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Degrees
Awarded
FY 1999-00
12 Associates
2,973 Bachelor’s
85 Post Bachelor’s Cert.
2,010 Master’s
- Post Master’s Cert.
388 First Professional
58 Specialist
246 Doctoral

Enrollment
Headcount
23,728
includes full & part-time students

Faculty
1,436 incl. those holding academic rank & primary assignment of instruction, research or public service. (IPEDS)

Tuition
Academic Year
2000-01
$3,868 In-State, Full-Time Student
$10,154 Out-of-State, Full-Time Student
(includes required tuition and fees, IPEDS Inst. Characteristics Survey)

SAT
Average
1112 (1st-time entering freshmen. Includes converted ACT scores.)

Financial
Dollars In Millions
FY 1999-00
$441.9 Total Revenue, excluding auxiliary
$447.7 Total Educ & General Expenditures and Transfers, excluding auxiliary (IPEDS Finance Survey)

Performance Score Summary
Each indicator or indicator subpart is scored using a 3-point scale. In some cases, institutions may qualify for an additional 0.5 for achieving a certain level of improvement over past performance. Details by indicator follow on pages 2-5. Additional information on the scoring process can be accessed on-line at www.che400.state.sc.us/web/publications.htm - select the "Performance Funding Workbook." (See pages 4-5.)

Total Applicable Indicators (including 2 now assessed in other indicators.) 36 Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intercalation</th>
<th>Exceeded Standards (or received scores of 3) on 10 Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achieved Standards (or received scores of 2.00-2.99) on 10 Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did Not Achieve Standards (or received scores of 1.00-1.99) on 0 Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achieved Compliance (or received scores of &quot;Complied&quot;) on 5 Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluated in Years Other Than Performance Year 2000-01 (includes 2 Deferred) 9 Indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpreting Overall Score
Comparing the average score on applicable indicators to the maximum 3.00 possible produces the percentage score shown in the upper right hand corner. Institutions within the same sector whose percentage is in the same range as shown below are considered to be performing at similar levels.

Scale for Overall Scoring Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>95% to 100%</th>
<th>87% to 94%</th>
<th>80% to 86%</th>
<th>67% to 80%</th>
<th>48% to 66%</th>
<th>33% to 47%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substantially Exceeds</td>
<td>2.85 to 3.00</td>
<td>2.60 to 2.84</td>
<td>2.00 to 2.59</td>
<td>1.45 to 1.99</td>
<td>1.00 to 1.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Performance Funding" in SC began with the ratification of Act 359 of 1996, effective July 1, 1996, which required that the SC Commission on Higher Education (CHE) measure annually each public institution's performance in various areas and base allocation of state appropriated dollars on performance. Each year, the CHE in cooperation with institutions and other stakeholders has worked to refine the system implemented in 1996 in an effort to ensure and improve the quality of SC's public colleges and universities so they will be globally competitive. Data and scores for indicators used for purposes of allocating FY 2001-02 dollars follow. Yearly revisions and differences across and within sectors make comparisons across performance years and institutions difficult. For a better understanding, please see our website at www.che400.state.sc.us where a detailed guide to the system and measurement (see Performance Funding Workbook, Sept 2000) and data details may be accessed.

DATA and SCORING KEY: Below are performance details for each performance indicator as measured in Performance Year 2000-01, including: the measurement timeframe for this year's performance, historical and current performance data, the standard used in judging current year performance, and subpart and overall indicator scores. In July 2000, the CHE set standards for indicators for similar institutions based on national, regional or state data; data from peer institutions or past institutional performance. For the majority of indicators, performance is judged using a 3-point scale and comparing it to the standard, which is expressed as a range. A score of "2" is awarded if an institution is at or within the range. Performance exceeding the range in a desired direction merits a "3" while performance falling short of the range receives a "1." Additionally, 0.5 points may be added to scores of 1 or 2 for some indicators if performance reaches or exceeds a certain level of improvement over past performance. Performance on other indicators is judged by determining compliance with policies or practices. Compliance is expected and a score of 1 is given for non-analysis of an institutional appeal requesting special consideration. To determine overall performance (summarized on page 1 and at the end of this report); scores displayed for each indicator in the far right column are averaged; the average places the institution in 1 of 5 performance categories; and funding is allocated based on the category, not the individual score or average.

### Report for: University of SC Columbia

#### Research Institutions Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Presented by Critical Success Factor</th>
<th>Measure Timeframe</th>
<th>Institution's Performance</th>
<th>2000-01 Standard</th>
<th>Score &lt;2; Earn 0.5 for Improvement if</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>2000-01 Performance Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Subpart (reference #/letter and descriptive title)</td>
<td>Current PF YR</td>
<td>3 Yrs Prior</td>
<td>2 Yrs Prior</td>
<td>1 Yr Prior</td>
<td>Current PF YR</td>
<td>&quot;1&quot; if # shown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission. (Instruction+Research+ Academic Support+ Scholarship/Fellowships to E&amp;G Expend.)</td>
<td>FY 1999-00</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>72.0% to 75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B Curricula offered to achieve mission</td>
<td>as of Feb 2001</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>95% to 99%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institution achieved compliance on indicators 1C, Approval of a mission statement, and 1D, Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement. Indicator 1E, Attainment of the strategic plan goals, was deferred while goals and targets were established in the 2000-01 performance year as part of Indicator 1D.

