College of Education Blueprint for Academic Excellence 2013 - 2014

I. Executive Summary

A. Contribution to the Academic Dashboard

College of Education statistics mostly reflect that of the University as a whole on the majority of the academic dashboard items. Nonetheless, the College has yet to make a strong purposeful contribution to addressing targets. This will be done in two major ways: (1) collecting data and setting targets at the level of degree programs, with the College data becoming an aggregate of these programs, and (2) implementing the strategic initiatives outlined in Section II of this Blueprint. Here is a summary of the current College picture through the lens of the academic dashboard.

Undergraduate enrollment has increased in the past year. The **average SAT score** of entering freshmen has also increased, but is about 50 points behind the University average. The **freshman-sophomore retention rate** has dropped in the past year and is slightly behind that of the University as a whole. The **six-year graduation rate** is approximately the same as the University's rate. We do not have **student-faculty ratio numbers** for the College, but the size of the faculty was substantially increased in the past year. Both total sponsored awards and **research expenditures** decreased in the past year, primarily due to a stellar previous year. There are very few **national awards and honors** on the accepted list that college faculty can realistically hope to achieve. The College awards a proportionately large number of **doctoral degrees**.

B. Contribution to Key Performance Parameters

All five college annual and five-year goals are clearly related to the key performance parameters. We naturally place a high emphasis on quality education. This is reflected internally in our goals for our degree programs, but also in our work with school districts and education agencies, relating directly to the performance parameter of service to the State. One of our listed strengths is our ability to balance the responsibilities of a professional school with our contribution to the research mission of a research university.

Specifically, Goal #1 (strengthening internal and external communication) provides the kind of information that will draw stakeholders to look to the University for educational solutions as we provide service to the State. Goal #2 (leading in technological innovation for teaching, educating teachers, and conducting research in educational arenas) directly supports quality teaching and research recognition. Goal #3 (addressing State needs in education) defines our role in providing service to the State. Goal #4 (maintaining some programs that are nationally recognized) addresses research recognition. Goal #5 (being a diverse and supportive community in teaching and research) address key parameters by enhancing the quality of our teaching, achieving research recognition, and serving the educational needs of a State with a diverse population. Most or all of these goals serve to promote the sustainability of our work, our College, and our University.

II. Meeting Academic Dashboard Targets

1. Total Undergraduate Enrollment. The College administration and faculty did not create strategies for addressing undergraduate enrollment in previous years. Consequently, we cannot attribute undergraduate enrollment to any systematic plan, but rather trust that in addition to factors that we cannot control (e.g. market forces), that our efforts to offer quality programs are largely responsible for our enrollment numbers. Though total enrollment dipped in AY2012, undergraduate enrollment in AY2013 is the highest in the past four years, both in terms of FTE and headcount. Our plans moving forward are based on a commitment to be more strategic in addressing student enrollment at every level.

- Programs will discuss capacity and potential growth for all degree areas, then set enrollment targets.
- We will develop a plan to meet program enrollment targets.
- We will participate in Palmetto College and explore other potential online course and program delivery.
- We will maintain the Teaching Fellows program and our commitment to the SC Teacher Cadet College Partnership Program.

2. Average SAT Score. The average SAT score of incoming freshmen to the College has risen by 30 points in the past three years, though this average is still 50 points lower than the average SAT score for entering freshmen at the University. Over 80% of our undergraduate students come from South Carolina. We believe a local undergraduate population to be an important characteristic for a College of Education that seeks to provide the most qualified teaching force to the State. Consequently, we have no strategic plan in this area beyond maintaining our admission standards and providing access that promotes the recruitment of a diverse student body.

3. Freshman-Sophomore Retention Rate. The College of Education's goal is to meet or exceed the university goal of a 90% freshman to sophomore retention rate and a 95% sophomore to junior retention rate. The past year resulted in about a six percentage point decline in the freshmen retention rate. This rate was previously higher than the overall University retention rate. Going forward, the College will develop and implement a retention plan. This plan will include:

- Review of advisement practices
- Establishment of a process for identifying and assisting at-risk students
- Review of student involvement beyond the classroom
- Mechanisms for providing assistance on the Praxis I exam
- A review of undergraduate program policies/rules which might unnecessarily have a negative impact on retention
- Implementation of programmatic data collection to help understand and address future retention issues

4. Six-year Graduation Rate. Our latest cohort six-year graduation rate of 69% is close to that for the University as a whole. This is also an area where program-level data and review are needed. Our strategies will address this over the next year.

- We will review programs to determine where there are graduation rate issues
- We will develop and implement plans to address program graduation rate issues, as needed

5. Student to Faculty Ratio. Our student to faculty ratio strategies focus on increasing the size of the faculty and retaining these faculty members. In all instructional faculty categories (tenure-track, clinical, instructors, and adjunct faculty members), we increased our numbers from fall 2011 to fall 2012. The size of the tenured and tenure-track faculty increased from 64 to 72 members. Our strategies now are:

- Implement a salary enhancement plan to retain faculty members
- Continue to participate in University hiring initiatives, as available
- Collect data on per program student-to-faculty ratios to determine areas of need

6. Research Expenditures. Total extramural funding was $7,437,746 in FY2012. This is a significant decrease from extramural funding of $10,858,592 in FY2011. FY2011 was an exceptional year in which the College was awarded several large multi-year grants. College research expenditures were $1,650,536 in FY2011 and $1,013,315 in FY2012. In the past, our strategies for addressing extramural funding was primarily through faculty hiring criteria. With faculty growth slowing and stabilizing, our attention will focus on these strategies:

- The implementation of an internal grants program to motivate external proposals
- The development of grant mentoring for junior faculty members
- Promotion and support of trips to meet with external funding program officers
- Professional development related to funding procurement

7. National Honors and Awards for Faculty. The College administration will continue to support faculty members who seek to become Fulbright Scholars. Our most recent Scholars were in AY2009 and AY2011. This is our primary participation in the national honors and awards metric. Most of the listed awards do not have natural entry points for strong and productive scholars in education.

