - \$94,858 for MUSC.


**Professors, Four-Year Colleges and Universities**

For Year 12 (2007-08) ratings, the "Achieves" range was \$56,164 - \$66,624 for Four-Year Colleges and Universities



**Two-Year Institutions-Branches of USC**

The data below represent the average full-time faculty salary over the last three years.





For Year 12 (2007-08) ratings, an "Achieves" range of \$35,687- \$45,156 applied.

**State Technical and Comprehensive Education System**

The data below represent the average of all full-time faculty over the last three years. The technical colleges do not have faculty rank.

For Year 12 (2007-08) ratings, an "Achieves" range of \$34,188 - \$43,260 applied.



(blank page)

# Section 3

## Classroom Quality



(blank page)

## CLASSROOM QUALITY

This section presents a group of tables and performance funding indicators designed to give a picture of the overall quality of the classroom experience in South Carolina's institutions of higher education.

Table 3.1, required by Act 255, as amended, indicates the number and percentage of course sections taught by full-time faculty, part-time faculty and graduate assistants.

Data on **national accreditation of specific academic degree programs** are provided in Table 3.2, which summarizes the number of programs at each institution that are eligible for accreditation based on a CHE-approved list of agencies and programs and the number of those that are accredited. Some accrediting bodies (e.g., education and public health) accredit schools or units within the institutions, while others (e.g., business and engineering) accredit individual programs within the school or unit. The numbers seen in Table 3.2 reflect the number of accrediting agencies that acknowledge one or more programs at the institutions. The process of accreditation involves an external review based on national standards typically pertaining to the curriculum, faculty, students, resources and overall administration of the program; therefore, attainment of such accreditation is often considered an indication of overall program quality. However, some institutional administrators intentionally choose not to pursue accreditation for an accreditable program because the cost to do so is considered too high. In performance funding, institutions are measured on the percentage of accredited programs, with the standard for an "Achieves" being 90 – 99%, or all but one program accredited. Measurement details for each institution are displayed in Section 11. Institutional performance on this indicator for Performance Year 11 (2006-07) is shown in Figure 3.1.

Each Teaching Sector institution is expected to attain accreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Performance funding indicator **3E-Institutional Emphasis on Quality Teacher Education and Reform** encompasses this accreditation measure within subpart **3E1-Program Quality, NCATE Accreditation**. To earn credit, attainment of initial accreditation and maintaining such accreditation once achieved are expected. As of June 30, 2000, all public teacher education programs in South Carolina were accredited by NCATE, and remain so. Beginning in Year 6, the Research Sector is no longer included in Indicator 3E. However, their education programs also meet NCATE standards and are accredited. This accreditation is also included as part of indicator **3D-Accreditation of Programs**.

Also as part of **Indicator 3E-Institutional Emphasis on Quality of Teacher Education and Reform**, Teaching Sector institutions are measured on the success of their graduates on teacher certification exams (3E2) and on producing teaching graduates who can fill critical shortages - both for specific subject areas (3E3a) and for minority teachers (3E3b). The critical shortages measures have been deferred since Performance Years 9 (2004-05).

**Courses Taught by Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty and by Graduate Assistants**

Provided here are data across all four sectors on the type of instructional personnel used to teach Lower Division sections during Fall 2007. **Full-time Faculty** are those personnel at the institution who were identified as full-time at the institution, had primary responsibility (over 50%) for instruction, and had a reported salary on CHEMIS. This definition captures faculty that were included under the Salaries, Tenure, and Fringe Benefit report. For the technical colleges, unclassified continuing education program coordinators are counted as faculty. **Lower Division** here represents those courses that were coded in the CHEMIS course file as Remedial or Lower Division, including courses offered for credit toward the first and second year of an associate degree program and technical/vocational degrees offered below the baccalaureate level.

**TABLE 3.1 IS LOCATED ON THE NEXT PAGE.**



**TABLE 3.1 - Courses Taught by Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty and by Graduate Assistants**

Fall 2007

**LOWER DIVISION SECTIONS TAUGHT BY**

Institutions	TOTAL LOWER DIVISION SECTIONS	Faculty				Graduate Assistants	
		Full Time		Part Time		#	%
		#	%	#	%		
<b>Research Universities</b>							
Clemson	1994	1171	58.7%	535	26.8%	288	14.4%
USC Columbia	1991	961	48.3%	713	35.8%	317	15.9%
<i>2007 Research Subtotal</i>	3,985	2,132	53.5%	1,248	31.3%	605	15.2%
<b>Four-Year Colleges and Universities</b>							
The Citadel	461	273	59.2%	188	40.8%	0	0.0%
Coastal Carolina	1025	558	54.4%	467	45.6%	0	0.0%
College of Charleston	1470	908	61.8%	562	38.2%	0	0.0%
Francis Marion	563	462	82.1%	101	17.9%	0	0.0%
Lander	439	348	79.3%	91	20.7%	0	0.0%
SC State	663	485	73.2%	178	26.8%	0	0.0%
USC Aiken	455	302	66.4%	152	33.4%	1	0.2%
USC Beaufort	218	127	58.3%	91	41.7%	0	0.0%
USC Upstate	583	273	46.8%	308	52.8%	2	0.3%
Winthrop	948	499	52.6%	449	47.4%	0	0.0%
<i>2007 Four-Year Subtotals</i>	6,825	4,235	62.1%	2,587	37.9%	3	0.0%
<b>Two-Year Branches of USC</b>							
USC Lancaster	256	151	59.0%	105	41.0%	0	0.0%
USC Salkehatchie	150	64	42.7%	86	57.3%	0	0.0%
USC Sumter	216	136	63.0%	80	37.0%	0	0.0%
USC Union	62	22	35.5%	40	64.5%	0	0.0%
<i>2007 Two-Year Subtotals</i>	684	373	54.5%	311	45.5%	0	0.0%
<b>Technical Colleges</b>							
Aiken	427	250	58.5%	177	41.5%	0	0.0%
Central Carolina	535	372	69.5%	163	30.5%	0	0.0%
Denmark	263	204	77.6%	59	22.4%	0	0.0%
Florence-Darlington	984	502	51.0%	482	49.0%	0	0.0%
Greenville	2308	1371	59.4%	937	40.6%	0	0.0%
Horry-Georgetown	910	561	61.6%	349	38.4%	0	0.0%
Midlands	1908	1031	54.0%	877	46.0%	0	0.0%
Northeastern	317	182	57.4%	135	42.6%	0	0.0%
Orangeburg-Calhoun	484	413	85.3%	71	14.7%	0	0.0%
Piedmont	1068	589	55.1%	479	44.9%	0	0.0%
Spartanburg	851	446	52.4%	405	47.6%	0	0.0%
TCL	330	211	63.9%	119	36.1%	0	0.0%
Tri-County	914	463	50.7%	451	49.3%	0	0.0%
Trident	1867	1220	65.3%	647	34.7%	0	0.0%
Williamsburg	203	114	56.2%	89	43.8%	0	0.0%
York	940	538	57.2%	402	42.8%	0	0.0%
<i>2007 Technical College Subtotals</i>	14,309	8,467	59.2%	5,842	40.8%	0	0.0%

**Indicator 3D – Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs**

This indicator is used in assessing program accreditation in the performance funding system. Details regarding accreditation as applicable to performance funding are found in Section 11. Since April 2002, institutions are assessed in performance funding on percentage of accredited programs. It should be noted that CHE policy provides an institution five years to attain full accreditation after a new program is added at an institution and provides the same length of time to gain accreditation of an existing program when an agency is added to the list of accrediting bodies recognized by CHE. For additional information, see our website at <http://www.che.sc.gov> and go to "Academic Affairs and Licensing."

For USC Beaufort, this was a compliance indicator during the transition from two to four-year status, based on satisfactory progress toward SACS accreditation as a four-year institution.


The following charts show accreditation percentages used in Year 12 (2007-08) performance funding ratings.

**Figure 3.1 Indicator 3D - Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs**


Source: Institutional reports

The “Achieves” range in effect for **all** institutions was 90% to 99%, or all but one program, for ratings in Spring 2008.

**Research Institutions**



**Teaching Institutions**





\*USC Beaufort had no programs eligible for accreditation prior to Spring 2006

In Year 12 (2007-08), the Citadel, Coastal Carolina, College of Charleston, Francis Marion, Lander, and South Carolina State had all but one program accredited.

**Two-Year Branch Campuses of USC** – The only branch campus having programs eligible for accreditation is USC Lancaster. Both of its programs are accredited.

**Technical Colleges**



**Year 12 (2007-08) Accreditation Data and Table**

In addition to reporting the performance levels on accreditation for the most recent scored performance year, the law requires that institutions report their current program accreditation status. The following table (Table 3.2) gives accreditation information submitted by the institutions on August 1, 2008. This information will be updated in the Spring of 2009 for performance indicator 3D. The reader may note that, due to the use of updated data for performance funding calculations, numbers on institutional ratings reports may differ from those displayed in this table.

**The numbers presented in Table 3.2 (next page) reflect a count of the number of agencies for which the institution has one or more programs accredited.**

**Table 3.2 Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs Source: Institutional IE Reports to CHE**

	As of June 30, 2008		
	Areas Eligible for Accreditation	Areas with one or More Programs Accredited	% Accredited
<b>Research Universities</b>			
Clemson	13	13	100%
USC - Columbia	27	27	100%
MUSC	16	16	100%
<b>Teaching Universities</b>			
The Citadel	17	17	100%
Coastal Carolina Univ.	5	4	80%
College of Charleston	8	8	100%
Francis Marion Univ.	6	4	67%
Lander University*	7	6	86%
SC State Univ.	16	15	94%
USC - Aiken	3	3	100%
USC - Beaufort**	3	0	N/A
USC-Upstate	4	4	100%
Winthrop University	13	13	100%
<b>Two-Year Branches of USC</b>			
USC - Lancaster	2	2	100%
USC - Salkehatchie	n/a	n/a	
USC - Sumter	n/a	n/a	
USC - Union	n/a	n/a	
<b>Technical Colleges</b>			
Aiken Tech	7	7	100%
Central Carolina Tech	9	9	100%
Denmark Tech	4	3	75%
Florence-Darlington	9	9	100%
Greenville Tech	16	16	100%
Horry-Georgetown Tech	13	10	77%
Midlands Tech	14	14	100%
Northeastern Tech	2	0	0%
Orangeburg-Calhoun	8	8	100%
Piedmont Tech	9	9	100%
Spartanburg Community	9	9	100%
Tech Coll. of LowCountry	6	6	100%
Tri-County Tech	10	10	100%
Trident Tech	15	15	100%
Williamsburg Tech	1	1	100%
York Tech	9	9	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>95%</b>

\*This institution has one program within the five-year window for accreditation.

\*\*This institution has three programs within the five-year window for accreditation.

**Student Performance on Teacher Education Examinations**

**Performance Funding Indicator 3E, Subpart 3E2a** measures the percentage of students who pass the PRAXIS II Professional Learning and Teaching (PLT) exam. As of 2000-01, graduating teacher education students are not required to take this exam immediately upon graduation, but are given a three-year window to take and pass the exam. Differing institutional policies on test-taking by new graduates led to test-taking rates that vary widely, causing a situation in which charting the institutional passing rates would lead to meaningless comparisons. This indicator has been deferred since 2001. Data on prior years are reported in the 2001 edition of *A Closer Look*.

**Performance Funding Indicator 3E, Subpart 3E2b** measures the percentage of students who pass the PRAXIS II Specialty Area Exams. These exams are required of all graduates. In Year 6, this indicator was identified as the mission focused measure for teaching sector institutions. Clemson and USC Columbia continue to report the data as part of Indicator 7D.


**Four-Year Colleges and Universities**

The chart below represents the percentage of teacher education students at each institution who passed Specialty Area Examinations during the year indicated. Since 1999-2000 these have been based on the PRAXIS II exam. The annual reporting timeframe is April 1 – March 31. It should be noted that the pass rates for the Praxis II exam are based on all student takers rather than first time takers as on other certification exams reported in Section 7 of this document.

Although Clemson and USC Columbia are not included in this indicator, their education graduates take the same exams. For 2007-2008, Clemson’s students had a pass rate of 96.0% and USC Columbia’s students had a pass rate of 85.2%.

**Figure 3.2 Percentage of Students in Teacher Education Programs Who Pass the PRAXIS II Specialty Area Exams. Source: Institutional IE Reports to CHE**

The “Achieves” range for this indicator was 75% - 89% for Performance Year 12 (2007-08)



\* Does not apply

**Performance Funding Indicator 3E (Subparts 3a and 3b), Teacher Education Graduates in Critical Shortage Areas**, assesses two critical needs areas for teachers: 1) the number of graduates in state critical shortage areas; and 2) minority graduates from teacher preparation programs. These measures apply only to Teaching Sector institutions.