#### 2. QUALITY OF FACULTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2A Academic and other credentials of professors and instructors</th>
<th>2.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 % headcount faculty teaching undergraduates meeting SACs requirements</td>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a % headcount faculty with terminal degrees teaching undergraduate classes</td>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b % full-time faculty with terminal degrees teaching undergraduate classes</td>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2D Compensation of Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2D Compensation of Faculty</th>
<th>2.88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a Instructor Average</td>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b Assistant Professor Average</td>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c Associate Professor Average</td>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d Professor Average</td>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2E Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom: (Assessed every two years)  
1. % classroom faculty rated satisfied on availability.  
   - Fall 2000: 93%  
   - Spring 2000: 96%  
   - Improvement factor not applicable for this indicator  
2. % of students satisfied with availability of advisors.  
   - Fall 2000: 93%  
   - Spring 2000: 96%  
   - 5% of prior 3-yr avg

3. CLASSROOM QUALITY

3A Class sizes and student/teacher ratios:

| Measure       | Timeframe | Institution's Performance | 2000-01 Standard | Score | N or T | 2000-01 Performance
|---------------|-----------|---------------------------|------------------|-------|--------|-----------------------
| 1a average lower division class size | Fall 2000 | 32.4 | 31.9 | 30.6 | 30.0 | 25.0 to 40.0 | Improvement factor not applicable for this indicator |
| 1b average upper division class size | Fall 2000 | 27.9 | 29.6 | 29.1 | 28.3 | 20.0 to 35.0 |
| 2a large classes: % undergrad lecture sections >=50 | Fall 2000 | 13% | 12% | 0% to 20% |
| 2b large classes: % lower division lecture sections >=100 | Fall 2000 | 3% | 2% | 0% to 5% |
| 3 FTE students per FTE teaching faculty | Fall 2000 | 15.1 | 14.3 | 13.7 | 13.6 | 10.0 to 20.0 |

3C Ratio of full-time faculty as compared to other full-time employees  
- Fall 2000: 33.1%  
- Expected Subpart Ranges: 3% of prior 3-yr avg

3D Accreditation of degree-granting programs  
- as of review Spring 2001 | 96% | 95% | 100% | 100% | 90% to 99% | N/A (2) | 3.00

3E Institutional emphasis on quality teacher education and reform  
- NCATE accreditation as of Spring 2001 | YES | YES | YES | N/A, compliance required or a score of 1 is awarded. | N/A | Complied  
- 2a % students passing NTE or PRAXIS II - Professional Knowledge | 4/1/99 - 3/31/00 | 96.0% | 98.8% | 99.0% | 94.7% | 90.0% to 94.0% | 3% of prior 3-yr avg
- 2b % students passing NTE or PRAXIS II - Specialty Area Exams | 87.5% | 85.9% | 92.2% | 95.3% | 80.0% to 89.0% | 3% of prior 3-yr avg
- 3a % teacher education graduates in critical shortage areas | FY 1999-00 | 24% | 32% | 47% | 45% | 20% to 34% | 5% of prior 3-yr avg
- 3b % teacher education graduates who are minority | FY 1999-00 | 17% | 12% | 10% to 20% |

Indicator 3B, Number of credit hours taught by faculty, was deferred from assessment in the 2001-02 performance year due to data issues.

4. INSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION & COLLABORATION  
Indicators 4A, Sharing use of technology programs equipment supplies and source matter experts within the institution, with other institutions, and with the business community, and 4B, Cooperation and collaboration with private industry, are assessed every 2 years and were not scheduled for assessment during the 2000-01 performance year.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE EFFICIENCY

5A Percentage of administrative costs to academic costs  
- FY 1999-00 | 10.0% | 9.4% | 9.3% | 7.6% | 7.0% to 9.0% | 3% of prior 3-yr avg |

5D Amount of general overhead costs  
- FY 1999-00 | $1,259 | $1,265 | $1,358 | $1,227 | $1,168 to $1,848 | 3% of prior 3-yr avg

Institution achieved compliance on Indicator 5B, Use of best management practices. Indicator 5C, Elimination of unjustified duplication of and waste in administrative and academic programs, is assessed every 3 years and was not scheduled for assessment during the 2000-01 performance year.
### Measures Presented by Critical Success Factor

#### Indicator (reference #/letter at far left and title)
- **Indicator Subpart (reference #/letter and descriptive title if applicable)**

#### Measure Timeframe
- **Institution's Performance**
- **2000-01 Standard**
- **5% if Prior 3-yr avg Subpart Indicator**
- **Score**

#### Performance Year 2000-01 impacting FY 2001-02 Allocation
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### Report for: University of SC Columbia

