

Report of the Data Verification  
Team Visit  
to  
The College of Charleston  
February 16-18, 1999

## **Introduction**

On February 16-18, 1999, a team of staff members visited The College of Charleston for the purpose of verifying data that are submitted in reports in support of the performance funding process, the CHEMIS (Commission on Higher Education Management Information System), and state administered financial aid programs. This was the second in a series of data verification visits to the public senior institutions. The areas in which data were reviewed follow:

Average Class Size (Performance Funding Indicator 3A1)  
Financial Support for Reform in Teacher Education (Performance Funding Indicator 9A)  
Student Residency  
Ratio of Full-time Faculty as Compared to other Full-time Employees (Performance Funding Indicator 3C)  
Scores of Graduates on Licensing and Certification Examinations (Performance Funding Indicator 7D)  
Transferability of Credits (Performance Funding Indicator 8A)  
Availability of Faculty to Students Outside of the Classroom (Performance Funding Indicator 2E),  
Review of administration of LIFE, Palmetto Fellows, and Need-Based Grants

The team members appreciate the hospitality and support provided by The College of Charleston during the visit. Special thanks are owed to Ms. Michelle Smith, who served as the College's coordinator and liaison with the team during the visit, Ms. Clara Hodges, who assisted with arranging for accommodations and hospitality, and to the many administrators, staff and faculty who provided support and responded to questions posed by team members.

The main body of this report summarizes the purpose for verifying each element, the method used to do the verification, observations and/or findings as a result of the verification, and any recommendations for the institution or the Commission. Section A deals with data elements that are used for performance funding and CHEMIS. Section B contains information about the review of the various student financial aid programs administered by the Commission. As is true with any case where complex processes and data are being verified, there were a number of instances where initial problems or discrepancies were resolved through more detailed examination and/or explanation. Detailed data (where it does not violate privacy), background and supporting materials, and individual team members complete reports are available in the Commission offices.

The final section of the report consecutively lists all findings and recommendations in the report, and the Appendix lists those individuals who were interviewed or who assisted the team as the data were examined.

## **Section A: Performance Funding Data Elements**

### **Average Class Size (Performance Funding Indicator 3A1)**

I. Purpose: To verify that course enrollments are accurately reported to the Commission by the institution.

II. Method: A random sample (10 each) of lower division, upper division, and graduate courses was selected by the Commission from the Fall, 1997 CHEMIS course data. Detailed data on the thirty courses was checked to confirm the accuracy of the course number, section, level of course, contact hours, method of instruction, enrollment type, course credit hours, course enrollment, instructor identifier, days of week of course, start time, end time, site identifier, building identifier, and room identifier. Computer screens were used to check these data. If differences existed between the data on the computer screens and the CHEMIS data, class rolls and individuals' records were examined to determine that the differences were appropriate.

III. Observations: All reported course data matched with the data on the computer screens or were reconciled with class rolls and individual's records. Courses are coded with appropriate CIP codes.

IV. Recommendations: None

### **Financial Support for Reform in Teacher Education (Performance Funding Indicator 9A)**

I. Purpose: To determine if the institution's reported listing of grants and expenditures for teacher education as stipulated in the measure agrees with copies of funded grant proposals and actual expenditure records.

II. Method: Following the protocol established for verification of this data element, all the expenditures for grants to support reform in teacher education for FY1994-95, FY1995-96, FY1996-97, and FY1997-98 were verified. This was done by comparing the expenditure total listed on the spreadsheet provided by the College of Charleston against the matching account on a computer printout (for the fiscal years that were no longer maintained on the system) or a computer screen.

The following six grants were selected for further examination in an attempt to determine whether they qualified under the "teacher reform" label.

- 1) Creation of Statewide Accelerated Schools on the Network
- 2) Javits Gifted and Talented
- 3) The GLOBE Program
- 4) The Accelerated Schools Project
- 5) Family Science Training
- 6) Project Star

### III. Findings and Observations:

#### **a. Findings: Recording of Expenditures of Grants**

A discrepancy was found with the 1996-97 expenditures as reported by the College of Charleston on their historical data for performance funding and the spreadsheet that listed the detailed expenditures. The reported data showed an expenditure of \$2,453 for the Family Science Training project, while the detailed worksheet showed \$2,543.

