CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

REPORT ON
INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

SUBMITTED TO
COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

August 2, 2004

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
REPORT ON INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

SUBMITTED TO SC COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
August 2, 2004

The 2004 Institutional Effectiveness summary report for Clemson University includes:

Component 2 - Majors or Concentrations,

Component 3 - Performance of Professional Program Graduates on Licensing and Certification Exams (annual table)

Component 5 - Academic Advising

Component 6 - Entry-level Placement and Developmental Education (annual table)

Component 17 - Research: Students Involved in sponsored Research (annual table)

Programs Eligible for Accreditation and Programs Accredited (annual table)

Component 8 - Achievement of Students Transferring from Two to Four Year Institutions. Transmitted under separate cover, 2004; next reporting period is 2006

The following remaining elements will be reported on by Clemson University in the annotated year:

Alumni Survey Placement (2005)

Component 1   - General Education (2006)

Component 12 - Procedures for Student Development (2007)

Component 13 - Library Resources and Services (2005)

Clemson University continues to evaluate the discipline-based programs leading to undergraduate degree majors or concentrations. The review and reporting of program successes and opportunities is embedded in Section 59-101-350 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976. Since its establishment, mandated reporting protocol has been adjusted. A recent adjustment by the S. C. Commission on Higher Education occurred as it responded to state budget reductions. Concurrently, Clemson University was finalizing its Self-Study in anticipation of its reaffirmation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Commission on Colleges. Resulting from these events, the University drafted, adopted, and implemented a Graduate and Undergraduate Program Review outlining the process, content, reporting, and cycle of programs to be examined annually.

Highlights from the Guidelines mimic many of those requirements of both the Commission on Higher Education and those stipulated by many of the selected national discipline accrediting agencies. For instance, each program is to prepare a Self-Study and review in detail the academic program of the students. This information is then used by an appointed Review Committee for making its judgment on the quality of the departmental programs from the viewpoint of scholars. Conclusions are drawn from the following materials provided by the academic department: (1) a statement of the department's mission and goals, (2) faculty vitae, (3) course listings and program options with appropriate descriptions and assessments, (4) statistical data on enrollment, degrees granted, and total FTE students, (5) financial data and assessment of resources, (6) description of facilities, equipment, space, and library holdings, and (7) description of advising responsibilities, service activities, undergraduate research, honors programs, and study abroad programs.

However, the Review Committee's report is not limited to the Department's Self-Study but may include interviews, on-site studies, or reviews of appropriate materials. Once prepared, the report is submitted to the Dean of the college and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies. The department has an opportunity to review the report before its being sent to the Undergraduate Council for deliberation. The Undergraduate Council then prepares a final report and submits it to the Provost.

Clemson University is in the midst of its first full cycle of this process. The reviews and reports prepared in the academic year 2003-2004 are being assembled for the Undergraduate Council review in Fall 2004. The summary materials gathered from the preliminary reviews of the Review Committees,

Deans, and some of the departments are the base-information for Component 2. As the process for program review continues, each step will be documented with all recommendations and actions being recorded. The undergraduate degrees being examined in this cycle include:

Agricultural & Applied Economics	Food Science & Human Nutrition
Agricultural Education	History
Agricultural Mechanization & Business	Horticulture
	Mathematical Sciences
Animal & Veterinary Science	Packaging Science
Biosystems Engineering	Philosophy
Community & Economic Development	Psychology
	Sociology
Economics	Turfgrass

For the purpose of this general report, the comments from the review team have been summarized. It is critical to keep in mind several important guidelines: (1) there may be other highlights or opportunities incorporated in the Department's Self-Study that are not included in this report, (2) not all of the reports have been assembled for further review, thus, this summary may not include all topics to be addressed by the Undergraduate Council, (3) not all Review Committees reported in a similar format or covered the same areas. The following information must be taken as a preliminary step in institutionalizing a new process that may need adjusting as the reviews continue. Nonetheless, the current review provides significant insight into the achievements of undergraduate programs. This review reflects the aggregation of the comments into two segments, Highlights and Opportunities. Each of these is subdivided into (1) Mission and Plans, (2) Student Success, (3) Curriculum, (4) Faculty, and (5) Facilities and Resources. The following discussion expands on each of these areas as described in the Review Committees' reports.

