



**SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION**

1333 MAIN STREET

SUITE 200

COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201

RAYBURN BARTON  
Executive Director

TELEPHONE  
803/737-2260

FAX NUMBER  
803/737-2297

July 9, 1998

**MEMORANDUM**

To: R. Austin Gilbert, Jr., and Members, Commission on Higher Education

From: Rayburn Barton *RB*

**Extension of Midlands Technical College Associate Degree Program**

Midlands Technical College has entered into discussions with Policy Management Systems Corporation (PMSC) and other private companies in the Columbia area regarding the extension of their existing majors leading to the Associate Degree in Computer Technology to sites throughout the MTC service area (Richland, Lexington, and Fairfield Counties). Under our current policy, Midlands Tech would need to secure Commission approval to extend these majors to new off-campus locations within its service area. However, our new proposed approval policy for such programs, currently in draft form, would allow any technical college to extend an existing program to any site within its Commission-approved service area without additional CHE approval. The proposed new policy reads as follows:

*Programs approved for delivery by the technical colleges and the two-year branches of the University of South Carolina are approved for delivery at any site within the Commission-approved service area or region of the institution awarding the degree.*

Given the fact that the extension of the MTC majors leading to the Associate Degree in Computer Technology plays an integral role in the continued economic competitiveness of the Columbia area and indeed the state as whole, I would like to suggest that the Commission waive the existing approval policy and apply our proposed new approval policy in this one case. Under this policy, Midlands Technical College could offer its Computer Technology and Telecommunications Systems Management majors leading to the Associate Degree in Computer Technology anywhere within the MTC service area without additional CHE review and approval.

**Recommendation**

The staff recommends that the Commission waive its existing academic program approval policy in favor of the proposed approval policy presented above in the case of the Computer Technology and Telecommunications Systems Management majors leading to the Associate Degree in Computer Technology at Midlands Technical College. By this action, the Commission approves Midlands Technical College to offer the Computer Technology and Telecommunications Systems Management majors leading to the Associate Degree in Computer Technology at any site within its Commission-approved service area.

# TECHNICAL COLLEGES

---

## Aiken Technical College

Proposed

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Secondary performance of A and B institutions after a preparatory year										
Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
<b>1. Mission Focus</b>										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	51.8%	51.1%	51.1%		4		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>2. Quality of faculty</b>										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	99%	100%	N/A	91%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$33,287	\$42,383	\$34,670	\$35,754	\$35,619		4		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>3. Instructional Quality</b>										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A. 1.	Average class size - Lower Division	18.6	16-18	18.3	18.3	19.3	3	4.0		
	Average class size - Upper Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
A. 2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.8	17-18	16.5	17.1	17.1	5			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	247 *	None	244	240	248		5		
C.	Ratio of full faculty as compared to other full employees (expressed as a % of total)	40.6% *	40.1%	38.6%	40.1%	41.9%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting programs	61.9% *	100%	33%	25%	25%		4		
<b>5. Administrative Efficiency</b>										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	16.3%	14.4%	17.2%	18.0%	17.7%	5	4.5		
	Academic Costs	64.9%	65.0%	63.9%	63.9%	64.2%	4			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$863	\$869	\$890	\$1,000	\$990		4		
<b>6. Entrance Requirements</b>										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	N/A	None	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	N/A	N/A	88.5%	Not Applicable	N/A		N/A		
<b>7. Graduates' Achievements</b>										
A.	Graduation Rate	18.5%	None	17.5%	14.0%	14.4%		5		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D. 1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	93.7%	95.0%	100.0%	95.0%	100.0%		5		
D. 2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	112.1% *	110%	113.6%	111.6%	111.6%		4		
<b>8. User-Friendliness of Institution</b>										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an institution	95.0%	100.0%	N/A	90.0%	90.0%		4		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C. 1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	26.2%	None	30.2%	31.0%	33.6%	6	6.0		
C. 1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	94.1%	94.2%	105.7%	6			
	Retention of Other Race students	52.3%	None	47.5%	49.0%	53.7%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	55.0%	None	50.5%	52.0%	50.8%				
<b>9. Research Funding</b>										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	79	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								85		85
Performance Percentage							**	92%	**	0%
* Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average										
** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers										

**Higher Education Performance Indicators Report Card - 1998-99**  
**Central Carolina Technical College**

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
 2 - Needs Improvement  
 3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
 5 - Exceeds Goal  
 (Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

**Proposed**

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
1. Mission Focus										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	52.8%	53.8%	57.9%		5		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
2. Quality of faculty										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	99%	100%	N/A	100%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$33,287	\$42,333	\$30,099	\$31,058	\$32,178		5		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
3. Instructional Quality										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	18.6	16-18	13.3	16.0	17.2	5	5.0		
	Average class size - Upper Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.8	17-18	15.8	17.0	17.3	5			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	247 *	None	170	175	175		4		
C.	Ratio of FTE faculty as compared to other FTE employees (expressed as a % of total)	40.6% *	40.1%	46.5%	42.9%	42.9%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting programs	61.9% *	100%	40%	50%	40%		3		
5. Administrative Efficiency										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	16.3%	14.4%	15.0%	14.8%	11.3%	5	6.0		
	Academic Costs	64.9%	65.0%	67.0%	67.9%	72.1%	5			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$863	\$869	\$772	\$755	\$602		6		
6. Entrance Requirements										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	N/A	None	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	N/A	N/A	99.8%	Not Applicable	N/A		N/A		
7. Graduates' Achievements										
A.	Graduation Rate	18.5%	None	17.5%	14.9%	16.5%		5		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad., prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	93.7%	95.0%	100.0%	95.0%	98.4%		5		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	112.1% *	110%	112.0%	110.0%	110.0%		5		
8. User-Friendliness of Institution										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	95.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	26.2%	None	37.6%	38.7%	38.6%	4	3.0		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	93.8%	95.7%	92.0%	2			
	Retention of Other Race students	52.3%	None	51.0%	50.0%	49.4%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	55.0%	None	54.4%	52.3%	53.7%				
9. Research Funding										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	81	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								85		85
Performance Percentage							**	95%	**	0%
* Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average										
** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers										

**Higher Education Performance Indicators Report Card - 1998-99**  
**Chesterfield-Marlboro Technical College**

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
 2 - Needs Improvement  
 3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
 5 - Exceeds Goal  
 (Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

**Proposed**

Indicator Number & Description	Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Commission Recommendation	Commission Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
<b>1. Mission Focus</b>									
A. Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	38.6%	39.5%	39.5%		4		
C. Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D. Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>2. Quality of faculty</b>									
B. Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	99%	100%	N/A	100%	100%		5		
D. Compensation of faculty	\$33,287	\$42,333	\$28,943	\$30,100	\$30,687		5		
E. Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>3. Instructional Quality</b>									
A. Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1. Average class size - Lower Division	18.6	16-18	15.4	15.4	15.4	4	4.0		
Average class size - Upper Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
A.2. FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.8	17-18	15.0	15.1	15.0	4			
B. Number of credit hours taught by faculty	247 *	None	252	269	269		4		
C. Ratio of full-time faculty as compared to other full-time employees (expressed as a % of total)	40.6% *	40.1%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%		4		
D. Accreditation of degree granting programs	61.9% *	100%	0%	0%	0%		4		
<b>5. Administrative Efficiency</b>									
A. Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
Administrative Costs	16.3%	14.4%	23.2%	23.1%	23.1%	4	4.0		
Academic Costs	64.9%	65.0%	54.4%	56.3%	56.3%	4			
D. Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$863	\$869	\$1,227	\$1,226	\$1,235		4		
<b>6. Entrance Requirements</b>									
A. SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B. High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	N/A	None	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D. Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	N/A	N/A	99.1%	Not Applicable	N/A		N/A		
<b>7. Graduates' Achievements</b>									
A. Graduation Rate	18.5%	None	20.0%	20.0%	22.1%		5		
D. Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1. % of total students passing cert. exams first time	93.7%	95.0%	92.8%	91.7%	92.9%		5		
D.2. % of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F. Credit hours earned of graduates	112.1% *	110%	120.1%	114.3%	109.3%		5		
<b>8. User-Friendliness of Institution</b>									
A. Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	95.0%	100.0%	N/A	90.0%	90.0%		4		
C. Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a. Percentage of Other Race students	26.2%	None	36.4%	43.6%	39.4%	3	4.0		
C.1b. Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	88.2%	88.6%	111.6%	5			
Retention of Other Race students	52.3%	None	50.2%	52.5%	59.8%				
Retention of Non-Other Race students	55.0%	None	56.9%	59.2%	53.6%				
<b>9. Research Funding</b>									
A. Financial support for reform in teacher education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B. Amount of public and private sector grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
<b>Total Rating</b>						**	76	**	0
<b>Maximum Potential Rating</b>							85		85
<b>Performance Percentage</b>						**	89%	**	0%
<p>* Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average</p> <p>** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers</p>									

## Denmark Technical College

Proposed

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Senior Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
<b>1. Mission Focus</b>										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	38.6%	53.0%	53.3%		4		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>2. Quality of faculty</b>										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	99%	100%	N/A	91%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$33,287	\$42,333	\$29,126	\$28,342	\$28,209		4		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>3. Instructional Quality</b>										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A. 1.	Average class size - Lower Division	18.6	16-18	19.0	18.5	24.4	2	3.5		
	Average class size - Upper Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
A. 2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.8	17-18	20.5	17.0	17.7	5			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	247 *	None	267	315	305		4		
C.	Ratio of f-t faculty as compared to other f-t employees (expressed as a % of total)	40.6% *	40.1%	37.0%	38.0%	38.6%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting programs	61.9% *	100%	0%	50%	50%		4		
<b>5. Administrative Efficiency</b>										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	16.3%	14.4%	32.3%	23.0%	22.3%	5	4.5		
	Academic Costs	64.8%	65.0%	38.6%	53.0%	53.3%	4			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$863	\$869	\$1,883	\$1,175	\$1,135		5		
<b>6. Entrance Requirements</b>										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	N/A	None	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	N/A	N/A	96.2%	Not Applicable	N/A		N/A		
<b>7. Graduates' Achievements</b>										
A.	Graduation Rate	18.5%	None	36.2%	31.0%	28.3%		3		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D. 1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	93.7%	95.0%	90.0%	100.0%	90.3%		3		
D. 2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	112.1% *	110%	107.0%	106.0%	106.0%		5		
<b>8. User-Friendliness of Institution</b>										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	95.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C. 1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	26.2%	None	6.2%	5.0%	5.0%	4	4.5		
C. 1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	120.1%	107.4%	115.1%	5			
	Retention of Other Race students	52.3%	None	65.6%	73.0%	53.3%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	55.0%	None	54.6%	68.0%	46.3%				
<b>9. Research Funding</b>										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	75	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								85		85
Performance Percentage							**	88%	**	0%
<p>• Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average</p> <p>•• Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers</p>										

**Higher Education Performance Indicators Report Card - 1998-99**  
**Florence Darlington Technical College**

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
 2 - Needs Improvement  
 3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
 5 - Exceeds Goal  
 (Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 5 may be awarded for exemplary performance or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

**Proposed**

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
1. Mission Focus										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	15.1%	14.2%	14.8%		5		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
2. Quality of faculty										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	99%	100%	N/A	90%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$33,287	\$42,333	\$31,911	\$32,708	\$33,211		5		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
3. Instructional Quality										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	18.6	16-18	18.8	18.0	19.4	2	3.0		
	Average class size - Upper Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.8	17-18	16.2	15.2	15.1	4			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	247 *	None	227	229	229		4		
C.	Ratio of f-t faculty as compared to other f-t employees (expressed as a % of total)	40.6% *	40.1%	47.1%	48.0%	49.2%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting programs	61.9% *	100%	100%	100%	100%		5		
5. Administrative Efficiency										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	16.3%	14.4%	17.3%	18.0%	17.9%	4	4.0		
	Academic Costs	64.9%	65.0%	63.1%	60.5%	61.0%	4			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$863	\$869	\$943	\$1,000	\$1,089		3		
6. Entrance Requirements										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	N/A	None	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	N/A	N/A	99.2%	Not Applicable	N/A		N/A		
7. Graduates' Achievements										
A.	Graduation Rate	18.5%	None	21.4%	20.0%	21.2%		5		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	93.7%	95.0%	89.1%	90.0%	91.9%		5		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	112.1% *	110%	120.3%	119.0%	119.0%		4		
8. User-Friendliness of Institution										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	95.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	26.2%	None	33.4%	33.9%	34.8%	5	5.0		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	91.2%	90.2%	94.9%	5			
	Retention of Other Race students	52.3%	None	54.8%	55.0%	60.0%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	55.0%	None	60.1%	61.0%	63.2%				
9. Research Funding										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	78	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								85		85
Performance Percentage							**	92%	**	0%
• Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average										
** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers										

## Greenville Technical College

Proposed

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 5 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Indicator Number & Description	Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
<b>1. Mission Focus</b>									
A. Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	54.5%	54.0%	54.1%		4		
C. Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D. Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>2. Quality of faculty</b>									
B. Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	99%	100%	N/A	100%	100%		5		
D. Compensation of faculty	\$33,287	\$42,333	\$30,971	\$32,500	\$33,036		5		
E. Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>3. Instructional Quality</b>									
A. Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1. Average class size - Lower Division	18.6	16-18	N/A	21.4	21.3	4	4.5		
Average class size - Upper Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
A.2. FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.8	17-18	17.4	17.0	17.2	5			
B. Number of credit hours taught by faculty	247 *	None	251	238	238		4		
C. Ratio of (4 faculty as compared to other (4 employees (expressed as a % of total)	40.6% *	40.1%	43.2%	41.0%	41.5%		5		
D. Accreditation of degree granting program	61.9% *	100%	94%	94%	94%		4		
<b>5. Administrative Efficiency</b>									
A. Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
Administrative Costs	16.3%	14.4%	13.3%	13.3%	13.2%	5	5.0		
Academic Costs	64.9%	65.0%	68.2%	68.2%	68.4%	5			
D. Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$863	\$869	\$764	\$825	\$769		5		
<b>6. Entrance Requirements</b>									
A. SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B. High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	N/A	None	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D. Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	N/A	N/A	97.7%	Not Applicable	N/A		N/A		
<b>7. Graduates' Achievements</b>									
A. Graduation Rate	18.5%	None	13.8%	16.0%	13.2%		2		
D. Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1. % of total students passing cert. exams first time	93.7%	95.0%	90.6%	87.0%	87.5%		4		
D.2. % of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F. Credit hours earned of graduates	112.1% *	110%	117.5%	120.0%	119.7%		4		
<b>8. User-Friendliness of Institution</b>									
A. Transferability of Credits to and from an institution	95.0%	100.0%	N/A	90.0%	90.0%		4		
C. Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a. Percentage of Other Race students	26.2%	None	16.2%	16.2%	16.4%	4	4.5		
C.1b. Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	102.1%	96.0%	98.5%	5			
Retention of Other Race students	52.3%	None	56.3%	52.1%	53.2%				
Retention of Non-Other Race students	55.0%	None	55.1%	54.3%	54.0%				
<b>9. Research Funding</b>									
A. Financial support for reform in teacher education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B. Amount of public and private sector grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	75	**
Maximum Potential Rating								85	85
Performance Percentage							**	88%	0%
<p>* Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average</p> <p>** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers</p>									

## Horry-Georgetown Technical College

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 0 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Proposed

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
1. Mission Focus										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	8.9%	9.9%	9.6%		5		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
2. Quality of faculty										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	99%	100%	N/A	100%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$33,287	\$42,333	\$33,452	\$34,239	\$34,604		5		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
3. Instructional Quality										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	18.6	16-18	17.5	16.9	17.9	5	5.0		
	Average class size - Upper Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.8	17-18	17.2	17.6	17.6	5			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	247 *	None	256	247	249		4		
C.	Ratio of FTE faculty as compared to other FTE employees (expressed as a % of total)	40.6% *	40.1%	49.6%	45.0%	46.4%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting programs	61.9% *	100%	60%	66%	66%		4		
5. Administrative Efficiency										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	16.3%	14.4%	20.1%	19.0%	17.6%	5	5.0		
	Academic Costs	64.9%	65.0%	64.1%	65.9%	65.9%	5			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$863	\$869	\$785	\$869	\$713		5		
6. Entrance Requirements										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	N/A	None	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	N/A	N/A	89.1%	Not Applicable	N/A		N/A		
7. Graduates' Achievements										
A.	Graduation Rate	18.5%	None	21.6%	20.7%	19.3%		3		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	93.7%	95.0%	86.7%	92.0%	92.7%		4		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	112.1% *	110%	111.0%	110.0%	109.3%		5		
8. User-Friendliness of Institution										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an institution	95.0%	100.0%	N/A	90.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	26.2%	None	16.9%	19.0%	19.1%	4	3.5		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	76.3%	96.0%	94.2%	3			
	Retention of Other Race students	52.3%	None	43.1%		53.2%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	55.0%	None	56.5%		56.5%				
9. Research Funding										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	79	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								85		85
Performance Percentage							**	92%	**	0%
* Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average										
** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers										

## Midlands Technical College

Proposed

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

secondary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.										
Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
1. Mission Focus										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	7.2%	9.3%	10.0%		5		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
2. Quality of faculty										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	99%	100%	N/A	100%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$33,287	\$42,333	\$33,305	\$34,143	\$34,677		5		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
3. Instructional Quality										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	18.6	16-18	17.9	18.0	18.1	4	4.5		
	Average class size - Upper Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.8	17-18	16.6	17.0	17.0	5			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	247 *	None	224	227	250		5		
C.	Ratio of f/t faculty as compared to other f/t employees (expressed as a % of total)	40.6% *	40.1%	42.5%	42.5%	42.8%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting programs	61.9% *	100%	100%	100%	100%		5		
5. Administrative Efficiency										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	16.8%	14.4%	19.2%	14.2%	13.8%	5	5.0		
	Academic Costs	84.9%	85.0%	84.3%	86.0%	86.4%	5			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$863	\$869	\$874	\$825	\$675		5		
6. Entrance Requirements										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body ( % of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	N/A	None	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	N/A	N/A	96.7%	Not Applicable	N/A		N/A		
7. Graduates' Achievements										
A.	Graduation Rate	18.5%	None	9.0%	10.0%	10.4%		5		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	93.7%	95.0%	92.4%	91.5%	91.5%		4		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	112.1% *	110%	115.1%	117.0%	116.6%		4		
8. User-Friendliness of Institution										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	95.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	26.2%	None	31.8%	30.0%	31.9%	5	3.5		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	89.8%	90.4%	88.9%	2			
	Retention of Other Race students	52.3%	None	50.9%	51.5%	49.5%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	55.0%	None	56.7%	57.0%	55.7%				
9. Research Funding										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	81	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								85		85
Performance Percentage							**	95%	**	0%
* Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average										
** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers										

**Higher Education Performance Indicators Report Card - 1998-99**  
**Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College**

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
 2 - Needs Improvement  
 3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
 5 - Exceeds Goal  
 (Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

**Proposed**

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
1. Mission Focus										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	55.3%	54.0%	54.8%		5		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
2. Quality of faculty										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	99%	100%	N/A	91%	91%		4		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$33,287	\$42,333	\$30,087	\$29,465	\$29,623		4		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
3. Instructional Quality										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	18.6	16-18	16.2	16.0	16.1	5	4.0		
	Average class size - Upper Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.8	17-18	14.5	14.5	14.3	3			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	247 *	None	247	255	287		5		
C.	Ratio of full-time faculty as compared to other full-time employees (expressed as a % of total)	40.6% *	40.1%	46.4%	46.0%	46.4%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting program	61.9% *	100%	75%	75%	88%		5		
5. Administrative Efficiency										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	16.3%	14.4%	17.4%	19.0%	18.3%	5	4.5		
	Academic Costs	64.9%	65.0%	65.9%	64.0%	64.4%	4			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$863	\$889	\$984	\$1,040	\$1,031		4		
6. Entrance Requirements										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st-time freshmen exceeding goal)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	N/A	None	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	N/A	N/A	99.8%	Not Applicable	N/A		N/A		
7. Graduates' Achievements										
A.	Graduation Rate	18.5%	None	31.0%	31.0%	32.3%		5		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	93.7%	95.0%	88.9%	90.0%	97.7%		5		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	112.1% *	110%	116.0%	115.0%	112.2%		5		
8. User-Friendliness of Institution										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	95.0%	100.0%	N/A	90.0%	90.0%		4		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	26.2%	None	48.5%	45.0%	52.0%	5	5.0		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	79.5%	80.0%	90.2%	5			
	Retention of Other Race students	52.3%	None	52.6%	52.0%	52.5%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	55.0%	None	66.1%	65.0%	58.2%				
9. Research Funding										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	80	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								85		85
Performance Percentage							**	94%	**	0%
* Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average										
** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers										

**Higher Education Performance Indicators Report Card - 1998-99**  
**Piedmont Technical College**

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
 2 - Needs Improvement  
 3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
 5 - Exceeds Goal  
 (Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