**Critical shortage areas** are those determined by the South Carolina Department of Education based on state need and for purposes of loan repayments. Data for the percentage of graduates in critical shortage areas for the past three years are shown below in Figure 3.3. The critical shortage areas have changed over the years as teacher shortages have increased. For performance funding, those areas identified in 2000 have been used. These are: Art, Business Education, English/Language Arts, Family and Consumer Science (Home Economics), Foreign Languages (French, German, Latin, and Spanish), Industrial Technology, Library Science, Mathematics, Science (all areas), Music (Choral), and Special Education (all areas including speech pathology, occupational, and physical therapy).

**This measure has been deferred since Year 9 (2004-05).** For previous performance data, see *A Closer Look at Public Higher Education in South Carolina – January 2005*.

#### **Teacher Education Graduates Who are Minority**

Minority Teacher Education Graduates, as defined in the Performance Funding Workbook for Year 10 (2005-06), for the years shown include African-American, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, and Hispanic students who graduated from public institutions in teacher education.

**This measure has been deferred since Year 9 (2004-05).** For previous performance data, see *A Closer Look at Public Higher Education in South Carolina – January 2005*.

### **Assessment Information for the Institution’s Title II of the Federal Higher Education Act of 1998 Report**

In 2001, the South Carolina Legislature amended Section 59-101-350 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, to include the following as an institutional effectiveness reporting requirement.

- Assessment information for the institution’s Title II of the Federal Higher Education Act of 1998 report that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications and the performance of the candidates and graduates;

A link to South Carolina Title II summary information, maintained by the SC Department of Education (SDE), is <http://www.title2.org/title2dr/StateHome.asp>. Updated data showing institutions’ performance on various requirements of Title II reporting will be posted by the SDE as they become available. These tables will include information on all South Carolina teaching institutions, to include private institutions. Links to the Title II reports of the individual institutions can be found below.

#### **Institutional Web Address of Title II Report**

##### **Research Universities**

Clemson University <http://www.clemson.edu/assessment/reports/index.html>  
University of South Carolina-Columbia <http://kudzu.ipr.sc.edu/effectiveness/>

##### **Teaching Universities**

The Citadel <http://www.citadel.edu/instresearch/title2/2008/contents.html>  
Coastal Carolina University <http://www.coastal.edu/effect/research/title2.html>  
College of Charleston <http://www.cofc.edu/~oap/2008/index.html>  
Francis Marion University <http://www.fmarion.edu/about/Reports>  
Lander University <http://www.lander.edu/education/titleII/index.html>  
South Carolina State University <http://ir.scsu.edu/TitleII.htm>  
University of South Carolina-Aiken <http://www.usca.edu/education/title2.html>  
University of South Carolina-Beaufort N/A  
University of South Carolina-Upstate <http://www.uscupstate.edu/academics/education/default.aspx?id=2489>  
Winthrop University <http://coe.winthrop.edu/title2/results.htm>

(blank page)



# Section 4

## Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration



Section 4 – Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration

(blank page)

## **Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration**

***Indicators 4A and 4B have been deferred for all institutions since Year 9 (2004-2005) The definitions that follow are for previous Performance Funding years.***

**Indicators 4A – Sharing and use of Technology, Programs, Equipment, Supplies and Source Matter within the Institution, with Other Institutions and with the Business Community and 4B – Cooperation and Collaboration with Private Industry**, were scored as compliance indicators based on institutional reporting of activities in Performance Year 3. Given the nature of these indicators and the high level of compliance, they were put on a three-year scoring cycle, and were not scored in Years 4 and 5. During Year 5, the Commission approved continuing, for Year 6 and beyond, a revised measure of institutional cooperation and collaboration as a scored indicator tailored to each sector.

As described in the following excerpt from the “Performance Funding Workbook for Year 7, (p II, 83)”

Effective Year 7, measures and standards for each of the sectors were approved on September 5, 2002 (Research, Regional Campuses, and Technical Colleges) and on November 7, 2002 (Teaching). The research sector measure focuses on enhancing collaborative research within the sector and is intended to be followed for 5 years (Years 6-10). The teaching sector measure focuses on program advisory boards and program internships/co-ops to improve the cooperation and collaboration between the sector and the profit and non-profit sectors and is intended to be followed over 4 years (Years 7-10). The regional campuses sector measure focuses on strengthening the campuses community outreach efforts with the private and public sectors and is intended as a 4 year measure (Years 6-9). The technical colleges measure focuses on strengthening technical college program advisory committees through enhanced involvement of business, industry and community representatives and is intended as a 3 year measure (Years 7-9)

***It is important that the reader refer to the current Performance Funding Workbook, [http://www.che.sc.gov/Finance/Perf\\_Fund/Yr9WorkBook\\_Rev.htm](http://www.che.sc.gov/Finance/Perf_Fund/Yr9WorkBook_Rev.htm) (pages II 83 - II 113), to find information on the components and scoring of this indicator.***

**These measures have been deferred since Year 9 (2004-05).** For previous performance data, see *A Closer Look at Public Higher Education in South Carolina – January 2005*.

Section 4 – Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration

(blank page)

# Section 5

## Administrative Efficiency



(blank page)

## **ADMINISTRATIVE EFFICIENCY**

This performance indicator (5A) was deferred due to changes in federal reporting requirements for financial data. These changes affect all public higher education institutions, making comparisons to past data invalid. The changes are of such a nature as to render “administrative efficiency” as defined in the past impossible to evaluate. The indicator is under revision for future years. For definitions and standards used in past years, see pp. 133-135 of the September 2000 Performance Funding workbook.

Past performance on indicator 5A as previously defined can be found in the publication *A Closer Look at Public Higher Education in South Carolina – January 2003*.

(Blank Page)



# Section 6

# Entrance Requirements



(blank page)

## ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS

The Commission on Higher Education (CHE) collects data on institutions' entrance requirements, preparation of entering freshmen, and developmental course offerings. Portions of these data are used in performance funding evaluations for Critical Success Factor 6.

Effective in Year 6 (2001-02), Indicator 6A - SAT and ACT Scores of Entering Freshmen, and 6B – High School Standing, Grade Point Averages (GPA) were combined in a single indicator measuring entrance credentials of first-time entering freshmen. This indicator applies to the Research Sector (except MUSC), the Teaching Sector, and Two-Year Regional Campuses of USC. A comparable measure has been implemented for MUSC. See Figure 6.1 for additional details and data.

Act 255 of 1992, as amended, requires information to be reported on the “percent of graduate students who received undergraduate degrees at the institutions, within the State, within the United States, and from other nations.” This information can be found in Table 6.1, with three years of data shown.

Admission standards for South Carolina's public in-state institutions are addressed more thoroughly in Table 6.2, and Figures 6.3 and 6.4. The data excerpted here are from a report on admissions standards that is prepared annually by the Commission's Division of Academic Affairs and can be accessed at [www.che.sc.gov](http://www.che.sc.gov). A summary of the report is provided in the illustrations named above.


### Qualifications of Entering Freshmen

**Performance Indicator 6A/B– SAT Scores of the Student Body/High School Standing, Grade Point Average, and Activities of the Student Body** measures the percentage of first-time freshmen who meet or exceed Commission-approved target scores on the SAT or ACT, high school grade point average, or high school class standing. The composite SAT and ACT scores for all first-time entering freshmen test takers including provisional students are considered. The data shown below are representative of SAT scores of 1000 and higher and ACT scores of 21 and higher, a GPA of at least 3.0 on a 4.0 scale, or class standing in the top 30%.

A comparable version of this measure was approved for MUSC beginning in Year 6. For MUSC, first-time entering graduate and first professional entering credentials are assessed. Scores on the Medical College Admissions Test (MCAT-26.6), Dental Admission Test (DAT-34), Pharmacy College Admission Test (PCAT-200), Graduate Record Exam (GRE-1587 for all three parts), Graduate Management Admissions Test (GMAT-521), college GPA (at least 3.0 on a 4 point scale), and class standing (top 30%) are considered. The range for “Achieves” is 70% to 85%, and MUSC had 96.0% of its entering first-time graduate students and first professionals meeting the criteria in Year 9 (2004-05). **The measure has been deferred for MUSC since Year 9 (2004-05).** This measure is not applicable to the Technical College Sector.

**Figure 6.1 – SAT/ACT Scores and High School Rank and GPA of Student Body**  
 Source: CHEMIS Data


#### Research Universities




For Fall 2007 data, an “Achieves” range of 75% to 89.9% applied for Clemson and USC Columbia.

#### Four-Year Colleges and Universities

For Fall 2007 data, an “Achieves” range of 50% to 79.9% applied.



**Two-Year Institutions-Regional Campuses of USC**



For Fall 2007 data, an “Achieves” range of 20% to 49.9% applied.

**Success of Students in Developmental Courses**

Students are usually enrolled in developmental courses because they have been determined by the institution to lack certain skills that are needed for college level work. None of the research or teaching universities provide such courses. Several senior institutions contract with a nearby technical college to offer some developmental courses. Students who complete such courses at technical colleges are not included in this report.

**Sources of First-Time Degrees for Graduate Students**

The following table summarizes the data on the sources of undergraduate degrees for first-time, degree-seeking graduates at the state’s public institutions.

**Table 6.1 Sources of First-Time Degrees for Graduate Students (Next Page)**  
**Source: CHEMIS Data**

Section 6 – Entrance Requirements

Institution	Year	First-time, Degree-seeking Graduate Enrollment	Undergraduate Degrees Were Received From :									
			Reporting Institution		Other SC Institutions		Other U.S. Institutions		Non-U.S. Institutions		Unknown	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
<b>Research Universities</b>												
Clemson	Fall 05	745	185	24.83%	118	15.84%	249	33.42%	128	17.18%	65	8.72%
	Fall 06	894	178	19.91%	143	16.00%	299	33.45%	183	20.47%	91	10.18%
	Fall 07	933	172	18.44%	139	14.90%	300	32.15%	223	23.90%	99	10.61%
USC Columbia	Fall 05	888	0	0.00%	98	11.04%	37	4.17%	0	0.00%	753	84.80%
	Fall 06	913	0	0.00%	91	9.97%	39	4.27%	0	0.00%	783	85.76%
	Fall 07	942	193	20.49%	43	4.56%	14	1.49%	0	0.00%	692	73.46%
MUSC	Fall 05	341	0	0.00%	47	13.78%	289	84.75%	0	0.00%	5	1.47%
	Fall 06	296	0	0.00%	48	16.22%	246	83.11%	0	0.00%	2	0.68%
	Fall 07	325	0	0.00%	55	16.92%	264	81.23%	0	0.00%	6	1.85%
<b>Sector Totals</b>	<b>Fall 05</b>	<b>1974</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>9.37%</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>13.32%</b>	<b>575</b>	<b>29.13%</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>6.48%</b>	<b>823</b>	<b>41.69%</b>
	<b>Fall 06</b>	<b>2103</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>8.46%</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>13.41%</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>27.77%</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>8.70%</b>	<b>876</b>	<b>41.65%</b>
	<b>Fall 07</b>	<b>2200</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>16.59%</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>10.77%</b>	<b>578</b>	<b>26.27%</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>10.14%</b>	<b>797</b>	<b>36.23%</b>
<b>Four-Year Colleges &amp; Universities</b>												
Citadel	Fall 05	190	11	5.79%	97	51.05%	68	35.79%	2	1.05%	12	6.32%
	Fall 06	156	14	8.97%	87	55.77%	48	30.77%	0	0.00%	7	4.49%
	Fall 07	207	16	7.73%	112	54.11%	64	30.92%	2	0.97%	13	6.28%
Coastal Carolina	Fall 05	79	0	0.00%	31	39.24%	29	36.71%	0	0.00%	19	24.05%
	Fall 06	118	0	0.00%	52	44.07%	45	38.14%	0	0.00%	21	17.80%
	Fall 07	83	0	0.00%	14	16.87%	24	28.92%	0	0.00%	45	54.22%
Coll. Of Charleston	Fall 05	157	42	26.75%	43	27.39%	69	43.95%	3	1.91%	0	0.00%
	Fall 06	149	35	23.49%	40	26.85%	71	47.65%	3	2.01%	0	0.00%
	Fall 07	159	44	27.67%	49	30.82%	61	38.36%	5	3.14%	0	0.00%
Francis Marion	Fall 05	47	18	38.30%	22	46.81%	7	14.89%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
	Fall 06	45	17	37.78%	16	35.56%	12	26.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
	Fall 07	34	15	44.12%	12	35.29%	7	20.59%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Lander	Fall 05	8	4	50.00%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%
	Fall 06	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%
	Fall 07	8	1	12.50%	6	75.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%
SC State	Fall 05	151	13	8.61%	10	6.62%	2	1.32%	0	0.00%	126	83.44%
	Fall 06	130	29	22.31%	43	33.08%	8	6.15%	0	0.00%	50	38.46%
	Fall 07	143	18	12.59%	52	36.36%	12	8.39%	0	0.00%	61	42.66%
USC Aiken	Fall 05	11	0	0.00%	2	18.18%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	9	81.82%
	Fall 06	10	0	0.00%	1	10.00%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	8	80.00%
	Fall 07	20	4	20.00%	1	5.00%	1	5.00%	0	0.00%	14	70.00%
USC Upstate	Fall 05	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
	Fall 06	0	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
	Fall 07	0	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Winthrop	Fall 05	231	77	33.33%	47	20.35%	100	43.29%	7	3.03%	0	0.00%
	Fall 06	311	90	28.94%	77	24.76%	132	42.44%	8	2.57%	4	1.29%
	Fall 07	261	87	33.33%	50	19.16%	112	42.91%	9	3.45%	3	1.15%
<b>Sector Totals</b>	<b>Fall 05</b>	<b>875</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>18.86%</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>29.14%</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>31.54%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1.37%</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>19.09%</b>
	<b>Fall 06</b>	<b>920</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>20.11%</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>34.35%</b>	<b>317</b>	<b>34.46%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1.20%</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>9.89%</b>
	<b>Fall 07</b>	<b>915</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>20.22%</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>32.35%</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>30.71%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1.75%</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>14.97%</b>

