

## Preliminary Program Productivity Results, 2012 – 2016

As of February 28, 2018

- 1087 programs reviewed
  - Using the 2017 revised policy (approved by the institutions June 2015)
    - 934 were compliant (85.92%)
    - 153 were non-compliant (14.08%) – a 264% increase in non-compliant programs when compared to the results using the 2002 Policy
- Standards for Review – 2017 Revised Policy  
Degree programs **must meet both of these standards** to comply with Commission policy.

(Five-Year Average Benchmarks for Enrollment and Completion) Degree Level	Major Enrollment	Completion (Degrees Awarded)
Baccalaureate	12.5	8
Master's/ Specialist/ Doctor's – Professional Practice	6	3
Doctor's – Research/Scholarship	4.5	2

**Note:** The revised *Policies and Procedures for Academic Degree Program Productivity* were approved by the CHE in January 2017.

### **CHE Productivity Findings:**

- Many of the non-compliant programs met and exceeded the enrollment standards, but not the completion standards for the programs.
- Approx. half of SC public institutions have begun to terminate at least one non-compliant program.
- Public institutions have noted developing and implementing strategic plans to increase enrollment and completion in non-compliant programs.
- Retention is a critical issue across institutions in the fields of STEM, Education, and Fine Arts.
- As a result of the findings, CHE will begin to engage institutions to understand strategies and procedures to improve academic progress.
- CHE will remain proactive in collaborating with institutions to improve program productivity.

**Non-Compliant Degree Programs for Public Four-Year Institutions, 2012-2016**

Institution	Programs Reviewed	Using 2017 Revised Policy			Institutional Responses	
		Compliant Programs	Programs Non-compliant	% Non-compliant	Program Status Requests	Rationale
<b>The Citadel</b>	46	39	7	15.22%	6 for exemption 1 for termination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfactory enrollment</li> <li>• Revenue generation</li> </ul>
<b>Clemson</b>	201	182	19	9.45%	9 for exemption 10 for probation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting state workforce needs</li> <li>• Cost efficiency</li> <li>• Plans to increase enrollment</li> </ul>
<b>Coastal Carolina</b>	81	77	4	4.94%	No request	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support institution mission</li> <li>• Revenue generation</li> <li>• Demand for STEM programs</li> </ul>
<b>College of Charleston</b>	95	90	5	5.26%	5 for probation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support institution mission</li> <li>• Continue recent enrollment increases</li> </ul>
<b>Francis Marion</b>	45	35	10	22.22%	10 for exemption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support institution mission</li> <li>• Plans to increase enrollment and completion</li> <li>• Serve critical educator preparation needs</li> </ul>
<b>Lander</b>	30	26	4	13.33%	4 for exemption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support institution mission</li> <li>• Cost efficiency</li> <li>• Serve critical educator preparation needs</li> </ul>
<b>MUSC</b>	43	41	2	4.65%	1 for exemption 1 for termination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly specialized discipline results in low enrollment</li> </ul>
<b>SC State</b>	67	45	22	32.84%	17 for exemption 5 for termination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Efforts made to increase enrollment</li> <li>• Service function</li> <li>• Revenue generation</li> </ul>
<b>USC Aiken</b>	36	28	8	22.22%	7 for exemption 1 for termination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support institution mission</li> <li>• Revenue generation</li> <li>• Serve critical needs of the state</li> </ul>
<b>USC Beaufort</b>	19	17	2	10.53%	2 for exemption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost efficiency</li> <li>• Plans to increase enrollment</li> <li>• Plans to modify one program</li> </ul>

Non-Compliant Degree Programs for Public Four-Year Institutions, 2012-2016						
Institution	Programs Reviewed	Using 2017 Revised Policy			Institutional Responses	
		Compliant Programs	Programs Non-compliant	% Non-compliant	Program Status Requests	Rationale
<b>USC Columbia</b>	290	241	49	16.90%	38 for exemption 7 for probation 1 for termination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting the state workforce needs</li> <li>• Cost efficiency</li> <li>• Service function</li> <li>• Program uniqueness</li> </ul>
<b>USC Upstate</b>	49	44	5	10.20%	2 for exemption 2 for termination No request for one program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost efficiency</li> <li>• Service function</li> <li>• Retention plan for one program</li> </ul>
<b>Winthrop</b>	85	66	19	22.35%	8 for exemption 6 for termination 5 for modification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support institution mission</li> <li>• Cost efficiency</li> <li>• Plans to modify programs</li> </ul>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1087</b>	<b>934</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>14.08%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

\*Complete and detailed report to be presented for review at March 29<sup>th</sup> ACAP;  
May 15<sup>th</sup> CAAL; and June 7<sup>th</sup> CHE meetings