**Proposed**

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
1. Mission Focus										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	44.9%	46.0%	46.0%		4		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
2. Quality of faculty										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	99%	100%	N/A	91%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$33,287	\$42,333	\$28,588	\$29,750	\$31,045		5		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
3. Instructional Quality										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A. 1.	Average class size - Lower Division	18.6	16-18	14.9	15.2	15.1	4	4.0		
	Average class size - Upper Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
A. 2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.8	17-18	14.7	15.0	15.0	4			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	247 *	None	240	239	240		4		
C.	Ratio of f-t faculty as compared to other f-t employees (expressed as a % of total)	40.6% *	40.1%	36.0%	37.0%	37.0%		4		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting programs	61.9% *	100%	100%	100%	100%		5		
5. Administrative Efficiency										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	16.3%	14.4%	18.9%	18.5%	19.8%	2	3.5		
	Academic Costs	64.9%	65.0%	49.9%	49.6%	61.5%	5			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$863	\$869	\$1,190	\$974	\$1,083		3		
6. Entrance Requirements										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	N/A	None	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	N/A	N/A	99.1%	Not Applica	N/A		N/A		
7. Graduates' Achievements										
A.	Graduation Rate	18.5%	None	32.6%	31.0%	28.3%		3		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D. 1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	93.7%	95.0%	96.6%	92.0%	94.0%		5		
D. 2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	112.1% *	110%	115.0%	113.0%	112.0%		4		
8. User-Friendliness of Institution										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	95.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C. 1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	26.2%	None	31.5%	33.0%	32.2%	3	4.0		
C. 1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	94.7%	95.5%	103.6%	5			
	Retention of Other Race students	52.3%	None	57.7%	58.3%	62.5%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	55.0%	None	60.9%	61.0%	60.3%				
9. Research Funding										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	74	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								85		85
Performance Percentage							**	86%	**	0%
• Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average										
** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers										

**Higher Education Performance Indicators Report Card - 1998-99**  
**Spartanburg Technical College**

**Proposed**

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
 2 - Needs Improvement  
 3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
 5 - Exceeds Goal  
 (Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 5 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
<b>1. Mission Focus</b>										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	53.8%	52.8%	54.6%		5		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>2. Quality of faculty</b>										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	99%	100%	N/A	100%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$33,287	\$42,333	\$30,472	\$31,336	\$32,043		5		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>3. Instructional Quality</b>										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	18.6	16-18	17.3	18.0	18.0	5	5.0		
	Average class size - Upper Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.8	17-18	14.6	15.0	15.3	5			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	247 *	None	207	211	214		6		
C.	Ratio of f-t faculty as compared to other f-t employees (expressed as a % of total)	40.6% *	40.1%	47.0%	40.1%	44.6%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting programs	61.9% *	100%	88%	80%	78%		4		
<b>5. Administrative Efficiency</b>										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	16.3%	14.4%	20.4%	18.0%	15.8%	5	5.0		
	Academic Costs	84.8%	65.0%	65.0%	65.0%	66.4%	5			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$869	\$869	\$1,090	\$1,090	\$859		6		
<b>6. Entrance Requirements</b>										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	N/A	None	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	N/A	N/A	99.3%	Not Applica	N/A		N/A		
<b>7. Graduates' Achievements</b>										
A.	Graduation Rate	18.5%	None	24.9%	23.0%	27.4%		5		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	93.7%	95.0%	81.9%	88.0%	93.9%		5		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	112.1% *	110%	105.9%	110.0%	105.9%		5		
<b>8. User-Friendliness of Institution</b>										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	95.0%	100.0%	N/A	90.0%	90.0%		4		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	26.2%	None	20.1%	21.6%	22.9%	5	5.0		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	93.6%	91.0%	99.5%	5			
	Retention of Other Race students	52.3%	None	54.2%	50.3%	54.5%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	55.0%	None	57.9%	55.3%	54.8%				
<b>9. Research Funding</b>										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	84	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								85		85
Performance Percentage							**	99%	**	0%
<p>* Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average</p> <p>** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers</p>										

**Higher Education Performance Indicators Report Card - 1996-99**  
**Technical College of the Lowcountry**

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
 2 - Needs Improvement  
 3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
 5 - Exceeds Goal  
 (Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 0 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

**Proposed**

compliance performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)										
Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
1. Mission Focus										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	56.0%	54.7%	57.6%		5		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
2. Quality of faculty										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	99%	100%	N/A	91%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$33,287	\$42,333	\$28,846	\$29,387	\$30,239		5		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
3. Instructional Quality										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A. 1.	Average class size - Lower Division	18.6	16-18	14.2	15.5	18.1	5	5.0		
	Average class size - Upper Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
A. 2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	18.8	17-18	15.2	16.0	17.2	5			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	247 *	None	221	240	288		6		
C.	Ratio of f-t faculty as compared to other f-t employees (expressed as a % of total)	40.6% *	40.1%	41.2%	40.1%	40.3%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting program	61.9% *	100%	33%	25%	25%		4		
5. Administrative Efficiency										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	16.3%	14.4%	22.5%	23.8%	22.1%	5	5.0		
	Academic Costs	84.9%	65.0%	56.0%	54.7%	57.9%	5			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$863	\$869	\$1,437	\$1,437	\$1,564		3		
6. Entrance Requirements										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	N/A	None	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	N/A	N/A	97.3%	Not Applicable	N/A		N/A		
7. Graduates' Achievements										
A.	Graduation Rate	18.5%	None	21.1%	17.5%	19.6%		5		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D. 1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	93.7%	95.0%	93.7%	95.0%	98.3%		5		
D. 2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	112.1% *	110%	110.8%	110.0%	107.4%		5		
8. User-Friendliness of Institution										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	95.0%	100.0%	N/A	90.0%	90.0%		4		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C. 1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	26.2%	None	32.4%	33.0%	35.7%	5	5.0		
C. 1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	83.5%	85.2%	98.0%	6			
	Retention of Other Race students	52.3%	None	40.4%	42.0%	53.4%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	55.0%	None	48.4%	49.3%	54.5%				
9. Research Funding										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	82	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								85		85
Performance Percentage							**	96%	**	0%
* Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average										
** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers										

## Tri-County Technical College

Proposed

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
<b>1. Mission Focus</b>										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	51.2%	52.6%	53.4%		5		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>2. Quality of faculty</b>										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	99%	100%	N/A	100%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$33,287	\$42,333	\$32,372	\$33,345	\$33,366		4		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>3. Instructional Quality</b>										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	18.6	16-18	13.7	16.2	16.3	5	5.0		
	Average class size - Upper Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.8	17-18	16.8	17.0	17.3	5			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	247 *	None	228	232	233		4		
C.	Ratio of FTE faculty as compared to other FTE employees (expressed as a % of total)	40.6% *	40.1%	42.2%	41.5%	42.4%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting programs	61.9% *	100%	67%	71%	71%		4		
<b>5. Administrative Efficiency</b>										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	16.3%	14.4%	21.2%	17.5%	16.9%	5	5.0		
	Academic Costs	64.9%	65.0%	63.6%	65.1%	66.0%	5			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$863	\$869	\$1,155	\$883	\$869		5		
<b>6. Entrance Requirements</b>										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	N/A	None	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	N/A	N/A	94.6%	Not Applicable	N/A		N/A		
<b>7. Graduates' Achievements</b>										
A.	Graduation Rate	18.5%	None	22.3%	22.4%	22.8%		5		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	93.7%	95.0%	87.6%	90.9%	91.3%		4		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	112.1% *	110%	111.7%	117.9%	114.2%		5		
<b>8. User-Friendliness of Institution</b>										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an institution	95.0%	100.0%	N/A	90.0%	90.0%		4		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	26.2%	None	10.7%	10.7%	10.8%	4	4.0		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	96.7%	96.2%	96.4%	4			
	Retention of Other Race students	52.3%	None	54.5%	53.0%	53.2%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	55.0%	None	56.4%	55.1%	55.2%				
<b>9. Research Funding</b>										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	79	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								85		85
Performance Percentage							**	93%	**	0%
• Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average										
•• Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers										

## Trident Technical College

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 5 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Proposed

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
<b>1. Mission Focus</b>										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	50.6%	51.0%	51.6%		5		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>2. Quality of faculty</b>										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	99%	100%	N/A	91%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$33,287	\$42,333	\$34,893	\$35,765	\$35,891		4		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>3. Instructional Quality</b>										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	18.6	16-18	24.1	23.0	23.0	4	4.5		
	Average class size - Upper Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	18.8	17-18	18.5	18.0	18.0	5			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	247 *	None	237	223	223		4		
C.	Ratio of f-t faculty as compared to other f-t employees (expressed as a % of total)	40.6% *	40.1%	45.5%	44.9%	45.5%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting programs	61.9% *	100%	80%	80%	80%		4		
<b>5. Administrative Efficiency</b>										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	16.3%	14.4%	17.3%	16.0%	15.3%	5	5.0		
	Academic Costs	64.9%	65.0%	61.3%	63.0%	65.0%	5			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$868	\$869	\$952	\$905	\$796		5		
<b>6. Entrance Requirements</b>										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	N/A	None	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	N/A	N/A	93.8%	Not Applicable	N/A		N/A		
<b>7. Graduates' Achievements</b>										
A.	Graduation Rate	18.5%	None	16.5%	15.7%	14.4%		3		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	93.7%	95.0%	91.2%	91.4%	91.1%		4		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	112.1% *	110%	117.3%	115.8%	115.1%		4		
<b>8. User-Friendliness of Institution</b>										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an institution	95.0%	100.0%	N/A	90.0%	90.0%		4		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	26.2%	None	22.1%	21.7%	21.8%	4	4.5		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	86.9%	86.4%	88.3%	5			
	Retention of Other Race students	52.3%	None	50.2%	48.2%	47.4%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	55.0%	None	57.8%	55.8%	53.7%				
<b>9. Research Funding</b>										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	76	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								85		85
Performance Percentage							**	89%	**	0%
<p>• Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average</p> <p>•• Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers</p>										

## Williamsburg Technical College

Proposed

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
1. Mission Focus										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	7.2%	6.9%	8.3%		5		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
2. Quality of faculty										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	99%	100%	N/A	91%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$33,287	\$42,333	\$27,798	\$28,386	\$28,387		4		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
3. Instructional Quality										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	18.6	16-18	11.4	11.3	11.3	4	4.5		
	Average class size - Upper Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.8	17-18	13.8	13.4	13.6	5			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	247 *	None	290	198	214		5		
C.	Ratio of f-t faculty as compared to other f-t employees (expressed as a % of total)	40.6% *	40.1%	19.6%	21.5%	22.4%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting program	61.9% *	100%	0%	0%	0%		4		
5. Administrative Efficiency										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	16.3%	14.4%	43.9%	37.4%	39.4%	3	4.0		
	Academic Costs	64.9%	65.0%	36.3%	36.3%	37.1%	5			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$863	\$869	\$2,489	\$2,300	\$2,204		5		
6. Entrance Requirements										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	N/A	None	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	N/A	N/A	100.0%	Not Applica	N/A		N/A		
7. Graduates' Achievements										
A.	Graduation Rate	18.5%	None	42.3%	18.9%	19.3%		5		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	93.7%	95.0%	None	95.0%	100.0%		5		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	112.1% *	110%	105.0%	110.0%	108.0%		5		
8. User-Friendliness of Institution										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	95.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	26.2%	None	59.0%	61.8%	60.0%	3	4.0		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	109.1%	102.2%	112.5%	5			
	Retention of Other Race students	52.3%	None	48.1%	46.0%	54.1%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	55.0%	None	44.1%	45.0%	48.1%				
9. Research Funding										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	81	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								85		85
Performance Percentage							**	95%	**	0%
* Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average										
** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers										

## York Technical College

Proposed

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
<b>1. Mission Focus</b>										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	51.6%	51.8%	52.2%		4		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>2. Quality of faculty</b>										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	99%	100%	N/A	91%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$33,287	\$42,333	\$32,009	\$33,100	\$33,272		4		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>3. Instructional Quality</b>										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	18.6	16-18	19.4	19.8	19.8	4	4.5		
	Average class size - Upper Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.8	17-18	17.1	17.9	17.9	5			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	247 *	None	296	293	293		4		
C.	Ratio of full-time faculty as compared to other full-time employees (expressed as a % of total)	40.6% *	40.1%	38.3%	38.5%	38.5%		4		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting programs	61.9% *	100%	86%	75%	86%		5		
<b>5. Administrative Efficiency</b>										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	16.3%	14.4%	20.3%	19.5%	17.6%	5	5.0		
	Academic Costs	64.9%	65.0%	60.1%	61.5%	63.6%	5			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$863	\$869	\$1,151	\$1,100	\$925		5		
<b>6. Entrance Requirements</b>										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	N/A	None	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	N/A	N/A	99.0%	Not Applicable	N/A		N/A		
<b>7. Graduates' Achievements</b>										
A.	Graduation Rate	18.5%	None	21.2%	17.5%	18.9%		5		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	93.7%	95.0%	93.0%	95.0%	97.3%		5		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	112.1% *	110%	110.0%	110.0%	106.6%		5		
<b>8. User-Friendliness of Institution</b>										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an institution	95.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	26.2%	None	20.2%	21.0%	22.2%	5	3.5		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	90.9%	90.9%	86.6%	2			
	Retention of Other Race students	52.3%	None	50.3%	50.3%	46.5%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	55.0%	None	55.3%	55.3%	53.7%				
<b>9. Research Funding</b>										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	79	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								85		85
Performance Percentage							**	93%	**	0%
<p>• Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average</p> <p>•• Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers</p>										

## REGIONAL CAMPUSES OF U.S.C.

## U. S. C. - Beaufort

Proposed

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 5 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
<b>1. Mission Focus</b>										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	55.7%	54.5%	55.5%		5		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>2. Quality of faculty</b>										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	100%	100%	N/A	100%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$40,492	\$43,271	\$39,443	\$39,850	\$39,983		4		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>3. Instructional Quality</b>										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	18.4	16-18	19.2	18.0	17.1	5	3.5		
	Average class size - Upper Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	13.5	17-18	13.9	13.9	12.1	2			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	243 *	None	250	251	220		2		
C.	Ratio of f.t. faculty as compared to other f.t. employees (expressed as a % of total)	47.0%	40.1%	55.6%	54.0%	56.0%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting programs	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
<b>5. Administrative Efficiency</b>										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	14.8%	14.4%	16.2%	15.5%	15.4%	4	4.0		
	Academic Costs	60.2%	65.0%	57.3%	57.0%	57.1%	4			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$1,024	\$869	\$978	\$1,100	\$1,063		5		
<b>6. Entrance Requirements</b>										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	25%	33%	34%	28%	31%		5		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	39%	None	N/A	31%	32%		5		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	N/A	N/A	97.2%	N/A	N/A		N/A		
<b>7. Graduates' Achievements</b>										
A.	Graduation Rate	22.0%	None	10.8%	10.8%	13.0%		5		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	N/A	95.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	125.9%	110%	115.1%	115.1%	119.7%		3		
<b>8. User-Friendliness of Institution</b>										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	98.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	20.3%	None	17.2%	16.8%	16.6%	2	2.0		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	97.0%	None	89.3%	89.3%	85.3%	2			
	Retention of Other Race students	50.7%	None	42.7%		36.5%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	52.3%	None	47.8%		42.8%				
<b>9. Research Funding</b>										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	74	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								85		85
Performance Percentage							**	86%	**	0%
<p>* Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average</p> <p>** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers</p>										

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
1. Mission Focus										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	50.7%	45.4%	45.5%		4		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
2. Quality of faculty										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	100%	100%	N/A	100%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$40,492	\$43,271	\$41,555	\$43,043	\$43,043		5		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
3. Instructional Quality										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	18.4	16-18	18.2	18.0	18.0	4	3.5		
	Average class size - Upper Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	18.5	17-18	15.8	15.8	14.6	3			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	243 *	None	288	274	232		2		
C.	Ratio of FTE faculty as compared to other FTE employees (expressed as a % of total)	47.0%	40.1%	43.1%	44.0%	42.7%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting program	N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%		5		
5. Administrative Efficiency										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	14.8%	14.4%	8.3%	10.3%	10.3%	5	4.0		
	Academic Costs	60.2%	65.0%	63.6%	59.8%	58.9%	3			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$1,024	\$869	\$534	\$600	\$663		5		
6. Entrance Requirements										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	25%	33%	23%	23%	22%		2		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	39%	None	N/A	32%	38%		5		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	N/A	N/A	99.6%	N/A	N/A		N/A		
7. Graduates' Achievements										
A.	Graduation Rate	22.0%	None	12.1%	12.5%	28.0%		6		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	N/A	95.0%	100.0%	95.0%	100.0%		5		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	125.9%	110%	123.0%	123.0%	126.3%		3		
8. User-Friendliness of Institution										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	98.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	20.3%	None	18.6%	18.6%	17.0%	3	3.0		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	97.0%	None	97.4%	97.4%	93.0%	3			
	Retention of Other Race students	50.7%	None	56.2%	54.2%	53.1%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	52.3%	None	57.7%	58.3%	57.1%				
9. Research Funding										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	83	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								95		95
Performance Percentage							**	87%	**	0%
• Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average										
** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers										

## U. S. C. - Salkehatchie

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Proposed

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
<b>1. Mission Focus</b>										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	57.5%	57.5%	58.6%		5		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>2. Quality of faculty</b>										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	100%	100%	N/A	100%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$40,492	\$43,271	\$34,528	\$34,700	\$34,946		4		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>3. Instructional Quality</b>										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	18.4	16-18	16.8	18.1	17.5	5	4.0		
	Average class size - Upper Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	13.5	17-18	13.8	13.8	12.6	3			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	243 *	None	254	243	243		4		
C.	Ratio of fte faculty as compared to other fte employees (expressed as a % of total)	47.0%	40.1%	56.5%	54.0%	58.7%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting program	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
<b>5. Administrative Efficiency</b>										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	14.8%	14.4%	17.3%	17.3%	18.5%	3	3.5		
	Academic Costs	60.2%	65.0%	60.2%	60.2%	59.6%	4			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$1,024	\$869	\$1,116	\$950	\$1,268		2		
<b>6. Entrance Requirements</b>										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	25%	33%	18%	18%	19%		5		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	39%	None	N/A	40%	40%		5		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	N/A	N/A	99.5%	N/A	N/A		N/A		
<b>7. Graduates' Achievements</b>										
A.	Graduation Rate	22.0%	None	7.0%	10.0%	21.0%		6		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	N/A	95.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	125.9%	110%	124.7%	117.3%	124.7%		2		
<b>8. User-Friendliness of Institution</b>										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	98.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	20.3%	None	37.2%	37.2%	34.6%	3	4.0		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	97.0%	None	87.5%	100.0%	107.4%	5			
	Retention of Other Race students	50.7%	None	45.0%	42.0%	56.8%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	52.3%	None	51.4%	42.0%	52.9%				
<b>9. Research Funding</b>										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	75	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								85		85
Performance Percentage							**	88%	**	0%
<p>* Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average</p> <p>** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers</p>										

## U. S. C. - Sumter

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Proposed

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Committee Rating	Committee Rating
<b>1. Mission Focus</b>										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	61.3%	62.0%	64.1%		5		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>2. Quality of faculty</b>										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	100%	100%	N/A	91%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$40,492	\$43,271	\$43,778	\$40,257	\$42,647		5		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>3. Instructional Quality</b>										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	18.4	16-18	17.7	17.7	20.3	3	4.0		
	Average class size - Upper Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	13.5	17-18	14.5	14.2	14.6	5			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	243 *	None	285	270	281		5		
C.	Ratio of FTE faculty as compared to other FTE employees (expressed as a % of total)	47.0%	40.1%	42.0%	40.1%	42.7%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting program	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
<b>5. Administrative Efficiency</b>										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	14.8%	14.4%	14.4%	14.4%	13.0%	5	4.5		
	Academic Costs	60.2%	65.0%	62.1%	64.6%	64.6%	4			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$1,024	\$869	\$987	\$950	\$922		5		
<b>6. Entrance Requirements</b>										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	25%	33%	30%	26%	30%		5		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	39%	None	N/A	30%	41%		5		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	N/A	N/A	98.6%	N/A	N/A		N/A		
<b>7. Graduates' Achievements</b>										
A.	Graduation Rate	22.0%	None	16.9%	16.9%	19.0%		5		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	N/A	95.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	125.9%	110%	139.0%	130.0%	130.8%		4		
<b>8. User-Friendliness of Institution</b>										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	98.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	20.8%	None	19.7%	19.0%	19.5%	5	4.0		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	97.0%	None	106.9%	100.0%	94.5%	3			
	Retention of Other Race students	50.7%	None	63.9%	61.6%	62.0%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	52.3%	None	60.4%	61.6%	65.0%				
<b>9. Research Funding</b>										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	82	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								85		85
Performance Percentage							**	96%	**	0%
<p>• Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average</p> <p>•• Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers</p>										