## Admission Standards

Annually, SC public institutions of higher education report to the Commission on Higher Education (CHE) on admission standards for first-time entering freshmen. The Division of Academic Affairs compiles a report, “Annual Report on Admission Standards for First-Time Entering Freshmen,” based on information submitted from institutions. A copy of the full report can be found by clicking <http://www.che.sc.gov/> and then selecting the Division of Academic Affairs. Some of the data reported include high school course prerequisites for college admission taken by applicants, SAT/ACT scores of applicants, provisional admissions, and applications, acceptance and enrollment. Table 6.2 details the number and percentage of students who applied for and were offered admission at each public senior institution.

**Table 6.2 Applications and Admission Offers, SC Senior Public Institutions**  
**Source: CHE’s “Annual Report on Admission Standards for First-time Entering Freshmen”**

	Fall 2007			Fall 2006			Fall 2005		
	Applications Received	Number Offered Admission	Percent Offered Admission	Applications Received	Number Offered Admission	Percent Offered Admission	Applications Received	Number Offered Admission	Percent Offered Admission
<b>Research Institutions</b>									
Clemson	14,254	7,154	50.2%	12,784	6,990	54.7%	12,463	7,154	57.4%
USC Columbia	14,994	8,908	59.4%	13,994	8,780	62.7%	13,023	8,813	67.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>29,248</b>	<b>16,062</b>	<b>54.9%</b>	<b>26,778</b>	<b>15,770</b>	<b>58.9%</b>	<b>25,486</b>	<b>15,967</b>	<b>62.7%</b>
<b>Four-Yr Colleges and Universities</b>									
Citadel	2,081	1,629	78.3%	1,999	1,490	74.5%	1,912	1,500	78.5%
Coastal	6,618	4,524	68.4%	6,218	4,238	68.2%	5,427	4,017	74.0%
Coll of Charleston	8,939	5,775	64.6%	8,675	5,332	61.5%	8,219	5,438	66.2%
Francis Marion	2,725	1,760	64.6%	2,692	1,799	66.8%	2,524	1,804	71.5%
Lander	2,230	946	42.4%	1,907	1,187	62.2%	1,853	1,345	72.6%
SC State	3,866	3,403	88.0%	2,592	2,049	79.1%	3,383	2,759	81.6%
USC Aiken	2,422	1,257	51.9%	2,412	1,330	55.1%	2,071	1,244	60.1%
USC Beaufort	782	576	73.7%	555	407	73.3%	464	404	87.1%
USC Upstate*	2,802	1,771	63.2%	2,433	1,601	65.8%	2,296	1,605	69.9%
Winthrop	3,996	2,781	69.6%	5,328	3,704	69.5%	4,303	2,985	69.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>36,461</b>	<b>24,422</b>	<b>67.0%</b>	<b>34,811</b>	<b>23,137</b>	<b>66.5%</b>	<b>32,452</b>	<b>23,101</b>	<b>71.2%</b>
<b>Total for SC Senior Institutions</b>	<b>65,709</b>	<b>40,484</b>	<b>61.6%</b>	<b>61,589</b>	<b>38,907</b>	<b>63.2%</b>	<b>57,938</b>	<b>39,068</b>	<b>67.4%</b>

**Figure 6.2 Percentage of Applicants Offered Admission who Subsequently Accepted and Enrolled**

Source: CHE’s “Annual Report on Admission Standards for First-time Entering Freshmen”





Figure 6.3 shows a comparison of the average SAT or ACT combined scores of first-time entering freshmen for each institution for Fall 2005, 2006, and 2007. In order to calculate the average, ACT scores are converted to SAT equivalents using the ACT/SAT Concordance tables. SAT scores include the Verbal and Math exams. All entering freshmen including foreign, provisional, and students over 22 years old are included. The data in Figure 6.3 are reviewed annually by the CHE as part of its annual report on admission standards of first-time entering freshmen.

**Figure 6.3 Average SAT/ACT Combined Scores of All First-time Entering Freshmen for 4- and 2-year SC Public Institutions**


Source: From CHEMIS

Research Universities (excluding MUSC)






**Teaching Universities**



**Two-Year Regional Campuses of USC**



(blank page)

# Section 7

## Graduates’ Achievements



(blank page)

## **GRADUATES’ ACHIEVEMENTS**

The Commission on Higher Education (CHE) evaluates graduates’ achievements based on graduation rates (Performance Indicator 7A), scores on licensure and professional examinations (Performance Indicators 3E2a, 3E2b, and 7D), and, for the regional campuses of USC, the regional campus sector focused measure, 7E, Number of Graduates Who Continued Their Education. This measure, developed in Year 6, is a cohort-based measure of the percentage of students who earn a baccalaureate degree within six years from a four-year degree granting institution.

A measure of graduation rates of graduate students was implemented for MUSC in Year 6 (2001-2002). This measure captures the percentage of first-time, full-time graduate students, except those in Ph. D. programs, and first professional students who complete graduate degree programs within a specified timeframe.

The measure for two-year institutions is cohort-based, assessing graduation within 150% of normal program time, transfer-out within 150% of normal program time or continued enrollment following 150% of normal program time. The measure uses the same cohort of students as defined in graduation rate information presented on the following pages. During Year 6, baseline data were collected and measurement definitions were refined. The measures are presented by Sector in Figure 7.1.


For additional information on degrees awarded, undergraduate and graduate, in South Carolina, the reader is referred to the CHE’s publication “Higher Education Statistical Abstract for South Carolina.” A copy of the 2008 edition and several past years are available on-line by selecting “Publications” on the Commission’s home page.

### **Performance Funding Graduation Rate**

For **Performance Funding Indicator 7A – Graduation Rates**, institutions are assessed based on the percentage of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduate freshmen receiving degrees within 150% of normal time. Generally, 150% of normal program time is three years for a two-year degree and six years for a four-year degree. Shown below are data from IPEDS. The reader should note that Figure 7.1 shows graduation results for students in cohorts entering in Fall 1999, 2000, and 2001 for four-year institutions and cohorts entering in Fall 2002, 2003, and 2004 for two-year institutions. Data for the 2001 and 2004 cohorts are comparable to the percents displayed for graduation within six years or 150% of normal time for the four-year institutions and within 150% of program time for the two-year institutions. A comparable indicator applied to MUSC has been deferred since Year 9 (2004-2005).

**Figure 7.1 - Performance Funding Indicator 7A – Graduation Rates**  
**Source: CHEMIS Data**


**Research Universities**



The figure displayed at left represents the percentage of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduate freshmen receiving degrees within 150% of program time. The range for an “Achieves” for the 2001 cohort was 64% to 67% for Clemson and 53% to 61% for USC. These ranges were based on national peer data for each.

**Four-Year Colleges and Universities**


The figure below displays the percentage of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduate freshmen receiving degrees at each four-year college and university within 150% of program time. The “Achieves” range for the 2001 cohort for these institutions was 36% to 49%. This range was based on data available from comparable four-year institutions.





\*This measure does not apply to USC Beaufort during its transition to four-year status – see Indicator 7E.

**Two-Year Institutions-Regional Campuses of USC (Success Rate)**

The table at right displays those first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduate freshmen graduating within 150% of normal program time, transferred out within 150% of normal program time or continued enrollment following 150% of normal program time. The “Achieves” range for the 2004 cohort for these institutions was 50% to 65%. *The data for the F03 and F04 cohorts incorporate only in-state transfers and are not comparable to past years.*




**State Technical and Comprehensive Education System (Success Rate)** The figures below represent the percent of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduate freshmen who graduated within 150% of normal program time, transferred out within 150% of normal program time or continued enrollment following 150% of normal program time. The “Achieves” range for the 2004 cohort for these institutions was 30% to 45%. *The data for the F03 and F04 cohorts incorporate only in-state transfers and are not comparable to past years.*





**Figure 7.2 – Graduation Within 150% of Program Time (GRS Rate), Regional Campuses of USC and Technical Colleges**

These charts present the GRS graduation rates for the Regional and Technical College sectors. These data were not used in calculating performance scores.

**Regional Campuses**



**Technical Colleges**





## Graduation Rate – Research, Teaching, and Two-Year Institutions (Southern Regional Education Board)

### Southern Regional Education Board States Compared to South Carolina

South Carolina is a member of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), which is comprised of 16 states in the southeast. The SREB collects data on an annual basis on various types of information from all member institutions and publishes it in their “SREB State Data Exchange.” The following table (7.1) on graduation rates is taken from the December, 2008, publication.

**Table 7.1 - Southern Regional Education Board States Compared to South Carolina**  
Source: 2008 SREB State Data Exchange

<b>Student Progression Rates, Full-Time, First-Time, Bachelor's Seeking Undergraduates<sup>1</sup> All Public Four-Year Colleges and Universities, 2001 Cohort</b>							
	Percent of Total First-Time Freshmen in Cohort	Student Progression Rate <sup>2</sup>	Percent Completing a Bachelor's at Institution of Initial Enrollment	Percent Still Enrolled at Institution of Initial Enrollment	Percent Transfers	All Other	Total
SREB states	94	74	52	5	16	26	100
Alabama	92	63	47		16	37	100
Arkansas	96	70	40	6	24	30	100
Delaware	89	81	81			19	100
Florida	94	71	58	5	8	29	100
Georgia	89	73	49	6	18	27	100
Kentucky	83	66	48	6	12	34	100
Louisiana	95	62	37	7	18	38	100
Maryland	99	68	62	3	4	32	100
Mississippi	98	54	48	5		46	100
North Carolina	99	76	59	3	14	24	100
Oklahoma	86	81	47	7	26	19	100
South Carolina	99	76	59	2	15	24	100
Tennessee	96	68	45	9	13	32	100
Texas	95	83	49	6	29	17	100
Virginia	98	84	67	3	14	16	100
West Virginia	81	68	46	6	16	32	100

<sup>1</sup> The SREB student progression rate includes completers, those still enrolled and transfers from the cohort within 150 percent of normal time. Members of the initial cohort who are deceased, totally and permanently disabled, left school to serve in the armed forces or the federal foreign aid service such as the Peace Corps, or who left school to serve on an official church mission are subtracted from the cohort before percentages are calculated. Members of the initial cohort who completed only an award below the baccalaureate level and those who completed a bachelor's but not within 150 percent of normal time are not counted in the columns shown.

<sup>2</sup> Within 150 percent of normal time.

**Graduation Rate – Senior and Two-Year Institutions - Southern Regional  
Education Board (cont.)**

**Student Progression Rates,  
Full-Time, First-Time, Degree or Certificate Seeking Undergraduates,<sup>1</sup>  
All Public Two-Year, 2004 Cohort**

	Percent of Total First-Time Freshmen in Cohort	Student Progression Rate <sup>2</sup>	Percent Completing a Degree/ Certificate at Institution of Initial Enrollment	Percent Still Enrolled at Institution of Initial Enrollment	Percent Transfers	All Other	Total
SREB states	55	47	16	14	17	53	100
Alabama	78	43	17		26	57	100
Arkansas	67	49	20	14	15	51	100
Delaware	62	9	9			91	100
Florida	58	59	30	15	14	41	100
Georgia	75	47	11	15	21	53	100
Kentucky	72	41	16	16	9	59	100
Louisiana	69	46	5	16	26	54	100
Maryland	60	50	7	19	24	50	100
Mississippi							
North Carolina	28	27	18		9	73	100
Oklahoma	70	58	18	14	26	42	100
South Carolina	70	41	11	18	12	59	100
Tennessee	80	46	14	17	16	54	100
Texas	52	46	11	16	19	54	100
Virginia	58	46	15	19	12	54	100
West Virginia	83	40	13	12	15	60	100

<sup>1</sup> The SREB student progression rate includes completers, those still enrolled and transfers from the cohort within 150 percent of normal time. Members of the initial cohort who are deceased, totally and permanently disabled, left school to serve in the armed forces or the federal foreign aid service such as the Peace Corps, or who left school to serve on an official church mission are subtracted from the cohort before percentages are calculated. Members of the initial cohort who completed only an award below the baccalaureate level and those who completed a bachelor's but not within 150 percent of normal time are not counted in the columns shown.