<u>Mission and Plans</u> Clemson University expects each academic program to be clearly related to the mission of the institution. Each of the Self-Studies included the mission for the program. Several of the highlights noted by the Review Committee were that some of the program mission statements emphasized a connection of the discipline to the institutional central issues, were well-articulated with specific goals or supported by the curriculum, or included comprehensive plans on resources and hiring. It was suggested by two committees that additional issues or areas of institutional interest be included in any revisions of the Departments' mission statements.

<u>Student Success</u> was reported by all Review Committees. Success was recorded as using effective student handbooks, training TA's before permitting them to conduct a classroom, and administering placement tests prior to course assignment. Other Student Successes were measured by increases in the student GPAs, program enrollment, increases in the pass rates on national

examinations, using the University Supplemental Instruction and Help Centers, and student participation in co-operative experiences or laboratories. Skills and abilities such as recognizing interdisciplinary relations with other majors or developing expertise through concentrations or use of equipment were other examples. Opportunities for improvement in some programs in the area of Student Success reflected many of the areas of success in other programs. Review Committees noted that a program could improve its success in first-time test takers' pass rates on national examinations, success may improve if selection criteria for enrollment in the major were better defined; or that the number and timing of transfer students into the major were addressed by the Department. One area truly falls both within Student Success and Curriculum. Review Committees for four disciplines noted that students' communication skills needed improvement. Suggestions from the Committees include (1) specific writing exercises or opportunities be incorporated in current classes or a specific course in writing be developed, and (2) more opportunities for in-class oral communication.

Curriculum Other opportunities regarding the Curriculum included the necessity to examine the content of the programs, evaluation of specific program activities, and incorporating applied experiences including the development of capstone courses or internships. One discipline is a foundation of the General Education program and relies on multiple sections of each course for the delivery. It was recommended that consistency in the delivery across multiple sections be strengthened. Although every program is conducting assessment, refined benchmarks and standards were recommended. Some programs may benefit from expanded emphasis areas or program focus areas. These are examples of the depth to which the Program Review process addresses opportunities for Curriculum enhancements. Be assured, each program received multiple points of recognition. Highlights included the requirement for significant reading and writing in support of the Department's mission statement, diverse methods of assessment of student outcomes and faculty performance, as well as the number and variety of courses and student activities.

Faculty characteristics of quality and productivity were cited in each report. Quality was described as the types of publication journals, the institution from which the faculty member received the highest degree, or similar references. Productivity included the type and number of grants (including amounts) and publications. Service within the institution, to professional societies, the community, or international engagement were referenced in all reports. Specific comments were made about the high quality of internal and external relations. Departments were commended for the value placed on teaching skills, mentoring of both students and other faculty, and being good advisors to students. Many reports contained opportunities for salary adjustment and personnel support (other faculty, technical assistance, TA's). Where some programs are doing well regarding faculty, other programs face opportunities to

improve. For example, it was suggested to some Departments to expand the diversity of the faculty, reduce tension among department faculty, increase research and publications, and distribute service obligations more equitably. Enhancing teaching effectiveness and engaging tenured faculty in lower level or service courses were observations made of one program. All these will be duly considered by the Undergraduate Council.

<u>Facilities and Resources</u> are impacted by the Department and University budgets. In spite of a continued reduction in State support to Clemson University, there are many areas in which the facilities and resources are reported to be exemplary. However, these highlights are not universally distributed. The library resources are adequate for some programs but not for others, which would benefit from more holdings, primary journals, more on-line journals, and a reduction in the need for frequent interlibrary loans. Some of the campus buildings have recently been rehabilitated; thus, the programs using these facilities generally reported satisfaction with the current faculty and administrative office space, classrooms, computer technology and access. The Review Committees of other programs indicated that these were opportunities for improvement to enhance the quality of the program. Program specific anomalies were identified such as the need to upgrade classrooms at the farms to insure compatibility with laptop teaching and to provide web camera access.