A second discrepancy involved the omission of a 1997-98 project which ended the fiscal year with a negative balance of \$183. The reported funding total for that year was \$796,611, while the change would have decreased the 1997-98 total expenditures to \$796,428.

#### **b. Observation: Classification of Grants**

Although decisions to include grants under the label "teacher reform" were probably appropriate, it was difficult for the reviewer to make definitive decisions because institutions make determinations as to which grants qualify as being directed toward teacher reform without clear guidelines from the Commission. *The Commission staff recognizes and is addressing this concern.*

**IV. Recommendations:** Institutional records should be corrected to reflect accurate expenditures for the two discrepancies that were noted, and corrected information (including three year weighted averages) should be submitted to the Commission.<sup>1</sup>

### Student Residency

I. Purpose: To verify that student residency classifications, which are used by the Commission and the institutions for performance funding, calculation of the MRR, and determination of qualification for student scholarship programs, are accurately reported to the Commission by the institutions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Corrected information has been submitted to the Commission as recommended in this report.

II. Method: A random sample of 200 undergraduate students and 100 graduate students enrolled at The College of Charleston during Fall 1997 was selected from the Commission on Higher Education Management Information System (CHEMIS). CHEMIS residency data represents residency for fee purposes. Additionally, a second sample of 80 full-time graduate students was selected because 80 graduate students in the first sample were primarily part-time students taking "contract" courses for credit. "Contract" courses are arranged with South Carolina school districts by a number of public colleges and universities and allow teachers to take education-related courses, often at their local schools, for professional development and college credit. Students enrolled in "contract" courses at the College of Charleston do not complete standard admissions applications have been assumed to be South Carolina residents. The "contracts" specify the amount that will be paid by the students or the school district for the course.

Residency determinations are made at the time of admission based on information reported by applicants on their admissions applications. Therefore, the staff used original (hard copy) files to substantiate the appropriateness of the classification that had been reported on CHEMIS. Information that was reviewed included students' statements of permanent address, mailing address, parents' address and employment, high school address, and statement of legal residency. In instances in which students were out-of-state residents or classified as in-state residents for fee purposes although their legal residence was not in South Carolina, computerized information on the College of Charleston's database was also reviewed to determine if they were appropriately charged.

III. Findings: **It was determined that two undergraduate students out of the sample of 200 had their residency classification changed from nonresident to resident for no apparent reason. College officials explained that a total of 84 students had been identified through an internal audit for which the residency had been changed from nonresident to resident in error. The College estimated that \$268,320 in tuition was lost due to the error. However, reviewers believe that this estimate is probably low, since the estimate is only through the Fall of 1997 and students with residency changes were assessed tuition at the residency rate for the Spring 1998 semester as well. The students' residency status was not corrected until the Fall 1998 semester and the College of Charleston decided not to assess the students the back fees owed as a result of the College's error. College officials have corrected the computer program that allowed the error to occur by changing the update access policy to assure that the problem will not happen in the future.**

**Of the 92 full time graduate students sampled (there were some duplications in the two graduate samples), two students were classified as residents for whom there was no documentation of residency. Based on discussions with College officials, it is believed that those students were, in fact, residents for whom proper residency documentation can be obtained. Such residency should be documented or corrections should be made.**

As stated earlier, **information was not available to document residency status for the nearly 80 part-time contract students in the sample.** While it is probable that most if not all contract students are South Carolina residents, State law requires that a tuition differential be charged to any from out-of-state; therefore, the College of Charleston must determine residency in order to be in compliance with the statute.

**IV. Recommendations: 1) Since the residency status of students affects funding calculations for the MRR and performance funding indicator 6D, the College of Charleston should report corrected residency data for the fall semester of 1997 and the spring semester of 1998.**<sup>2</sup>

**2) The College should immediately establish a process for establishing residency for all students who register for contract courses.**

Ratio of Full-time Faculty as Compared to other Full-time Employees (Performance Indicator 3C)

I. Purpose: To verify that information reported on the institution's IPEDS Fall Faculty Survey accurately reflects employee information.