<sup>2</sup> Within 150 percent of normal time.

**Student Performance on Professional Examinations**

The following tables (7.2 - 7.4) summarize graduates’ performances on various professional examinations. These examinations are designed to measure minimum knowledge necessary for licensing or to practice in the designated profession. Institutions are required to report data on first-time test takers (with the exception of the PRAXIS Series, which includes all test takers) for the set time period. The Commission on Higher Education (CHE) obtains comparable data (when available) on national and state pass rates for each exam reported. These data are displayed in Table 7.3. The following table lists data from each institution on individual exams taken between April 1 – March 31 of the years reported. For **Performance Funding Indicator 7D – Scores of Graduates on Post-Undergraduate Professional, Graduate, or Employment-Related Examinations and Certification Tests**, data displayed in Table 7.2 are collasped by CHE to provide a single overall passing average for institutions as shown in Table 7.4.

**Table 7.2 – Student Performance on Professional Examinations by Exam by Year for SC’s Public Institutions**

**Source: Institutional IE Reports to CHE**

The following table lists data from each institution on individual exams taken between April 1 – March 31 of the years reported. Exam data from the most recent three-year period are included. Data for exams reported in timeframes not corresponding to the April-March period (e.g., “Jan-Jun 2007” or “ongoing during 2007 or 2008”) were included.

<i>Exams taken between April 1 and March 31 of year listed</i>										
Exam Title	Institution	2007-2008			2006-2007			2005-2006		
		#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
		Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing
ACC National Certif. Exam. in Nurse Midwifery	MUSC	3	3	100.0%	4	4	100.0%	9	9	100.0%
Aircraft Maintenance - Airframe	Greenville Tech	3	3	100.0%	5	5	100.0%	1	1	100.0%
	Trident Tech	2	2	100.0%	1	1	100.0%	26	26	100.0%
Aircraft Maintenance - General	Greenville Tech	4	3	75.0%	6	5	83.3%	3	3	100.0%
	Trident Tech	2	1	50.0%	1	1	100.0%	26	26	100.0%
Aircraft Maintenance - Powerplant	Greenville Tech	4	4	100.0%	10	10	100.0%	5	5	100.0%
	Trident Tech	1	1	100.0%	1	1	100.0%	26	26	100.0%
American Bd of Cardiovascular Perfusion Exam Part I (PBSE)	MUSC	10	9	90.0%	9	8	88.9%	4	4	100.0%
American Bd of Cardiovascular Perfusion Exam Part II (CAPE)	MUSC	6	5	83.3%	5	5	100.0%	2	2	100.0%
Barbering	Denmark Tech	0	0	-	0	0	-	1	1	100.0%
Certification Exam. For Entry Level Respiratory Therapy Practitioners (CRTT)	Florence-Darlington	11	10	90.9%	15	11	73.3%	8	7	87.5%
	Greenville Tech	19	17	89.5%	11	11	100.0%	14	10	71.4%
	Midlands Tech	8	8	100.0%	13	12	92.3%	11	11	100.0%
	Orangeburg-Calhoun	13	12	92.3%	16	15	93.8%	14	11	78.6%
	Piedmont Tech	14	10	71.4%	12	9	75.0%	12	12	100.0%
	Spartanburg CC	17	15	88.2%	7	7	100.0%			

## Section 7 – Graduates’ Achievements

*Exams taken between April 1 and March 31 of year listed*

Exam Title	Institution	2007-2008			2006-2007			2005-2006		
		#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
		Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing
Certified Medical Assistant Exam.	Tri-County Tech	13	9	69.2%	17	9	52.9%	13	9	69.2%
	Trident Tech	14	14	100.0%	14	14	100.0%	12	11	91.7%
	Central Carolina	8	8	100.0%	11	11	100.0%	2	2	100.0%
	Midlands Tech	11	9	81.8%	11	9	81.8%	10	9	90.0%
	Orangeburg-Calhoun	7	5	71.4%	17	9	52.9%	4	3	75.0%
	Spartanburg CC	14	14	100.0%	8	8	100.0%	13	11	84.6%
	Tri-County Tech	15	13	86.7%	13	13	100.0%	14	13	92.9%
Certified Occupational Therapy Assistant (COTA)	Trident Tech	10	9	90.0%	16	16	100.0%	23	21	91.3%
	Greenville Tech	24	20	83.3%	29	27	93.1%	11	10	90.9%
Cosmetology Examination	Trident Tech	7	7	100.0%	8	8	100.0%	14	13	92.9%
	Denmark Tech	7	5	71.4%	30	24	80.0%	4	4	100.0%
	Florence-Darlington	9	9	100.0%	41	36	87.8%	16	16	100.0%
	Greenville Tech	3	3	100.0%						
	Tech Coll of Low Ctry	0	0	-	0	0	-	11	11	100.0%
	Trident Tech	21	21	100.0%	8	8	100.0%	13	13	100.0%
Council on Certification of Nurse Anesthetists Exam.	Williamsburg Tech	12	11	91.7%	17	14	82.4%	4	4	100.0%
	MUSC	28	28	100.0%	15	12	80.0%	20	19	95.0%
Emergency Medical Technician - NREMT Basic	Greenville Tech	55	36	65.5%	32	23	71.9%	32	25	78.1%
Emergency Medical Technician - NREMT Intermediate	Greenville Tech	32	23	71.9%	11	8	72.7%	41	28	68.3%
Emergency Medical Technician - NREMT Paramedic	Greenville Tech	26	14	53.8%	24	20	83.3%	41	31	75.6%
Medical Laboratory Technician, ASCP	Florence-Darlington	5	2	40.0%	5	4	80.0%	5	5	100.0%
	Greenville Tech	15	13	86.7%	8	7	87.5%	5	5	100.0%
	Midlands Tech	6	6	100.0%	6	6	100.0%	8	7	87.5%
	Orangeburg-Calhoun	7	5	71.4%	8	8	100.0%	6	6	100.0%
	Spartanburg CC	6	6	100.0%	8	8	100.0%	7	7	100.0%
	Tri-County Tech	12	11	91.7%	11	11	100.0%	10	8	80.0%
	Trident Tech	9	9	100.0%	6	6	100.0%	5	5	100.0%
	York Tech	7	7	100.0%	7	7	100.0%	5	5	100.0%
Multi-State Pharmacy Jurisprudence Exam (MPJE)	USC-Columbia	128	121	94.5%	127	119	93.7%	105	95	90.5%
	MUSC	129	125	96.9%	116	109	94.0%	98	89	90.8%
National Board Dental Exam. Part I	MUSC	56	54	96.4%	54	47	87.0%	58	56	96.6%

## Section 7 – Graduates’ Achievements

*Exams taken between April 1 and March 31 of year listed*

Exam Title	Institution	2007-2008			2006-2007			2005-2006		
		#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
		Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing
National Board Dental Exam. Part II	MUSC	52	51	98.1%	58	56	96.6%	52	51	98.1%
National Bd for Dental Hygiene Exam.	Florence-Darlington	15	12	80.0%	14	10	71.4%	15	14	93.3%
	Greenville Tech	44	39	88.6%	23	23	100.0%	32	31	96.9%
	Horry-Georgetown	13	11	84.6%	16	13	81.3%	16	16	100.0%
	Midlands Tech	22	22	100.0%	23	22	95.7%	20	20	100.0%
	Trident Tech	20	18	90.0%	21	18	85.7%	23	20	87.0%
	York Tech	17	14	82.4%	16	16	100.0%	9	8	88.9%
National Council Licensure Exam.-Practical Nurse	Aiken Tech	9	7	77.8%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Central Carolina	21	21	100.0%	15	15	100.0%	-	-	-
	Florence-Darlington	148	148	100.0%	180	176	97.8%	14	13	96.8%
	Greenville Tech	57	55	96.5%	67	67	100.0%	93	90	95.8%
	Horry-Georgetown	32	32	100.0%	33	31	93.9%	23	22	95.7%
	Midlands Tech	49	48	98.0%	61	60	98.4%	51	51	100.0%
	Northeastern	15	13	86.7%	15	15	100.0%	20	17	85.0%
	Orangeburg-Calhoun	42	40	95.2%	22	22	100.0%	30	29	96.7%
	Piedmont Tech	74	70	94.6%	0	0	-	70	65	92.9%
	Spartanburg CC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Tech Coll of Low Ctry	-	-	-	20	20	100.0%	22	22	100.0%
	Tri-County Tech	34	33	97.1%	35	30	85.7%	34	32	94.1%
	Trident Tech	49	49	100.0%	29	29	100.0%	24	24	100.0%
York Tech	53	51	96.2%	4	39	975.0%	13	13	100.0%	
National Council Licensure Exam.-Registered Nurse (BSN)	Clemson	110	98	89.1%	110	99	90.0%	99	82	82.8%
	USC-Columbia	132	118	89.4%	122	111	91.0%	95	91	95.8%
	MUSC	93	85	91.4%	96	89	92.7%	123	116	94.3%
	Francis Marion Univ.	0	0	-	32	29	90.6%	27	25	92.6%
	Lander	40	36	90.0%	27	26	96.3%	-	-	-
	SC State	17	9	52.9%	9	8	88.9%	10	5	50.0%
	USC-Aiken	53	47	88.7%	72	56	77.8%	60	53	88.3%
	USC-Upstate	150	107	71.3%	112	92	82.1%	144	112	77.8%
National Council Licensure Exam.-Registered Nurse (ADN)	USC-Lancaster	19	14	73.7%	28	27	96.4%	12	12	100.0%
	Central Carolina	38	35	92.1%	52	49	94.2%	53	46	86.8%
	Florence-Darlington	170	154	90.6%	202	182	90.1%	122	99	81.1%
	Aiken Tech	50	34	68.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Greenville Tech	187	168	89.8%	199	180	90.5%	221	200	90.5%
	Horry-Georgetown	112	96	85.7%	109	79	72.5%	55	41	74.5%
	Midlands Tech	118	108	91.5%	109	108	99.1%	112	105	93.8%
	Orangeburg-Calhoun	51	50	98.0%	41	41	100.0%	40	40	100.0%
Piedmont Tech	79	56	70.9%	69	68	98.6%	54	47	87.0%	

## Section 7 – Graduates’ Achievements

*Exams taken between April 1 and March 31 of year listed*

Exam Title	Institution	2007-2008			2006-2007			2005-2006		
		#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
		Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing
	Tech Coll of Low Ctry	0	0	-	44	38	86.4%	40	38	95.0%
	Tri-County Tech	85	76	89.4%	45	44	97.8%	72	61	84.7%
	Trident Tech	129	115	89.1%	153	142	92.8%	110	105	95.5%
	York Tech	53	44	83.0%	25	23	92.0%	20	17	85.0%
National Physical Therapist Licensing Exam. (PT)	MUSC	58	40	69.0%	51	37	72.5%	45	28	62.2%
	USC-Columbia	24	17	70.8%	8	6	75.0%	-	-	-
National Physical Therapist Assistant Exam (PTA)	Greenville Tech	28	25	89.3%	36	32	88.9%	28	26	92.9%
	Midlands Tech	10	10	100.0%	9	8	88.9%	10	10	100.0%
	Piedmont Tech	0	0		61	54	88.5%	13	13	100.0%
	Trident Tech	21	19	90.5%	13	11	84.6%	13	13	100.0%
Neonatal Nurse Practitioner Exam.	MUSC	4	3	75.0%	2	2	100.0%	-	-	-
North American Pharmacist Licensure Exam. (NAPLEX)	USC-Columbia	81	77	95.1%	73	69	94.5%	116	110	94.8%
	MUSC	74	72	97.3%	72	68	94.4%	63	58	92.1%
Nuclear Medicine Technology, ARRT	Midlands Tech	5	5	100.0%	19	19	100.0%	13	13	100.0%
	Horry-Georgetown	12	9	75.0%	6	5	83.3%	-	-	-
Nuclear Medicine Technology Certification Board Exam.	Midlands Tech	13	13	100.0%	20	20	100.0%	16	16	100.0%
Nurse Aid Competency Evaluation Program (NACEP)	Orangeburg-Calhoun	22	21	95.5%	31	31	100.0%	18	18	100.0%
	Tech Coll of Low Ctry	0	0		0	0				
Occupational Therapy, Registered (OTR)	MUSC	28	27	96.4%	45	44	97.8%	14	14	100.0%
Physician Assistant National Certifying Exam.	MUSC	55	53	96.4%	50	50	100.0%	44	44	100.0%
PRAXIS Series II: Subject Assessment/Specialty Area Tests	Clemson	651	625	96.0%	120	109	90.8%	708	614	86.7%
	USC-Columbia	566	539	95.2%	615	585	95.1%	442	411	93.0%
	The Citadel	125	115	92.0%	157	134	85.4%	134	115	85.8%
	Coastal Carolina Coll. of Charleston	312	282	90.4%	318	280	88.1%	253	220	87.0%
	Francis Marion	317	280	88.3%	381	354	92.9%	427	402	94.1%
	Lander	151	141	93.4%	118	101	85.6%	132	118	89.4%
	Lander	14	11	78.6%	29	24	82.8%	24	18	75.0%
	SC State	31	31	100.0%	28	28	100.0%	34	34	100.0%
	USC-Aiken	149	116	77.9%	162	145	89.5%	166	132	79.5%
	USC-Upstate	312	279	89.4%	182	168	92.3%	273	238	87.2%
	Winthrop	344	320	93.0%	357	332	93.0%	486	456	93.8%
PRAXIS- Specialty Area (Speech-Language Path.)	MUSC	25	25	100.0%	25	25	100.0%	24	23	95.8%

