

# Winthrop University

Sector: Four-Year Colleges  
and Universities

1999-2000 Performance Year Score

91%

2.73 out of a Maximum of 3.00

**EXCEEDS STANDARDS**

See Interpreting Scores at bottom of page


## Performance Score Summary

Total Applicable Indicators (incl. 2 now assessed within other indicators.)	35 Indicators
Exceeded Standards (or received scores of 3) on	14 Indicators
Achieved Standards (or received scores of 2.00-2.99) on	6 Indicators
Did Not Achieve Standards (or received scores of 1.00-1.99) on	0 Indicators
Achieved Compliance (or received scores of "Complied") on	7 Indicators
Evaluated in Years Other Than Performance Year 1999-00	6 Indicators

## Winthrop At A Glance

**Anthony J. DiGiorgio, President**  
701 Oakland Avenue  
Rock Hill, SC 29733  
(803) 323-2211  
[www.winthrop.edu](http://www.winthrop.edu)

Founded in 1886  
For link to institution's mission,  
see [www.che400.state.sc.us](http://www.che400.state.sc.us) and  
select "Performance Funding"



### Enrollment

**Headcount** 5,839  
incl. full & part time students  
79% of headcnt Undergraduate  
86% of headcnt from SC at entry  
24% of headcnt Minority

**Full-Time** 4,221 (72% of headcnt)

**Full-Time Faculty** 263  
incl. those holding academic rank & primary assignment of instruction, research or public service. (IPEDS)

**SAT Average** 1043 (1st-time entering freshmen, incl. converted ACT scores)

**Tuition** \$4,126 In State, Full-Time Student  
Academic Year \$7,434 Out of State, Full-Time Student  
1999-00 (incl. required tuition and fees, IPEDS Inst. Characteristics Survey)

**Degrees Awarded** FY 1998-99  
N/A Associates  
671 Bachelor's  
251 Master's  
N/A First Professional  
18 Specialist  
N/A Doctoral

**Financial** \$52.7 Total Revenue, excl. auxiliary  
Dollars In Millions \$52.1 Total Educ. & General Expend.  
FY 1998-99 excl. auxiliary  
(IPEDS Finance Survey)

*(Fall 1999 data unless noted otherwise)*

## Interpreting Scores

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

### If Percent or Overall Score Range is:

95% to 100% or 2.85 to 3.00  
87% to 94% or 2.60 to 2.84  
67% to 86% or 2.00 to 2.59  
48% to 66% or 1.45 to 1.99  
33% to 47% or 1.00 to 1.44

### Performance Category is:

Substantially Exceeds  
Exceeds  
Achieves  
Does Not Achieve  
Substantially Does Not Achieve

SC Commission on Higher Education's Ratings for the 1999-00 Performance Year to impact Fiscal Year 2000-01  
Approved May 4, 2000. Report prepared by the Commission's Division of Planning, Assessment & Perf. Funding  
1333 Main St., Suite 200 \* Columbia, SC 29201 \* (803) 737-2260 \* [www.che400.state.sc.us](http://www.che400.state.sc.us)

**PERFORMANCE FUNDING IN SC** : "Performance Funding" began in SC with the ratification of Act 359 of 1996, effective July 1, 1996. Act 359 required that the State's coordinating board for higher education (SC Commission on Higher Education or "CHE") measure annually each public institution's performance in various areas and base allocation of state appropriated dollars on performance. A 3-year, phase-in period was provided for CHE to design a system that translated indicators specified in legislation to measures and to provide a process translating performance to dollars. CHE worked with the business and higher education communities to design the current system which has evolved since its initial conceptualization. During the phase-in period as the system and indicators were defined, only selected indicators were used to determine a percentage of dollars received. Last year, CHE determined each institution's allocation for FY 1999-00 based on performance. The system continues to undergo refinements as measures and data are better understood. In the years ahead, standards set for SC's institutions will continue to increase in an effort to ensure and improve the quality of SC's public institutions of higher education so they will be globally competitive.