II. Method: The Coordinator of Research and Planning was interviewed to determine the source of the data and the process used in deriving reported IPEDS Fall Staff Survey data and in ensuring accuracy in the Fall Staff Survey Report. An attempt was made to verify a small sample of staff and faculty records on-line; however, the records on-line did not include the appropriate information to determine whether employees were classified appropriately. Due to time constraints, the reviewer was unable to examine actual personnel files.<sup>3</sup>

III. Observations: The reviewer established that the classifications used by the College of Charleston to classify faculty were consistent with those used by Winthrop University as determined by a data verification visit at Winthrop in December, 1998. Based on the examination of the process used, it is concluded that The College of Charleston determined information reported on the IPEDs Fall Staff Survey in a manner that is consistent with the requirements of that survey.

IV. Recommendations: None

---

<sup>2</sup> Corrected data have been submitted to the Commission for the undergraduate students that were misclassified as residents. Information on the graduate students is still pending.

<sup>3</sup> CHE is in the process of developing a faculty file to be reported through CHEMIS. When the faculty file is finalized, the CHEMIS file will be used to identify the sample and information about the sample to be verified. When this protocol is in place a larger sample will be reviewed and faculty information will be verified in accordance with the Commissions requirements.

Scores of Graduates on Licensing and Certification Examinations (Performance Funding Indicator 7D)

I. Purpose: To verify that pass rates on licensure and certification examinations have been accurately calculated and reported.

II. Method: Pass Rates on the National Teacher Examinations (now PRAXIS) are the only results of licensing or certification examinations reported by The College of Charleston. Using a Commission produced table of reported pass rates on both the Professional Knowledge and Specialty Area examinations beginning in 1995, the data reported to the Commission by The College of Charleston was compared to a summary of test scores available on campus. Next, the pass/fail rates on College's actual list of students who took the examinations were compared to the pass/fail reports reported to the Commission. Finally, a sample the College's examinees were compared to PRAXIS data provided to the institution for 1996-97 and 1997-98 (the College could not exclude non-College of Charleston students from data prior to 1996-97. -

III. Observations: The reviewer noted three discrepancies with reported data. Two of the three involved different test dates, one in 1997-98 and one in 1995-96, and each involved a difference of one. The third involved a difference in numbers reported for a 1996-97 test date.

IV. Recommendations: None

Transferability of Credits (Performance Funding Indicator 8A)

I. Purpose: To verify that the accuracy of the information submitted by the institution that indicates the extent to which the criteria stipulated in the Commission's "Policy and Procedures for Transferability of Credits" document is met.

II. Method: Verification of the data for this indicator involved three activities: 1) a comparison of courses in the College's published guide for potential transfer students to courses on the Commission approved Statewide Articulation Agreement (list of 74 technical college courses); 2) a review of a Commission generated random sample of 50 transfer student's transcripts to verify that the College appropriately accepted coursework on the Statewide Articulation Agreement and the Statewide transfer blocks; and 3) discussions with admissions and registrar staff about compliance with specific areas of the indicator.

III. Observations: The College of Charleston's transfer pamphlet lists every course included in the Statewide Articulation Agreement except one. That course, MAT 122 – Finite College Mathematics, is accepted for transfer credit by the College, but was purposely omitted from the pamphlet to avoid confusion for students from Trident Technical College, which does not offer the course and is the major provider of transfer students to the College of Charleston. *It is strongly suggested that MAT 122 be added to future editions of the pamphlet to comply with the requirements of the articulation agreement.* The College of Charleston accepts many more technical college course than those listed on the Statewide Articulation Agreement and updates its online list of accepted transfer courses at numerous times during the year.

The College of Charleston accepted all of the technical college courses on the Statewide Articulation Agreement submitted for transfer by the fifty students in the sample cohort. Although there was nothing in any of the files that mentioned the acceptance of "transfer blocks," admissions staff stated that all coursework in the blocks is accepted towards the baccalaureate degree. Students who present the required number of credit hours with a grade of "C" or above are being awarded junior status.

The College of Charleston is able to send and receive transcripts via the SPEEDE/ExPRESS electronic format. A new version of the software that is being installed this semester should eliminate problems other campuses have experienced regarding verification of transcripts received by the College. However, representatives of the College reported that SPEEDE/ExPRESS is not yet operable at all feeder institutions, which precludes the College from making maximum use of the system.