The office for Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment reviews annual assessment records for every academic program. These records were used in the development of many of the Self-Studies and were examined by many of the Review Committees. Multiple strategies were reported being used to assess student outcomes. From the assessment records and the program review documents, Clemson University is certain to continue reviewing the integrity of the academic programs and all areas of the institution contributing to quality undergraduate education.

CHE COMPONENT 5
ACADEMIC ADVISING

Since last reported, academic advising at Clemson University has been significantly revitalized. This deliberate change came about over a period of a few brief years. As a part of the Self-Study for reaffirmation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Commission on College, Clemson University extensively examined academic advising practices. Used in the evaluation were surveys from currently enrolled students, alumni, and faculty, review of department or college academic advising procedures, and interviews with faculty and staff assigned to the academic advising of undergraduate students. Triangulation of historical data from the Student Satisfaction Inventory Survey (SSI) with the other data provided a foundation for the critical

analysis of academic advising practices strengths and weaknesses. Evolving during this time were several other fortuitous factors including a new Provost and President beginning their tenure, a reduction in State funding (therefore a need to streamline current practices), the appointment of an Interim Assistant Dean of Academic Advising, and a rise to individual college advising centers without university-wide coordination.

The Self-Study resulted in the formation of a committee charged to develop an Academic Advising Policies and Procedures document. In May 2002, the Faculty Senate adopted the academic advising mission statement and goals. Following the SACS reaffirmation visit, the Interim Assistant Dean assisted in the establishment of academic advising centers within each college. Additionally workshops and national teleconference opportunities were provided. The development of the Academic Support Center led to the creation of the Academic Advising Resource Manual, conducting academic advising workshops for new faculty and staff, assisting in orientation programs for new and transfer students, coordinating the Freshman Academic Success program.

The 2003 – 2004 Assessment Report for the Clemson University Academic Support Center included the analysis and interpretation of data on the programs that it now offers including Tutoring, Supplemental Instruction (SI), PASS, Academic Skills Workshops, Academic Counseling, Online Learning Center, Student Disability Services (SDS), and Early Success Program (ESP). The Center used these data as a foundation for program enhancements and to mark achievements in program delivery or student success. The following information, extracted from this report, provides evidence of Clemson University's commitment to the academic success of its students.

One program, Supplemental Instruction, helps students develop skills to enhance their academic performance and successfully complete high-risk courses (courses with a 30% or higher D, F, W rate). The criteria for success is benchmarked as 50% of students enrolled in an SI course will attend at least one SI session during the semester.

Fall 2003	Total # of SI Sections	Total Enrollment*	Students Visiting SI	% Attendance	Total SI Visits	Average Visits Per Participant
BIOSC 222	2	252	170	67.50	1,860	10.9
CH 101	9	1,296	748	57.70	4,389	5.9
MTHSC 106	25	759	492	64.80	4,138	8.4
MTHSC 108	10	327	206	63.00	1,717	8.3
PHYS 122	2	258	141	54.70	896	6.4
Total	48	2,892	1,757	60.80	13,000	7.4
Spring 2004						
ACCT 201	10	449	277	61.70	1,847	6.7

BIOL 104	1	170	52	30.60	620	11.9
BIOSC 223	2	211	119	56.40	1,181	9.9
CH 101	2	408	196	48.00	1,311	6.7
E M 201	7	279	188	67.40	2,033	10.8
MTHSC 103	1	83	38	45.80	403	10.6
MTHSC 106	12	316	199	63.00	2,133	10.7
MTHSC 108	14	457	286	62.60	2,365	8.3
PHYS 122	3	545	318	58.30	1,936	6.1
Total	52	2,918	1,673	57.30	13,829	8.3

As a result of examining these data, the Center decided to pursue innovative ways to promote student participation, especially in auditorium sections. Another measure was the frequency of participation. Based on the desired criteria for success of 45% of the SI participants will attend 6 or more sessions, it is evident that this outcome was achieved. The results will be used to continue to stress that students who attend SI regularly outperform those who do not attend regularly.