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
1. Mission Focus										
A	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	48.6%	49.0%	43.3%		2		
C	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
2. Quality of faculty										
B	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	100%	100%	N/A	100%	100%		5		
D	Compensation of faculty	\$40,492	\$43,271	\$39,881	\$40,668	\$40,668		4		
E	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
3. Instructional Quality										
A	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1	Average class size - Lower Division	18.4	16-18	14.0	18.0	18.4	3	4.0		
	Average class size - Upper Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
A.2	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	13.5	17-18	11.2	11.1	13.1	5			
B	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	243 *	None	210	240	241		4		
C	Ratio of f-t faculty as compared to other f-t employees (expressed as a % of total)	47.0%	40.1%	39.3%	39.3%	37.9%		3		
D	Accreditation of degree granting programs	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
5. Administrative Efficiency										
A	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	14.6%	14.4%	17.4%	17.4%	25.0%	2	2.5		
	Academic Costs	60.2%	65.0%	61.3%	61.3%	55.4%	3			
D	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$1,024	\$869	\$1,207	\$1,207	\$2,053		2		
6. Entrance Requirements										
A	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	25%	33%	14%	12%	18%		5		
B	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	39%	None	N/A	29%	42%		5		
D	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	N/A	N/A	99.1%	N/A	N/A		N/A		
7. Graduates' Achievements										
A	Graduation Rate	22.0%	None	5.4%	10.0%	23.0%		6		
D	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	N/A	95.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D.2	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F	Credit hours earned of graduates	125.9%	110%	127.0%	127.0%	128.1%		4		
8. User-Friendliness of Institution										
A	Transferability of Credits to and from an institution	98.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	90.0%		3		
C	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a	Percentage of Other Race students	20.3%	None	19.0%	19.0%	10.0%	2	2.0		
C.1b	Comparative Retention Percentage	97.0%	None	99.4%	97.0%	73.4%	2			
	Retention of Other Race students	50.7%	None	50.0%		40.9%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	52.3%	None	50.3%		55.7%				
9. Research Funding										
A	Financial support for reform in teacher education	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B	Amount of public and private sector grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	67	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								85		85
Performance Percentage							**	78%	**	0%
* Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average										
** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers										

## TEACHING UNIVERSITIES

## The Citadel

Proposed

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
1. Mission Focus										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	35.2%	34.9%	34.8%		4		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
2. Quality of faculty										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	98%	100%	N/A	91%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$43,889	\$48,166	\$46,765	\$47,700	\$47,171		4		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
3. Instructional Quality										
A.	Class size and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	27.1	25-27	26.2	25.0	24.8	4	4.75		
	Average class size - Upper Division	18.9	18-20	19.5	21.0	20.5	5			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.6	15-16	16.3	16.0	15.6	5			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	236 *	None	224	220	222		4		
C.	Ratio of FTE faculty as compared to other FTE employees (expressed as a % of total)	38.0%	29.6%	27.0%	24.9%	26.1%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting programs	47.8% *	100%	75%	75%	75%		4		
5. Administrative Efficiency										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	13.8%	12.9%	15.9%	15.0%	15.0%	4	4.0		
	Academic Costs	62.5%	65.0%	57.5%	58.8%	58.8%	4			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$1,119	\$2,742	\$1,511	\$1,462	\$1,462		5		
6. Entrance Requirements										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	55%	60%	69%	60%	68%		5		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	52%	None	N/A	41%	42%		5		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	81.6%	80.0%	55.0%	52.5%	52.5%		4		
7. Graduates' Achievements										
A.	Graduation Rate	46.8%	None	76.7%	77.0%	73.1%		5		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	92.0%	95.0%	87.1%	87.1%	86.9%		4		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	106.8% *	110%	104.0%	106.0%	103.0%		5		
8. User-Friendliness of Institution										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	100.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	13.8%	None	7.9%	7.9%	7.3%	3	2.5		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	97.1%	93.0%	85.8%	2			
	Retention of Other Race students	74.8%	None	86.5%		75.0%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	78.4%	None	89.1%		87.4%				
9. Research Funding										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	118.1% *	105%	36.4%	25.0%	38.0%		5		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	120.8%	105%	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	95	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								105		105
Performance Percentage							**	91%	**	0%
* Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average										
** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers										

## Coastal Carolina University

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 5 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Proposed

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
1. Mission Focus										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	43.6%	43.0%	43.1%		4		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
2. Quality of faculty										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	98%	100%	N/A	80%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$43,889	\$48,166	\$39,869	\$41,250	\$42,004		5		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
3. Instructional Quality										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A. 1.	Average class size - Lower Division	27.1	25-27	29.9	29.9	29.9	4	4.25		
	Average class size - Upper Division	18.9	18-20	19.4	20.0	19.8	5			
A. 2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.6	15-16	17.7	17.2	17.2	4			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	236 *	None	265	265	264		4		
C.	Ratio of f-t faculty as compared to other f-t employees (expressed as a % of total)	38.0%	29.6%	36.7%	35.0%	37.7%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting program	47.8% *	100%	0%	0%	20%		5		
5. Administrative Efficiency										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	13.8%	12.9%	13.0%	12.5%	13.0%	4	4.0		
	Academic Costs	62.5%	65.0%	60.2%	62.5%	62.7%	4			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$1,119	\$2,742	\$1,002	\$1,100	\$1,058		5		
6. Entrance Requirements										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	55%	60%	49%	52%	52%		4		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	52%	None	N/A	41%	43%		5		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	81.6%	80.0%	75.0%	75.0%	77.8%		5		
7. Graduates' Achievements										
A.	Graduation Rate	46.8%	None	31.1%	32.5%	34.2%		5		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D. 1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	92.0%	95.0%	90.7%	93.7%	93.7%		4		
D. 2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	106.8% *	110%	107.0%	107.0%	107.0%		5		
8. User-Friendliness of Institution										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	100.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C. 1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	13.8%	None	8.9%	8.9%	8.9%	4	3.5		
C. 1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	100.9%	100.9%	95.3%	3			
	Retention of Other Race students	74.8%	None	70.5%	70.5%	67.1%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	78.4%	None	69.9%	69.9%	70.4%				
9. Research Funding										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	118.1% *	105%	131.0%	105.0%	117.0%		5		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	120.8%	105%	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating **							98	**	0	
Maximum Potential Rating							105		105	
Performance Percentage **							93%	**	0%	
* Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average										
** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers										

## College of Charleston

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Proposed

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
1. Mission Focus										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	50.8%	51.0%	51.8%		5		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
2. Quality of faculty										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	98%	100%	N/A	100%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$43,889	\$48,166	\$42,289	\$44,079	\$43,677		4		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
3. Instructional Quality										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	27.1	25-27	28.8	28.8	28.7	4	4.0		
	Average class size - Upper Division	18.9	18-20	20.5	21.0	20.8	4			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.6	15-16	17.6	17.5	17.5	4			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	296 *	None	254	247	250		5		
C.	Ratio of full-time faculty as compared to other full-time employees (expressed as a % of total)	38.0%	29.6%	47.4%	29.6%	45.4%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting program	47.8% *	100%	43%	43%	43%		4		
5. Administrative Efficiency										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	13.8%	12.9%	14.0%	13.8%	12.9%	5	5.0		
	Academic Costs	62.5%	65.0%	65.4%	65.0%	66.6%	5			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$1,119	\$2,742	\$894	\$1,658	\$836		5		
6. Entrance Requirements										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	55%	60%	79%	60%	87%		6		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	52%	None	N/A	61%	68%		5		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	81.6%	80.0%	69.8%	69.8%	66.9%		3		
7. Graduates' Achievements										
A.	Graduation Rate	46.8%	None	55.6%	52.8%	53.9%		5		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	92.0%	95.0%	92.6%	90.0%	91.7%		5		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	106.8% *	110%	106.3%	110.0%	106.5%		5		
8. User-Friendliness of Institution										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	100.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	13.8%	None	8.0%	8.1%	8.2%	5	4.5		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	96.1%	96.1%	96.3%	4			
	Retention of Other Race students	74.8%	None	78.0%	78.0%	78.7%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	78.4%	None	81.2%	81.2%	81.7%				
9. Research Funding										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	118.1% *	105%	145.0%	105.0%	143.0%		5		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	120.8%	105%	162.0%	105.0%	108.0%		5		
Total Rating							**	108	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								110		110
Performance Percentage							**	96%	**	0%
• Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average										
•• Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers										

## Francis Marion University

Proposed

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 5 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Indicator Number & Description	Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
<b>1. Mission Focus</b>									
A. Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	56.2%	57.0%	57.4%		4		
C. Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D. Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>2. Quality of faculty</b>									
B. Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	98%	100%	N/A	100%	100%		5		
D. Compensation of faculty	\$43,889	\$48,166	\$44,672	\$46,100	\$44,760		3		
E. Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>3. Instructional Quality</b>									
A. Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1. Average class size - Lower Division	27.1	25-27	25.2	25.5	24.0	3	4.5		
Average class size - Upper Division	18.9	18-20	16.0	16.3	16.5	5			
A.2. FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.6	15-16	15.7	15.5	15.3	5			
B. Number of credit hours taught by faculty	236 *	None	248	231	232		4		
C. Ratio of full-time faculty as compared to other full-time employees (expressed as a % of total)	38.0%	29.6%	34.7%	36.0%	36.7%		5		
D. Accreditation of degree granting program	47.8% *	100%	29%	50%	50%		4		
<b>5. Administrative Efficiency</b>									
A. Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
Administrative Costs	13.8%	12.9%	15.5%	13.8%	14.2%	3	3.0		
Academic Costs	62.5%	65.0%	60.0%	61.5%	60.8%	3			
D. Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$1,119	\$2,742	\$1,222	\$1,190	\$1,167		5		
<b>6. Entrance Requirements</b>									
A. SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	55%	60%	32%	35%	38%		5		
B. High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	52%	None	N/A	40%	40%		4		
D. Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	81.6%	80.0%	92.2%	92.0%	91.9%		5		
<b>7. Graduates' Achievements</b>									
A. Graduation Rate	46.8%	None	40.4%	38.5%	35.5%		3		
D. Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1. % of total students passing cert. exams first time	92.0%	95.0%	82.2%	84.5%	84.8%		4		
D.2. % of total students passing cert. exams subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F. Credit hours earned of graduates	106.8% *	110%	105.7%	110.0%	105.3%		5		
<b>8. User-Friendliness of Institution</b>									
A. Transferability of Credits to and from an institution	100.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%		5		
C. Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a. Percentage of Other Race students	13.8%	None	28.2%	27.7%	27.7%	4	4.5		
C.1b. Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	107.6%	100.0%	102.4%	5			
Retention of Other Race students	74.8%	None	76.3%	71.0%	71.5%				
Retention of Non-Other Race students	78.4%	None	70.9%	71.0%	69.8%				
<b>9. Research Funding</b>									
A. Financial support for reform in teacher education	118.1% *	105%	113.9%	103.0%	70.0%		3		
B. Amount of public and private sector grants	120.8%	105%	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating **							91	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating							105		105
Performance Percentage **							87%	**	0%
* Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average									
** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers									

Higher Education Performance Indicators Report Card - 1998-99  
Lander University

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

**Proposed**

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
<b>1. Mission Focus</b>										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	17.9%	17.4%	17.1%		5		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>2. Quality of faculty</b>										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	98%	100%	N/A	100%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$43,889	\$48,166	\$42,446	\$43,719	\$43,493		4		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>3. Instructional Quality</b>										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	27.1	25-27	27.7	27.5	28.0	2	4.25		
	Average class size - Upper Division	18.9	18-20	19.8	19.6	19.4	5			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.6	15-16	15.5	15.3	15.3	5			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	236 *	None	244	244	245		4		
C.	Ratio of f.t. faculty as compared to other f.t. employees (expressed as a % of total)	38.0%	29.6%	43.0%	40.0%	42.7%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting programs	47.8% *	100%	14%	28%	29%		4		
<b>5. Administrative Efficiency</b>										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	13.8%	12.9%	17.9%	17.4%	17.1%	5	5.0		
	Academic Costs	62.5%	65.0%	66.3%	56.8%	57.4%	5			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$1,119	\$2,742	\$1,389	\$1,431	\$1,515		5		
<b>6. Entrance Requirements</b>										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	55%	60%	43%	43%	42%		4		
B.	High school standing, grade point average, and activities of student body	52%	None	N/A	45%	61%		5		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	81.6%	80.0%	94.8%	90.0%	93.0%		5		
<b>7. Graduates' Achievements</b>										
A.	Graduation Rate	46.8%	None	39.0%	40.0%	46.6%		5		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	92.0%	95.0%	89.6%	91.0%	93.6%		5		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	106.8% *	110%	N/A	110.0%	101.8%		5		
<b>8. User-Friendliness of Institution</b>										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	100.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	13.8%	None	19.6%	19.6%	19.5%	4	3.0		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	93.2%	95.0%	92.9%	2			
	Retention of Other Race students	74.8%	None	74.8%		73.6%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	78.4%	None	80.3%		79.2%				
<b>9. Research Funding</b>										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	118.1% *	105%	77.5%	80.0%	270.8%		6		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	120.8%	105%	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	99	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								105		105
Performance Percentage							**	95%	**	0%
* Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average										
** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers										

## S. C. State University

Proposed

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 5 may be awarded for exemplary performance or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
1. Mission Focus										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	11.1%	11.5%	14.7%		6		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
2. Quality of faculty										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	98%	100%	N/A	82%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$49,889	\$48,166	\$39,813	\$41,007	\$41,721		5		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
3. Instructional Quality										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	27.1	25-27	26.8	27.0	26.3	5	3.0		
	Average class size - Upper Division	18.9	18-20	16.0	16.0	15.1	3			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.6	15-16	18.2	18.0	18.3	2			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	236 *	None	192	188	188		4		
C.	Ratio of FTE faculty as compared to other FTE employees (expressed as a % of total)	38.0%	29.6%	33.0%	33.5%	35.5%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting program	47.8% *	100%	58%	58%	58%		4		
5. Administrative Efficiency										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	13.8%	12.9%	19.0%	16.5%	15.6%	5	5.0		
	Academic Costs	62.5%	65.0%	58.3%	62.0%	63.1%	5			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$1,119	\$2,742	\$1,485	\$1,375	\$1,303		5		
6. Entrance Requirements										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	55%	60%	17%	15%	17%		5		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	52%	None	N/A	34%	36%		5		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	81.6%	80.0%	84.6%	80.0%	83.1%		5		
7. Graduates' Achievements										
A.	Graduation Rate	46.8%	None	50.6%	50.0%	46.6%		3		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	92.0%	95.0%	90.3%	91.0%	89.7%		2		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	106.8% *	110%	109.5%	110.0%	109.5%		5		
8. User-Friendliness of Institution										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	100.0%	100.0%	N/A	90.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	13.8%	None	3.6%	3.7%	3.9%	5	5.0		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	84.2%	90.0%	93.3%	5			
	Retention of Other Race students	74.8%	None	69.2%		76.2%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	78.4%	None	82.2%		81.7%				
9. Research Funding										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	118.1% *	105%	204.2%	105.0%	143.8%		5		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	120.8%	105%	78.0%	105.0%	132.9%		6		
Total Rating							**	103	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								110		110
Performance Percentage							**	94%	**	0%
• Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average										
•• Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers										

## U. S. C. - Aiken

Proposed

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 5 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Indicator Number & Description	Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
1. Mission Focus									
A. Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	45.1%	43.7%	43.6%		4		
C. Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D. Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
2. Quality of faculty									
B. Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	98%	100%	N/A	100%	100%		5		
D. Compensation of faculty	\$43,889	\$48,166	\$42,512	\$43,599	\$43,572		4		
E. Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
3. Instructional Quality									
A. Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1. Average class size - Lower Division	27.1	25-27	22.0	22.3	23.6	5	4.5		
Average class size - Upper Division	18.9	18-20	16.8	17.5	18.2	5			
A.2. FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.6	15-16	14.1	14.8	14.8	4			
B. Number of credit hours taught by faculty	236 *	None	262	264	264		4		
C. Ratio of full-time faculty as compared to other full-time employees (expressed as a % of total)	38.0%	29.6%	43.2%	41.1%	42.5%		5		
D. Accreditation of degree granting programs	47.8% *	100%	50%	50%	50%		4		
5. Administrative Efficiency									
A. Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
Administrative Costs	13.8%	12.9%	10.4%	11.5%	11.4%	5	4.5		
Academic Costs	62.5%	65.0%	64.2%	62.5%	62.4%	4			
D. Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$1,119	\$2,742	\$856	\$985	\$985		5		
6. Entrance Requirements									
A. SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	55%	60%	42%	39%	39%		5		
B. High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	52%	None	N/A	40%	40%		4		
D. Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	81.6%	80.0%	94.5%	90.0%	95.0%		5		
7. Graduates' Achievements									
A. Graduation Rate	46.8%	None	31.6%	32.2%	32.7%		5		
D. Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1. % of total students passing cert. exams first time	92.0%	95.0%	92.6%	93.5%	94.1%		4		
D.2. % of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F. Credit hours earned of graduates	106.8% *	110%	112.9%	110.0%	112.9%		2		
8. User-Friendliness of Institution									
A. Transferability of Credits to and from an institution	100.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%		5		
C. Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a. Percentage of Other Race students	13.8%	None	17.9%	18.6%	18.6%	4	3.0		
C.1b. Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	97.0%	100.0%	90.2%	2			
Retention of Other Race students	74.8%	None	74.2%	75.0%	71.8%				
Retention of Non-Other Race students	78.4%	None	76.5%	75.0%	79.6%				
9. Research Funding									
A. Financial support for reform in teacher education	118.1% *	105%	not avail	105.0%	115.0%		5		
B. Amount of public and private sector grants	120.8%	105%	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	93	**
Maximum Potential Rating								105	105
Performance Percentage							**	89%	0%
• Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average									
•• Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers									

## U. S. C. - Spartanburg

Proposed

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
<b>1. Mission Focus</b>										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	63.2%	65.0%	65.1%		4		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>2. Quality of faculty</b>										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	98%	100%	N/A	82%	82%		4		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$43,889	\$48,166	\$42,626	\$43,905	\$43,696		4		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>3. Instructional Quality</b>										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	27.1	25-27	25.9	25.0	26.8	5	3.0		
	Average class size - Upper Division	18.9	18-20	19.0	19.0	20.2	3			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.6	15-16	16.2	15.6	17.8	2			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	236 *	None	247	247	247		4		
C.	Ratio of f-t faculty as compared to other f-t employees (expressed as a % of total)	38.0%	29.6%	38.5%	29.6%	39.1%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting programs	47.8% *	100%	29%	42%	33%		3		
<b>5. Administrative Efficiency</b>										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	13.8%	12.9%	13.0%	13.0%	12.1%	5	5.0		
	Academic Costs	62.5%	65.0%	63.4%	65.0%	65.1%	5			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$1,119	\$2,742	\$1,015	\$1,658	\$945		5		
<b>6. Entrance Requirements</b>										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	55%	60%	38%	34%	35%		5		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	52%	None	N/A	36%	41%		5		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	81.6%	80.0%	95.6%	90.0%	95.3%		5		
<b>7. Graduates' Achievements</b>										
A.	Graduation Rate	46.8%	None	31.9%	35.0%	32.3%		3		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	92.0%	95.0%	92.9%	93.0%	94.8%		5		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	106.8% *	110%	111.8%	111.4%	111.5%		4		
<b>8. User-Friendliness of Institution</b>										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	100.0%	100.0%	N/A	90.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	13.8%	None	16.3%	16.5%	17.2%	5	4.0		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	105.3%	102.9%	96.5%	3			
	Retention of Other Race students	74.8%	None	75.5%	72.0%	71.4%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	78.4%	None	71.7%	70.0%	74.0%				
<b>9. Research Funding</b>										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	118.1% *	105%	102.0%	102.0%	102.0%		4		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	120.8%	105%	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating							**	92	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								105		105
Performance Percentage							**	88%	**	0%
• Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average										
** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers										

**Higher Education Performance Indicators Report Card - 1998-99**  
**Winthrop University**

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
 2 - Needs Improvement  
 3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
 5 - Exceeds Goal  
 (Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

**Proposed**

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
1. Mission Focus										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	40.5%	41.5%	42.0%		5		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
2. Quality of faculty										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	98%	100%	N/A	90%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$43,889	\$48,166	\$42,826	\$44,110	\$43,091		3		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
3. Instructional Quality										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	27.1	25-27	27.8	27.7	27.9	4	4.75		
	Average class size - Upper Division	18.9	18-20	17.9	18.0	19.5	5			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	16.6	15-16	14.4	14.5	15.7	5			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	236 *	None	210	212	212		4		
C.	Ratio of (4:1 faculty as compared to other FTE employees (expressed as a % of total)	38.0%	29.6%	37.3%	37.4%	37.6%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting programs	47.8% *	100%	83%	100%	100%		6		
5. Administrative Efficiency										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	13.8%	12.9%	14.6%	13.5%	13.1%	5	4.5		
	Academic Costs	62.5%	65.0%	58.7%	60.8%	61.2%	4			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$1,119	\$2,742	\$1,396	\$1,325	\$1,276		5		
6. Entrance Requirements										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	55%	60%	60%	58%	58%		4		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	52%	None	N/A	60%	65%		5		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	81.6%	80.0%	85.6%	80.0%	94.3%		5		
7. Graduates' Achievements										
A.	Graduation Rate	48.8%	None	67.1%	52.0%	51.2%		3		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	92.0%	95.0%	93.9%	90.0%	97.1%		5		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	106.8% *	110%	106.7%	107.0%	104.0%		5		
8. User-Friendliness of Institution										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	100.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	13.8%	None	21.9%	22.1%	23.1%	5	5.0		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	95.0%	None	97.7%	100.0%	102.1%	5			
	Retention of Other Race students	74.8%	None	79.8%	80.0%	82.3%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	78.4%	None	81.7%	80.0%	80.6%				
9. Research Funding										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	118.1% *	105%	not avail	102.0%	102.2%		4		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	120.8%	105%	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
Total Rating **								98	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								105		105
Performance Percentage **								94%	**	0%
• Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average										
•• Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers										

# RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES

Higher Education Performance Indicators Report Card - 1998-99  
Clemson University

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance 4 - Meets Goal  
2 - Needs Improvement 5 - Exceeds Goal  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 5 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