**KEY TO SCORING**

For the 1999-00 performance year, the SC Commission on Higher Education (CHE) rated each institution's performance on a set of measures approved by the CHE. Scores of 1 to 3 were awarded for performance on indicators or indicator subparts based on standards set last spring. Some standards were set by institutions and approved by CHE while others were set by CHE and were the same for all institutions. CHE, in limited cases, scored performance based on institutional appeals during the scoring process.

The range required for an institution to receive a score of 2 is shown below. Because of the method used to set standards, this range varies across indicators and institutions. Indicators where CHE considered an appeal and awarded scores based on that appeal rather than the range are noted. Applicable indicators for an institution depend on the institution's sector mission and individual characteristics as indicators are defined similarly for all institutions. To determine the overall score, the scores on applicable indicators are averaged. For indicators with multiple subparts, the subparts are scored and then averaged together to produce a single indicator score that contributes to the overall score. If the score for an indicator or subpart is:

**3** - The institution "Exceeds" the performance standard set for the institution or group of institutions or is at or above a standard identified to indicate a level beyond which continuous improvement is not expected.

**2** - The institution "Achieves" the performance standard set for the institution or group of institutions as indicated by the ranges shown below.

**1** - The institution "Does Not Achieve" the performance standard set for the institution or group of institutions.

**Indicators Requiring Compliance** - Some indicators require that an institution comply with a set of practices or policies. If an institution is in compliance the performance is scored "Complied" and no numeric score contributes to the final average. If an institution fails to comply, the institution receives a score of 1 for noncompliance. **Indicators "On Cycle"** - Some indicators are assessed at two or three year intervals.

Critical Success Factor / Indicator "Key" Number / Descriptive Measurement Title	(Time Period Measured This Yr)	Institution's Performance		1999-00 Standard for "Achieves" or "2"		N O T E S	1999-00 Performance Score	
		Prior Yr '98-99	This Yr '99-00	( 1 if below this #)	(3 if above this #)		Subpart	Indicator
<b>MISSION FOCUS</b>	<b>1A</b> Funds expended to achieve mission based on ratio of expenditure category to total educational and general expenditures. Expend. Category is "Instruction, Acad Support, Student Svces" (FY 98-99)	65.4%	66.0%	64.1%	to 68.1%			2.00
	<b>1B</b> Curricula offered to achieve mission measured as the % of programs appropriate to degree level, supported by mission, & with full approval in most recent CHE program review. (Spring 2000)	Not Avail	98%	95%	to 99% or not more than one not approved			2.00
	<b>1C</b> Approval of a mission statement. CHE approves once every 5 years with changes being assessed in the interim. (initial '98)	Complied	Complied	N/A, compliance required or a score of 1 is awarded.				Complied
	<b>1D</b> Adoption of a strategic plan. (FY 98-99)	Complied	Complied	N/A, compliance required or a score of 1 is awarded.				Complied
	<b>1E</b> Attainment of strategic plan goals. (FY 97-98)	Complied	Complied	N/A, compliance required or a score of 1 is awarded.				Complied
<b>QUALITY OF FACULTY</b>	<b>2A</b> Academic and other credentials of professors and instructors :							3.00
	<b>1</b> % headcount faculty teaching undergrads meeting Southern Assoc. of Colleges & Schools requirements (Fall 1999)	100.0%	100.0%	97.0%	to 99.9%	(2)	3	
	<b>2a</b> % headcount faculty with terminal degree teaching undergraduate courses. (Fall 1999)	Not Avail	Not Avail	N/A, Compliance measures for this year only (new measure that required collection of data during this year)				Complied
	<b>2b</b> % full-time faculty with terminal degree teaching undergraduate courses (Fall 1999)	Not Avail	Not Avail	N/A, Compliance measures for this year only (new measure that required collection of data during this year)				Complied
	<b>2B</b> Faculty performance review system. Assessed every 3 years.	100%	On Cycle	Not assessed this year. Assessed next in Spring 2002.				On Cycle
	<b>2C</b> Faculty post tenure review system. Assessed every 3 years.	100%	On Cycle	Not assessed this year. Assessed next in Spring 2002.				On Cycle
	<b>2D</b> Average faculty compensation by rank :							3.00
	<b>1a</b> Instructor (Fall 1999)	\$29,481	\$29,692	\$25,656	to \$28,831	(2)	3	
<b>1b</b> Assistant Professor (Fall 1999)	\$39,140	\$39,965	\$33,384	to \$37,515	(2)	3		
<b>1c</b> Associate Professor (Fall 1999)	\$43,993	\$45,823	\$44,860	to \$45,766	(2)	3		
<b>1d</b> Professor (Fall 1999)	\$52,940	\$55,341	\$53,983	to \$55,073	(2)	3		