IV. Recommendations: None

#### Availability of Faculty to Students Outside of the Classroom (Performance Funding Indicator 2E)

I. Purpose: To determine whether the institution used recommended procedures to survey students on the availability of faculty outside of the classroom and on the availability of faculty advisors.

II. Method: The person responsible for coordinating the administration of the surveys was interviewed and memoranda, answer sheets, and results and their analysis were examined.



**III. Finding: Up until the Spring of 1999 when the procedure was changed, the College of Charleston required that untenured and adjunct faculty be evaluated each semester, but that tenured faculty be evaluated at least once every three semesters. It was also learned that the survey used to determine student satisfaction with the availability of academic advisors outside of the classroom was conducted using a sample of summer students who had been in attendance during the Spring semester due to the inability of the College to prepare and administer the survey during the Spring semester as specified in the performance funding procedures.**

**IV. Recommendations: Appropriate procedures must be used to conduct surveys on the availability of faculty and academic advisors in the future.**

## **Section B: Financial Aid Data Elements**

### **Review of the Administration of Life, Palmetto Fellows, and Need-Based Grants**

**I. Purpose: To ensure that systems in place are adequate to administer the above awards in accordance with the provisions of pertinent statutes, regulations, and program guidelines.**

**II. Method: The scope of the review included the 1998-99 awarding period. The College of Charleston awarded a total of 1,354 LIFE Scholarships, 661 Need-Based Grants, and 158 Palmetto Fellows Scholarships during the Fall 1998 enrollment period. Student files of 100 recipients of LIFE scholarships, 25 recipients of Palmetto Fellows scholarships, and 50 recipients of Need-Based Grants were respectively sampled from each of the above cohorts to produce a total sample of 175. The institution provided an access code to review computerized data, and selected items (SAT/ACT scores, grade point averages, transfer hours, residency, and affidavits) were traced to the actual documents in student files. The process included the following:**

- 1. A review of award notifications to recipients and affidavit responses to ensure that they were on file, signed and dated;**
- 2. Verification of high school graduation dates and initial enrollment dates for each student in the sample;**
- 3. Verification of SAT/ACT scores and High School GPA's on file at the institution;**
- 4. Verification of cumulative GPAs for continuing students;**
- 5. Verification that annual credit hours met minimum award requirements based on the student's classification;**

6. Verification of transfer students' credit hours and grade point averages at all institutions in which they were enrolled;
7. A review of institutional budgets for Cost of Attendance (on-campus, off campus independent, and off campus living with parents) for all students in the sample
8. Verification that FAFSA forms were on file and a need analysis was conducted for Need-Based Grant recipients;
9. A review of Fall and Spring institutional disbursements to the students in the sample;
10. A verification that award adjustments for Palmetto Fellows scholarships and Need-Based Grants preceded other adjustments as required by the regulations: and
11. A review of the institution's policy for awarding scholarships/grants (a copy was obtained for Commission files).

The findings, observations, criteria, and recommendations for the three financial aid programs are described by program.

#### Legislative Incentives for Future Excellence (LIFE)

#### III & IV. Findings, Observations, and Recommendations:

**Finding:** The review of the student data for eligibility verification disclosed that one student was incorrectly awarded the LIFE Scholarship. This was a result of the student being classified as a third year continuing student (rising junior) during the Fall 1998 initial enrollment period. The enrollment data indicated that the student had earned 86 credit hours and a cumulative grade point average of 3.36. The student's annual credit hours (86) would meet the eligibility requirement for a student concluding his/her sophomore year based on the regulations (e.g., a total minimum of 60 credit hours). However, the staff review of the student's transcript revealed that she should have been classified as a fourth year continuing student (rising senior). The transcript indicates that she initially enrolled in college Fall 1995 and had completed six terms at the College of Charleston by Fall 1998. Given the above, the student would need to have earned a minimum of 90 credit hours to receive the LIFE Scholarship for academic year 1998-1999.

**Criteria:** Sections R62-540M (1) and (4) and R62-540U of the LIFE Regulations under "Student Eligibility" state: For initial LIFE eligibility, students currently enrolled in an eligible institution must earn a 3.0 cumulative grade point average and earn a minimum of ninety credit hours or an annual equivalent for students who begin mid-year (i.e., fifteen hours) at the participating institution and all prior institutions to be eligible for the scholarship as a continuing student (fourth year). Calculation of the maximum of terms available for scholarship funding begins with initial college enrollment and is based on the number of credit hours earned at all prior institutions.