## Section 7 – Graduates' Achievements

*Exams taken between April 1 and March 31 of year listed*

Exam Title	Institution	2007-2008			2006-2007			2005-2006		
		#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
		Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing
Radiography Exam., ARRT	Aiken Tech	10	9	90.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Florence-Darlington	13	13	100.0%	20	18	90.0%	15	13	86.7%
	Greenville Tech	29	29	100.0%	24	24	100.0%	26	25	96.2%
	Horry-Georgetown	21	17	81.0%	23	21	91.3%	16	13	81.3%
	Midlands Tech	14	14	100.0%	7	7	100.0%	11	11	100.0%
	Orangeburg-Calhoun	18	18	100.0%	12	12	100.0%	17	17	100.0%
	Piedmont Tech	18	18	100.0%	16	16	100.0%	16	14	87.5%
	Spartanburg CC	19	18	94.7%	14	14	100.0%	8	8	100.0%
	Tech of the Lowcountry	12	12	100.0%	11	11	100.0%	11	11	100.0%
	Trident Tech	20	18	90.0%	32	22	68.8%	18	10	55.6%
York Tech	15	15	100.0%	9	9	100.0%	9	9	100.0%	
Registered Health Information Technician (Formerly Accredited Record Technician)	Florence-Darlington	3	1	33.3%	7	1	14.3%	4	2	50.0%
	Greenville Tech	12	9	75.0%	16	10	62.5%	3	3	100.0%
	Midlands Tech	7	5	71.4%	1	1	100.0%	8	4	50.0%
Registry Exam. For Advanced Respiratory Therapy Practitioners (RRT) - Clinical Simulation	Greenville Tech	15	7	46.7%	8	5	62.5%	11	8	72.7%
	Midlands Tech	10	9	90.0%	9	9	100.0%	11	11	100.0%
	Orangeburg-Calhoun	2	2	100.0%	1	1	100.0%	1	1	100.0%
	Piedmont Tech	7	5	71.4%	5	5	100.0%	2	2	100.0%
	Spartanburg CC	9	5	55.6%	12	8	66.7%	8	7	87.5%
Registry Exam. for Advanced Respiratory Therapy Practitioners (RRT) - Written Registry	Greenville Tech	15	10	66.7%	10	7	70.0%	11	9	81.8%
	Midlands Tech	9	9	100.0%	9	9	100.0%	11	11	100.0%
	Orangeburg-Calhoun	3	3	100.0%	1	1	100.0%	1	1	100.0%
	Piedmont Tech	7	5	71.4%	5	5	100.0%	2	2	100.0%
	Spartanburg CC	12	7	58.3%	12	5	41.7%	12	7	58.3%
South Carolina Board of Law Examination	USC-Columbia	215	200	93.0%	503	403	80.1%	497	410	82.5%
Cytotechnology (ASCP)	MUSC	8	6	75.0%	11	10	90.9%	10	10	100.0%
SRTA Regional Exam. for Dental Hygienists	Florence-Darlington	11	11	100.0%	14	14	100.0%	15	14	93.3%
	Greenville Tech	30	30	100.0%	0	0		21	20	95.2%
	Horry-Georgetown	15	14	93.3%	16	15	93.8%	16	15	93.8%
	Midlands Tech	19	18	94.7%	0	0		41	39	95.1%
	Trident Tech	20	20	100.0%	21	21	100.0%	45	45	100.0%
	York Tech	-	-	-	15	14	93.3%	9	9	100.0%

## Section 7 – Graduates’ Achievements

*Exams taken between April 1 and March 31 of year listed*

Exam Title	Institution	2007-2008			2006-2007			2005-2006		
		#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
		Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing
State Board Dental Exam-SRTA Exam-	MUSC	42	36	85.7%	46	44	95.7%	49	40	81.6%
State Board Dental Exam-CRDTs Exam-New	MUSC	5	4	80.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Surgical Technologist National Certifying Exam.	Florence-Darlington	20	16	80.0%	18	16	88.9%	7	5	71.4%
	Greenville Tech	35	23	65.7%	8	4	50.0%	5	3	60.0%
	Midlands Tech	27	14	51.9%	31	22	71.0%	8	8	100.0%
	Piedmont Tech	2	2	100.0%						
	Spartanburg CC	20	20	100.0%	12	12	100.0%	14	14	100.0%
	Tri-County Tech	25	14	56.0%	9	5	55.6%	8	5	62.5%
US Medical Licensing Exam. - Step I	MUSC	130	123	94.6%	146	136	93.2%	138	133	96.4%
	USC-Columbia	71	65	91.5%	75	73	97.3%	78	74	94.9%
US Medical Licensing Exam. - Step II	MUSC	141	130	92.2%	-	-	-	139	135	97.1%
	USC-Columbia	72	71	98.6%	76	72	94.7%	-	-	-
Veterinary Technician National Examination	Tri-County Tech	10	8	80.0%	17	13	76.5%	12	10	83.3%
	Trident Tech	16	11	68.8%	13	12	92.3%	12	11	91.7%
TOTAL for all Examinations		7931	7153	90.2%	7385	6707	90.8%	7654	6871	89.8%
TOTAL for all Examinations		15862	14306	90.2%	14770	13414	90.8%	15308	13742	89.8%

<sup>1</sup> Joint nursing program with USC Lancaster and York Tech

<sup>2</sup> These examinations make up Indicator 3E2b for Teaching Sector institutions

### National and South Carolina Pass Rates on Professional Examinations

The following table lists national and South Carolina pass rates of graduates and/or prospective graduates on professional and certification examinations. Data reported are generally derived from the same time frame as requested from the institutions – April 1 – March 31 – and have been compiled from agency reports to the CHE. For data that may have crossed over the April – March reporting period or for a change in exam title, a footnote is provided at the end of the table. Calendar year reports that do not correspond to the April – March timeframe are included in the April – December time period for the appropriate year (e.g., Jan. - June 2003 summary data are included in 2003-04 data). Some agencies do not maintain national or state pass rates and thus cannot report them to the CHE. An empty space is left when an agency did not respond to CHE requests by the printing of this report. Each exam listed has been reported by state institutions at least once in the past. Some historical information has been updated to reflect verified data.



**Table 7.3 - National and South Carolina Pass Rates on Professional Examinations**  
**Source: Examination agencies’ reports to CHE**

Exam Title	2007-2008		2006-2007		2005-2006	
	National	SC	National	SC	National	SC
AMCB National Certification Exam in Nurse Midwifery	87.9	100.0%	84.1	100%	90	N/A
Aircraft Maintenance-Airframe	92%	100.0%	93%	100%	93%	100%
Aircraft Maintenance-General	91%	66.7%	89%	86%	89%	100%
Aircraft Maintenance-Powerplant	89%	100.0%	91%	100%	91%	100%
American Bd. of Cardiovascular Perfusion Exam - Part I (PBSE)	66%	90.0%	called 12/5	93%	70%	100%
American Bd. of Cardiovascular Perfusion Exam - Part II (CAPE)	73%	83.3%	called 12/5		76%	100%
Barbering	64%		63%	36%	52%	100%
Certification Exam. for Entry Level Respiratory Therapy Practitioners (CRTT)		87.2%		84%		85%
Certified Medical Assistant Exam.		89.2%		87%	68%	89%
Certified Occupational Therapist Assistant (COTA)	85%	87.1%	88%	95%	89%	92%
Cosmetology Examination	91%	92.5%	96%	99%	79%	100%
Council on Certification of Nurse Anesthetists Exam.		100.0%		80%		95%
Cytotechnology (ASCP) <i>In 2001-2002, changed from "Specialist in Cytotechnology."</i>		75.0%	Charge-data	91%		100%
Emergency Medical Technician - NREMT Basic	76%	65.5%		72%	65%	78%
Emergency Medical Technician - NREMT Intermediate	79%	71.9%		73%	62%	68%
Emergency Medical Technician - NREMT Paramedic	80%	53.8%		83%	65%	76%
Medical Laboratory Technician ASCP		88.1%		97%		94%
Multi-state Pharmacy Jurisprudence Exam (MPJE)		95.7%		94%		91%
National Board Dental Exam. Part I		96.4%		87%		97%
National Board Dental Exam. Part II		98.1%		97%		98%
National Board for Dental Hygiene Exam.		88.5%		90%		95%
National Council Licensure Exam - Practical Nurse	96%	97.3%		95%	88%	96%
National Council Licensure Exam - Registered Nurse (ADN)		87.1%		91%	87%	89%
National Council Licensure Exam - Registered Nurse (BSN)	86%	83.2%		88%		87%

Section 7 – Graduates’ Achievements

Exam Title	2007-2008		2006-2007		2005-2006	
	National	SC	National	SC	National	SC
National Physical Therapist Licensing Exam. (PT)	88%	69.5%		73%	71%	62%
National Physical Therapist Licensing Exam. (PT Asst.)	81%	91.5%		88%	89%	96%
North American Pharmacist Licensure Exam		96.1%	89%	95%		94%
Nuclear Medicine Technology AART		100.0%	93%	96%	92%	100%
Nuclear Medicine Technology Certification Bd. Exam.	92%	82.4%		100%		100%
Nurse Aid Competency Evaluation Program	86%	95.5%		100%		100%
Occupational Therapy, Registered (OTR)	87%	96.4%		98%	87%	100%
Physician Assistant National Certifying Exam. (PANCE)	94%	96.4%		100%	91%	100%
Praxis Series II: Subject Assessment/Specialty Area Tests		92.2%		92%		90%
Praxis Series II: Subject Assessment/Specialty Area Tests (Speech Path)		100.0%		100%		96%
Radiography Exam ARRT		95.8%	91%	92%	89%	89%
Registered Health Information Technician		68.2%	73%	50%	71%	60%
Registry Exam. For Advanced Respiratory Therapy Practitioners (RRT) - Clinical Simulation		65.1%		69%		88%
Registry Exam. For Advanced Respiratory Therapy Practitioners (RRT) - Written Registry		73.9%		73%		81%
South Carolina Board of Law Examination		93.0%		80%	N/A	83%
SRTA Regional Exam. for Dental Hygienists	95%	97.9%		67%		97%
State Board Dental Exam.-SRTA Exam. (previously known "SC Board of Dentistry")	74%	85.7%		96%	N/A	82%
Surgical Technologist National Certifying Exam	66%	69.0%		76%		8330%
US Medical Licensing Exam. - Step I		93.5%		95%		96%
US Medical Licensing Exam. - Step II		94.4%		95%		97%
Veterinary Technician National Exam	77%	73.1%		83%		67%

<sup>1</sup>Based on pass rates reported by public colleges.