**Proposed**

secondary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period										
Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
<b>1. Mission Focus</b>										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	39.8%	40.3%	40.7%		4		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>2. Quality of faculty</b>										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	97%	100%	N/A	100%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$55,957	\$59,642	\$54,433	\$55,800	\$56,133		4		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>3. Instructional Quality</b>										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	33.1	30-32	35.0	34.5	34.4	4	3.75		
	Average class size - Upper Division	27.1	25-27	25.5	26.0	26.2	5			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	14.8	15-16	15.0	15.0	14.7	3			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	204 *	None	215	211	208		3		
C.	Ratio of f.t. faculty as compared to other f-t employees (expressed as a % of total)	33.7%	29.6%	26.8%	26.7%	26.3%		3		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting program	95.8% *	100%	92%	92%	92%		4		
<b>5. Administrative Efficiency</b>										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	7.1%	7.6%	6.0%	6.7%	6.1%	5	4.5		
	Academic Costs	72.1%	80.0%	68.7%	67.2%	67.6%	4			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$1,510	\$2,631	\$1,125	\$1,250	\$1,187		5		
<b>6. Entrance Requirements</b>										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	78%	75%	86%	85%	85%		5		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	77%	None	N/A	75%	81%		5		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	83.5%	70.0%	76.7%	75.0%	76.9%		5		
<b>7. Graduates' Achievements</b>										
A.	Graduation Rate	62.7%	None	70.1%	69.0%	69.6%		5		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	90.5%	95.0%	89.3%	89.3%	88.8%		4		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	107.3% *	110%	103.0%	105.0%	104.0%		5		
<b>8. User-Friendliness of Institution</b>										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an institution	100.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	13.7%	None	8.0%	8.0%	7.8%	3	3.5		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	97.0%	None	96.9%	97.2%	97.6%	4			
	Retention of Other Race students	83.6%	None	86.4%	86.5%	82.6%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	86.4%	None	89.2%	89.0%	79.7%				
<b>9. Research Funding</b>										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	55.5% *	105%	65.0%	65.0%	65.0%		4		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	100.9%	105%	102.2%	100.0%	100.8%		4		
Total Rating							**	97	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								110		110
Performance Percentage							**	88%	**	0%
• Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average										
•• Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers										

## U.S.C. - Columbia

Proposed

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 0 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
<b>1. Mission Focus</b>										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	13.6%	13.6%	13.4%		3.5		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>2. Quality of faculty</b>										
E.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	97%	100%	N/A	100%	100%		5		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$55,957	\$59,642	\$55,250	\$56,631	\$56,828		4		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>3. Instructional Quality</b>										
A.	Class size and student/teacher ratios									
A.1.	Average class size - Lower Division	33.1	30-32	30.6	31.0	32.4	3	4.0		
	Average class size - Upper Division	27.1	25-27	25.2	26.0	27.9	3			
A.2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	14.8	15-16	14.7	14.7	15.1	5			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	204 *	None	224	225	226		4		
C.	Ratio of f:t faculty as compared to other ft employees (expressed as a % of total)	33.7%	29.6%	33.8%	33.0%	33.1%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting programs	95.8% *	100%	95%	95%	96%		4		
<b>5. Administrative Efficiency</b>										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	7.1%	7.6%	8.9%	8.0%	7.2%	5	4.5		
	Academic Costs	72.1%	80.0%	71.4%	72.0%	72.3%	4			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$1,510	\$2,631	\$1,463	\$1,500	\$1,269		5		
<b>6. Entrance Requirements</b>										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	78%	75%	67%	67%	69%		5		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	77%	None	N/A	72%	78%		5		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	83.5%	70.0%	87.6%	88.0%	88.2%		5		
<b>7. Graduates' Achievements</b>										
A.	Graduation Rate	62.7%	None	61.9%	61.6%	56.2%		2		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D.1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	90.5%	95.0%	91.6%	90.0%	89.9%		4		
D.2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	107.3% *	110%	110.5%	110.0%	110.5%		4		
<b>8. User-Friendliness of Institution</b>										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	100.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C.1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	13.7%	None	18.7%	18.0%	18.6%	5	4.5		
C.1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	97.0%	None	99.0%	97.6%	97.9%	4			
	Retention of Other Race students	83.6%	None	83.0%	82.0%	82.6%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	86.4%	None	83.8%	84.0%	84.4%				
<b>9. Research Funding</b>										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	55.5% *	105%	139.6%	50.0%	46.0%		3		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	100.9%	105%	99.5%	99.5%	102.3%		5		
Total Rating							**	97	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								110		110
Performance Percentage							**	88%	**	0%
<p>* Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average</p> <p>** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers</p>										

## Medical University of S. C.

Rating Scale: 1 - Non-Compliance  
2 - Needs Improvement  
3 - Satisfactory Progress

4 - Meets Goal  
5 - Exceeds Goal  
(Note: At the discretion of the Commission a score of 6 may be awarded for exemplary performance, or a 0 for non-compliance after a probationary period.)

Proposed

Indicator Number & Description		Sector Average	Sector Benchmark	Beginning Institutional Average	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Sub-Part Committee Recommendation	Committee Recommendation	Sub-Part Commission Rating	Commission Rating
<b>1. Mission Focus</b>										
A.	Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission	N/A	None	5.7%	7.4%	6.8%		3		
C.	Approval of a mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
D.	Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>2. Quality of faculty</b>										
B.	Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations	97%	100%	N/A	91%	91%		4		
D.	Compensation of faculty	\$55,957	\$59,642	\$54,041	\$53,365	\$50,225		3		
E.	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom	YES	YES	N/A	YES	YES		5		
<b>3. Instructional Quality</b>										
A.	Class sizes and student/teacher ratios									
A. 1.	Average class size - Lower Division	33.1	30-32	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.5		
	Average class size - Upper Division	27.1	25-27	25.2	16.9	28.7	3			
A. 2.	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	14.8	15-16	5.8	12.1	12.1	4			
B.	Number of credit hours taught by faculty	204 *	None	not avail.	175	177		5		
C.	Ratio of FTE faculty as compared to other FTE employees (expressed as a % of total)	33.7%	29.6%	48.5%	33.0%	51.6%		5		
D.	Accreditation of degree granting programs	95.8% *	100%	100%	100%	100%		5		
<b>5. Administrative Efficiency</b>										
A.	Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs									
	Administrative Costs	7.1%	7.6%	6.7%	6.4%	6.0%	5	5.0		
	Academic Costs	72.1%	80.0%	79.1%	76.0%	77.5%	5			
D.	Amount of general overhead costs (per FTE student)	\$1,510	\$2,631	\$6,137	\$5,341	\$5,845		3		
<b>6. Entrance Requirements</b>										
A.	SAT and ACT scores of student body (% of 1st time freshmen exceeding goal)	78%	75%	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body	77%	None	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D.	Priority on enrolling in-state students (expressed as a %)	83.6%	70.0%	95.1%	95.0%	96.5%		5		
<b>7. Graduates' Achievements</b>										
A.	Graduation Rate	62.7%	None	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
D.	Scores of graduates on post-undergrad. prof., grad., or employment-related exams and certification tests									
D. 1.	% of total students passing cert. exams first time	90.5%	95.0%	94.2%	94.2%	99.8%		4		
D. 2.	% of total students passing cert. exams on subsequent attempts	*** Data Not Available for this Sub Indicator ***								
F.	Credit hours earned of graduates	107.3% *	110%	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
<b>8. User-Friendliness of Institution</b>										
A.	Transferability of Credits to and from an Institution	100.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%		5		
C.	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State									
C. 1a.	Percentage of Other Race students	13.7%	None	7.7%	9.5%	10.4%	5	5.0		
C. 1b.	Comparative Retention Percentage	87.0%	None	95.1%	97.9%	100.8%	5			
	Retention of Other Race students	83.6%	None	85.2%	76.2%	80.3%				
	Retention of Non-Other Race students	86.4%	None	89.6%	77.8%	79.7%				
<b>9. Research Funding</b>										
A.	Financial support for reform in teacher education	55.5% *	105%	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
B.	Amount of public and private sector grants	100.9%	105%	123.1%	102.2%	99.6%		3		
Total Rating							**	74	**	0
Maximum Potential Rating								85		85
Performance Percentage							**	86%	**	0%
<p>* Average of Institutions in Sector, Not Weighted Average</p> <p>** Calculations are performed to two decimal places and presented as rounded whole numbers</p>										

## Back-up Data

### Summaries of Institutional Information

#### By Indicator

Note ) Staff recommended Ratings are shown in the far right column of each sheet.  
Committee Ratings are reflected on the respective institutional Report Card.

## Expenditure of Funds to Achieve Institutional Mission

	Expenditure Category	1993 - 1994 Actual	1994 - 1995 Actual	1995 - 1996 Actual	96-97 Institutional Benchmark	96-97 Actual Performance	1997 - 1998 Target	1998 - 1999 Target	Assumes Direction of
<b>Research Universities</b>									
Clemson	Instr, St Ser, Sch	39.8%	39.7%	39.8%	40.3%	40.7%	40.8%	41.3%	4
U.S.C. - Columbia	Research	13.5%	15.1%	13.8%	13.6%	13.4%	14.0%	16.0%	3
Medical University of S. C.	Public Service	3.1%	6.1%	5.7%	7.4%	6.8%	7.4%	7.4%	3
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>		None							
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>									
The Citadel	Ac Spt/St Ser/Inst	34.2%	33.9%	35.2%	34.9%	34.8%	39.1%	40.0%	4
Coastal Carolina University	Instruction	43.3%	44.1%	43.6%	43.0%	43.1%	43.5%	44.0%	4
College of Charleston	Instruction	49.8%	50.1%	50.8%	51.0%	51.8%	51.1%	51.2%	5
Francis Marion University	Instr/Acad Suppt	56.9%	56.2%	56.2%	57.0%	57.4%	58.4%	58.8%	4
Lander University	Inst. Support	17.6%	18.5%	17.9%	17.4%	17.1%	17.1%	16.8%	5
South Carolina State University	Acad Support	12.3%	10.7%	11.1%	11.5%	14.7%	12.0%	12.5%	5
U.S.C. - Aiken	Instruction	46.4%	48.4%	45.1%	43.7%	43.6%	45.0%	46.0%	4
U.S.C. - Spartanburg	Inst/Ac Spt/Sch	66.7%	65.6%	63.2%	65.0%	65.1%	65.0%	65.0%	4
Winthrop University	Instruction	38.7%	39.6%	40.5%	41.5%	42.0%	41.8%	42.1%	5
Note) Direction for Lander University is Down									
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>		None							
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>									
U.S.C. - Beaufort	Instr/Acad Suppt	59.2%	57.7%	55.7%	54.5%	55.5%	56.0%	57.0%	5
U.S.C. - Lancaster	Instruction	45.5%	48.7%	50.7%	45.4%	45.5%	48.0%	48.5%	4
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie	Instr/Acad Suppt	57.7%	59.1%	57.5%	57.5%	58.6%	58.5%	59.5%	5
U.S.C. - Sumter	Instr/Acad Suppt	56.8%	59.8%	61.3%	62.0%	64.1%	62.0%	62.3%	5
U.S.C. - Union	Instruction	45.5%	49.2%	48.6%	49.0%	43.3%	50.0%	51.0%	2
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>		None							
<b>Technical Colleges</b>									
Aiken Tech	Instruction	51.5%	49.7%	51.8%	51.1%	51.1%	51.7%	52.3%	4
Central Carolina Tech	Instruction	50.8%	51.9%	52.8%	53.8%	57.9%	56.2%	58.8%	5
Chesterfield-Marlboro Tech	Instruction	39.5%	38.0%	38.6%	39.5%	39.5%	40.0%	41.0%	4
Denmark Tech	Inst, Ac.Spt., Sch	39.0%	36.3%	38.6%	53.0%	53.3%	58.0%	62.0%	4
Florence-Darlington Tech	Acad Support	14.4%	12.2%	15.1%	14.2%	14.8%	14.5%	14.7%	5
Greenville Tech	Instruction	56.0%	56.4%	54.5%	54.0%	54.1%	54.1%	54.2%	4
Horry-Georgetown Tech	Plant O&M	12.2%	8.9%	8.9%	9.9%	9.6%	10.4%	11.9%	5
Midlands Tech	Student Services	9.1%	6.8%	7.2%	9.3%	10.0%	9.6%	10.0%	5
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech	Instruction	50.1%	52.4%	55.3%	54.0%	54.8%	54.0%	54.0%	5
Piedmont Tech	Instruction	46.0%	43.4%	44.9%	46.0%	48.0%	48.1%	48.7%	4
Spartanburg Tech	Instruction	51.7%	52.8%	53.8%	52.8%	54.6%	54.0%	54.0%	5
Tech College of the Low Country	Instr & Acad Spt	55.3%	57.9%	58.0%	54.7%	57.6%	55.5%	56.1%	5
Tri-County Tech	Instruction	50.4%	51.6%	51.2%	52.6%	53.4%	53.5%	54.3%	5
Trident Tech	Instruction	52.5%	51.0%	50.6%	51.0%	51.6%	52.0%	52.1%	5
Williamsburg Tech	Student Services	8.2%	5.8%	7.2%	6.9%	8.3%	7.0%	7.6%	5
York Tech	Instruction	48.5%	49.9%	51.5%	51.8%	52.2%	52.3%	52.5%	4
Note) Direction for Horry Georgetown Tech is Down									
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>		None							

## Expenditure of Funds to Achieve Institutional Mission

	Expenditure Category	1993 - Actual	1994 - Actual	1995 - Actual	96-97 Institutional Benchmark	96-97 Actual Performance	1997 - Target	1998 - Target	Assumes Direction
<b>Research Universities</b>									
Clemson	Instr, St Ser, Sch	39.8%	39.7%	39.8%	40.3%	40.7%	40.8%	41.3%	4
U.S.C. - Columbia	Research	13.5%	15.1%	13.6%	13.6%	13.4%	14.0%	16.0%	3
Medical University of S. C.	Public Service	3.1%	6.1%	5.7%	7.4%	6.8%	7.4%	7.4%	3
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>		None							
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>									
The Citadel	Ac Spt/St Ser/Inst	34.2%	33.9%	35.2%	34.9%	34.8%	39.1%	40.0%	4
Coastal Carolina University	Instruction	43.3%	44.1%	43.6%	43.0%	43.1%	43.5%	44.0%	4
College of Charleston	Instruction	49.8%	50.1%	50.8%	51.0%	51.8%	51.1%	51.2%	5
Francis Marion University	Instr/Acad Suppt	56.9%	56.2%	56.2%	57.0%	57.4%	58.4%	58.8%	4
Lander University	Inst. Support	17.6%	18.5%	17.9%	17.4%	17.1%	17.1%	16.8%	5
South Carolina State University	Acad Support	12.3%	10.7%	11.1%	11.5%	14.7%	12.0%	12.5%	5
U.S.C. - Aiken	Instruction	46.4%	46.4%	45.1%	43.7%	43.6%	45.0%	45.0%	4
U.S.C. - Spartanburg	Inst/Ac Spt/Sch	66.7%	65.6%	63.2%	65.0%	65.1%	65.0%	65.0%	4
Winthrop University	Instruction	38.7%	39.6%	40.5%	41.5%	42.0%	41.8%	42.1%	5
Note) Direction for Lander University is Down									
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>		None							
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>									
U.S.C. - Beaufort	Instr/Acad Suppt	59.2%	57.7%	55.7%	54.5%	55.5%	56.0%	57.0%	5
U.S.C. - Lancaster	Instruction	45.5%	48.7%	50.7%	45.4%	45.5%	48.0%	48.5%	4
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie	Instr/Acad Suppt	57.7%	59.1%	57.5%	57.5%	58.6%	58.5%	59.5%	5
U.S.C. - Sumter	Instr/Acad Suppt	56.6%	59.8%	61.3%	62.0%	64.1%	62.0%	62.3%	5
U.S.C. - Union	Instruction	45.5%	49.2%	48.6%	49.0%	43.3%	50.0%	51.0%	2
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>		None							
<b>Technical Colleges</b>									
Aiken Tech	Instruction	51.5%	49.7%	51.8%	51.1%	51.1%	51.7%	52.3%	4
Central Carolina Tech	Instruction	50.8%	51.9%	52.8%	53.8%	57.9%	56.2%	58.8%	5
Chesterfield-Marlboro Tech	Instruction	39.5%	38.0%	38.6%	39.5%	39.5%	40.0%	41.0%	4
Denmark Tech	Inst, Ac.Spt., Sch	39.0%	36.3%	38.6%	53.0%	53.3%	58.0%	62.0%	4
Florence-Darlington Tech	Acad Support	14.4%	12.2%	15.1%	14.2%	14.8%	14.5%	14.7%	5
Greenville Tech	Instruction	56.0%	56.4%	54.5%	54.0%	54.1%	54.1%	54.2%	4
Horry-Georgetown Tech	Plant O&M	12.2%	8.9%	8.9%	9.9%	9.6%	10.4%	11.9%	5
Midlands Tech	Student Services	9.1%	6.8%	7.2%	9.3%	10.0%	9.6%	10.0%	5
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech	Instruction	50.1%	52.4%	55.3%	54.0%	54.8%	54.0%	54.0%	5
Piedmont Tech	Instruction	46.0%	43.4%	44.8%	46.0%	46.0%	48.1%	48.7%	4
Spartanburg Tech	Instruction	51.7%	52.8%	53.8%	52.8%	54.6%	54.0%	54.0%	5
Tech College of the Low Country	Instr & Acad Spt	55.3%	57.9%	56.0%	54.7%	57.6%	55.5%	56.1%	5
Tri-County Tech	Instruction	50.4%	51.6%	51.2%	52.6%	53.4%	53.5%	54.3%	5
Trident Tech	Instruction	52.5%	51.0%	50.6%	51.0%	51.8%	52.0%	52.1%	5
Williamsburg Tech	Student Services	8.2%	5.8%	7.2%	6.9%	8.3%	7.0%	7.6%	5
York Tech	Instruction	48.5%	49.9%	51.5%	51.8%	52.2%	52.3%	52.5%	4
Note) Direction for Horry Georgetown Tech is Down									
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>		None							

# **Performance Review System for Faculty to include Student and Peer Evaluations**

	Fall 1994 Actual	Fall 1995 Actual	Fall 1996 Actual	Fall 1997 Institutional Benchmark	Fall 1997 Actual Performance	Fall 1998 Target	Fall 1999 Target	Assumes Direction of Up
<b>Research Universities</b>								
Clemson			N/A	100.0%	100.0%			5
U.S.C. - Columbia			N/A	100.0%	100.0%			5
Medical University of S. C.			N/A	90.9%	90.9%			4
Weighted Avg. of Research Univ.					97.0%			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				<b>100%</b>				
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>								
The Citadel			N/A	91.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	5
Coastal Carolina University			N/A	80.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	5
College of Charleston			N/A	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	5
Francis Marion University			N/A	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	5
Lander University			N/A	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	5
South Carolina State University			N/A	82.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	5
U.S.C. - Aiken			N/A	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	5
U.S.C.-Spartanburg			N/A	82.0%	82.0%	100%	100%	4
Winthrop University			N/A	90.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	5
Weighted Avg. of Teaching Colleges & Univ.					98.0%			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				<b>100%</b>				
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>								
U.S.C. - Beaufort			N/A	100.0%	100.0%			5
U.S.C. - Lancaster			N/A	100.0%	100.0%			5
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie			N/A	100.0%	100.0%			5
U.S.C. - Sumter			N/A	90.9%	100.0%	100%		5
U.S.C. - Union			N/A	100.0%	100.0%			5
Weighted Avg. of Regional Campuses of USC					100.0%			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				<b>100%</b>				
<b>Technical Colleges</b>								
Aiken Tech			N/A	91.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	5
Central Carolina Tech			N/A	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	5
Chesterfield-Marlboro Tech			N/A	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	5
Denmark Tech			N/A	90.9%	100.0%	100%	100%	5
Florence-Darlington Tech			N/A	90.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	5
Greenville Tech			N/A	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	5
Horry-Georgetown Tech			N/A	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	5
Midlands Tech			N/A	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	5
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech			N/A	90.9%	90.9%	100%	100%	4
Piedmont Tech			N/A	90.9%	100.0%	91%	100%	5
Spartanburg Tech			N/A	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	5
Tech College of the Low Country			N/A	90.9%	100.0%	100%	100%	5
Tri-County Tech			N/A	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%	5
Trident Tech			N/A	90.9%	100.0%	100%	100%	5
Williamsburg Tech			N/A	90.9%	100.0%	91%	100%	5
York Tech			N/A	90.9%	100.0%	100%	100%	5
Weighted Avg. of Tech. Colleges					99.4%			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				<b>100%</b>				