Frequency of SI Participation

Visits	Students	Percent
Fall 2003		
0 Visits	797	37.44
1+ visits	1,332	62.56
Total	2,129	100.00
1 Visit	209	15.69
2-5 visits	451	33.86
6 + visits	672	50.45
Total	1,332	100.00
Fall 2004		
0 Visits	967	41.68
1+ visits	1,353	58.32
Total	2,320	100.00
1 Visit	181	13.38
2-5 visits	441	32.59
6 + visits	731	54.03
Total	1,353	100.00

Similar data were collected for the other components of the program and similar analysis were provided. Student performance of the SI participants was used as a part of the program evaluation. The Drop, Fail, Withdrawal (DFW) rate for SI participants will be less than 30% thus measuring Satisfactory Course Completion.

Course	# Students	# SI	% A	% B	%C	% D,	Final	Semester

	(%)	sections				F,&W	Grade	GPR
Fall 2003								
TOTAL	2,854 (100.0)		14.40	26.10	25.50	33.90	2.23	2.67
NON-SI	1,237 (43.3)	48	12.10	22.90	24.40	40.60	2.04	2.48
SI	1,617 (56.7)		16.20	28.60	26.40	28.80	2.37	2.81
Spring 2004								
TOTAL	2914 (100.0)		14.10	28.80	26.20	30.60	2.3	2.65
NON-SI	1340 (46.0)	52	13.10	24.80	23.00	38.30	2.14	2.43
SI	1574 (54.0)		14.90	32.10	28.80	24.00	2.42	2.84

The staff of the Center will continue to capitalize on the progress made thus far in high-risk courses. They will work on individual courses with DFW rates exceeding 30%, stress study skills, and train SI Leaders to be more aware of student concerns and motivational problems. The question is: Is the SI Program working? Yes, and both the participants and the faculty are satisfied. Using a satisfaction survey, the respondents rated their satisfaction on a 5-point scale. The criteria for success was set at 3.5. The results are displayed below.

	Semester	Mean	# Returned/ Sent	Response Rate
Participant	Fall 2003	3.5	2180/2892	75.40%
	Spring 2004	4.1	1289/2918	44.10%
Faculty	Fall 2003	4.5	33/48	68.80%
	Spring 2004	4.7	46/51	90.20%

Tutoring services were examined using strategies similar to those employed for the SI program. In general, success continues to be achieved. However data from the Student Participation in Schilletter General Tutoring indicate that the effectiveness of this program (including costs) should be evaluated further.

The Academic Skills Workshops are offered to students by the Center share strategies and techniques to enhance their academic success. A survey of participants was used to evaluate the Value and Usefulness of Information Presented using a 5- point scale. The criteria for success was set at 3.5 or higher mean score on the 5-point scale.

	Value/Usefulness of Information Presented	Quality of Facilitator's Presentation
Fall 2003 34 Workshops	4.4	4.6
Spring 2004 21 Workshops	4.5	4.6

Based on the rating of these workshops, evaluations will be used to select future presenters and workshop topics, such as: ["Time Management", "Test-Taking Tactics", "Speed Reading", "How to Write a Dissertation", "How To Write a Winning Grant Proposal", and "Using the TI-89 Calculator"].

Individual Academic Counseling assists students in identifying their learning behaviors and develop strategies to enhance their academic success. Students rated their overall SBI experience on a 5-point scale with the criteria for success being a mean score of 3.5 or higher. As shown below, the criteria for success were exceeded.

Survey Questions	Average	N
1. Overall, the session was a positive experience for me	4.63	75
2. The strategies we discussed have helped me improve my study skills.	4.23	73
3. As a result of the session, I have made progress toward retaining my scholarship.	4.14	50

In compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the American's with Disabilities Act of 1990, Student Disability Services (SDS) shall coordinate the provision of reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities. All students with disabilities shall receive accommodations that are individualized, flexible, and confidential based on the nature of the disability and the academic environment. Compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the American with Disabilities Act of 1990 All of the 118 SDS students enrolled in fall and spring who presented appropriate documentation received accommodations. Clemson University will continue to evaluate student records and determine eligibility for services in an efficient and timely manner for students.