**Recommendation:** Commission staff will not request an adjustment of funds awarded for Fall 1998 due to the fact that funds have been applied toward tuition, room and board, books and other associated expenditures for the institution. However, it is recommended that funds awarded for Spring 1999 be adjusted and refunded to the LIFE Scholarship program for this student. This adjustment needs to be documented in the final reconciliatory disbursement data requested at the end of Spring 1999 listing the student's name, social security number and a credit of \$1,000.<sup>4</sup> Additionally, Commission staff recommends that the institution conduct a periodic review of the enrollment data for all recipients of the LIFE Scholarships to ensure the following:

- Annual earned credit hours for all institutions are taken into consideration during initial enrollment for transfer students.
- The initial enrollment date into college is taken into consideration for all students who are enrolled, classified and determined eligible to receive the LIFE Scholarship.
- Students do not receive the LIFE Scholarship for more terms than they are qualified to receive the funds.

Observation: A selected sample of students transcripts were reviewed to determine the method the institution used in calculating grade point averages as it relates to determining eligibility for the LIFE Scholarship program. The review revealed that there were a variety of GPAs reported on the high school transcripts such as, 5.0 and 6.0 scales and weighted and unweighted scales. One file disclosed the following:

Date of Transcript	Weighted GPA	Unweighted GPA
9/22/97	3.48	3.05
6/14/98	3.67	3.10

The GPA reported on the CHEMIS report for this student was the unweighted 3.05. The institution stated that grade point averages are usually computed by the high school guidance counselor; however, if they receive a transcript that does not compute the grade point average on a 4.0 scale, the high school is contacted to obtain the grading scale and the grade point average is then computed and input into the system. The institution also stated that the unweighted scale is used for admission purposes and the weighted scale is used to determine eligibility for LIFE recipients. The Office of Financial Aid extracts computed grade point

---

<sup>4</sup> The institution concurred with the finding and has submitted source documentation to substantiate the adjustment to the student's account. The institution has agreed to replace the LIFE Scholarship funds with institutional funds.

averages from the system for all recipients of LIFE, Palmetto Fellows and Need-Based Grants.

Criteria: R62-540H of the LIFE Regulations states:

Institutions shall use the final grade point average as reported by the high school. For numerical grade point averages, the institution shall use the equivalent 4.0 scale based on the approved policies of the high school.

If a weighted grade point average is provided by the high school, the institution shall use the high schools weighted grade point average based on the approved policies of the high school in determining whether the student meets the "B" average. If more than one final grade point average is reported by the high school on the final transcript, the institution may use the highest grade point average.

*This was the only exception noted in the grade point averages file review, and it did not prevent the student from receiving the LIFE Scholarship. Therefore, during the exit conference, institutional representatives were requested to ensure that in the future, the Admissions Office uses the weighted grade point average or highest grade point average reported to the institution. This will ensure that those students with unweighted grade point averages that are a little below the required 3.0 are reviewed fairly to determine if their weighted grade point averages would make them eligible to receive the LIFE Scholarship, in those cases where the high school uses both scales.*

#### Need-Based Grant Program

#### III & IV. Findings, Observations, and Recommendations:

**Finding:** The review of the student data for the Need-Based Grants disclosed that one student who did not qualify received an award for academic year 1998-1999. The disbursement screen revealed that the student was awarded the maximum award (\$1,500), according to the institution's awarding policy, during Fall 1998. The transcript display screen indicated the student attempted 13 hours for the semester; however, she withdrew from four classes (10 hours) on 9/23/98 and received an incomplete in the only class that she remained enrolled at the end of the semester. A further review indicated that the student attempted 12 credit hours during the previous semester (Spring 1998); however, she also withdrew from two courses during this period which resulted in her ending the semester with 6 credit hours.

Given the above, it appears the student did not complete the required credit hours for the academic year (1997-1998); thus, the student was not eligible to receive the Need-Based Grant award for Fall 1998. Additionally, it should be noted that

this student was the only student selected in our sample that received the maximum award in one semester and is not currently enrolled for Spring 1999.