#### Research Institutions Sector

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Institution's Performance</th>
<th>2000-01 Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Current PF YR</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 Yrs Prior</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 Yrs Prior</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>&quot;3&quot; if &gt;= shown</strong></td>
<td><strong>Factor Applied</strong></td>
<td><strong>&gt;= to # shown</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>5% if Prior 3-yr avg Subpart Indicator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>5% if Prior 3-yr avg Subpart Indicator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 6. ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS

#### 6A SAT and ACT scores of student body
- **Fall 2000**
  - 68.2%
  - 71.4%
  - 74.7%
  - 78.9%
  - 60.0% to 74.0%
  - 5% of prior 3-yr avg
  - 75.0%
  - 3.00

#### 6B High school class standing, GPA and activities of student body
- **Fall 2000**
  - 78.5%
  - 84.5%
  - 85.8%
  - 83.0%
  - 75.0% to 89.0%
  - 5% of prior 3-yr avg
  - 87.0%
  - 2.00

#### 6D Priority on enrolling in-state students
- **Fall 2000**
  - 82.8%
  - 81.7%
  - 79.9%
  - 65.0% to 79.0%
  - 5% of prior 3-yr avg
  - 86.4%
  - 3.00

---

### 7. GRADUATES’ ACHIEVEMENTS

#### 7A Graduation rate (1st-time, full-time, degree-seeking students graduating within 150% of normal program time)
- **1994 cohort**
  - 56.2%
  - 55.7%
  - 60.2%
  - 55.0%
  - 53.0% to 61.0%
  - 3% of prior 3-yr avg
  - 59.1%
  - 2.00

#### 7D Scores of graduates on post-undergrad professional, graduate or employment-related examinations and certification tests
- **4/1/99 - 3/31/00**
  - 91.7%
  - 91.6%
  - 92.6%
  - 90.9%
  - 80.0% to 89.0%
  - 3% of prior 3-yr avg
  - 94.8%
  - 4
  - 3.00

#### 7F Credit hours earned of graduates
- **of earned degrees AY 1999-00**
  - 111%
  - 109%
  - 107%
  - 104%
  - 106% to 110%
  - 3% of prior 3-yr avg
  - 106%
  - 3
  - 3.00

---

### 8. USER-FRIENDLINESS OF THE INSTITUTION

#### 8A Transferability of credits to and from the institution
- **as of Feb 2001 report**
  - 100%
  - 100%
  - 100%
  - 100%
  - 83% to 99%
  - N/A
  - 3.00

---

### 9. RESEARCH FUNDING

#### 9A Financial support for reform in teacher education
- **FY 00 / FYs 97,98,99 Avg**
  - 32.0%
  - 235.3%
  - 297.9%
  - 158.7%
  - 80.0% to 119.0%
  - N/A
  - 3.00

#### 9B Amount of public and private sector grants
- **FY 00 / FYs 97,98,99 Avg**
  - 103.5%
  - 118.0%
  - 126.7%
  - 127.4%
  - 110.0% to 114.0%
  - N/A
  - 3.00
**Performance Year 2000-01 impacting FY 2001-02 Allocation**

**Report for: University of SC Columbia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Measure Timeframe</th>
<th>Institution’s Performance</th>
<th>2000-01 Standard Factor Applied</th>
<th>Score &lt; 3 Earn 0.5 for Improvement if</th>
<th>2001-01 Performance Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Subpart (reference #/letter and descriptive title) if applicable</th>
<th>1 Yr Prior</th>
<th>2 Yrs Prior</th>
<th>3 Yrs Prior</th>
<th>Current PF YR</th>
<th>“1” if &lt; # shown</th>
<th>“2” if at/within range shown</th>
<th>“3” if &gt;= # shown</th>
<th>Factor Applied</th>
<th>&gt; or = to # shown</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Subpart Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PERFORMANCE YEAR 2000-01 SCORING SUMMARY (OVERALL SCORE TO IMPACT FY 2001-02 ALLOCATION)**

- Based on scores in the above column at far right labeled “2000-01 Performance Scores”:
  - 36 Total Applicable Indicators (including two that are assessed within other indicators).
  - Exceeded standards (scores of 3) on 10 indicators.
  - Achieved Standards (scores of 2.00 to 2.99) on 10 indicators.
  - Did Not Achieve Standards (scores of 1.00 to 1.99) on 0 indicators.
  - Achieved Compliance on 5 indicators, 7 indicators assessed On Cycle, 2 indicators were deferred.

**NOTES:**

1. Includes restricted and unrestricted funds for research institutions and unrestricted funds only for all others. Excludes funds transfers for all.
2. Percentage reflects programs accredited and on track for accreditation by April 2002.
3. A downward trend is expected. If performance is lower than the low end of the range (# on right for this indicator) a 3 is awarded.
4. For institutions with teacher education programs, scores for the middle school pedagogy examination (PLT 5-9) are excluded. Curricula are being developed/adopted to support this new certification.