## Compensation of Faculty

	Fall 1994 Actual	Fall 1995 Actual	Fall 1996 Actual	Fall 1997 Institutional Benchmark	Fall 1997 Actual Performance	Fall 1998 Target	Fall 1999 Target	Assumes Direction of Up
<b>Research Universities</b>								
Clemson	\$50,316	\$52,491	\$54,433	\$55,800	\$56,133	\$57,000	\$58,000	4
U.S.C. - Columbia (excluding medicine)	52,125	54,111	55,250	56,631	56,828	58,046	59,497	4
Medical University of S. C. (excluding medicine)	60,460	54,132	54,041	53,365	50,225	67,195	69,211	3
Weighted Average of Research Universities					55,957			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				<b>59,642</b>				
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>								
The Citadel	43,154	46,138	46,765	47,700	47,171	48,166	48,166	3
Coastal Carolina University	37,087	38,881	39,869	41,250	42,004	42,900	44,600	5
College of Charleston	38,545	40,937	42,289	44,079	43,677	44,421	45,309	4
Francis Marion University	39,739	41,834	44,672	46,100	44,760	47,392	48,814	3
Lander University	39,202	40,337	42,446	43,719	43,493	45,031	46,382	4
South Carolina State University	38,735	38,506	39,813	41,007	41,721	42,237	43,504	5
U.S.C. - Aiken	39,478	40,486	42,512	43,599	43,572	44,900	46,250	4
U.S.C.-Spartanburg	38,511	40,576	42,626	43,905	43,696	45,222	46,578	4
Winthrop University	38,875	41,653	42,826	44,110	43,091	45,434	46,797	3
Weighted Average of Teaching Colleges & Univ.			42,695		43,889			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				<b>48,166</b>				
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>								
U.S.C. - Beaufort	36,913	38,042	39,443	39,850	39,983	41,046	41,866	4
U.S.C. - Lancaster	37,727	39,720	41,555	43,043	43,043	44,334	45,664	4
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie	33,488	34,949	34,528	34,700	34,946	34,946	35,644	4
U.S.C. - Sumter	39,012	41,042	43,778	40,257	42,647	41,465	42,709	5
U.S.C. - Union	38,290	39,275	39,881	40,668	40,668	41,078	42,310	4
Weighted Average of Regional Campuses of S. C.			40,329		40,492			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				<b>43,271</b>				
<b>Technical Colleges</b>								
Aiken Tech	31,809	33,177	34,670	35,754	35,619	36,647	37,564	4
Central Carolina Tech	28,476	29,095	30,099	31,058	32,178	32,300	33,592	5
Chesterfield-Marlboro Tech	27,311	27,992	28,943	30,100	30,687	30,853	31,624	5
Denmark Tech	25,164	26,673	29,126	28,342	28,209	29,192	30,068	4
Florence-Darlington Tech	29,084	30,776	31,911	32,708	33,211	33,526	34,364	5
Greenville Tech	29,276	30,638	30,971	32,500	33,036	33,475	34,479	5
Horry-Georgetown Tech	30,870	32,743	33,452	34,239	34,604	34,772	35,565	5
Midlands Tech	31,114	32,194	33,305	34,143	34,677	35,031	36,012	5
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech	27,372	29,472	30,087	29,465	29,623	30,202	30,957	4
Piedmont Tech	27,360	28,601	28,588	29,750	31,045	30,622	31,495	5
Spartanburg Tech	27,319	28,887	30,472	31,336	32,043	31,493	31,650	5
Tech College of the Low Country	26,301	27,908	28,846	29,387	30,239	30,121	30,874	5
Tri-County Tech	30,569	30,960	32,372	33,345	33,366	34,239	35,133	4
Trident Tech	32,573	33,595	34,893	35,765	35,891	36,659	37,576	4
Williamsburg Tech	26,972	26,700	27,798	28,386	28,387	29,300	30,300	4
York Tech	30,123	31,036	32,009	33,100	33,272	34,258	35,525	4
Weighted Average of Technical Colleges	29,810	30,973	31,961		33,287			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				<b>42,333</b>				

## Approval of a Mission Statement

	Fall 1994 Actual	Fall 1995 Actual	Fall 1996 Actual	Fall 1997 Institutional Benchmark	Fall 1997 Actual Performance	Fall 1998 Target	Fall 1999 Target	Yes = 5
<b>Research Universities</b>								
Clemson			N/A	YES	YES			5
U.S.C. - Columbia			N/A	YES	YES			5
Medical University of S. C.			N/A	YES	YES			5
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>								
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>								
The Citadel			N/A	YES	YES			5
Coastal Carolina University			N/A	YES	YES			5
College of Charleston			N/A	YES	YES			5
Francis Marion University			N/A	YES	YES			5
Lander University			N/A	YES	YES			5
South Carolina State University			N/A	YES	YES			5
U.S.C. - Aiken			N/A	YES	YES			5
U.S.C. - Spartanburg			N/A	YES	YES			5
Winthrop University			N/A	YES	YES			5
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>								
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>								
U.S.C. - Beaufort			N/A	YES	YES			5
U.S.C. - Lancaster			N/A	YES	YES			5
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie			N/A	YES	YES			5
U.S.C. - Sumter			N/A	YES	YES			5
U.S.C. - Union			N/A	YES	YES			5
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>								
<b>Technical Colleges</b>								
Aiken Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Central Carolina Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Chesterfield-Marlboro Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Denmark Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Florence-Darlington Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Greenville Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Horry-Georgetown Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Midlands Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Piedmont Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Spartanburg Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Tech College of the Low Country			N/A	YES	YES			5
Tri-County Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Trident Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Williamsburg Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
York Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>								

## Adoption of a Strategic Plan to Support the Mission Statement

	Fall 1994 Actual	Fall 1995 Actual	Fall 1996 Actual	Fall 1997 Institutional Benchmark	Fall 1997 Actual Performance	Fall 1998 Target	Fall 1999 Target	Yes = 5
<b>Research Universities</b>								
Clemson			N/A	YES	YES			5
U.S.C. - Columbia			N/A	YES	YES			5
Medical University of S. C.			N/A	YES	YES			5
<b>Sector Benchmark</b> YES								
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>								
The Citadel			N/A	YES	YES			5
Coastal Carolina University			N/A	YES	YES			5
College of Charleston			N/A	YES	YES			5
Francis Marion University			N/A	YES	YES			5
Lander University			N/A	YES	YES			5
South Carolina State University			N/A	YES	YES			5
U.S.C. - Aiken			N/A	YES	YES			5
U.S.C.-Spartanburg			N/A	YES	YES			5
Winthrop University			N/A	YES	YES			5
<b>Sector Benchmark</b> YES								
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>								
U.S.C. - Beaufort			N/A	YES	YES			5
U.S.C. - Lancaster			N/A	YES	YES			5
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie			N/A	YES	YES			5
U.S.C. - Sumter			N/A	YES	YES			5
U.S.C. - Union			N/A	YES	YES			5
<b>Sector Benchmark</b> YES								
<b>Technical Colleges</b>								
Aiken Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Central Carolina Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Chesterfield-Marlboro Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Denmark Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Florence-Darlington Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Greenville Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Horry-Georgetown Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Midlands Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Piedmont Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Spartanburg Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Tech College of the Low Country			N/A	YES	YES			5
Tri-County Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Trident Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Williamsburg Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
York Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
<b>Sector Benchmark</b> YES								

## Availability of Faculty to Students Outside the Classroom

	Fall 1994 Actual	Fall 1995 Actual	Fall 1996 Actual	Fall 1997 Institutional Benchmark	Fall 1997 Actual Performance	Fall 1998 Target	Fall 1999 Target	Yes = 5
<b>Research Universities</b>								
Clemson			N/A	YES	YES			5
U.S.C. - Columbia			N/A	YES	YES			5
Medical University of S. C.			N/A	YES	YES			5
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>								
<b>YES</b>								
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>								
The Citadel			N/A	YES	YES			5
Coastal Carolina University			N/A	YES	YES			5
College of Charleston			N/A	YES	YES			5
Francis Marion University			N/A	YES	YES			5
Lander University			N/A	YES	YES			5
South Carolina State University			N/A	YES	YES			5
U.S.C. - Aiken			N/A	YES	YES			5
U.S.C. - Spartanburg			N/A	YES	YES			5
Winthrop University			N/A	YES	YES			5
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>								
<b>YES</b>								
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>								
U.S.C. - Beaufort			N/A	YES	YES			5
U.S.C. - Lancaster			N/A	YES	YES			5
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie			N/A	YES	YES			5
U.S.C. - Sumter			N/A	YES	YES			5
U.S.C. - Union			N/A	YES	YES			5
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>								
<b>YES</b>								
<b>Technical Colleges</b>								
Aiken Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Central Carolina Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Chesterfield-Marlboro Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Denmark Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Florence-Darlington Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Greenville Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Horry-Georgetown Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Midlands Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Piedmont Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Spartanburg Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Tech College of the Low Country			N/A	YES	YES			5
Tri-County Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Trident Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
Williamsburg Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
York Tech			N/A	YES	YES			5
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>								
<b>YES</b>								

**Average Class Size**  
**Method of Instruction - Lecture only**

Research Universities	Fall 1994		Fall 1995		Fall 1996		Fall 1997		Fall 1998		Fall 1999		Lower Div Assumes Direction of Toward Range	Upper Div Assumes Direction of Toward Range
	Actual		Actual		Actual		Institutional Benchmark		Target		Target			
	Lower Div	Upper Div	Lower Div	Upper Div	Lower Div	Upper Div	Lower Div	Upper Div	Lower Div	Upper Div	Lower Div	Upper Div		
Clemson	33.6	26.6	33.7	25.4	35.0	25.5	34.5	26.0	34.0	26.0	33.0	26.0	4	5
U.S.C. - Columbia	22.4	26.3	33.4	26.8	30.6	25.2	31.0	26.0	31.0	26.0	31.0	26.0	3	3
Medical University of S.C.	N/A	24.5	N/A	25.2	N/A	25.2	N/A	15.9	N/A	N/A	N/A	16.5	N/A	3
Weighted Average of Research Universities														
Sector Benchmarks														
Lower Division 30-32														
Upper Division 25-27														
Teaching Colleges & Universities														
The Citadel	25.8	20.9	25.5	20.2	26.2	19.5	25.0	21.0	25.0	21.0	25.0	21.0	4	5
Coastal Carolina University	28.0	20.0	29.6	19.6	29.9	19.4	29.9	20.0	29.0	20.0	28.0	20.0	4	5
College of Charleston	28.9	21.1	29.4	20.2	28.8	20.5	28.8	21.0	28.5	20.5	28.0	20.0	4	4
Francis Marion University	26.7	17.0	25.5	16.6	25.2	16.0	25.5	16.3	26.0	17.0	26.5	18.0	3	5
Lander University	27.1	16.9	29.0	19.4	27.2	19.8	27.5	19.6	28.0	19.4	27.0	19.4	2	5
South Carolina State University	26.5	18.8	25.7	16.4	26.8	16.0	27.0	16.0	26.3	15.1	27.0	17.0	2	3
U.S.C. - Aiken	24.2	18.0	22.2	19.4	22.0	16.8	22.3	17.5	23.6	18.2	22.5	17.7	5	3
U.S.C. - Spartanburg	27.4	21.1	26.3	20.3	25.9	19.0	25.0	19.0	26.3	20.2	25.0	19.0	5	3
Winthrop University	29.0	18.0	27.5	18.0	27.8	17.9	27.7	18.0	27.9	19.5	27.3	18.0	4	5
Weighted Average of Teaching Colleges & Univ.	27.4	19.4	27.4	18.9	27.4	18.3								
Sector Benchmarks														
Lower Division 25-27														
Upper Division 18-20														
Regional Campuses of U.S.C.														
U.S.C. - Beaufort	22.0	16.1	22.6	11.4	19.2	N/A	18.0	N/A	18.0	N/A	18.0	N/A	5	N/A
U.S.C. - Lancaster	29.5	14.2	20.5	14.4	18.2	N/A	18.0	N/A	18.0	N/A	18.0	N/A	4	N/A
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie	20.4	9.5	21.8	13.8	16.8	N/A	18.1	N/A	18.0	N/A	17.0	N/A	5	N/A
U.S.C. - Sumter	20.6	10.5	19.8	16.4	17.7	N/A	17.7	N/A	20.3	N/A	21.0	N/A	3	N/A
U.S.C. - Union	15.6	0.0	14.6	19.5	14.0	N/A	18.0	N/A	18.0	N/A	18.0	N/A	3	N/A
Weighted Average of Regional Campuses of U.S.C.	22.4	16.3	20.5	14.7	17.7	12.5								
Sector Benchmark														
Lower Division 16-18														
Technical Colleges														
Alcon Tech	17.8	19.0	18.3	18.3	18.3	N/A	18.3	N/A	18.2	N/A	18.2	N/A	3	N/A
Central Carolina Tech	13.8	14.3	13.3	13.3	13.3	N/A	16.0	N/A	17.0	N/A	17.0	N/A	5	N/A
Chesterfield-Mariboro Tech	15.1	14.2	15.4	15.4	15.4	N/A	15.4	N/A	15.4	N/A	15.4	N/A	4	N/A
Diemack Tech	21.8	17.5	19.0	18.8	18.8	N/A	18.5	N/A	17.5	N/A	17.0	N/A	2	N/A
Florence-Darlington Tech	15.8	19.8	18.8	18.8	18.8	N/A	18.0	N/A	18.0	N/A	18.0	N/A	2	N/A
Greenville Tech	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	16.9	N/A	21.3	N/A	20.5	N/A	4	N/A
Henry-Georgetown Tech	17.0	17.0	17.5	17.5	17.5	N/A	17.9	N/A	17.0	N/A	17.0	N/A	5	N/A
Midlands Tech	17.8	18.6	17.9	17.9	17.9	N/A	18.0	N/A	18.0	N/A	18.0	N/A	4	N/A
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech	18.1	17.1	16.2	16.2	16.2	N/A	16.0	N/A	16.0	N/A	16.0	N/A	5	N/A
Piedmont Tech	15.6	14.8	14.9	14.9	14.9	N/A	15.2	N/A	15.6	N/A	16.0	N/A	4	N/A
Spartanburg Tech	15.8	15.8	17.3	17.3	17.3	N/A	18.0	N/A	18.0	N/A	18.0	N/A	5	N/A
Tech College of the Low Country	12.1	13.7	14.2	14.2	14.2	N/A	16.2	N/A	16.2	N/A	17.0	N/A	5	N/A
Tri-County Tech	14.0	13.5	13.7	13.7	13.7	N/A	16.2	N/A	16.4	N/A	16.7	N/A	5	N/A
Trenton Tech	23.1	23.8	24.1	24.1	24.1	N/A	23.0	N/A	22.5	N/A	22.0	N/A	4	N/A
Willamaburg Tech	11.7	12.9	11.4	11.4	11.4	N/A	11.3	N/A	11.8	N/A	12.1	N/A	4	N/A
York Tech	19.8	18.3	19.3	19.3	19.3	N/A	19.8	N/A	19.7	N/A	19.5	N/A	4	N/A
Weighted Average of Technical Colleges	21.0	21.3	21.9				19.8	N/A						
Sector Benchmark														
Lower Division 16-18														

## FTE Students per FTE Teaching Faculty (Instructional)

	Fall 1994 Actual	Fall 1995 Actual	Fall 1996 Actual	Fall 1997 Institutional Benchmark	Fall 1997 Actual Performance	Fall 1998 Target	Fall 1999 Target	Assumes Direction of Toward Range
<b>Research Universities</b>								
Clemson	15.8	15.6	15.0	15.0	14.7	14.8	14.6	3
U.S.C. - Columbia	16.0	15.2	14.7	14.7	15.1	14.0	14.0	5
Medical University of S. C.	6.1	12.5	5.8	12.1	12.1	11.5	11.5	4
Weighted Average of Research Universities					14.8			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>15-16</b>							
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>								
The Citadel	16.9	16.3	16.3	16.0	15.6	16.3	16.3	5
Coastal Carolina University		17.7	17.7	17.2	17.2	17.1	17.0	4
College of Charleston	18.1	18.0	17.6	17.5	17.5	17.4	17.3	4
Francis Marion University	18.1	16.0	15.7	15.5	15.3	15.5	15.5	5
Lander University	15.6	16.4	15.5	15.3	15.3	15.3	15.4	5
South Carolina State University	20.1	19.6	18.2	18.0	18.3	17.8	17.6	2
U.S.C. - Aiken	14.8	14.2	14.1	14.8	14.8	15.0	15.0	4
U.S.C.-Spartanburg	17.1	15.4	16.2	15.6	17.8	15.6	15.6	2
Winthrop University	14.3	14.2	14.4	14.5	15.7	14.5	14.5	5
Weighted Average of Teaching Colleges & Univ.					16.6			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>15-16</b>							
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>								
U.S.C. - Beaufort	14.1	15.0	13.9	13.9	12.1	14.5	15.3	2
U.S.C. - Lancaster	15.7	14.1	15.8	15.8	14.6	17.4	17.4	3
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie	12.8	15.1	13.8	13.8	12.6	15.0	15.3	3
U.S.C. - Sumter	14.4	13.5	14.5	14.2	14.6	17.0	17.0	5
U.S.C. - Union	10.1	11.1	11.2	11.1	13.1	15.0	15.5	5
Weighted Average of Regional Campuses of S. C.					13.5			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>17-18</b>							
<b>Technical Colleges</b>								
Aiken Tech	15.9	17.3	16.5	17.1	17.1	17.0	17.0	5
Central Carolina Tech	14.3	14.7	15.8	17.0	17.3	17.0	17.0	5
Chesterfield-Marlbora Tech	14.1	14.1	15.0	15.1	15.0	15.0	15.1	4
Denmark Tech	19.7	17.1	20.5	17.0	17.7	17.0	17.0	5
Florence-Darlington Tech	14.6	13.7	16.2	15.2	15.1	15.3	15.5	4
Greenville Tech	16.9	18.0	17.4	17.0	17.2	17.0	17.0	5
Horry-Georgetown Tech	16.4	16.9	17.2	17.6	17.6	17.5	17.5	5
Midlands Tech	17.1	18.6	16.6	17.0	17.0	17.5	17.5	5
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech	15.4	14.3	14.5	14.5	14.3	14.5	14.7	3
Piedmont Tech	11.1	13.4	14.7	15.0	15.0	15.5	16.2	4
Spartanburg Tech	14.2	14.2	14.6	15.0	15.3	15.3	15.5	5
Tech College of the Low Country	13.4	15.0	15.2	16.0	17.2	16.5	17.0	5
Tri-County Tech	16.6	16.6	16.8	17.0	17.3	17.2	17.5	5
Trident Tech	19.3	20.0	18.5	18.0	18.0	18.0	18.0	5
Williamsburg Tech	11.8	14.3	13.8	13.4	13.6	13.8	14.0	5
York Tech	17.2	17.1	17.1	17.9	17.9	18.0	18.0	5
Weighted Average of Technical Colleges					16.8			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>17-18</b>							

## Average Number of Credit Hours Taught by Full-time (Teaching) Faculty

	Fall 1994 Actual	Fall 1995 Actual	Fall 1996 Actual	Fall 1997 Institutional Benchmark	Fall 1997 Actual Performance	Fall 1998 Target	Fall 1999 Target	Assumes Direction of Up
<b>Research Universities</b>								
Clemson	222	221	215	211	208	207	203	3
U.S.C. - Columbia	262	234	224	225	226	225	230	4
Medical University of S. C.			not avail.	175	177	175	175	5
Average of Research Universities * (not weighted)					204 *			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	None							
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>								
The Citadel	228	219	224	220	222	220	220	4
Coastal Carolina University	253	265	265	265	264	265	265	4
College of Charleston	261	256	254	247	250	245	244	5
Francis Marion University	260	248	248	231	232	235	240	4
Lander University	238	244	244	244	245	244	244	4
South Carolina State University	208	197	192	188	188	190	190	4
U.S.C. - Aiken	263	278	262	264	264	265	265	4
U.S.C. - Spartanburg	247	247	247	247	247	247	247	4
Winthrop University	209	212	210	212	212	212	212	4
Average of Teaching Colleges & Univ. * (not weighted)					236 *			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	None							
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>								
U.S.C. - Beaufort	263	289	250	251	220	257	264	2
U.S.C. - Lancaster	302	331	288	274	232	300	312	2
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie	261	285	254	243	243	243	243	4
U.S.C. - Sumter	286	268	285	270	281	270	270	5
U.S.C. - Union	201	231	210	240	241	240	240	4
Average of Regional Campuses of S. C. * (not weighted)					243 *			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	None							
<b>Technical Colleges</b>								
Aiken Tech	267	257	244	240	248	250	250	5
Central Carolina Tech	159	181	170	175	175	200	225	4
Chesterfield-Marlboro Tech	242	244	252	269	269	277	285	4
Denmark Tech	361	261	267	315	305	315	315	4
Florence-Darlington Tech	203	233	227	229	229	231	233	4
Greenville Tech	252	258	251	238	238	240	242	4
Horry-Georgetown Tech	248	251	256	247	249	250	250	4
Midlands Tech	228	235	224	227	250	229	231	5
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech	292	262	247	255	267	255	255	5
Piedmont Tech	235	243	240	239	240	242	245	4
Spartanburg Tech	229	211	207	211	214	216	220	5
Tech College of the Low Country	210	221	221	240	268	250	260	6
Tri-County Tech	218	218	228	232	233	236	241	4
Trident Tech	261	269	237	223	223	226	228	4
Williamsburg Tech	223	284	290	198	214	210	222	5
York Tech	298	297	296	293	293	293	293	4
Average of Technical Colleges * (not weighted)					247 *			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	None							