Criteria: Section R62-453A (5) in the Need-Based Grant Regulations states:

To be eligible for a need-based grant each academic year, the student must be enrolled at the time of the grant disbursement in a minimum of 12 semester credit hours if full-time for the semester or six semester credit hours if part-time for the semester (or its equivalent). A student must complete a minimum of 24 semester credit hours if enrolled full-time or 12 semester credit hours if enrolled part-time within an academic year (two semesters or three quarters). Credits earned during additional interim, winterim, Maymester, summer or other non-regular terms cannot be used to replace or reduce the minimum semester or quarter credit hour requirement during any fall or spring semester or fall, winter, and spring quarter terms.

Section R62-454A under "Withdrawal, Suspension, or Dropping Below Full-Time or Part-Time Status states:

In the event a student who has been awarded a need-based grant withdraws or is suspended from the institution, or drops below full-time (12 semester credit hours) or part-time (6 semester credit hours) status during any regular term of the academic year, institutions must reimburse the Need-Based Grant Program for the amount of the need-based grant for the term in question pursuant to the refund policies of the institution.

Section R62-458A under "Institutional Procedures for Award Notification" states:

The Institution will identify the award amounts, which cannot exceed \$2,500 per eligible full-time student and \$1,250 per eligible part-time student per academic year. Half of each grant shall be disbursed during the fall semester and half during the spring semester of each year, assuming student meets continued eligibility.

**Recommendations:** While this may be an isolated case and the College of Charleston is implementing procedures to prevent this incident from reoccurring; the Commission recommends that the institution do the following:

- **Monitor award amounts on a periodic basis to ensure they are within the guidelines of the regulations and policy and procedures of the institution.**
- **Review the student's earned credit hours the prior academic year to ensure they meet the criteria for continuing eligibility.**

Finally, Commission staff recommends that the institution reimburse the Need-Based Grant program the total amount awarded to this student, \$1,500. This adjustment should be noted in the institution's final reconciliation for the end of the academic year.<sup>5</sup>

#### Palmetto Fellows Scholarship

III. Findings and Observations: There were no exceptions noted during our review of the Palmetto Fellows recipients.

IV. Recommendations: None

#### Conclusion

The overall review disclosed that the systems in place at College of Charleston are adequate for administering awards for LIFE, Palmetto Fellows and Need-Based Grants in accordance with program statutes, rules and regulations, and other statutory requirements governing these funds. The institution submitted adequate documentation to resolve the findings disclosed in this report; therefore, there are no unresolved issues to date. However, the staff's recommendations contained herein are offered as suggestive internal control mechanisms to enhance the institution's overall administration of the scholarship/grant programs.

---

<sup>5</sup>The institution concurs with the finding and has submitted source documentation to substantiate the adjustment to the student's account. The institution has agreed to replace the Need-Based Grant funds with institutional funds.

## **Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

### **Finding #1: Recording of Expenditures of Grants**

A discrepancy was found with the 1996-97 expenditures as reported by the College of Charleston on their historical data for performance funding and the spreadsheet that listed the detailed expenditures. The reported data showed an expenditure of \$2,453 for the Family Science Training project, while the detailed worksheet showed \$2,543.

A second discrepancy involved the omission of a 1997-98 project which ended the fiscal year with a negative balance of \$183. The reported funding total for that year was \$796,611, while the change would have decreased the 1997-98 total expenditures to \$796,428.

**Recommendation #1:** Institutional records should be corrected to reflect accurate expenditures for the two discrepancies that were noted, and corrected information (including three year weighted averages) should be submitted to the Commission.<sup>6</sup>

**Finding #2:** It was determined that two undergraduate students out of the sample of 200 had their residency classification changed from nonresident to resident for no apparent reason. College officials explained that a total of 84 students had been identified through an internal audit for which the residency had been changed from nonresident to resident in error.

Of the 92 full time graduate students sampled (there was some duplications in the two graduate samples), two students were classified as residents for whom there was no documentation of residency.

**Recommendation #2:** Since the residency status of students affects funding calculations for the MRR and performance funding indicator 6D, the College of Charleston should report corrected residency data for the fall semester of 1997 and the spring semester of 1998.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Corrected information has been submitted to the Commission as recommended in this report.