**NOTES:**

(1) A downward trend is expected. If performance is lower than the low end of the range (# on right side of range shown) a 3 is awarded.

(2) A standard has been identified for this indicator at which continued performance is not expected and a score of 3 is awarded. If applicable, the range shown for a score of "2" has been adjusted to take into account this standard. The levels identified are as follows:  
 2A1=100%; 2D1a=\$32,070; 2D1b=\$41,730; 2D1c=\$50,642; and 2D1d=\$62,864

Critical Success Factor / Indicator "Key" Number / Descriptive Measurement Title	(Time Period Measured This Yr)	Institution's Performance		1999-00 Standard for "Achieves" or "2"		NOTES	1999-00 Performance Score		
		Prior Yr '98-99	This Yr '99-00	(1 if below this #)	(3 if above this #)		Subpart	Indicator	
<b>QUALITY OF FACULTY (cont)</b>	2E	Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom as based on standard survey questions:							On Cycle
	1	% classroom faculty rated satisfied on availability. Assessed every 2 years.	93%	On Cycle	Not assessed this year. Assessed next in Spring 2001.			On Cycle	
	2	% advisors rated satisfied on availability. Assessed every 2 years.	81%	On Cycle	Not assessed this year. Assessed next in Spring 2001.			On Cycle	
	2F	Community and public service activities of faculty for which no extra compensation is paid. This measure has been incorporated into the measurement of Indicator 2B.							
<b>CLASSROOM QUALITY</b>	3A	Class size and student /teacher ratios : (Expected Ranges for 3A)							3.00
	1a	lower division class size (Fall 1999)	28.1	29.7	20 to 30			in range	
	1b	upper division class size (Fall 1999)	19.9	19.8	15 to 25				
	2a	% undergrad lecture sections of 50 & up (Fall 1999)	Not Avail	4.9%	0% to 20%			in range	
	2b	% lower division lecture of 100 & up (Fall 1999)	Not Avail	0.2%	0% to 5%				
	3	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty (Fall 1999)	14.6	14.8	14 to 19			in range	
	3B	Average # credit hours taught by full-time faculty teaching at least 3 hours. (Fall 1999)	208	209	204 to 216		(2)		2.00
	3C	Ratio of full-time faculty as compared to other full-time employees. (Fall 1999)	37.2%	37.4%	28.7% to 29.5%		(2)		3.00
	3D	Accreditation of degree granting programs. (Spring 2000)	100%	100%	90% to 99% or all but 1 program		(3)		3.00
	3E	Institutional emphasis on quality teacher education and reform :							2.50
	1	NCATE accreditation (Spring 2000)	Complied	Complied	N/A, compliance required or a score of 1 is awarded.			Complied	
2a	% students passing NTE or PRAXIS II - Professional Knowledge (4/1/98 - 3/31/99)	96.7%	99.3%	94.3% to 99.9%			2		
2b	% students passing NTE or PRAXIS II - Specialty Area Exams (4/1/98 - 3/31/99)	90.2%	89.9%	87.3% to 92.7%			2		
3a	% teacher ed. grads in critical shortage areas (FY 98-99)	23%	31%	23% to 24%			3		
3b	% teacher ed. grads who are minority (FY 98-99)	Not Avail	20%	16% to 18%			3		
<b>COOPERATION &amp; COLLABORATION</b>	4A	Sharing and use of technology, programs, equipment, supplies and source matter experts within the institution, with other institutions, and/or with the business community. Assessed every 3 years.		Complied	On Cycle	Not assessed this year. Assessed next in Spring 2002.		On Cycle	
	4B	Cooperation and collaboration with private industry. Assessed every 3 years.		Complied	On Cycle	Not assessed this year. Assessed next in Spring 2002.		On Cycle	
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE EFFICIENCY</b>	5A	Ratio of administrative expenditures to academic expenditures, expressed as a %. (FY 98-99)	21.3%	21.2%	24.9% to 24.3%		(1) (2)	3.00	
	5B	Use of best management practices measured by extent of incorporation of identified best practices. Assessed every 2 years.	100%	On Cycle	Not assessed this year. Assessed next in Spring 2001			On Cycle	
	5C	Elimination of unjustified duplication of and waste in administrative and academic programs. Assessed every 3 years. (FY 99-00)	Complied	Complied	N/A, compliance required or a score of 1 is awarded.			Complied	
	5D	General overhead expenditures per full-time equivalent student. (FY 98-99)	\$1,239	\$1,276	\$1,366 to \$1,327		(1) (2)	3.00	
<b>ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS</b>	6A	SAT scores of entering freshmen, % with 1000 SAT/20 ACT or higher. (Fall 1999)	60.0%	65.6%	58.2% to 59.9%		(2)	3.00	
	6B	% entering freshmen with high school rank in top 30% or 3.0 GPA or higher on a 4.0 scale. (Fall 1999)	72.8%	78.4%	69.8% to 74.2%		(2)	3.00	
	6C	Policy for considering post-secondary non-academic achievements of non-traditional students, compliance with CHE guidelines. (as of Spring 2000)	Complied	Complied	N/A, compliance required or a score of 1 is awarded.			Complied	
	6D	Priority on enrolling in-state students, based on those considered in-state for fee purposes. (Fall 1999)	95.4%	95.2%	77.6% to 79.9%		(2)	3.00	