### Ratio of Full-time Faculty as Compared to All Other Full-time Employees

	Fall 1994 Actual	Fall 1995 Actual	Fall 1996 Actual	Fall 1997 Institutional Benchmark	Fall 1997 Actual Performance	Fall 1998 Target	Fall 1999 Target	Assumes Direction of Up
<b>Research Universities</b>								
Clemson	26.7%	26.3%	26.8%	26.7%	26.3%	26.5%	27.0%	3
U.S.C. - Columbia	34.7%	33.3%	33.8%	33.0%	33.1%	33.0%	33.0%	5
Medical University of S. C.	19.6%	46.0%	48.5%	33.0%	51.6%	33.5%	34.0%	5
Weighted Average of Research Universities	26.5%	32.7%	33.8%		33.7%			
<b>Sector Benchmark 29.6%</b>								
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>								
The Citadel	26.3%	28.5%	27.0%	24.9%	26.1%	24.0%	24.0%	5
Coastal Carolina University	43.8%	38.5%	36.7%	35.0%	37.7%	34.5%	34.0%	5
College of Charleston	39.8%	43.1%	47.4%	29.6%	45.4%	29.6%	29.6%	5
Francis Marion University	40.0%	38.0%	34.7%	36.0%	36.7%	36.5%	37.0%	5
Lander University	40.5%	39.5%	43.0%	40.0%	42.7%	40.0%	40.0%	5
South Carolina State University	30.9%	30.9%	33.0%	33.5%	35.5%	33.5%	33.5%	5
U.S.C. - Aiken	44.2%	42.2%	43.2%	41.1%	42.5%	39.5%	39.2%	5
U.S.C.-Spartanburg	44.9%	40.7%	38.5%	29.6%	39.1%	29.6%	29.6%	5
Winthrop University	39.9%	37.6%	37.3%	37.4%	37.6%	37.5%	37.6%	5
Weighted Average of Teaching Colleges & Univ.	37.7%	36.9%	37.6%		38.0%			
<b>Sector Benchmark 29.6%</b>								
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>								
U.S.C. - Beaufort	56.3%	54.6%	55.6%	54.0%	56.0%	54.5%	54.5%	5
U.S.C. - Lancaster	46.9%	43.8%	43.1%	44.0%	42.7%	44.4%	45.0%	5
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie	54.0%	51.1%	56.5%	54.0%	58.7%	54.5%	54.5%	5
U.S.C. - Sumter	41.1%	45.1%	42.0%	40.1%	42.7%	40.1%	40.1%	5
U.S.C. - Union	44.8%	41.4%	39.3%	39.3%	37.9%	40.0%	41.0%	3
Weighted Average of Regional Campuses of U.S.C.	47.3%	46.9%	46.5%		47.0%			
<b>Sector Benchmark 40.1%</b>								
<b>Technical Colleges</b>								
Aiken Tech	40.5%	41.1%	38.6%	40.1%	41.9%	41.7%	42.0%	5
Central Carolina Tech	45.1%	43.8%	46.5%	42.9%	42.9%	44.5%	45.8%	5
Chesterfield-Marlboro Tech	33.8%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	34.2%	4
Denmark Tech	31.0%	35.7%	37.0%	38.0%	38.6%	40.0%	41.0%	5
Florence-Darlington Tech	45.2%	48.4%	47.1%	48.0%	49.2%	48.0%	48.0%	5
Greenville Tech	41.7%	43.2%	43.2%	41.0%	41.5%	41.5%	41.5%	5
Horry-Georgetown Tech	51.7%	49.5%	49.6%	45.0%	46.4%	45.0%	45.0%	5
Midlands Tech	43.6%	43.2%	42.5%	42.5%	42.8%	42.5%	42.5%	5
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech	45.8%	48.2%	46.4%	46.0%	46.4%	45.5%	45.0%	5
Piedmont Tech	36.0%	37.0%	36.0%	37.0%	37.0%	38.0%	39.0%	4
Spartanburg Tech	47.6%	48.6%	47.0%	40.1%	44.6%	40.1%	40.1%	5
Tech College of the Low Country	39.2%	39.2%	41.2%	40.1%	40.3%	40.1%	40.1%	5
Tri-County Tech	41.1%	42.1%	42.2%	41.5%	42.4%	42.0%	42.2%	5
Trident Tech	45.5%	46.0%	45.5%	44.9%	45.5%	45.0%	45.0%	5
Williamsburg Tech	19.2%	18.5%	19.6%	21.5%	22.4%	23.7%	25.0%	5
York Tech	42.4%	43.9%	38.3%	38.5%	38.5%	39.0%	39.5%	4
Weighted Average of Technical Colleges					40.6% *			
<b>Sector Benchmark 40.1%</b>								

## Accreditation of Degree Granting Programs

	1994-95 Actual	1995-96 Actual	1996-97 Actual	1997-98 Institutional Benchmark	1997-98 Actual Performance	1998-99 Target	1999-2000 Target	Assumes Direct of L
<b>Research Universities</b>								
Clemson	91.0%	92.0%	92.0%	92.0%	92.0%			4
U.S.C. - Columbia	96.0%	96.0%	95.5%	95.5%	95.5%	100.0%	100.0%	4
Medical University of S. C.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	5
Weighted Average of Research Universities		96.0%	98.0%		95.8% *			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>100.0%</b>							
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>								
The Citadel	50.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	4
Coastal Carolina University	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	40.0%	5
College of Charleston	43.0%	43.0%	43.0%	43.0%	43.0%	57.0%	57.0%	4
Francis Marion University	0.0%	29.0%	29.0%	50.0%	50.0%			4
Lander University	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%	28.0%	28.6%	42.0%	42.0%	4
South Carolina State University	58.0%	58.0%	58.0%	58.0%	58.0%			4
U.S.C. - Aiken	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	4
U.S.C.-Spartanburg	29.0%	29.0%	29.0%	42.0%	33.0%	42.0%	57.0%	3
Winthrop University	75.0%	75.0%	83.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	6
Weighted Average of Teaching Colleges & Univ.					47.8% *			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>100.0%</b>							
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>								
U.S.C. - Beaufort			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
U.S.C. - Lancaster	N/A	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			5
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
U.S.C. - Sumter			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
U.S.C. - Union			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Weighted Average of Regional Campuses of S. C.		100.0%	100.0%		N/A			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>100.0%</b>							
<b>Technical Colleges</b>								
Aiken Tech	50.0%	25.0%	33.0%	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	75.0%	4
Central Carolina Tech	17.0%	38.0%	40.0%	50.0%	40.0%	83.0%	100.0%	3
Chesterfield-Marlboro Tech	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	4
Denmark Tech	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	4
Florence-Darlington Tech	69.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			5
Greenville Tech	93.0%	94.0%	94.0%	94.0%	94.4%	94.0%	100.0%	4
Horry-Georgetown Tech	60.0%	60.0%	60.0%	66.0%	66.0%	83.3%	100.0%	4
Midlands Tech	93.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	5
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech	71.0%	71.0%	75.0%	75.0%	87.5%	75.0%	75.0%	5
Piedmont Tech	75.0%	75.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			5
Spartanburg Tech	70.0%	80.0%	68.0%	80.0%	77.8%	80.0%	90.0%	4
Tech College of the Low Country	33.0%	33.0%	33.0%	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	100.0%	4
Tri-County Tech	63.0%	63.0%	67.0%	71.4%	71.4%	85.7%	85.7%	4
Trident Tech	71.0%	80.0%	80.0%	80.0%	80.0%	86.7%	93.3%	4
Williamsburg Tech	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	4
York Tech	67.0%	75.0%	86.0%	75.0%	86.0%	75.0%	88.0%	5
Weighted Average of Technical Colleges					61.9% *			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>100.0%</b>							

## Percentage of Administrative Costs as Compared to Academic Costs

	1993 - 1994		1994 - 1995		1995 - 1996		1996 - 1997		1997 - 1998		1998 - 1999		Assumes Direction of Up
	% Admin.	% Acad.	% Admin.	% Acad.	% Admin.	% Acad.	% Admin.	% Acad.	% Admin.	% Acad.	% Admin.	% Acad.	
<b>Research Universities</b>													
Clemson	6.3%	68.0%	6.1%	68.3%	6.0%	68.7%	6.1%	67.2%	6.7%	67.2%	6.7%	67.2%	5
U.S.C. - Columbia	7.7%	71.8%	7.7%	72.2%	8.9%	71.4%	7.2%	72.0%	7.5%	72.0%	7.5%	72.0%	4
Medical University of S. C.	6.7%	81.3%	4.8%	80.7%	6.7%	79.1%	6.4%	76.0%	8.4%	76.0%	8.1%	76.2%	5
Weighted Average of Research Universities	7.0%	72.4%	6.6%	72.5%	8.1%	74.8%	7.1%	72.1%					
* Academic Costs include Instruction, Research, and Academic Support costs													
** Administrative Costs include Institutional Support costs													
<b>Sector Benchmarks</b>													
Administrative 7.6%													
Academic 80.0%													
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>													
The Citadel	16.0%	55.9%	15.3%	57.4%	15.9%	57.1%	15.0%	58.8%	15.6%	54.5%	16.3%	53.3%	4
Coastal Carolina University	14.0%	58.0%	14.0%	58.2%	13.0%	60.3%	12.9%	62.7%	12.3%	63.1%	12.0%	63.8%	4
College of Charleston	14.5%	64.5%	13.9%	65.0%	14.0%	65.4%	13.8%	65.0%	13.3%	65.0%	12.9%	65.0%	5
Francis Marion University	15.6%	60.8%	15.0%	60.1%	15.5%	60.3%	14.2%	60.8%	13.4%	62.3%	13.0%	63.0%	3
Lander University	17.6%	56.3%	18.5%	55.4%	17.9%	58.3%	17.4%	56.8%	17.1%	57.1%	16.8%	57.4%	5
South Carolina State University	20.9%	57.1%	17.8%	59.5%	19.0%	58.3%	16.5%	63.1%	16.0%	62.5%	15.6%	63.0%	5
U.S.C. - Allen	10.3%	64.9%	10.4%	63.8%	10.4%	64.2%	11.5%	62.5%	11.0%	63.0%	11.0%	64.0%	4
U.S.C. - Spartanburg	11.9%	66.7%	13.4%	65.6%	13.0%	63.4%	13.0%	65.0%	13.0%	65.0%	13.0%	65.0%	5
Winthrop University	14.2%	57.3%	15.4%	57.0%	14.6%	58.2%	13.5%	60.1%	13.2%	61.3%	12.9%	61.8%	5
Weighted Average of Teaching Colleges & Univ.	15.4%	60.1%	15.0%	60.4%	14.9%	60.7%	13.8%	62.5%					4
* Academic Costs include Instruction, Research, and Academic Support costs													
** Administrative Costs include Institutional Support costs													
<b>Sector Benchmarks</b>													
Administrative 12.9%													
Academic 65.0%													
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>													
U.S.C. - Beaufort	12.3%	60.6%	16.5%	59.0%	16.2%	57.3%	14.4%	57.1%	15.4%	58.0%	15.2%	59.0%	4
U.S.C. - Lancaster	11.9%	56.3%	10.8%	59.6%	8.3%	63.6%	10.3%	59.8%	12.0%	59.9%	12.0%	60.0%	3
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie	13.6%	59.5%	15.9%	61.1%	17.3%	60.2%	18.5%	59.6%	17.0%	60.5%	17.0%	61.0%	4
U.S.C. - Sumter	12.7%	66.0%	15.0%	60.4%	14.4%	62.1%	13.0%	64.6%	14.4%	64.8%	14.4%	65.0%	4
U.S.C. - Union	15.9%	58.2%	16.9%	61.3%	17.4%	61.3%	17.4%	61.3%	16.9%	62.0%	16.0%	63.9%	3
Weighted Average of Regional Campuses of U.S.C.	12.9%	61.0%	14.7%	60.1%	14.1%	61.1%	14.8%	60.2%					
* Academic Costs include Instruction, Research, and Academic Support costs													
** Administrative Costs include Institutional Support costs													
<b>Sector Benchmarks</b>													
Administrative 14.4%													
Academic 65.0%													
<b>Technical Colleges</b>													
Allen Tech	20.8%	62.2%	16.2%	61.9%	17.2%	63.9%	17.7%	64.2%	17.2%	65.0%	17.0%	65.0%	5
Central Carolina Tech	15.6%	64.6%	16.4%	64.6%	15.0%	67.0%	11.3%	72.1%	13.4%	70.5%	12.2%	71.2%	5
Chesapeake-Tarboro Tech	22.8%	55.6%	24.3%	54.0%	23.2%	54.4%	23.1%	56.3%	23.8%	57.4%	20.6%	57.9%	4
Dartmouth Tech	34.6%	39.0%	38.3%	36.3%	32.1%	38.6%	22.3%	53.3%	14.0%	58.0%	14.0%	62.0%	4
Florence-Darlington Tech	20.3%	57.8%	18.2%	60.2%	17.3%	63.1%	17.0%	61.0%	17.9%	61.0%	17.8%	61.5%	4
Greenville Tech	13.8%	68.0%	12.5%	69.0%	13.1%	68.1%	12.2%	68.4%	13.3%	68.5%	13.3%	68.5%	5
Henry George-Town Tech	12.6%	63.5%	20.1%	64.6%	20.1%	64.1%	19.6%	65.9%	19.6%	66.0%	20.1%	66.0%	5
Midlands Tech	18.3%	64.2%	17.0%	64.6%	19.2%	64.3%	14.2%	66.0%	13.8%	66.4%	14.2%	66.0%	5
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech	20.4%	61.6%	19.1%	64.5%	17.4%	63.9%	18.5%	64.0%	18.3%	64.4%	19.0%	64.0%	5
Piedmont Tech	19.3%	62.2%	19.6%	64.5%	18.9%	65.0%	18.5%	65.0%	18.5%	65.0%	18.0%	66.0%	5
Spartanburg Tech	21.4%	55.3%	21.5%	57.9%	22.5%	56.0%	22.1%	57.9%	21.0%	51.0%	19.0%	56.0%	2
Tech College of the Low Country	23.4%	62.0%	21.4%	63.0%	20.4%	63.0%	18.5%	65.4%	18.0%	65.0%	16.0%	66.0%	5
Tri-County Tech	20.2%	63.5%	18.5%	65.2%	21.2%	63.6%	17.5%	65.1%	16.9%	65.0%	15.7%	66.0%	5
Trident Tech	16.0%	64.5%	17.4%	62.1%	17.3%	61.3%	16.0%	63.0%	15.3%	63.5%	15.0%	64.0%	5
Williamsonburg Tech	39.5%	40.1%	37.5%	43.9%	43.9%	36.3%	39.4%	37.1%	36.0%	36.0%	35.0%	37.0%	3
York Tech	18.2%	58.3%	20.3%	59.1%	20.3%	60.1%	19.5%	61.5%	18.5%	61.0%	17.5%	61.5%	5
Weighted Average of Technical Colleges			18.1%	62.6%	18.1%	62.6%	16.3%	64.9%					
* Academic Costs include Instruction, Research, and Academic Support costs													
** Administrative Costs include Institutional Support costs													
<b>Sector Benchmarks</b>													
Administrative 14.4%													
Academic 65.0%													

## General Overhead Costs Per FTE Student

	1993 - 1994 Actual	1994 - 1995 Actual	1995 - 1996 Actual	1996 - 1997 Institutional Benchmark	1996 - 1997 Actual Performance	1997 - 1998 Target	1998 - 1999 Target	Assu Direct of Down
<b>Research Universities</b>								
Clemson	\$1,069	\$1,125	\$1,125	\$1,250	\$1,187	\$1,350	\$1,450	5
U.S.C. - Columbia	1,124	1,209	1,463	1,500	1,259	1,500	1,500	5
Medical University of S. C.	5,561	4,291	6,137	5,341	5,845	7,307	7,289	3
Weighted Average of Research Universities	1,356	1,356	1,617		1,510			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				<b>2,631</b>				
* General Overhead Costs include Institutional Support costs								
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>								
The Citadel	1,312	1,334	1,511	1,462	1,462	1,792	1,923	5
Coastal Carolina University	917	972	1,002	1,100	1,058	1,175	1,250	5
College of Charleston	878	880	894	1,658	836	1,658	1,658	5
Francis Marion University	1,067	1,142	1,222	1,190	1,167	1,175	1,150	5
Lander University	1,283	1,401	1,389	1,431	1,515	1,474	1,518	5
South Carolina State University	1,473	1,289	1,485	1,375	1,303	1,360	1,350	5
U.S.C. - Aiken	725	775	856	985	985	1,010	1,070	5
U.S.C.-Spartanburg	805	934	1,015	1,658	945	1,658	1,658	5
Winthrop University	1,322	1,477	1,396	1,325	1,276	1,275	1,260	5
Weighted Average of Teaching Colleges & Univ.	1,082	1,114	1,169		1,119			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				<b>2,742</b>				
* General Overhead Costs include Institutional Support costs								
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>								
U.S.C. - Beaufort	684	1,058	978	1,100	1,063	1,000	900	5
U.S.C. - Lancaster	704	630	534	600	663	600	600	5
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie	807	1,009	1,116	950	1,268	1,000	900	2
U.S.C. - Sumter	725	891	987	950	922	945	940	5
U.S.C. - Union	993	1,146	1,207	1,207	2,053	1,100	1,000	2
Weighted Average of Regional Campuses of U.S.C.	747	902	920		1,024			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				<b>869</b>				
* General Overhead Costs include Institutional Support costs								
<b>Technical Colleges</b>								
Aiken Tech	926	935	890	1,000	990	944	916	4
Central Carolina Tech	696	788	772	755	602	739	723	6
Chesterfield-Marlboro Tech	1,061	1,286	1,227	1,226	1,235	1,226	1,225	4
Denmark Tech	1,741	1,940	1,883	1,175	1,135	869	869	5
Florence-Darlington Tech	1,106	1,007	943	1,000	1,089	990	980	3
Greenville Tech	665	672	764	825	769	825	825	5
Horry-Georgetown Tech	686	775	785	869	713	952	952	5
Midlands Tech	701	743	874	825	675	825	825	5
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech	960	992	984	1,040	1,031	1,020	1,000	4
Piedmont Tech	1,083	1,162	1,190	974	1,063	1,050	1,000	3
Spartanburg Tech	901	1,084	1,090	1,090	859	1,075	1,050	6
Tech College of the Low Country	1,469	1,233	1,437	1,437	1,564	1,450	1,425	3
Tri-County Tech	887	883	1,155	883	869	876	869	5
Trident Tech	723	864	952	905	796	927	950	5
Williamsburg Tech	3,123	2,522	2,489	2,300	2,204	2,230	2,175	5
York Tech	931	1,067	1,151	1,100	925	1,050	1,000	5
Weighted Average of Technical Colleges		1,087	1,080		863			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				<b>\$869</b>				
* General Overhead Costs include Institutional Support costs								

## SAT Scores of Student Body

	Fall 1994 Actual	Fall 1995 Actual	Fall 1996 Actual	Fall 1997 Institutional Benchmark	Fall 1997 Actual Performance	Fall 1998 Target	Fall 1999 Target	Assumes Direction of Up
<b>Research Universities</b>								
Clemson	88.9%	87.0%	85.5%	85.0%	85.0%	85.0%	85.0%	5
U.S.C. - Columbia	67.4%	69.3%	67.3%	67.0%	68.9%	67.0%	67.0%	5
MUSC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Weighted Average of Research Universities	78.2%	78.0%	76.2%					
<b>Sector Benchmark 75.0%</b>								
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>								
The Citadel	65.9%	68.4%	69.3%	60.0%	67.9%	61.0%	61.0%	5
Coastal Carolina University	44.6%	47.6%	49.0%	52.0%	51.6%	53.0%	54.0%	4
College of Charleston	78.1%	78.7%	79.3%	60.0%	87.2%	60.0%	60.0%	6
Francis Marion University	38.0%	68.8%	32.0%	35.0%	37.5%	36.0%	37.0%	5
Lander University	37.7%	46.6%	43.0%	43.0%	42.0%	33.0%	35.0%	4
South Carolina State University	13.6%	8.9%	17.1%	15.0%	16.5%	16.0%	17.0%	5
U.S.C. - Aiken	48.9%	42.9%	42.3%	38.5%	38.9%	39.0%	40.0%	5
U.S.C.-Spartanburg	44.9%	36.3%	38.2%	33.5%	35.0%	34.0%	35.0%	5
Winthrop University	68.3%	59.9%	60.3%	58.0%	57.8%	58.0%	59.0%	4
Weighted Average of Teaching Colleges & Univ.	53.6%	51.6%	53.2%					
<b>Sector Benchmark 60.0%</b>								
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>								
U.S.C. - Beaufort	39.1%	28.4%	33.6%	28.3%	31.3%	29.0%	29.5%	5
U.S.C. - Lancaster	30.6%	29.6%	22.5%	23.0%	22.1%	24.0%	24.0%	2
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie	17.3%	16.1%	18.3%	18.0%	19.3%	18.0%	18.5%	5
U.S.C. - Sumter	37.2%	36.2%	29.7%	26.0%	30.1%	28.0%	29.0%	5
U.S.C. - Union	26.2%	25.5%	14.0%	12.0%	17.8%	12.5%	13.0%	5
Weighted Average of Regional Campuses of U.S.C.	30.9%	28.3%	25.3%					
<b>Sector Benchmark 33.3%</b>								
<b>Technical Colleges</b>								
Aiken Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Central Carolina Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Chesterfield-Mariboro Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Denmark Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Florence-Darlington Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Greenville Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Horry-Georgetown Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Midlands Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Piedmont Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Spartanburg Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Tech College of the Low Country			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Tri-County Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Trident Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Williamsburg Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
York Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Weighted Average of Technical Colleges								
<b>Sector Benchmark N/A</b>								