<sup>7</sup> Corrected data have been submitted to the Commission for the undergraduate students that were misclassified as residents. Information on the graduate students is still pending.

**Finding #3:** Information was not available to document residency status for the nearly 80 part-time contract students in the sample.

**Recommendation #3:** The College should immediately establish a process for establishing residency for all students who register for contract courses.

**Finding #4:** Up until the Spring of 1999 when the procedure was changed, the College of Charleston required that untenured and adjunct faculty be evaluated each semester, but that tenured faculty be evaluated at least once every three semesters. It was also learned that the survey used to determine student satisfaction with the availability of academic advisors outside of the classroom was conducted using a sample of summer students who had been in attendance during the Spring semester due to the inability of the College to prepare and administer the survey during the Spring semester as specified in the performance funding procedures.

**Recommendation #4:** Appropriate procedures must be used to conduct surveys on the availability of faculty and academic advisors in the future.

**Finding #5:** The review of the student data for eligibility verification disclosed that one student was incorrectly awarded the LIFE Scholarship.

**Recommendation #5:** It is recommended that funds awarded for Spring 1999 be adjusted and refunded to the LIFE Scholarship program for this student. This adjustment needs to be documented in the final reconciliatory disbursement data requested at the end of Spring 1999 listing the student's name, social security number and a credit of \$1,000.<sup>8</sup> Additionally, Commission staff recommends that the institution conduct a periodic review of the enrollment data for all recipients of the LIFE Scholarships to ensure the following:

- Annual earned credit hours for all institutions are taken into consideration during initial enrollment for transfer students.
- The initial enrollment date into college is taken into consideration for all students who are enrolled, classified and determined eligible to receive the LIFE Scholarship.
- Students do not receive the LIFE Scholarship for more terms than they are qualified to receive the funds.

---

<sup>8</sup> The institution concurred with the finding and has submitted source documentation to substantiate the adjustment to the student's account. The institution has agreed to replace the LIFE Scholarship funds with institutional funds.



**Finding #6: The review of the student data for the Need-Based Grants disclosed that one student who did not qualify received an award for academic year 1998-1999.**

**Recommendation #6: The institution should: 1) Monitor award amounts on a periodic basis to ensure they are within the guidelines of the regulations and policy and procedures of the institution, and 2) Review the student's earned credit hours the prior academic year to ensure they meet the criteria for continuing eligibility.**

**Finally, Commission staff recommends that the institution reimburse the Need-Based Grant program the total amount awarded to this student, \$1,500. This adjustment should be noted in the institution's final reconciliation for the end of the academic year.<sup>9</sup>**

---

<sup>9</sup> The institution concurs with the finding and has submitted source documentation to substantiate the adjustment to the student's account. The institution has agreed to replace the Need-Based Grant funds with institutional funds.

## **Appendix**

### **List of Data Verification Team Members**

Mr. Michael Brown, Coordinator – Financial Analysis  
Ms. Julie Carullo, Coordinator – Planning, Assessment, and Performance Funding  
Dr. David Loope, Coordinator – Research  
Ms. Betty Martin, Retired Administrator, USC Union  
Ms. Isalene Montgomery, Auditor – Student Services  
Ms. Tobi Swartz, Project Administrator, LIFE Scholarship Program  
Dr. Karen Woodfaulk, Director – Student Services  
Mr. Alan Krech – Sr. Exec. Asst. for Policy and Administration (Chairman)

### **List of Individuals Interviewed or Assisting the Team**

Mr. Bill Anderson, Registrar  
Ms. Althea Brown, Data Entry Coordinator  
Ms. Priscilla Burbage, Budget Director  
Mr. Don Burkard, Dean of Admissions and Adult Student Services  
Ms. Barbara Gray, Director of Research and Grants Administration  
Mr. Don Griggs, Director of Financial Aid  
Ms. Trish Huhn, Director of Transfer Admissions and Systems Administration  
Ms. Michelle Smith, Coordinator of Institutional Research and Planning  
Ms. Rachel Soper, Assistant Registrar  
Dr. Nancy Sorenson, Dean of the School of Education  
Ms. Chris Warnquist, Associate Registrar