**NOTES:** (1) A downward trend is expected. If performance is lower than the low end of the range (# on right side of range shown) a 3 is awarded.  
 See last page for notes after (2) A standard has been identified for this indicator at which continued performance is not expected and a score of 3 is awarded. If applicable, the range shown for a score of "2" has been adjusted to take into account this standard. The levels identified are as follows: 3B=260\*; 3C=29.6%; 3E3a=25%\*; 3E3b=20%\*; 5A=24.2%; 5D=\$1,326; 6A=60%; 6B=75%\*; 6D=80% (\* temporary level approved for current year)  
 (3) (3) Percentage reflects both programs accredited and on track for accreditation to be awarded by April 2002.

Critical Success Factor / Indicator "Key" Number / Descriptive Measurement Title	(Time Period Measured This Yr)	Institution's Performance		1999-00 Standard for "Achieves" or "2"		NOTES	1999-00 Performance Score	
		Prior Yr '98-99	This Yr '99-00	( 1 if below this #)	(3 if above this #)		Subpart	Indicator
<b>GRADUATES' ACHIEVEMENTS</b>	<b>7A</b> Graduation rate :							3.00
	1 150% of program time, considers 1st-time, full-time, degree-seeking students.	1993 cohort	53.2%	55.2%	51.7%	to 54.9%		3
	2 150% of program time, excluding those enrolled in 2 or more developmental courses 1st semester (applies to Tech Colleges only).	same cohort as 7A1	N/A	N/A	N/A	to N/A		N/A
	<b>7B</b> Employment and education rate for graduates (Assessed every 2 years) :							Complied
	1 system for tracking undergraduates on employment or continued education with response rate of 20%		Not Avail	Complied	N/A, compliance required or a score of 1 is awarded.			Complied
	2 % graduates either employed or enrolled at a more advanced level		Not Avail	On Cycle	Not assessed while data is collected. Will be assessed with part 1 every 2 years starting with Performance Year 1999-00.			On Cycle
	3 % graduates employed within 1 year		Not Avail	On Cycle				On Cycle
	<b>7C</b> Employer feedback on graduates (Assessed every 2 years) :							Complied
	1 process for surveying employers who interview or hire prospective graduates		Not Avail	Complied	N/A, compliance required or a score of 1 is awarded.			Complied
	2 employers' level of satisfaction with graduates interviewed		Not Avail	On Cycle	Not assessed while data is collected. Will be assessed with part 1 every 2 years starting with Performance Year 1999-00.			On Cycle
	3 employers' satisfaction with employees		Not Avail	On Cycle				On Cycle
	<b>7D</b> % of students passing professional examinations.	(4/1/98 - 3/31/99)	92.1%	93.8%	89.4%	to 95.0%		2.00
	<b>7E</b> Number of graduates continuing their education. This measure has been incorporated into the measurement of Indicator 7B.							