### High School Class Standing, Grade Point Averages, and Activities of Student Body

	Fall 1994 Actual	Fall 1995 Actual	Fall 1996 Actual	Fall 1997 Institutional Benchmark	Fall 1997 Actual Performance	Fall 1998 Target	Fall 1999 Target	Assumes Direction of Up
<b>Research Universities</b>								
Clemson			N/A	75.0%	80.9%	76.0%	77.0%	5
U.S.C. - Columbia			N/A	72.0%	72.9%	72.0%	72.0%	5
Medical University of S. C.			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Weighted Avg. of Research Univ.					76.8%			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				None				
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>								
The Citadel			N/A	41.0%	41.7%	41.0%	41.0%	5
Coastal Carolina University			N/A	41.0%	42.7%	42.0%	43.0%	5
College of Charleston			N/A	61.0%	68.4%	63.0%	65.0%	5
Francis Marion University			N/A	40.3%	40.3%	41.5%	43.5%	4
Lander University			N/A	45.0%	61.1%	40.0%	43.0%	5
South Carolina State University			N/A	34.0%	36.2%	35.0%	36.0%	5
U.S.C. - Aiken			N/A	40.0%	40.0%	42.0%	43.5%	4
U.S.C.-Spartanburg			N/A	36.0%	41.3%	37.0%	38.0%	5
Winthrop University			N/A	60.0%	64.6%	62.0%	64.0%	5
Weighted Avg. of Teaching Colleges & Univ.					52.1%			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				None				
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>								
U.S.C. - Beaufort			N/A	31.0%	32.2%	32.0%	33.0%	5
U.S.C. - Lancaster			N/A	32.0%	37.7%	33.5%	35.0%	5
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie			N/A	39.7%	40.1%	40.0%	40.5%	5
U.S.C. - Sumter			N/A	30.0%	40.7%	30.0%	32.0%	5
U.S.C. - Union			N/A	29.0%	41.5%	31.0%	33.0%	5
Weighted Avg. of Regional Campuses of USC					38.6%			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				None				
<b>Technical Colleges</b>								
Aiken Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Central Carolina Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Chesterfield-Marlboro Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Denmark Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Florence-Darlington Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Greenville Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Horry-Georgetown Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Midlands Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Piedmont Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Spartanburg Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Tech College of the Low Country			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Tri-County Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Trident Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Williamsburg Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
York Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Weighted Avg. of Tech. Colleges								
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				None				

## Priority on Enrolling In-State Students

	Fall 1994 Actual	Fall 1995 Actual	Fall 1996 Actual	Fall 1997 Institutional Benchmark	Fall 1997 Actual Performance	Fall 1998 Target	Fall 1999 Target	Assumes Direction of Up
<b>Research Universities</b>								
Clemson	77.0%	76.8%	76.7%	75.0%	76.9%	75.0%	75.0%	5
U.S.C. - Columbia	84.7%	83.9%	87.8%	88.0%	88.2%	87.0%	86.0%	5
Medical University of S. C.	93.7%	94.4%	95.1%	95.0%	96.5%	95.0%	95.0%	5
Weighted Average of Research Universities	81.7%	81.1%	83.2%					
<b>Sector Benchmark 70.0%</b>								
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>								
The Citadel	58.8%	56.8%	55.0%	52.5%	52.5%	53.0%	53.0%	4
Coastal Carolina University	77.8%	78.9%	75.0%	75.0%	77.8%	75.0%	75.0%	5
College of Charleston	74.8%	72.5%	69.8%	69.8%	66.9%	68.0%	70.0%	3
Francis Marion University	94.8%	93.5%	92.2%	92.0%	91.9%	92.2%	92.2%	5
Lander University	93.6%	93.7%	94.8%	90.0%	93.0%	90.0%	90.0%	5
South Carolina State University	87.8%	85.9%	84.6%	80.0%	83.1%	80.0%	80.0%	5
U.S.C. - Aiken	95.6%	95.5%	94.5%	90.0%	95.0%	90.0%	90.0%	5
U.S.C. - Spartanburg	97.4%	94.8%	95.6%	90.0%	95.3%	90.0%	90.0%	5
Winthrop University	86.3%	85.6%	85.6%	80.0%	94.3%	80.0%	80.0%	5
Weighted Average of Teaching Colleges & Univ.	84.3%	83.0%	81.4%					
<b>Sector Benchmark 80.0%</b>								
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>								
U.S.C. - Beaufort	98.2%	98.7%	97.2%	N/A	N/A			N/A
U.S.C. - Lancaster	99.6%	99.5%	99.6%	N/A	N/A			N/A
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie	98.1%	98.0%	99.5%	N/A	N/A			N/A
U.S.C. - Sumter	99.0%	99.6%	98.6%	N/A	N/A			N/A
U.S.C. - Union	99.7%	99.7%	99.1%	N/A	N/A			N/A
Weighted Average of Regional Campuses of U.S.C.	98.9%	99.1%	98.7%					
<b>Sector Benchmark N/A</b>								
<b>Technical Colleges</b>								
Aiken Tech	86.2%	87.7%	88.5%	Not Applicable	N/A			N/A
Central Carolina Tech	100.0%	100.0%	99.8%	Not Applicable	N/A			N/A
Chesterfield-Marlboro Tech	98.7%	98.4%	99.1%	Not Applicable	N/A			N/A
Denmark Tech	95.4%	95.7%	96.2%	Not Applicable	N/A			N/A
Florence-Darlington Tech	99.6%	99.6%	99.2%	Not Applicable	N/A			N/A
Greenville Tech	98.9%	98.7%	97.7%	Not Applicable	N/A			N/A
Horry-Georgetown Tech	92.1%	90.3%	89.1%	Not Applicable	N/A			N/A
Midlands Tech	98.8%	98.1%	96.7%	Not Applicable	N/A			N/A
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech	99.8%	99.9%	99.8%	Not Applicable	N/A			N/A
Piedmont Tech	99.2%	99.1%	99.1%	Not Applicable	N/A			N/A
Spartanburg Tech	99.3%	99.2%	99.3%	Not Applicable	N/A			N/A
Tech College of the Low Country	97.3%	96.5%	97.3%	Not Applicable	N/A			N/A
Tri-County Tech	94.8%	94.4%	94.6%	Not Applicable	N/A			N/A
Trident Tech	95.7%	94.7%	93.8%	Not Applicable	N/A			N/A
Williamsburg Tech	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	Not Applicable	N/A			N/A
York Tech	98.9%	99.0%	99.0%	Not Applicable	N/A			N/A
Weighted Average of Technical Colleges	97.3%	96.9%	96.3%					
<b>Sector Benchmark N/A</b>								

## Graduation Rate

	Fall 1994 Actual	Fall 1995 Actual	Fall 1996 Actual	Fall 1997 Institutional Benchmark	Fall 1997 Actual Performance	Fall 1998 Target	Fall 1999 Target	Assumes Direction of Up
<b>Research Universities</b>								
Clemson	71.7%	72.3%	70.1%	69.0%	69.6%	68.0%	67.0%	4
U.S.C. - Columbia	61.7%	61.2%	61.9%	61.6%	56.2%	63.0%	63.0%	2
Medical University of S. C.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Weighted Avg. of Research Univ.								
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	None							
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>								
The Citadel	69.8%	73.0%	76.7%	77.0%	73.1%	70.0%	70.0%	4
Coastal Carolina University	36.9%	34.8%	31.1%	32.5%	34.2%	33.0%	34.0%	5
College of Charleston	54.5%	52.8%	55.6%	52.8%	53.9%	52.8%	52.8%	5
Francis Marion University	38.7%	38.5%	40.4%	38.5%	35.5%	37.5%	38.5%	3
Lander University	53.4%	47.3%	39.0%	40.0%	46.6%	41.0%	42.0%	5
South Carolina State University	49.5%	41.6%	50.6%	50.0%	46.6%	50.5%	51.0%	3
U.S.C. - Aiken	28.9%	30.0%	31.6%	32.2%	32.7%	43.5%	44.5%	5
U.S.C.-Spartanburg	38.0%	35.0%	31.9%	35.0%	32.3%	40.0%	40.0%	3
Winthrop University	49.6%	51.5%	57.1%	52.0%	51.2%	53.0%	54.0%	3
Weighted Avg. of Teaching Colleges & Univ.	48.6%	46.8%	48.7%					
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	None							
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>								
U.S.C. - Beaufort	9.3%	9.0%	10.8%	10.8%	13.0%	11.0%	11.0%	5
U.S.C. - Lancaster	11.4%	11.0%	12.1%	12.5%	28.0%	12.5%	13.0%	6
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie	10.0%	12.0%	7.0%	10.0%	21.0%	31.5%	32.0%	6
U.S.C. - Sumter	22.2%	19.8%	16.9%	16.9%	19.0%	18.0%	19.0%	5
U.S.C. - Union	4.3%	10.0%	5.4%	10.0%	23.0%	6.0%	7.0%	6
Weighted Avg. of Regional Campuses of USC			18.4%					
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	None							
<b>Technical Colleges</b>								
Aiken Tech	14.8%	15.0%	17.5%	14.0%	14.4%	15.0%	15.0%	5
Central Carolina Tech	17.1%	16.6%	17.5%	14.9%	16.5%	15.3%	15.9%	5
Chesterfield-Marlboro Tech	20.0%	18.0%	20.0%	20.0%	22.1%	20.0%	20.0%	5
Denmark Tech	24.8%	22.9%	36.2%	31.0%	28.3%	31.0%	31.0%	3
Florence-Darlington Tech	22.0%	17.0%	21.4%	20.0%	21.2%	20.5%	20.9%	5
Greenville Tech	24.1%	19.2%	13.8%	16.0%	13.2%	10.0%	11.0%	2
Horry-Georgetown Tech	22.6%	20.9%	21.6%	20.7%	19.3%	20.8%	20.9%	3
Midlands Tech	17.0%	13.0%	9.0%	10.0%	10.4%	10.0%	11.0%	5
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech	31.0%	29.0%	31.0%	31.0%	32.3%	27.0%	27.0%	5
Piedmont Tech	24.8%	30.8%	32.6%	31.0%	28.3%	31.5%	32.0%	3
Spartanburg Tech	30.1%	25.8%	24.9%	23.0%	27.4%	23.0%	24.0%	5
Tech College of the Low Country	26.0%	15.6%	21.1%	17.5%	19.6%	19.0%	20.0%	5
Tri-County Tech	29.9%	20.8%	22.3%	22.4%	22.8%	22.8%	23.1%	5
Trident Tech	18.2%	17.4%	16.5%	15.7%	14.4%	15.8%	15.9%	3
Williamsburg Tech	20.6%	25.6%	42.3%	18.9%	19.3%	22.0%	25.0%	5
York Tech	26.5%	22.3%	21.2%	17.5%	18.9%	17.5%	17.8%	5
Weighted Avg. of Tech. Colleges	22.6%	20.1%	19.2%					
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	None							

## Results of Professional Examinations

	1993 - 1994	1994 - 1995	1995 - 1996	1996 - 1997	1996 - 1997	1997 - 1998	1998 - 1999	Assumes
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Institutional Benchmark	Actual Performance	Target	Target	Direction of Up
<b>Research Universities</b>								
Clemson	88.9%	94.6%	89.3%	89.3%	88.8%	89.0%	90.0%	4
U.S.C. - Columbia	94.8%	93.8%	91.6%	90.0%	89.9%	90.0%	92.0%	4
Medical University of S. C.	94.2%	94.5%	94.2%	94.2%	93.8%	95.0%	95.0%	4
Weighted Average of Research Universities								
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>95.0%</b>							
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>								
The Citadel	93.1%	93.9%	87.1%	87.1%	86.9%	90.0%	93.0%	4
Coastal Carolina University	94.4%	92.5%	90.7%	93.7%	93.7%	94.0%	94.3%	4
College of Charleston	93.9%	94.4%	92.6%	90.0%	91.7%	91.0%	93.0%	5
Francis Marion University	None	84.4%	82.2%	84.5%	84.8%	86.5%	88.5%	4
Lander University	89.0%	90.6%	89.6%	91.0%	93.6%	91.1%	91.1%	5
South Carolina State University	94.2%	91.5%	90.3%	91.0%	89.7%	91.5%	92.0%	2
U.S.C. - Aiken	92.4%	92.1%	92.6%	93.5%	94.1%	94.0%	94.5%	4
U.S.C. - Spartanburg	94.6%	92.7%	92.9%	93.0%	94.8%	93.5%	94.0%	5
Winthrop University	97.1%	94.9%	93.9%	90.0%	97.1%	90.0%	90.0%	5
Weighted Average of Teaching Colleges & Univ.								
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>95.0%</b>							
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>								
U.S.C. - Beaufort			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
U.S.C. - Lancaster		100.0%	100.0%	95.0%	100.0%	95.0%	95.0%	5
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
U.S.C. - Sumter			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
U.S.C. - Union			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Weighted Avg. of Regional Campuses of USC			N/A	N/A	N/A			
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>95.0%</b>							
<b>Technical Colleges</b>								
Aiken Tech	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	95.0%	100.0%	95.0%	95.0%	5
Central Carolina Tech	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	95.0%	98.4%	95.0%	95.0%	5
Chesterfield-Marlboro Tech	100.0%	100.0%	92.3%	91.7%	92.9%	92.3%	92.9%	5
Denmark Tech	100.0%	90.0%	90.0%	100.0%	90.3%	100.0%	100.0%	3
Florence-Darlington Tech	95.0%	92.0%	89.1%	90.0%	91.9%	91.0%	91.5%	5
Greenville Tech	88.6%	81.8%	90.6%	87.0%	87.5%	87.5%	88.0%	4
Horry-Georgetown Tech	89.7%	81.6%	85.7%	92.0%	92.7%	95.0%	95.0%	4
Midlands Tech	89.0%	91.5%	92.4%	91.5%	91.5%	91.9%	92.3%	4
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech	89.7%	96.8%	88.9%	90.0%	97.7%	90.0%	90.0%	5
Piedmont Tech	93.1%	88.4%	96.6%	92.0%	94.0%	94.0%	96.0%	5
Spartanburg Tech	81.5%	83.9%	81.9%	88.0%	93.9%	89.0%	89.0%	5
Tech College of the Low Country	93.8%	90.9%	93.7%	95.0%	98.3%	95.0%	95.0%	5
Tri-County Tech	89.8%	94.1%	87.6%	90.9%	91.3%	91.6%	92.6%	4
Trident Tech	91.9%	91.5%	91.2%	91.4%	91.1%	91.6%	91.8%	4
Williamsburg Tech	None	None	None	95.0%	100.0%	95.0%	95.0%	5
York Tech	84.0%	91.3%	93.0%	95.0%	97.3%	95.0%	95.0%	5
Weighted Average of Technical Colleges								
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>95%</b>							

## Credit Hours Earned of Graduates

	Not Required		Fall 1996 Actual	Fall 1997 Institutional Benchmark	Fall 1997 Actual Performance	Fall 1998 Target	Fall 1999 Target	Assumes Direction of Down
	Fall 1994 Actual	Fall 1995 Actual						
<b>Research Universities</b>								
Clemson	104.7%	103.9%	103.0%	105.0%	104.0%	105.0%	105.0%	5
U.S.C. - Columbia	109.8%	110.4%	110.5%	110.0%	110.5%	109.0%	108.0%	4
Medical University of S. C.			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Weighted Avg. of Research Univ.								
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>110.0%</b>							
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>								
The Citadel	104.0%	104.0%	104.0%	106.0%	103.0%	106.0%	106.0%	5
Coastal Carolina University		108.0%	107.0%	107.0%	107.0%	107.0%	107.0%	5
College of Charleston	105.8%	105.5%	106.3%	110.0%	106.5%	110.0%	110.0%	5
Francis Marion University			105.7%	110.0%	105.3%	105.7%	105.7%	5
Lander University			N/A	110.0%	101.8%	110.0%	110.0%	5
South Carolina State University		109.2%	109.5%	110.0%	109.5%	109.0%	108.0%	5
U.S.C. - Aiken	109.5%	110.2%	112.9%	110.0%	112.9%	110.0%	110.0%	2
U.S.C. - Spartanburg	109.7%	110.0%	111.8%	111.4%	111.5%	110.8%	110.0%	4
Winthrop University			106.7%	107.0%	104.0%	107.0%	107.0%	5
Weighted Avg. of Teaching Colleges & Univ.								
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>110.0%</b>							
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>								
U.S.C. - Beaufort	118.0%	117.7%	115.1%	115.1%	119.7%	118.0%	116.0%	3
U.S.C. - Lancaster	123.0%	120.0%	123.0%	123.0%	126.3%	120.0%	120.0%	3
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie	119.0%	117.3%	124.7%	117.3%	124.7%	117.3%	117.3%	2
U.S.C. - Sumter	139.0%	138.0%	139.0%	130.0%	130.8%	130.0%	131.0%	4
U.S.C. - Union	120.0%	123.0%	127.0%	127.0%	128.1%	127.0%	125.0%	4
Weighted Avg. of Regional Campuses of USC								
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>110.0%</b>							
<b>Technical Colleges</b>								
Aiken Tech			113.6%	111.6%	111.6%	111.0%	110.8%	4
Central Carolina Tech	115.0%	115.0%	112.0%	110.0%	110.0%	109.0%	107.0%	5
Chesterfield-Marlboro Tech	120.1%	117.5%	120.1%	114.3%	109.3%	113.4%	112.6%	5
Denmark Tech			107.0%	106.0%	106.0%	106.0%	106.0%	5
Florence-Darlington Tech	110.0%	106.6%	120.3%	119.0%	119.0%	118.0%	117.5%	4
Greenville Tech			117.5%	120.0%	119.7%	119.5%		4
Horry-Georgetown Tech			111.0%	110.0%	109.3%	110.0%	110.0%	5
Midlands Tech			115.1%	117.0%	116.6%	117.0%	117.0%	4
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech			116.0%	115.0%	112.2%	115.0%	115.0%	5
Piedmont Tech	120.0%	118.0%	115.0%	113.0%	112.0%	112.0%	110.0%	4
Spartanburg Tech			105.9%	110.0%	105.9%	110.0%	110.0%	5
Tech College of the Low Country			110.8%	110.0%	107.4%	110.0%	110.0%	5
Tri-County Tech			111.7%	117.9%	114.2%			5
Trident Tech			117.3%	115.8%	115.1%	115.6%	115.4%	4
Williamsburg Tech	106.0%	106.0%	105.0%	110.0%	108.0%	107.0%	106.0%	5
York Tech			110.0%	110.0%	106.6%	110.0%	110.0%	5
Weighted Avg. of Tech. Colleges								
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>110%</b>							

## Transferability of Credits to and from the Institution

	Fall 1994 Actual	Fall 1995 Actual	Fall 1996 Actual	Fall 1997 Institutional Benchmark	Fall 1997 Actual Performance	Fall 1998 Target	Fall 1999 Target	Assumes Direction of Up
<b>Research Universities</b>								
Clemson			N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	5
U.S.C. - Columbia			N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	5
Medical University of S. C.			N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	5
Weighted Avg. of Research Univ.								
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				<b>100%</b>				
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>								
The Citadel			N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	5
Coastal Carolina University			N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	5
College of Charleston			N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	5
Francis Marion University			N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	5
Lander University			N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	5
South Carolina State University			N/A	90%	100%	95%	100%	5
U.S.C. - Aiken			N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	5
U.S.C.-Spartanburg			N/A	90%	100%	90%	100%	5
Winthrop University			N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	5
Weighted Avg. of Teaching Colleges & Univ.								
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				<b>100%</b>				
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>								
U.S.C. - Beaufort			N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	5
U.S.C. - Lancaster			N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	5
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie			N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	5
U.S.C. - Sumter			N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	5
U.S.C. - Union			N/A	100%	90%	100%	100%	3
Weighted Avg. of Regional Campuses of USC								
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				<b>100%</b>				
<b>Technical Colleges</b>								
Aiken Tech			N/A	90%	90%	90%	100%	4
Central Carolina Tech			N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	5
Chesterfield-Marlboro Tech			N/A	90%	90%	100%	100%	4
Denmark Tech			N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	5
Florence-Darlington Tech			N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	5
Greenville Tech			N/A	90%	90%	100%	100%	4
Horry-Georgetown Tech			N/A	90%	100%	100%	100%	5
Midlands Tech			N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	5
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech			N/A	90%	90%	100%	100%	4
Piedmont Tech			N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	5
Spartanburg Tech			N/A	90%	90%	90%	100%	4
Tech College of the Low Country			N/A	90%	90%	90%	90%	4
Tri-County Tech			N/A	90%	90%	100%	100%	4
Trident Tech			N/A	90%	90%	90%	90%	4
Williamsburg Tech			N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	5
York Tech			N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	5
Weighted Avg. of Tech. Colleges								
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				<b>100%</b>				