Students were asked to rate their satisfaction with the services. A mean score of 3.2 or higher on a 4-point scale was set at the benchmark of satisfaction. The responses are shown below.

Service	Mean Scores
Academic Accommodations	3.14
Assistive Technology	2.55
Customer Services	2.97
Disabilities Specialist	3.05
Interpreter/C-Print	2.17
Lengthened Testing Time	3.55
Letters of Accommodation	3.48

Test Proctoring Center	2.85
Total	3.10

The results will be used to continue to provide satisfactory service to students and develop strategies to improve rating. Faculty and staff were also surveyed to determine their awareness of SDS Policies and Procedures. Based on the results of the survey, the Center will be able to design new approaches to enhancing awareness of SDS through the use of workshops and other educational materials. The survey results from the faculty and staff follow.

Service	Mean (3pt. Scale)
Customer Services	1.71
Consultation w/ Disabilities Specialist	1.83
Access to Assistive Technology	1.69
Role of the Test Proctoring Center	2.08

Students who participate in the Early Success Program shall receive intensive academic advising and structured academic support, as well as participate in an academic seminar to enhance their academic success and persistence. The benchmark for success is that students will achieve a Cumulative GPR, which exceeds their predicted GPR by at least .1 point. The outstanding achievement is shown in the following table.

ESP Freshmen	2003-04 Cum. GPR	Predict GPR	Difference	Number (%) above 3.0 GPR
48 students	2.70	2.43	+0.27	19 (40)

An additional 6 students will be able to retain their LIFE Scholarships by attending summer school and making A's in one to three courses. These results will be used to support the academic support services/requirements of the Early Success Program. Another goal of the program is to enhance retention rates. Assessment of this will occur in Fall 2004.

Students who participate in Freshman Academic Success Program (FASP) shall receive quality academic advising during summer orientation, early academic feedback and assistance with academic performance (if appropriate). To evaluate the impact, participants rateed workshop information and material usefulness with succeed being a mean score of 3.5 or higher on a 5-point scale.

Information Evaluations	June 10th Mean Score	June 11th Mean Score
a. Academic advising resources	4.09	4.56
b. General orientation information	4.03	4.40
c. General advising and registration information	4.03	4.40
d. Course-specific information	4.18	4.32

e. Special program information	4.09	4.48

Presentation Evaluations

a. Value/usefulness of the information presented	3.94	4.64
b. Quality of the presentations	3.71	4.32
c. Quality of the materials	3.79	4.72
d. Organization of the workshop	3.94	4.48

Item: Rating of effectiveness (5-Very effective, 1-Not very effective)

Additional narrative comments were collected and analyzed. Most comments were about the poor acoustics of the room and the inclusion of band, CU 101 on the program. Future workshops will be held in different auditoriums and less emphasis will be placed on non-core curriculum courses.

Freshman Retention is another measure to evaluate the success of the program. The benchmark is the first to second year retention rate will exceed 90%. The first to second year retention rate for freshmen beginning in Fall 2002 was 89.98%. Continuous retention progress has been documented for the past seven years. The Academic Support Center and other programs and services on campus will continue to strive to meet this retention goal.

Additionally, the Academic Probation Rate is a point of measure with the criteria for success less than 10%. The freshman first semester academic probation rate was 14.01% for 2003-2004. This probation rate is up from the previous year's freshman first semester academic probation rate of 11.8%. The Center will explore possible reasons for the increase in the freshman probation rate.

FASP advisors were invited to provide feedback several times throughout the academic year. First, two focus groups were held to solicit advisor feedback on summer orientation. Their comments were primarily focused on the lack of available courses, placement exam confusion, laptop confusion, and the difficulty of advising transfer students. Second, two focus groups for FASP advisors were held to gain insight about the Freshman Academic Progress Program (early midterm grade monitoring). Specific feedback will guide adjustments to the program.