	<b>7F</b> Average credit hours earned compared to average required for program completed of students earning bachelor's degrees.	(Degrees earned in 1998-99)	105%	105%	113%	to 111%	(1) (2)	3.00
<b>USER-FRIENDLINESS OF INSTITUTION</b>	<b>8A</b> Transferability of credits to and from the institution (extent of compliance with CHE guidelines)	(Spring 2000)	100%	100%	97%	to 99%	(2)	3.00
	<b>8B</b> Continuing education programs for graduates and others measured as total CEU's produced in FY. Applicable if CEU production >= 1000.	(FY 98-99)	N/A	N/A	N/A	to N/A		N/A
	<b>8C</b> Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the state :							3.00
	1 % of the undergraduate SC citizens enrolled who are minority (headcount)	(Fall 1999)	Not Avail	28.3%	25.6%	to 27.2%	(2)	3
	2 annual retention rate of SC degree-seeking undergrads who are minority.	(Fall '98 to Fall '99)	Not Avail	85.1%	81.1%	to 84.9%	(2)	3
	3 % graduate students who are minority (headcount)	(Fall 1999)	16.9%	17.8%	16.4%	to 17.4%		3
4 % teaching faculty who are minority (headcount)	(Fall 1999)	Not Avail	10.7%	9.0%	to 9.6%		3	
<b>RESEARCH FUNDING</b>	<b>9A</b> Financial support for reform in teacher education measured as FY research expenditures for teacher education compared to most recent 3-yr average.	(FY 99 to Avg FYs 96, 97, 98)	90.6%	99.2%	80%	to 119%		2.00
	<b>9B</b> Public and private sector grants measured as FY restricted research expenditures compared to most recent 3-yr Average. (Applicable if >= \$1 million in annual expenditures)	(FY 99 to Avg FYs 96, 97, 98)	N/A	N/A	N/A	to N/A		N/A
<b>Score Summary</b>	Based on data in the far right column, "1999-00 Performance Score" : Applicable Indicators 35 (including two that are assessed within other indicators). Exceeded standards (scores of 3) on 14 indicators. Achieved Standards (scores of 2.00 to 2.99) on 6 indicators. Did Not Achieve Standards (scores of 1.00 to 1.99) on 0 indicators. Achieved Compliance on 7 indicators. 6 indicators assessed On Cycle.				Subtotal : 54.50 # of indicators averaged 20  Average: 2.73 Average / 3.00 Max: 91% Category is EXCEEDS			

**NOTES:** (1) A downward trend is expected. If performance is lower than the low end of the range (# on right side of range shown) a 3 is awarded.  
 (2) A standard has been identified for this indicator at which continued performance is not expected and a score of 3 is awarded. If applicable, the range shown for a score of "2" has been adjusted to take into account this standard. The levels identified are as follows: 7F=110%; 8A=100%; 8C1=28.7%; and 8C2=85%\* (\* temporary level approved for current year)