## Percentage of Other Race\* Students

	Fall 1994 Actual Percentage	Fall 1995 Actual Percentage	Fall 1996 Actual Percentage	Fall 1997 Institutional Benchmark Percentage	Fall 1997 Actual Percentage	Fall 1998 Target Percentage	Fall 1999 Target Percentage	Assessment Direction of Up
<b>Research Universities</b>								
Clemson	8.7%	8.3%	8.0%	8.0%	7.8%	8.0%	8.3%	3
U.S.C. - Columbia	18.0%	17.9%	18.7%	18.0%	18.6%	18.0%	17.0%	5
Medical University of S. C.	7.7%	7.3%	7.7%	9.5%	10.4%	10.0%	10.5%	5
Weighted Average of Research Universities	13.8%	13.5%	13.7%					
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	None							
* African American								
** White, Non-Hispanic								
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>								
The Citadel	8.0%	8.4%	7.9%	7.9%	7.3%	7.5%	8.0%	3
Coastal Carolina University	7.7%	8.8%	8.9%	8.9%	8.9%	8.0%	9.1%	4
College of Charleston	7.5%	7.6%	8.0%	8.1%	8.2%	8.2%	8.4%	5
Francis Marion University	24.2%	25.3%	28.2%	27.7%	27.7%	27.7%	27.7%	4
Lander University	19.5%	19.7%	19.6%	19.6%	19.5%	19.8%	19.6%	4
South Carolina State University**	3.7%	3.4%	3.6%	3.7%	3.9%	3.8%	4.0%	5
U.S.C. - Aiken	16.1%	16.5%	17.9%	18.6%	18.6%	18.8%	19.0%	4
U.S.C. - Spartanburg	13.4%	14.0%	16.3%	16.5%	17.2%	17.0%	18.0%	5
Winthrop University	20.8%	21.5%	21.9%	22.1%	23.1%	22.2%	22.3%	5
Weighted Average of Teaching Colleges & Univ.	12.5%	12.9%	13.5%					
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	None							
* African American								
** White, Non-Hispanic								
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>								
U.S.C. - Beaufort	16.9%	16.4%	17.2%	16.8%	16.6%	17.0%	17.2%	2
U.S.C. - Lancaster	17.6%	16.1%	18.6%	18.6%	17.0%	18.3%	18.7%	3
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie	36.5%	36.5%	37.2%	37.2%	34.6%	37.2%	37.5%	3
U.S.C. - Sumter	19.3%	18.4%	19.7%	19.0%	19.5%	19.2%	19.4%	5
U.S.C. - Union	14.8%	15.6%	19.0%	19.0%	10.0%	20.0%	20.5%	2
Weighted Average of Regional Campuses of U.S.C.	20.8%	20.4%	21.8%					
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	None							
* African American								
** White, Non-Hispanic								
<b>Technical Colleges</b>								
Aiken Tech	31.7%	30.5%	30.2%	31.0%	33.6%	30.0%	32.0%	6
Central Carolina Tech	35.4%	36.3%	37.6%	38.7%	38.6%	40.0%	41.4%	4
Chesterfield-Marlboro Tech	32.6%	33.4%	36.4%	43.6%	39.4%	44.6%	45.8%	3
Denmark Tech**	6.1%	9.3%	8.2%	5.0%	5.0%	7.0%	10.0%	4
Florence-Darlington Tech	28.8%	31.0%	33.4%	33.9%	34.8%	34.3%	35.0%	5
Greenville Tech	14.9%	15.1%	16.2%	16.2%	16.4%	16.3%	16.4%	4
Horry-Georgetown Tech	16.2%	16.1%	16.9%	19.0%	19.1%	19.1%	19.2%	4
Midlands Tech	30.3%	31.8%	31.8%	30.0%	31.9%	30.0%	30.0%	5
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech	44.7%	44.6%	48.5%	45.0%	52.0%	45.0%	45.0%	5
Piedmont Tech	31.5%	31.0%	31.5%	33.0%	32.2%	34.0%	34.5%	3
Spartanburg Tech	19.8%	20.5%	20.1%	21.6%	22.9%	21.6%	21.6%	5
Tech College of the Low Country	34.1%	35.5%	32.4%	33.0%	35.7%	33.0%	33.0%	5
Tri-County Tech	11.5%	10.4%	10.7%	10.7%	10.8%	10.9%	11.1%	4
Trident Tech	19.6%	21.3%	22.1%	21.7%	21.8%	21.8%	21.9%	4
Williamsburg Tech	48.9%	54.3%	59.0%	61.8%	60.0%	62.0%	62.0%	3
York Tech	18.8%	18.8%	20.2%	21.0%	22.2%	22.0%	22.0%	5
Weighted Average of Technical Colleges	23.8%	24.7%	25.3%					
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	None							
* African American								
** White, Non-Hispanic								

### Other Race\* Students Retention Ratio

	Fall 1994 Actual	Fall 1995 Actual	Fall 1996 Actual	Benchmark Ratio	Actual Ratio	Assumes Direction of Up
<b>Research Universities</b>						
Clemson	96.2%	96.8%	96.9%	97.2%	97.6%	4
U.S.C. - Columbia	96.8%	95.8%	99.0%	97.6%	97.9%	4
Medical University of S. C.	96.5%	96.8%	95.1%	97.9%	100.8%	5
Weighted Average of Research Universities						

<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>None</b>
-------------------------	-------------

- \* African American  
\*\* White, Non-Hispanic

<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>						
The Citadel	93.0%	93.0%	97.1%	93.0%	85.8%	2
Coastal Carolina University	108.6%	101.8%	100.9%	100.9%	95.3%	3
College of Charleston	97.4%	95.0%	96.1%	96.1%	96.3%	4
Francis Marion University	102.5%	99.3%	107.6%	100.0%	102.4%	5
Lander University	100.5%	99.5%	93.2%	95.0%	92.9%	2
South Carolina State University**	92.6%	83.5%	84.2%	90.0%	93.3%	5
U.S.C. - Aiken	91.1%	94.7%	97.0%	100.0%	90.2%	2
U.S.C. - Spartanburg	95.4%	91.2%	105.3%	102.9%	96.5%	3
Winthrop University	98.3%	98.5%	97.7%	100.0%	102.1%	5
Weighted Average of Teaching Colleges & Univ.						

<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>None</b>
-------------------------	-------------

- \* African American  
\*\* White, Non-Hispanic

<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>						
U.S.C. - Beaufort	95.1%	99.8%	89.3%	89.3%	85.3%	2
U.S.C. - Lancaster	100.9%	88.8%	97.4%	97.4%	93.0%	3
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie	83.3%	101.9%	87.5%	100.0%	107.4%	5
U.S.C. - Sumter	110.8%	97.9%	106.9%	100.0%	94.5%	3
U.S.C. - Union	100.8%	102.9%	99.4%	97.0%	73.4%	2
Weighted Average of Regional Campuses of U.S.C.						

<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>None</b>
-------------------------	-------------

- \* African American  
\*\* White, Non-Hispanic

<b>Technical Colleges</b>						
Aiken Tech	98.5%	91.3%	94.1%	94.2%	105.7%	6
Central Carolina Tech	97.6%	90.4%	83.8%	95.7%	92.0%	2
Chesterfield-Marlboro Tech	81.8%	88.0%	88.2%	88.6%	111.6%	5
Denmark Tech**	120.3%	82.0%	120.1%	107.4%	115.1%	5
Florence-Darlington Tech	85.8%	86.1%	91.2%	90.2%	94.9%	5
Greenville Tech	95.0%	90.5%	102.1%	96.0%	98.5%	5
Horry-Georgetown Tech	84.9%	87.4%	76.3%	96.0%	94.2%	3
Midlands Tech	93.6%	93.9%	89.8%	90.4%	88.9%	2
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech	81.2%	83.4%	79.5%	80.0%	90.2%	5
Piedmont Tech	96.0%	95.2%	94.7%	95.5%	103.8%	5
Spartanburg Tech	90.9%	79.1%	93.6%	91.0%	99.5%	5
Tech College of the Low Country	98.3%	91.7%	83.5%	85.2%	98.0%	5
Tri-County Tech	97.6%	94.1%	96.7%	96.2%	96.4%	4
Trident Tech	86.4%	91.7%	86.9%	86.4%	88.3%	5
Williamsburg Tech	109.8%	111.3%	109.1%	102.2%	112.5%	5
York Tech	98.4%	95.4%	90.9%	90.9%	86.6%	2
Weighted Average of Technical Colleges						

<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>None</b>
-------------------------	-------------

- \* African American  
\*\* White, Non-Hispanic

# Other Race\* Students Retention Rates Used In Computing Retention Ratios

	Fall 1994 Actual			Fall 1995 Actual			Fall 1996 Actual			Fall 1997 Institutional Benchmark			Fall 1997 Actual Performance			Fall 1998 Target			Fall 1999 Target		
	Other Race	Non-O-R	Retention	Other Race	Non-O-R	Retention	Other Race	Non-O-R	Retention	Other Race	Non-O-R	Retention	Other Race	Non-O-R	Retention	Other Race	Non-O-R	Retention	Other Race	Non-O-R	Retention
<b>Research Universities</b>																					
Clemson	86.5%	90.2%	86.5%	86.5%	89.5%	86.4%	86.4%	89.2%	86.5%	86.5%	89.0%	86.7%	86.7%	89.4%	86.5%	86.7%	89.7%	86.7%	86.7%	89.9%	84.0%
U.S.C. - Columbia	82.1%	84.8%	82.1%	81.6%	85.4%	83.0%	83.0%	83.8%	82.0%	82.0%	84.0%	82.6%	82.6%	84.4%	82.0%	82.0%	84.0%	82.0%	82.0%	84.0%	84.0%
Medical University of S. C.	83.1%	86.1%	83.1%	87.0%	89.9%	85.2%	85.2%	89.6%	76.2%	76.2%	77.8%	80.3%	80.3%	79.7%							
Weighted Average of Research Universities	83.5%	87.4%	83.5%	87.5%	87.5%	86.6%	86.6%	86.6%													
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	None																				
* African American																					
** White, Non-Hispanic																					
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>																					
The Citadel	82.8%	89.0%	82.8%	81.3%	87.4%	86.5%	86.5%	88.1%	70.5%	69.8%	75.0%	87.4%	87.4%	87.4%	71.0%	71.0%	70.0%	71.0%	71.0%	70.0%	71.5%
Coastal Carolina University	75.5%	89.5%	75.5%	72.1%	70.8%	70.5%	70.5%	69.9%	78.0%	81.2%	81.2%	87.1%	87.1%	87.1%	78.0%	78.0%	70.0%	78.0%	78.0%	70.0%	71.5%
College of Charleston	78.8%	81.9%	78.8%	77.5%	81.6%	78.0%	78.0%	81.2%	71.0%	71.0%	71.0%	71.5%	71.5%	71.5%	71.0%	71.0%	71.5%	71.5%	71.5%	71.5%	71.5%
Francis Marion University	73.4%	71.6%	73.4%	71.6%	72.3%	76.3%	76.3%	70.9%	70.9%	70.9%	70.9%	73.6%	73.6%	73.6%	70.9%	70.9%	70.9%	70.9%	70.9%	70.9%	71.5%
Lander University	76.9%	76.5%	76.9%	77.0%	77.4%	74.8%	74.8%	80.3%	80.3%	80.3%	80.3%	76.2%	76.2%	76.2%	76.2%	76.2%	76.2%	76.2%	76.2%	76.2%	76.2%
South Carolina State University**	75.9%	82.0%	75.9%	68.1%	81.6%	69.2%	69.2%	82.2%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	71.8%	71.8%	71.8%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%
U.S.C. - Aiken	67.7%	74.3%	67.7%	70.2%	74.1%	74.2%	74.2%	76.5%	71.7%	71.7%	71.7%	71.4%	71.4%	71.4%	74.0%	74.0%	70.0%	74.0%	74.0%	70.0%	81.0%
U.S.C. - Spartanburg	71.0%	74.4%	71.0%	66.7%	73.1%	78.6%	78.6%	81.7%	80.0%	80.0%	80.0%	82.3%	82.3%	82.3%	81.0%	81.0%	81.0%	81.0%	81.0%	81.0%	81.0%
Winthrop University	79.2%	81.1%	79.2%	81.1%	82.3%	78.6%	78.6%	81.7%	78.4%	78.4%	78.4%										
Weighted Average of Teaching Colleges & Univ.	75.5%	78.1%	75.5%	74.5%	78.2%	76.5%	76.5%	78.4%													
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	None																				
* African American																					
** White, Non-Hispanic																					
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>																					
U.S.C. - Beaufort	42.6%	44.8%	42.6%	46.9%	47.0%	42.7%	42.7%	47.8%	54.2%	58.3%	38.5%	42.8%	42.8%	58.1%	53.9%	58.4%	58.1%	58.4%	58.1%	58.1%	58.1%
U.S.C. - Lancaster	56.3%	55.6%	56.3%	51.0%	59.2%	56.2%	56.2%	57.7%	42.0%	42.0%	58.3%	53.1%	53.1%	57.1%	53.9%	54.8%	54.8%	54.8%	54.8%	54.8%	54.8%
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie	43.9%	52.7%	43.9%	47.1%	48.2%	45.0%	45.0%	51.4%	51.6%	51.6%	51.6%	52.0%	52.0%	52.0%	52.0%	52.0%	52.0%	52.0%	52.0%	52.0%	52.0%
U.S.C. - Sumter	61.4%	55.4%	61.4%	50.9%	52.0%	53.9%	53.9%	50.4%	51.6%	51.6%	51.6%	52.0%	52.0%	52.0%	53.0%	53.0%	53.0%	53.0%	53.0%	53.0%	53.0%
U.S.C. - Union	47.8%	47.4%	47.8%	53.1%	51.6%	50.0%	50.0%	50.3%	51.6%	51.6%	51.6%	40.8%	40.8%	55.7%	53.0%	53.0%	53.0%	53.0%	53.0%	53.0%	53.0%
Weighted Average of Regional Campuses of U.S.C.	50.7%	52.3%	50.7%	49.5%	51.6%	51.8%	51.8%	51.8%													
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	None																				
* African American																					
** White, Non-Hispanic																					
<b>Technical Colleges</b>																					
Alcon Tech	44.8%	45.5%	44.8%	44.2%	48.4%	47.5%	47.5%	50.5%	49.0%	52.0%	53.7%	56.8%	56.8%	56.8%	52.0%	52.0%	52.0%	52.0%	52.0%	52.0%	52.0%
Central Carolina Tech	52.0%	53.3%	52.0%	51.0%	56.5%	51.0%	51.0%	54.4%	52.5%	52.3%	49.4%	53.7%	53.7%	53.7%	51.0%	51.0%	51.0%	51.0%	51.0%	51.0%	51.0%
Chesterfield-Marion Tech	47.7%	58.3%	47.7%	50.0%	58.9%	50.2%	50.2%	58.9%	58.9%	58.9%	58.9%	58.9%	58.9%	58.9%	53.0%	53.0%	53.0%	53.0%	53.0%	53.0%	53.0%
Denmark Tech**	83.9%	53.1%	83.9%	42.5%	51.8%	55.6%	55.6%	54.6%	73.0%	68.0%	53.3%	46.3%	46.3%	46.3%	73.0%	73.0%	73.0%	73.0%	73.0%	73.0%	73.0%
Florence-Darlington Tech	53.8%	62.7%	53.8%	54.9%	62.9%	54.8%	54.8%	60.1%	55.0%	51.0%	60.0%	60.0%	60.0%	60.0%	55.3%	55.3%	55.3%	55.3%	55.3%	55.3%	55.3%
Greenville Tech	52.0%	54.7%	52.0%	48.2%	53.2%	56.3%	56.3%	55.1%	52.1%	51.0%	51.0%	53.2%	53.2%	53.2%	54.0%	54.0%	54.0%	54.0%	54.0%	54.0%	54.0%
Horry-Georgetown Tech	48.2%	56.8%	48.2%	49.3%	56.4%	43.1%	43.1%	56.5%	51.5%	57.0%	49.5%	56.5%	56.5%	56.5%	52.3%	52.3%	52.3%	52.3%	52.3%	52.3%	52.3%
Midlands Tech	54.0%	57.7%	54.0%	53.5%	57.0%	50.9%	50.9%	56.7%	52.0%	57.0%	49.5%	56.7%	56.7%	56.7%	52.0%	52.0%	52.0%	52.0%	52.0%	52.0%	52.0%
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech	50.8%	60.5%	50.8%	53.9%	64.6%	52.6%	52.6%	66.1%	52.0%	65.0%	52.5%	62.5%	62.5%	62.5%	53.0%	53.0%	53.0%	53.0%	53.0%	53.0%	53.0%
Piedmont Tech	49.7%	54.7%	49.7%	47.0%	59.4%	54.2%	54.2%	60.9%	50.3%	61.0%	60.3%	62.5%	62.5%	62.5%	58.7%	58.7%	58.7%	58.7%	58.7%	58.7%	58.7%
Spartanburg Tech	51.3%	52.2%	51.3%	43.3%	52.7%	40.4%	40.4%	57.9%	50.3%	55.3%	54.5%	54.5%	54.5%	54.5%	51.1%	51.1%	51.1%	51.1%	51.1%	51.1%	51.1%
Tech College of the Low Country	53.9%	55.2%	53.9%	52.5%	55.8%	54.5%	54.5%	56.4%	42.0%	49.3%	53.4%	53.4%	53.4%	53.4%	42.5%	42.5%	42.5%	42.5%	42.5%	42.5%	42.5%
Tri-County Tech	48.2%	50.3%	48.2%	50.8%	55.4%	50.2%	50.2%	57.8%	48.0%	55.1%	55.2%	55.2%	55.2%	55.2%	54.8%	54.8%	54.8%	54.8%	54.8%	54.8%	54.8%
Triton Tech	50.3%	46.8%	50.3%	52.0%	46.7%	48.1%	48.1%	44.1%	48.0%	45.0%	47.4%	47.4%	47.4%	47.4%	48.1%	48.1%	48.1%	48.1%	48.1%	48.1%	48.1%
York Tech	51.4%	53.3%	51.4%	49.8%	52.3%	50.3%	50.3%	55.3%	50.3%	55.3%	46.5%	46.5%	46.5%	46.5%	49.0%	49.0%	49.0%	49.0%	49.0%	49.0%	49.0%
Weighted Average of Technical Colleges	51.8%	55.9%	51.8%	51.4%	55.6%	51.4%	51.4%	55.6%													
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	None																				
* African American																					
** White, Non-Hispanic																					

## Financial Support for Reform in Teacher Education

	Fall 1994 Actual	Fall 1995 Actual	Fall 1996 Actual	Fall 1997 Institutional Benchmark	Fall 1997 Actual Performance	Fall 1998 Target	Fall 1999 Target	Assumes Direction of Up
<b>Research Universities</b>								
Clemson			65.0%	65.0%	65.0%	66.0%	70.0%	4
U.S.C. - Columbia			139.6%	50.0%	46.0%	130.0%	130.0%	3
Medical University of S. C.			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Weighted Avg. of Research Univ.								
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				105%				
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>								
The Citadel			36.4%	25.0%	38.0%	60.0%	90.0%	5
Coastal Carolina University			131.0%	105.0%	117.0%	105.0%	105.0%	5
College of Charleston			145.0%	105.0%	143.0%	105.0%	105.0%	5
Francis Marion University			113.8%	103.0%	70.0%	103.0%	105.7%	3
Lander University			77.5%	80.0%	270.8%	80.5%	81.0%	6
South Carolina State University			204.2%	105.0%	143.8%	106.0%	107.0%	5
U.S.C. - Aiken			not avail	105.0%	115.0%	105.0%	105.0%	5
U.S.C. - Spartanburg			102.0%	102.0%	102.0%	100.0%	100.0%	4
Winthrop University			not avail	102.0%	102.2%	102.0%	102.0%	4
Weighted Avg. of Teaching Colleges & Univ.								
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				105%				
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>								
U.S.C. - Beaufort			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
U.S.C. - Lancaster			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
U.S.C. - Sumter			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
U.S.C. - Union			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				N/A				
<b>Technical Colleges</b>								
Aiken Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Central Carolina Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Chesterfield-Marlboro Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Denmark Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Florence-Darlington Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Greenville Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Horry-Georgetown Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Midlands Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Piedmont Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Spartanburg Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Tech College of the Low Country			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Tri-County Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Trident Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Williamsburg Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
York Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>				N/A				

## Amount of Public and Private Sector Grants

	Fall 1994 Actual	Fall 1995 Actual	Fall 1996 Actual	Fall 1997 Institutional Benchmark	Fall 1997 Actual Performance	Fall 1998 Target	Fall 1999 Target	Assumes Direction of Up
<b>Research Universities</b>								
Clemson	112.5%	114.1%	102.2%	100.0%	100.8%	105.0%	105.0%	4
U.S.C. - Columbia	125.9%	125.2%	99.5%	99.5%	102.3%	100.0%	101.0%	5
Medical University of S. C.	142.2%	141.7%	123.1%	102.2%	99.6%	100.0%	105.0%	3
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>105.0%</b>							
<b>Teaching Colleges &amp; Universities</b>								
The Citadel	161.0%	129.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Coastal Carolina University	122.0%	130.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
College of Charleston	162.0%	247.0%	162.0%	105.0%	108.0%	105.0%	105.0%	5
Francis Marion University	85.0%	55.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Lander University			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
South Carolina State University	113.0%	113.0%	78.0%	105.0%	132.9%	106.0%	107.0%	6
U.S.C. - Aiken	97.0%	183.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
U.S.C.-Spartanburg	104.0%	146.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Winthrop University	78.0%	58.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>105.0%</b>							
<b>Regional Campuses of U.S.C.</b>								
U.S.C. - Beaufort			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
U.S.C. - Lancaster			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
U.S.C. - Salkehatchie			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
U.S.C. - Sumter			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
U.S.C. - Union			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>N/A</b>							
<b>Technical Colleges</b>								
Aiken Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Central Carolina Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Chesterfield-Marlboro Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Denmark Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Florence-Darlington Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Greenville Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Horry-Georgetown Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Midlands Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Piedmont Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Spartanburg Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Tech College of the Low Country			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Tri-County Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Trident Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Williamsburg Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
York Tech			N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
<b>Sector Benchmark</b>	<b>N/A</b>							