**Overall Pass Rates on Professional Examinations by Year for SC's Public Institutions****Table 7.4 - Percentage of Students Who Pass Certification Examinations**

Source: Institutional Effectiveness Reports

	Percentage Passing Examinations taken from April 1 to March 31				Difference		
	2007-2008	2006-07	2005-06	2004-05	2006-07 to 2007-08	2005-06 to 2006-07	2004-05 to 2005-06
<b>Research Institutions</b>							
Clemson	95.0%	90.4%	86.2%	86.4%	4.6%	4.2%	-0.2%
USC Columbia	93.7%	89.0%	89.3%	96.3%	4.7%	-0.3%	-7.0%
MUSC	92.8%	92.7%	93.2%	92.8%	0.1%	-0.5%	0.4%
<b>Teaching Institutions</b>							
Citadel	92.0%	85.4%	85.8%	80.2%	6.6%	-0.4%	5.6%
Coastal Carolina	90.4%	88.1%	87.0%	86.0%	2.3%	1.1%	1.0%
College of Charleston	88.3%	92.9%	94.1%	94.2%	-4.6%	-1.2%	-0.1%
Francis Marion	93.4%	89.3%	89.4%	64.1%	4.1%	-0.1%	25.3%
Lander	87.0%	89.3%	84.3%	77.8%	-2.3%	5.0%	6.5%
SC State	83.3%	97.3%	88.6%	81.7%	-14.0%	8.7%	6.9%
USC Aiken	80.7%	85.9%	81.9%	92.1%	-5.2%	4.0%	-10.2%
USC Beaufort	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
USC Upstate	83.5%	89.1%	83.9%	85.4%	-5.6%	5.2%	-1.5%
Winthrop	93.0%	93.0%	93.8%	95.5%	0.0%	-0.8%	-1.7%
<b>Two-year Branch Campuses</b>							
USC Lancaster	73.7%	96.4%	100.0%	92.3%	-22.7%	-3.6%	7.7%
USC Salkehatchie	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
USC Sumter	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
USC Union	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Technical Colleges</b>							
Aiken	72.5%	N/A	N/A	88.2%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Central Carolina	95.5%	96.2%	88.4%	93.1%	-0.7%	7.8%	-4.7%
Denmark	71.4%	80.0%	100.0%	75.0%	-8.6%	-20.0%	25.0%
Florence-Darlington	92.8%	91.2%	88.3%	88.0%	1.6%	2.9%	0.3%
Greenville	83.4%	88.8%	87.5%	90.5%	-5.4%	1.3%	-3.0%
Horry-Georgetown	87.3%	80.8%	84.9%	89.4%	6.5%	-4.1%	-4.5%
Midlands	90.9%	95.1%	95.6%	98.2%	-4.2%	-0.5%	-2.6%
Northeastern	86.7%	100.0%	85.0%	85.7%	-13.3%	15.0%	-0.7%
Orangeburg-Calhoun	94.5%	94.0%	96.2%	89.9%	0.5%	-2.2%	6.3%
Piedmont	82.6%	93.5%	91.0%	81.4%	-10.9%	2.5%	9.6%
Spartanburg	87.6%	84.9%	87.1%	88.0%	2.7%	-2.2%	-0.9%
Tech Coll. of LowCountry	100.0%	92.0%	97.6%	90.2%	8.0%	-5.6%	7.4%
Tri-County	84.5%	85.0%	81.9%	73.1%	-0.5%	3.1%	8.8%
Trident	92.1%	92.0%	94.4%	89.1%	0.1%	-2.4%	5.3%
Williamsburg	91.7%	82.4%	100.0%	100.0%	9.3%	-17.6%	0.0%
York	90.3%	96.4%	93.8%	98.7%	-6.1%	2.6%	-4.9%

N/A – Institution reported no students taking an examination in this time frame.

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

Indicator 7D, Scores of Graduates on Post-Undergraduate Professional, Graduate, or Employment-Related Examinations and Certification Tests, measures the overall percentage of students at an institution taking certification examinations who pass the examinations. The data are taken from the individual tests as reported by each institution and displayed in Table 7.3. Because of the wide variety in the number of students, programs and examinations across institutions as evident in Table 7.3, the reader is cautioned against making direct comparisons of the overall percentage passing across institutions.


Some historical information has been updated to reflect verified data. This chart does not include results from the PRAXIS PLT exams or from the DANBE.

**Figure 7.3 – Results of Professional Examinations used for Performance Funding Indicator 7D**


The charts below indicate the Pass Rate used to determine Performance Funding scores earned by institutions on Indicator 7D for the 2004-05, 2005-2006, and 2006-07 performance years. Data for these performance years come from the preceding April – March period.

The range for an “Achieves” for these institutions for Year 12 (2005-06) performance funding was 75%-89%.

**Research Institutions**




**Four-Year Colleges and Universities**





\*This indicator did not apply to USC Beaufort during its transition to four-year status

**Two-Year Regional Campuses of USC**



USC – Lancaster was the only one of the regional campuses to have programs in which students took professional examinations.

**Technical College System**




**Number of Graduates Who Continued Their Education**

Beginning in Performance Year 7 (2002-2003), an indicator was developed to recognize the unique role played by the Regional Campus sector in preparing and transferring students to the state’s four-year campuses. This indicator is defined as:

Percentage of first-time, full-time degree-seeking students who earn a baccalaureate degree within 150% of normal program time (6 years for a baccalaureate degree) from in-state public institutions or from other institutions provided appropriate documentation can be presented by the reporting regional campus. (Performance Funding Workbook, September 2002, p II 167)

**Figure 7.4 – Performance Funding Indicator 7E: Number of Graduates Who Continued Their Education**

The range for an “Achieves” is from 25% to 40%.



\*USC Beaufort is included in this measure as part of its transition plan.

# Section 8

# User-Friendliness of the Institution



(blank page)



## **USER-FRIENDLINESS OF THE INSTITUTION**

The user-friendliness of institutions is evaluated through performance funding based and institutional effectiveness requirements mandated through Act 255 of 1992, as amended.

Table 8.1, “First-Time Undergraduate Transfers,” summarizes transfer data for first-time, full-time undergraduate students from and to different types of institutions in the state. This information is reported in fulfillment of institutional effectiveness reporting requirements.

Table 8.2, “Enrollment by Race,” displays minority enrollment for Fall 2002 and Fall 2007 and the percent change over these years. The number of African-American students increased 6.0% and other minority students increased 30.2% during the period displayed, while the total higher education population growth was 8.2%. It should be noted that all sectors other than Research showed increases in the number of African-American students. Clemson University showed a slight increase in African-American students, and USC-Columbia and MUSC showed decreases. Additional data on student enrollment and faculty are located in the CHE publication, “South Carolina Higher Education Statistical Abstract.”

**Performance Funding Indicator 8C – Accessibility to the Institutions of all Citizens of the State,** has been defined such that institutions are measured each year on the percentage of undergraduate students who are South Carolina citizens who are minority; the annual retention of undergraduate students who are South Carolina citizens who are degree-seeking; the percent of minority graduate students enrolled; and the percentage of minority faculty. Data for the past three years for these performance funding measures are found in Figures 8.1 through 8.4.

Details for the measurement of performance funding indicators are accessible on the web in the annual Performance Funding Workbook.

**Undergraduate Transfers**

The following table summarizes transfer data for first-time, full-time undergraduate students over the past three years and shows that students continue to transfer among all sectors (public and private) and all levels (two- and four-year) of institutions.

**Table 8.1 First-Time, Full-Time Undergraduate Transfers**  
Source: CHEMIS Data

TRANSFERRING FROM:	TRANSFERRING TO SOUTH CAROLINA'S:												
	Senior Public Institutions		2-Yr Regional Institutions		Technical Colleges		Senior Private Institutions		2-Yr Private Institutions		TOTAL (Transfers From)		
	FT*	PT**	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	All
RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS	202	27	13	2	289	277	44	15	0	0	548	321	869
COMPREHENSIVE TEACHING COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES	614	33	37	7	638	451	108	33	3	0	1,400	524	1,924
TWO YEAR REGIONAL CAMPUSES OF USC	358	50	5	2	98	54	33	7	0	0	494	113	607
TECHNICAL COLLEGES	1,674	374	63	42	743	641	442	183	8	4	2,930	1,244	4,174
Subtotal Two Year Colleges	2,032	424	68	44	841	695	475	190	8	4	3,424	1,357	4,781
INDEPENDENT SENIOR INSTITUTIONS	363	35	19	7	354	281	109	30	2	0	847	353	1,200
INDEPENDENT TWO YEAR COLLEGES	111	10	6	0	71	35	35	2	0	0	223	47	270
OUT-OF-STATE	1,414	219	44	28	1,021	1,429	506	47	6	0	2,991	1,723	4,714
FOREIGN	28	4	0	0	0	0	15	5	0	0	43	9	52
UNKNOWN	10	1	0	0	0	0	386	83	0	0	396	84	480
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,774</b>	<b>753</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>3,214</b>	<b>3,168</b>	<b>1,678</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9,872</b>	<b>4,418</b>	<b>14,290</b>

\*Full-time \*\*Part-time

## Enrollment by Race

Headcount enrollment of African-American, Other Minority (i.e., all nonwhite students) and Total All Students is displayed for enrollment in Fall 2002 and Fall 2007. The percentage change in enrollment is computed for the five-year period. Additional data on enrollment in SC public institutions may be found on-line in the CHE “Higher Education Statistical Abstract for SC” at: <http://www.che.sc.gov/>.

**Table 8.2 - Percentage Change in Minority Enrollment, Fall 2002 to Fall 2007**  
Source: CHEMIS Data

INSTITUTION	Headcount Enrollment Fall 2002			Headcount Enrollment Fall 2007			Percent Change, Fall 2002 to Fall 2007		
	Afr-Amer.	Other Minority <sup>1</sup>	Total Enrollment	Afr- Amer.	Other Minority <sup>1</sup>	Total Enrollment	% Change Afr-Amer.	% Change Other Minority	% Change Total Enrollment
<b>Research Universities</b>									
Clemson	1199	425	16876	1207	517	17585	0.7%	21.6%	4.2%
USC-Columbia	3887	1063	24140	3467	1348	27272	-10.8%	26.8%	13.0%
MUSC <sup>2</sup>	218	143	2260	202	185	2537	-7.3%	29.4%	12.3%
<b>Total, Research</b>	<b>5,304</b>	<b>1,631</b>	<b>43,276</b>	<b>4,876</b>	<b>2,050</b>	<b>47,394</b>	<b>-8.1%</b>	<b>25.7%</b>	<b>9.5%</b>
<b>Four-Year Colleges and Universities</b>									
Citadel	590	206	4058	333	195	3300	-43.6%	-5.3%	-18.7%
Coastal Carolina	572	155	5980	953	258	7872	66.6%	66.5%	31.6%
College of Charleston	1025	315	11716	790	436	11316	-22.9%	38.4%	-3.4%
Francis Marion	1098	67	3494	1585	91	3864	44.4%	35.8%	10.6%
Lander	542	43	2947	571	61	2408	5.4%	41.9%	-18.3%
SC State	4078	27	4568	4716	36	4933	15.6%	33.3%	8.0%
USC Aiken	785	101	3416	837	108	3267	6.6%	6.9%	-4.4%
USC Beaufort	268	90	1203	244	88	1461	-9.0%	-2.2%	21.4%
USC Upstate	1049	172	4362	1188	249	4916	13.3%	44.8%	12.7%
Winthrop	1571	162	6462	1603	233	6382	2.0%	43.8%	-1.2%
<b>Total Public, Four-Year Coll. &amp; Uni</b>	<b>11,578</b>	<b>1,338</b>	<b>48,206</b>	<b>12,820</b>	<b>1,755</b>	<b>49,719</b>	<b>10.7%</b>	<b>31.2%</b>	<b>3.1%</b>
<b>Two-Year Institutions/Branches of USC</b>									
USC-Lancaster	180	12	943	370	52	1502	105.6%	333.3%	59.3%
USC-Salkehatchie	299	13	747	373	19	909	24.7%	46.2%	21.7%
USC-Sumter	288	55	1149	319	61	1174	10.8%	10.9%	2.2%
USC-Union	67	5	347	99	5	398	47.8%	0.0%	14.7%
<b>Total Two-Year Inst. of USC</b>	<b>834</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>3,186</b>	<b>1,161</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>3,983</b>	<b>39.2%</b>	<b>61.2%</b>	<b>25.0%</b>
<b>State Tech. and Comprehensive Educ. System</b>									
Aiken	961	55	2455	830	110	2529	-13.6%	100.0%	3.0%
Central Carolina	1641	85	3265	1604	100	3283	-2.3%	17.6%	0.6%
Denmark	1326	3	1404	1493	12	1571	12.6%	300.0%	11.9%
Florence-Darlington	1870	53	4041	1735	77	3956	-7.2%	45.3%	-2.1%
Greenville	2536	550	12043	3541	825	14300	39.6%	50.0%	18.7%
Horry-Georgetown	1119	79	4562	1321	189	5800	18.1%	139.2%	27.1%
Midlands	3556	488	10347	3651	527	10706	2.7%	8.0%	3.5%
Northeastern	425	30	994	433	28	976	1.9%	-6.7%	-1.8%
Orangeburg-Calhoun	1329	35	2279	1426	33	2399	7.3%	-5.7%	5.3%
Piedmont	1887	66	4911	1852	71	4880	-1.9%	7.6%	-0.6%
Spartanburg	1127	168	3871	1142	198	4459	1.3%	17.9%	15.2%
TCL	817	84	1766	805	123	1893	-1.5%	46.4%	7.2%
Tri-County	572	80	4125	726	134	5223	26.9%	67.5%	26.6%
Trident	3362	504	11251	3223	570	12076	-4.1%	13.1%	7.3%
Williamsburg	379	2	517	436	4	601	15.0%	100.0%	16.2%
York	1109	154	4064	1168	203	4731	5.3%	31.8%	16.4%
<b>Total State Tech. System</b>	<b>24,016</b>	<b>2,436</b>	<b>71,895</b>	<b>25,386</b>	<b>3,204</b>	<b>79,383</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>31.5%</b>	<b>10.4%</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>41,732</b>	<b>5,490</b>	<b>166,563</b>	<b>44,243</b>	<b>7,146</b>	<b>180,479</b>	<b>6.0%</b>	<b>30.2%</b>	<b>8.4%</b>

<sup>1</sup> Includes American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, or Hispanic racial/ethnic designations.