Academic advising and general support for student success are provided through programs other than the formal advising centers. For example, Redfern Health Center has many resources where students are able to seek council for many different problems which may directly or indirectly affect their academic performance. Opportunities to enhance their lifestyles and improve their physical and emotional well-being are offered through individual or group counseling and special programs. The topic include but are not limited to cessation of smoking (Kick Butt, CU QUIT!), alcohol education (LifeStyles Program, Community Service, Alternative Spring Break, Late Nite Programming, Alcohol Awareness Week, and Safe Spring Break), HIV Testing

and Counseling, and STD Information. Physical and emotional health are encouraged through activities at Fike Recreational facilities; Residence Hall Advisors are trained to provide guidance to students on their halls. Individual sororities and fraternities encourage and support academic success. The Library has been remodeled to encourage student use not only as a place to conduct research but to study or gather for social purposes and promote academic success. All of these and many more contribute to the overall well-being of our students and underpin the efforts to provide comprehensive advising services.

Clemson practices a decentralized model of academic advising. This model provides great flexibility to each department in the practice of academic advising which may be conducted within the department or by the college advising center. This flexibility is one of the key components of success to advising, autonomy of the departments. However, there is no recognition or reward in tenure, promotion, or performance acknowledgements. Furthermore, there is no one accountable for the integrity and quality of the advising. Thus, improving or enhancing advising practices is limited by the current model.

To address these and other problems, the new Dean of Undergraduate Studies will examine the current practices of academic advising. Some of the challenges will include advising coordination and organization, personnel, assessment incentives, tools, training, and perhaps rewards. In the interim, the Academic Advising Center continues to work with the individual college advising centers but does not interact directly with each of the departmental faculty assigned to academic advising.

Thus, academic advising in the literal sense as well as the general sense is available to all students at Clemson University. Without such commitment from faculty, staff, and fellow students, Clemson students would not be as successful as they are.

Institution: | **Clemson University** |

Clemson University's National Institutional and Specialized Accrediting Bodies Recognized by the SC Commission on Higher Education

ACCREDITING AGENCIES AND AREAS	Accreditable Program	Fully Accredited Program	Details on Program			Date for next visit
			Date of last visit	Comments	Accreditation Expected, If in process	

AMERICAN ASSEMBLY OF COLLEGIATE SCHOOLS OF BUSINESS - International Association for Management Education	*An institution may be accredited by the AACSB or the ACBSP*					
Business (BUS)-Baccalaureate, Masters', and Doctoral degree programs in business administration and management	x	x	2000	Accredited		2010
Business (BUSA)-Baccalaureate, Masters', and Doctoral degree programs in accounting	x	x	April 2000	Accredited		2010
ACCREDITING BOARD FOR ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY, INC.						
Engineering (ENG)-Baccalaureate and master's level programs in engineering	x (8)	x(8)	Nov. 28-30, 1999	Accredited		2005
AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR CONSTRUCTION EDUCATION						
Construction Education (CONST) - Baccalaureate degree programs	x	x	March 1995	Accredited		Feb 10-13, 2001
AMERICAN DIETETIC ASSOCIATION, THE						
Dietetics (DIET) - Coordinated undergraduate programs	x	x	1996	Approved		2005
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE ACCREDITATION BOARD (LAAB)						
Landscape Architecture (LSAR) - Baccalaureate and master's programs leading to the first professional degree	x	x	2002	Accredited		2006
COMPUTING SCIENCE ACCREDITATION BOARD, INC.						
Computer Science (COMP) - Baccalaureate programs in computer science	x	x	1999-2000			2005-06
COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF COUNSELING AND RELATED EDUCATION PROGRAMS (CACREP)						
Masters degree programs to prepare individuals for community counseling, mental health counseling, marriage and family counseling, school counseling, student affairs practice in higher education,	X(2)	X(2)	2000	Report due 1/15/2002		2007
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF ART AND DESIGN						
Art & Design (ART) - Degree-granting schools and departments and nondegree-granting schools	x	x	2002	Accredited		2007
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION (NCATE)	x(2)	x(2)				
Teacher Education (TED) - Baccalaureate & graduate programs for the preparation of teachers & other professional personnel for elementary &secondary schools	x(22)	x(22)	2000	Accredited		2005
NATIONAL ARCHITECTURAL ACCREDITING BOARD, INC.						