Does not include "Unknown" or "Non-Resident Aliens."

<sup>2</sup> Excludes medical and dental residents and interns

**Accessibility to the Institution of All Citizens of the State**

Performance Funding Indicator **8C – Accessibility to the Institution of All Citizens of the State**, has four sub-parts.

**8C1** - The percent of undergraduate headcount students who are citizens of South Carolina who are minority according to federal reporting definitions and are enrolled at an institution. (Figure 8.1)

**8C2** - The Fall to Fall retention rate of minority, undergraduate students as defined in Part 1 of this measure, but limited to degree-seeking students. (Figure 8.2)

**8C3** - The percent of headcount graduate students enrolled at an institution who are minority according to federal reporting definitions. (Figure 8.3) This part does not apply to two-year regional campuses of USC and the technical colleges.

**8C4** - The percent of headcount teaching faculty who are minority. (Figure 8.4)

All institutions are measured on this indicator. Standards of achievement were developed based on Census population data. Additional information on these measures, including specific scoring ranges for individual institutions for Indicator 8C, can be found either in the Performance Funding Workbook or in past individual institutional Report Cards linked in Section 11.


**Figure 8.1 – 8C1, Percentage of Headcount Undergraduate Students who are Citizens of SC who are Minority**

Source: IPEDS


**Research and Teaching Institutions**

In defining the standard for “Achieves” for the research and teaching institutions, the state’s population is considered. The standard set for these institutions in Year 12 (2006-07) is being within 75% to 100% of the overall state percentage of minority citizens above the age of 18, 28.7%, as estimated from US Census data in 1998. The range for “Achieves” for these institutions for Year 12 (2007-08) is 21% to 28% minority population. Higher percentages score “Exceeds.”

**Research Institutions**




**Teaching Institutions**





**Two-Year Regional Campuses of USC**

The standard set for a score of “Achieves” for these institutions is defined by the percentage of minority citizens above the age of 18 in their service area, as estimated by the US Census Bureau in 1998. The range for “Achieves” for these institutions, based on being within 75% of the service area minority population percentage, is unique to each. As a result, institutional comparisons cannot be made based solely on this chart. Specific past institutional standards on this indicator can be found in the institution’s report card, linked in Chapter 11 of this document.



**Technical College System**


The standard set for a score of “Achieves” for these institutions is defined by the percentage of minority citizens above the age of 18 in their service area, as estimated by the US Census Bureau in 1998. The range for “Achieves” for these institutions, based on being within 75% of the service area minority population percentage, is unique to each. As a result, institutional comparisons cannot be made based solely on this chart. Specific past institutional standards on this indicator can be found in the institution’s report card, linked in Chapter 11 of this document.



**Figure 8.2 – 8C2, Retention of Minorities who are SC Citizens and Identified as Degree-Seeking Undergraduate Students Source: IPEDS**


**Research Institutions**

The standard for these institutions for this measure is based on +/- 5% of the median overall student retention for all of the state’s 4-yr institutions. A median retention rate of 83.0% is the reference and represents median retention of the 2005 cohort in Fall 2006 for South Carolina’s research and teaching universities. The range for a score of “Achieves” is 78.0 to 87.0%.




**Teaching Institutions**

The standard for these institutions for this measure is based on +/- 5% of the median overall student retention of the state’s teaching institutions. A median retention rate of 78.8% is the reference and represents median retention of the 2006 cohort in Fall 2007 for South Carolina’s teaching universities. The range for a score of “Achieves” is 74.0% to 82.0%.





**Two-Year Regional Campuses of USC**

The standard for these institutions for this measure is based on +/- 10% of the median overall student retention of the state’s regional campuses. A median retention rate of 52.7% is the reference and represents median retention of the 2006 cohort in Fall 2007 for USC’s regional campuses. The range for a score of “Achieves” is 47.0% to 57.0%.



**Technical Colleges**

The standard for these institutions for this measure is based on +/- 10% of the median overall student retention of the state’s technical campuses. A median retention rate of 55.4% is the reference and represents median retention of the 2006 cohort in Fall 2007 for technical colleges. The range for a score of “Achieves” is 49.0% to 60.0%.






**Figure 8.3 – 8C3, Percentage of Headcount Graduate Students Enrolled at the Institution who are Minority**

Source: IPEDS


**Research and Teaching Institutions**

The standard for this indicator is based on being at or within +/- 10% of US minority population with baccalaureate degrees. The reference used is 12% US minority population based on 1990 census data, “Educational attainment of persons 25 yrs and older.” The standard for a score of “Achieves” is 10% – 13 %. This part of Indicator 8C does not apply to the two-year regional campuses of USC or the technical colleges, which do not have equivalent programs.

**Research**



**Teaching**




**Figure 8.4 – 8C4 - Percentage of Headcount Teaching Faculty who are Minority**

Source: IPEDS


**Research Institutions, Teaching Institutions, and Regional Campuses**

“Teaching faculty” includes all those except graduate students who teach one or more credit courses in the Fall schedule. The standard for these three sectors is based on being at or within +/- 10% of US minority population with graduate degrees. The reference used is 11.9% US minority population with master’s and higher degrees based on 1990 census data, “Educational attainment of persons 25 yrs and older.” The standard for a score of “Achieves” for all three of these sectors is 10% to 13%.


**Research Institutions**





**Teaching Institutions**



**Regional Campuses of USC**



**Technical Colleges** – The standard for this indicator is based on being at or within +/- 10% of US minority population with baccalaureate degrees. The reference used is 12.0% US minority population based on 1990 census data, “Educational attainment of persons 25 yrs and older.” The standard for a score of “Achieves” for this sector is 10% to 13%.



*(Blank page)*

# Section 9

# Research Funding



(Blank page)

## RESEARCH FUNDING

Information on research data includes student involvement in research, grants and awards expended in support of teacher training, and public and private sector research grant expenditures. Tables 9.1 and 9.2 summarize the number and percent of upper-division, degree-seeking undergraduate and graduate students, respectively, funded through grants who participate in sponsored research. These data are reported as required by Act 255, as amended.

**Indicator 9A - Financial Support for Reform in Teacher Education**, measures expenditures by Clemson, USC Columbia, and the Teaching Sector institutions in the past year compared to the average of the previous three years for programs supporting teacher education. This measure has been deferred since Year 9 (2004-05). For previous performance data, see *A Closer Look at Public Higher Education in South Carolina – January 2005*.

**Indicator 9B – Amount of Public and Private Sector Grants**, measures the expenditures of dollars from public and private research grants of the three research institutions in the most recent ended fiscal year compared to the average of similar expenditures for the prior three fiscal years. **This indicator was deferred in Performance Year 7** and continues to be deferred due to changes in federal accounting practices which make data comparisons to previous years impossible.

## Student Involvement in Research

The following tables (9.1 and 9.2) summarize the number and percentage of degree-seeking upper-division undergraduate and graduate students who have received funding through grant monies and thus have participated in sponsored research activities. It should be noted that many students who participate in non-sponsored research, or in externally funded projects which are not classified as research, are not reflected in the data presented below.

**Table 9.1 Student Involvement in Research – Graduate Students**  
**Source: CHEMIS Data and Institutional IE Reports**

### Graduate Involvement in Research

Institution	Fall	Total Headcount Degree-seeking Graduate Students Enrolled	Number Receiving Stipends for Research	% Participating in Research	Change Over Prior Year in Enrollment	Change Over Prior Yr in # of Students w/ Stipends
<b>Research Universities</b>						
Clemson	2005	2,792	603	21.6%		
	2006	2,846	515	18.1%	54	-88
	2007	2,946	336	11.4%	100	-179
USC-Columbia	2005	5,581	637	11.4%	232	74
	2006	5,678	515	9.1%	97	-122
	2007	2,946	651	22.1%	-2,732	136
MUSC	2005	1,055	318	30.1%		
	2006	1,043	348	33.4%	-12	30
	2007	1,083	336	31.0%	40	-12
<b>Four-Year Colleges &amp; Universities</b>						
Citadel	2005	806	6	0.7%		
	2006	789	13	1.6%	-17	7
	2007	832	6	0.7%	43	-7
Coastal Carolina	2005	104	10	9.6%		
	2006	159	12	7.5%	55	2
	2007	181	6	3.3%	22	-6
Coll. of Chas.	2005	530	90	17.0%		
	2006	527	61	11.6%	-3	-29
	2007	481	45	9.4%	-46	-16
Francis Marion	2005	255	0	0.0%		
	2006	268	0	0.0%	13	0
	2007	221	0	0.0%	-47	0
Lander	2005	35	0	0.0%		
	2006	19	0	0.0%	-16	0
	2007	27	0	0.0%	8	0



**Graduate Involvement in Research**

Institution	Fall	Total Headcount Degree-seeking Graduate Students Enrolled	Number Receiving Stipends for Research	% Participating in Research	Change Over Prior Year in Enrollment	Change Over Prior Yr in # of Students w/ Stipends
SC State	2005	462	12	2.6%		
	2006	498	8	1.6%	36	-4
	2007	572	30	5.2%	74	22
USC-Aiken	2005	81	2	2.5%		
	2006	58	7	12.1%	-23	5
	2007	60	2	3.3%	2	-5
USC-Beaufort	2006	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2006	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2007	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
USC-Upstate	2005	10	0			
	2006	15	0	0.0%	5	0
	2007	21	0	0.0%	6	0
Winthrop	2005	667	13			
	2006	701	9	1.3%	34	-4
	2007	717	14	2.0%	16	5

**Upper-Division, Degree-Seeking Undergraduate Students**

Undergraduate students are also involved in research efforts at public institutions. Presented below are data reflecting the involvement of upper-division (junior and senior level) degree-seeking students in such research. Although the percentages are much lower, these students can make significant contributions to on-going research at these institutions.

**Table 9.2 Student Involvement in Research – Undergraduate Students**  
**Source: CHEMIS Data and Institutional IE Reports**

**Upper-division, Degree-seeking Undergraduate Involvement in Research**

Institution	Fall	Total Headcount Degree-seeking Upper-division Students Enrolled	Number Receiving Stipends for Research	% Participating in Research	Change Over Prior Year in Enrollment	Change Over Prior Yr in # of Students w/ Stipends	
Research Universities							
	Clemson	2005	7,151	99	1.4%		
		2006	7,260	90	1.2%	109	-9
2007		7,467	89	1.2%	207	-1	
USC-Columbia	2005	9,242	29	0.3%			
	2006	9,313	32	0.3%	71	3	
	2007	9,608	42	0.4%	295	10	

Section 9 – Research Funding

Upper-division, Degree-seeking Undergraduate Involvement in Research

Institution	Fall	Total Headcount Degree-seeking Upper-division Students Enrolled	Number Receiving Stipends for Research	% Participating in Research	Change Over Prior Year in Enrollment	Change Over Prior Yr in # of Students w/ Stipends
MUSC	2005	285	60	21.1%		
	2006	287	62	21.6%	2	2
	2007	269	42	15.6%	-18	-20
<b>Four-Year Colleges &amp; Universities</b>						
Citadel	2005	942	14	1.5%		
	2006	986	32	3.2%	44	18
	2007	989	29	2.9%	3	-3
Coastal Carolina	2005	2,650	29	1.1%		
	2006	2,829	7	0.2%	179	-22
	2007	2,933	15	0.5%	104	8
Coll. of Chas.	2005	4,702	87	1.9%		
	2006	4,755	109	2.3%	53	22
	2007	4,720	91	1.9%	-35	-18
Francis Marion	2005	1,421	2	0.1%		
	2006	1,402	3	0.2%	-19	1
	2007	1,414	7	0.5%	12	4
Lander	2005	1,275	3	0.2%		
	2006	1,400	4	0.3%	125	1
	2007	1,124	13	1.2%	-276	9
SC State	2005	1,460	40	2.7%		
	2006	1,568	13	0.8%	108	-27
	2007	1,719	136	7.9%	151	123
USC-Aiken	2005	1,430	26	1.8%		
	2006	1,378	17	1.2%	-52	-9
	2007	1,380	19	1.4%	2	2
USC-Beaufort	2006	328	1			
	2006	381	0	0.0%		
	2007	388	0	0.0%	7	0
USC-Upstate	2005	2,123	95	4.5%		
	2006	2,216	16	0.7%	93	-79
	2007	2,421	27	1.1%	205	11
Winthrop	2005	2,649	19	0.7%		
	2006	2,470	23	0.9%	-179	4
	2007	2,395	11	0.5%	-75	-12

### **Financial Support for Teacher Education**

**Performance Indicator 9A – Financial Support for Reform in Teacher Education** measures the amount of grants and awards expended to support teacher preparation or training, including applied research, professional development and training grants as compared to the average from the prior three years.

**This measure was deferred for Year 10 (2005-06) and Year 11 (2006-07).** For previous performance data, see *A Closer Look at Public Higher Education in South Carolina – January 2005*.

### **Amount of Public and Private Sector Grants**

*This indicator was deferred in Year 7 and subsequent years due to changes in federal accounting practices*

*(blank page)*

# Section 10

## Campus-Based Assessment



## CAMPUS-BASED ASSESSMENT

The institutions' summary reports reveal an active on-going process of assessment at institutions that was encouraged by legislative requirements, the Commission on Higher Education (CHE), the requirements for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools regional accreditation and also by some specialized accrediting bodies.

Section 59-104-660 (B) of the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, as amended, requires that as part of each public post-secondary institution's annual report to the CHE on institutional achievement, each institution must report on progress in developing assessment programs and on related information on student achievement. During 1997-98, the CHE streamlined reporting requirements in order to eliminate unnecessary duplication in reporting and to ensure reporting of data consistent with requirements of Act 359 of 1996.

Many of the components listed below are not reported annually, but based on a pre-determined and approved schedule submitted by each institution. However, the assessment of these components is an on-going process.

The summary reports for 2007-2008 were submitted electronically and are available through each institution's website at the addresses that follow this summary. The reports include the following components:

### **General Education**

The goals of general education, which is one of the most difficult components of curriculum to assess, may be defined narrowly in terms of basic skills or extremely broadly to include understanding and integrating knowledge spanning the full range of the humanities, sciences, and social sciences combined with attitudes and behaviors which enable the graduate to function effectively in today's complex society. In their assessment plans, institutions were asked to provide their definitions of general education, to indicate the methodologies for instruments they selected to assess the effectiveness of their general education, to list major findings or trends from their initial assessments, and to describe actions they have taken or plan to take to improve their general education programs as a result of the assessment process. While efforts to assess this component vary both in their complexity and their success, many institutions have already obtained findings that either reinforce what they are currently doing in their programs or enable them to make appropriate changes or improvements.

### **Majors or Concentrations**

Majors or concentrations provide students with specialized knowledge and skills. Because of the vast number of majors offered, institutions generally report on all of them over a four-year cycle. In their assessment plans for their majors, institutions are asked to list the majors on which they are reporting, to describe the various methods that are being used to assess each major and to highlight the findings and how they are being used for improvement. Examples of assessment methods being used by South Carolina's public institutions include both commercial and locally-developed tests; portfolios; internal and external peer reviews; capstone courses; results of licensing and certification examinations; exit interviews; focus groups; student, graduate and employer surveys; classroom research; and matrix analysis of curriculum content. Many reports describe significant changes that are being made in curriculum and teaching effectiveness as a result of the assessment of majors.

### **Academic Advising**

Academic Advising provides students with an understanding of their rights and responsibilities for completion of their degrees, programs and/or career preparation. Reports typically include information on student evaluations of services, special programs, changes, and student usage.

### **Achievement of Students Transferring from Two to Four Year Institutions**

Two-year public institutions report on this component every other year, when data on the academic performance of their former students are transferred from the four-year institutions back to the two-year institutions for examination and analysis. This report is included in the institutions' 2005 Institutional Effectiveness reports.

### **Procedures for Student Development**

Determining student growth and development throughout the college or university experience requires the application of multiple assessment procedures. All institutions were asked to assess their student services (e.g., financial aid, orientation, counseling, residence halls, and extracurricular activities) although some have chosen to cycle those assessments over several reporting years. Reports typically include descriptions of the services that have been evaluated, major findings, and any changes or improvements that have been made as a result of the assessments. In addition, most institutions are conducting pilot studies on the institutions' effect on their students' attitudes and behaviors, particularly as those attitudes affect academic and career success. While difficult to design, such studies respond to institutional mission statements that indicate intent to instill such values as civic responsibility, tolerance, cultural sensitivity, and ethical behavior.

### **Library Resources and Services**

Access to and use of appropriate library materials is a critical part of the learning process. In their summary reports, institutions indicate the results of assessments of their library services and collections. College and university librarians in South Carolina generally have done an outstanding job with these evaluations.

Please see the information below to obtain summary reports and the pre-approved reporting schedule for each institution.

## **2007 Summary Reports on Institutional Websites**

### **Research Universities**

Clemson University <http://www.clemson.edu/president/vision.html>  
Medical University of South Carolina [http://www.edserv.musc.edu/musc\\_ie\\_report\\_08/index.html](http://www.edserv.musc.edu/musc_ie_report_08/index.html)  
University of South Carolina-Columbia <http://kudzu.ipr.sc.edu/effectiveness/IEReports/>

### **Teaching Universities**

The Citadel [http://www.citadel.edu/academicaffairs/inst\\_eff08/2008\\_summary\\_report.pdf](http://www.citadel.edu/academicaffairs/inst_eff08/2008_summary_report.pdf)  
Coastal Carolina University <http://www.coastal.edu/effect/assessment/iereports.html>  
College of Charleston <http://www.cofc.edu/~oap/2008/index.html>  
Francis Marion University <http://www.fmarion.edu/about/IEReports>  
Lander University [http://www.lander.edu/assessment/IE\\_Report\\_Page](http://www.lander.edu/assessment/IE_Report_Page)

South Carolina State University	<a href="http://ir.scsu.edu/IE-MAIN.htm">http://ir.scsu.edu/IE-MAIN.htm</a>
University of South Carolina-Aiken	<a href="http://ie.usca.edu/assessment/IEReports/index.htm">http://ie.usca.edu/assessment/IEReports/index.htm</a>
University of South Carolina-Beaufort	<a href="http://www.uscb.edu/a/Working_at_USCB/Offices/Institutional_Effectiveness_and_Research_IER/Assessment/IER_Reports/index.php?page_id=399">http://www.uscb.edu/a/Working_at_USCB/Offices/Institutional_Effectiveness_and_Research_IER/Assessment/IER_Reports/index.php?page_id=399</a>
University of South Carolina-Upstate	<a href="http://www.uscupstate.edu/about_upstate/planning/assessment/default.aspx?id=10030">http://www.uscupstate.edu/about_upstate/planning/assessment/default.aspx?id=10030</a>
Winthrop University	<a href="http://www.winthrop.edu/assessment/IE/">http://www.winthrop.edu/assessment/IE/</a>

### USC-2 Year

University of South Carolina-Lancaster	<a href="http://kudzu.ipr.sc.edu/effectiveness/IEReports/">http://kudzu.ipr.sc.edu/effectiveness/IEReports/</a>
University of South Carolina-Salkehatchie	<a href="http://kudzu.ipr.sc.edu/effectiveness/IEReports/">http://kudzu.ipr.sc.edu/effectiveness/IEReports/</a>
University of South Carolina-Sumter	<a href="http://kudzu.ipr.sc.edu/effectiveness/IEReports/">http://kudzu.ipr.sc.edu/effectiveness/IEReports/</a>
University of South Carolina-Union	<a href="http://kudzu.ipr.sc.edu/effectiveness/IEReports/">http://kudzu.ipr.sc.edu/effectiveness/IEReports/</a>

### Technical College System

Aiken Technical College	<a href="http://www.atc.edu/p721.aspx">http://www.atc.edu/p721.aspx</a>
Central Carolina Technical College	<a href="http://www.cctech.edu/about/239.htm">http://www.cctech.edu/about/239.htm</a>
Denmark Technical College	<a href="http://www.denmarktech.edu">http://www.denmarktech.edu</a>
Florence-Darlington Technical College	<a href="http://www.fdtc.edu/AboutUs/history/IEreports/default.asp">http://www.fdtc.edu/AboutUs/history/IEreports/default.asp</a>
Greenville Technical College	<a href="http://www.gvltec.edu/about_greenvilletech/institution_effectiveness.html">http://www.gvltec.edu/about_greenvilletech/institution_effectiveness.html</a>
Horry-Georgetown Technical College	<a href="http://www.hgtc.edu/int_y.php?pageid=423">http://www.hgtc.edu/int_y.php?pageid=423</a>
Midlands Technical College	<a href="http://www.midlandstech.edu/arp/ACT62908.htm">http://www.midlandstech.edu/arp/ACT62908.htm</a>
Northeastern Technical College	<a href="http://www.netc.edu">http://www.netc.edu</a>
Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College	<a href="http://www.octech.edu/sacs/Shared/IE_Summary_Report_2008.pdf">http://www.octech.edu/sacs/Shared/IE_Summary_Report_2008.pdf</a>
Piedmont Technical College	<a href="http://www.atc.edu/p68.aspx">http://www.atc.edu/p68.aspx</a>
Spartanburg Community College	<a href="http://www.sccsc.edu/ie/ie_report_2008.pdf">http://www.sccsc.edu/ie/ie_report_2008.pdf</a>
Technical College of the Lowcountry	<a href="http://www.tcl.edu/About_Us/officialReports.asp">http://www.tcl.edu/About_Us/officialReports.asp</a>
Tri-County Technical College	<a href="http://www.tctc.edu/visitors_media/college_information/instdev/iesummary08.htm">http://www.tctc.edu/visitors_media/college_information/instdev/iesummary08.htm</a>
Trident Technical College	<a href="http://www.tridenttech.edu/p+rEffectiveness.htm">http://www.tridenttech.edu/p+rEffectiveness.htm</a>
Williamsburg Technical College	<a href="http://www.wiltech.edu/IE/IE%20homepage.htm">http://www.wiltech.edu/IE/IE%20homepage.htm</a>
York Technical College	<a href="http://www.yorktech.com/CHE/REPORTS/CHE2008IE.pdf">http://www.yorktech.com/CHE/REPORTS/CHE2008IE.pdf</a>



# Section 11 Institutional Performance Ratings

(Performance Year 12, 2007-2008)



(blank page)

## **INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE RATINGS**

Institutional performance ratings from Performance Year 3 (1998-99) through Performance Year 9 (2004-2005) are displayed on the CHE website for each of South Carolina's public institutions of higher education.

Performance data continue to be collected and monitored for Performance Years subsequent to Year 9. Links to institutional report card and current data are listed below.

Beginning with Year 6, institutions are rated on a reduced set of indicators (13 or 14) that were selected for each sector to represent those most closely tied to its mission. The reduced set of indicators better focuses the system and reduces redundancy among the indicators. In reducing the number of measures impacting institutional scores, several indicator definitions were revised.

**Note on Report Format:** The ratings are posted as Adobe Acrobat files, with four pages for each institution. The first page provides a summary of overall performance and details about the institution itself including president's name and contact information as well as "quick facts" including enrollment, type degrees offered, faculty and financial data. The pages that follow provide indicator-by-indicator performance details including current and three years of historical data for each indicator.

The reader is cautioned against drawing comparisons between institutions in light of individual or overall performance scores due to the nature of the performance funding system employed in South Carolina. It should be kept in mind that there are differences in indicator definitions as well as differences in the applicability of indicators across sectors and institutions that make comparisons difficult. Also, as the reader will note, there is a great deal of variability across all institutions and within sectors as a portion of the institutions' scores result from a measurement of annual institutional progress. Thus, under South Carolina's performance funding system, the institution is largely in competition with itself and not with other institutions. As reflected on the rating sheets for each institution, those performing within the same overall performance category may be considered as performing similarly for purposes of allocating fiscal year appropriations.

## **INSTITUTIONAL REPORT CARDS**

[http://www.che.sc.gov/Finance/Perf\\_Fund/Perform/CollgRate/CollegeRatings.htm](http://www.che.sc.gov/Finance/Perf_Fund/Perform/CollgRate/CollegeRatings.htm)

## **PERFORMANCE FUNDING DATA**

[http://www.che.sc.gov/New\\_Web/Rep&Pubs/Per\\_Fund/PFData.htm](http://www.che.sc.gov/New_Web/Rep&Pubs/Per_Fund/PFData.htm)