Architecture (ARCH) -first professional degree programs	x	x	2002	Accredited		2008
NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR NURSING, INC						
Nursing (NUR) - Baccalaureate and higher degree programs	x	x	1998	Fully accredited		2006
SOCIETY OF AMERICAN FORESTERS						
Forestry (FOR) - Programs leading to a bachelor's or higher first professional degree	x	x	2002	On-site Visit		
Total	<u>14</u>	<u>14</u>				

SUCCESS OF STUDENTS IN DEVELOPMENTAL COURSES
Applicable to Four-Year Colleges and Universities
According to Section 59-101-350, the Commission is responsible for collecting "the percent and number of students enrolled in remedial courses and the number of students exiting remedial courses and successfully completing entry-level curriculum courses" from four-year institutions to be included in the annual report to the General Assembly. The following information will be collected from the four-year colleges and universities, but excludes the research universities, as these institutions do not offer these types of courses.

For purposes of counting students who exit developmental courses and successfully complete the appropriate entry level course, a student in more than one developmental course and completing more than one entry level course should be counted once for each developmental courses he/she exits and once for each entry level course he/she completes. Appropriate entry-level courses for which successful completion is determined will be defined by the developmental instructor as the course for which the student is being prepared.

Number of first-time, full-time entering freshmen enrolled in Fall 2002 (include first-time freshmen who enrolled either part-time or full-time in the Summer 2002 if they returned full-time in the Fall 2002) Item (1)	Number of students in Item (1) who were enrolled in one or more developmental courses in Summer or Fall 2002 Item (2)	Number of those students in each developmental course who successfully completed the appropriate entry level course by the end of Spring 2004 Item (3)
2464	0	0

STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN SPONSORED RESEARCH *Applicable to Four-Year Institutions – Measured for Fall 2003*

According to Section 59-101-350, the Commission is responsible for collecting "the percent of graduate and upper division undergraduate students participating in sponsored research programs" from four-year institutions to be included in the annual report to the General Assembly.

The numbers included here should reflect the graduate and upper division undergraduate students who participate in sponsored research programs. Each institution that receives research dollars generated by external funding (sponsored research) should report the number of students who benefit from these dollars.

The CHE will calculate the percentage using these data and headcount enrollment data from the Fall 2003 IPEDS Enrollment Forms.

	Number of Students Participating in Sponsored Research *(Exclude first professional students)*
Upper Division, Undergraduate Students	89
Graduate Students	699

RESULTS OF PROFESSIONAL EXAMINATIONS
Applicable to all sectors – Measured for April 1, 2003-March 31, 2004

Name of Exam	Date(s) Administered	# of Examinees	# of 1st Time Examinees	# of 1st Time Examinees who Passed	% 1st Time Examinees Passing
RESEARCH SECTOR					
National Council Licensure Exam. - Registered Nurse	Apr 1 – June 30, 02		54	51	94.4
	July 1 – Sept. 30, 02		36	32	88.9
	Oct. 1 – Dec. 31, 02		3	3	100.0
PRAXIS Series II: Principles of Learning & Teaching (K-6)	4/03, 6/03, 9/03, 11/03, 1/2004 3/04	150		138	92
PRAXIS Series II: Principles of Learning & Teaching (5-9)	11/03, 3/04	3		3	100
PRAXIS Series II: Principles of Learning & Teaching (7-12)	4/03, 6/03, 9/03, 11/03, 1/2004 3/04	66		42	63.6
PRAXIS Series II: Specialty Area Tests	4/03, 6/03, 9/03, 11/03, 1/2004 3/04	543		485	89.3