8. Doctoral Degrees. The College contributes substantially to University doctoral degree production. Of the approximately 280 doctoral graduates in AY2012, 64 of these were from the College of Education. Our current focus is on ascertaining the quality of doctoral degrees, while maintaining this quantity. Our strategies reflect this emphasis.

- Review the composition of doctoral committees and create a plan to address a mismatch of degree expectations and committee membership
- Review doctoral curricula and associated research training for doctoral students and develop plans to address problem areas
- Study the feasibility of a college-wide doctorate built on a curriculum core with discipline strands in order to ensure degree quality

III. College Goals and their Contribution to Key Performance Parameters

The relationship of progress and plans to key parameters are identified in brackets [].

A. 2013 – 2014 Academic Year Goals

Goal #1: Improve internal and external communications and public relations.

Progress. The Dean hosted information sessions within the College [obtaining information to address teaching excellence and scholarly reputation]. He also has met with school district superintendents, business leaders, and thought leaders in the state to discuss needs in state education [identifying educational needs in state]. We created brochures to better explain College programs and our work [demonstrating service to the State and enhancing sustainability].

Plans.

- Increase capacity of the College public relations office to better market programs and disseminate College information [to enhance teaching and research reputation and increase sustainability]
- Implement a major overhaul of the College web [to better present College teaching, research, and service and enhance sustainability]
- Create responsive systems that connect to social media outlets [to enhance both teaching and sustainability]
- Create an internal weekly communication from the Dean's office [to involve all members of the faculty and staff in the work of the College and enhance sustainability]
- Release the first issue of a new annual report [to disseminate teaching strengths, enhance research reputation, and address sustainability]

Goal #2: Integrate technology into all aspects of the College, to include academic, administrative, communications, and assessment functions.

Progress. We've begun development of an on-line delivery of the BA in Elementary Education. The College has identified additional potential graduate offerings to build on its #5 national ranking for online offerings [to enhance teaching, provide service to the State, and address sustainability]. We are building administrative calendaring and secure web-based data entry and storage mechanisms for administrative and assessment data [to provide data to identify areas to strengthen teaching, research, and service outcomes, thus enhancing sustainability].

Plans.

- Review and potentially adopt and implement a faculty productivity data collection system [to address teaching, research, and service strengths and weaknesses]
- Continue participation in University-led online program and course development initiatives [to enhance teaching excellence and increase program sustainability]
- Identify data elements within the College and develop additional systems for collection, security, and oversight [to document and address teaching, research, and service and enhance sustainability]

Goal #3: Strengthen the structure for decision-making to include internal perspectives and agility in responding to external needs.

Progress. The faculty governance structure is being revised to provide stronger faculty voice to academic program-related decisions [to address teaching and research excellence] as well as more agile responsiveness to external needs [to address service to the State] and administrative issues [to enhance sustainability]. Responsiveness to external needs assumes identification of those needs. The Dean has taken primary responsibility for this role by communicating on a regular basis with external audiences [to address service to the State.]

Plans.

- Continue to clarify the roles and processes of faculty committees [to enhance sustainability and address teaching, research, and service in the College in a wider venue with stronger faculty voice]
- Establish ongoing communication among College administration and faculty committees that includes specific requests to committees with responsiveness to deadlines [to better address state service as well as promote improvement in teaching and research]
- Systematically determine administrative functions that can be departmentalized and those that can be centralized [to increase efficiency and thus sustainability]

Goal #4: Develop systems for implementing and ascertaining the high quality of research programs.

Progress. We have implemented two new internal grant programs [to enhance research production and reputation]. Funding for full-time doctoral students has been increased and three doctoral student research rooms (with computer workstations) have been constructed [to promote research production and reputation].

Plans.

- Create a public research calendar for both internal and external grants opportunities [to promote funded scholarship]
- Develop College-level research dashboard items (e.g. faculty publications; student publications; research expenditures) [to promote research reputation]
- Create and disseminate research briefs [to promote research reputation]
- Collect program-level data on research productivity and develop plans for strengthening programs, as needed [to promote research productivity and reputation]

Goal #5: Promote a college culture that supports diversity of personnel, students, curriculum, pedagogy, and partnerships.

Progress. We now require a criterion-applicant matrix in hiring recommendations [to enhance teaching, research, and service through diverse populations]. The Diversity Committee sponsors colloquia conferences [to strengthen teaching and research]. Departments have assigned a diversity representative to performance review committees [to support teaching, research, and service]. The College is working with local schools to initiate collaborations involving a Chinese immersion program and a health sciences magnet program [to enhance teaching excellence

and service to the State]. The Professional Development School Network is restructuring to expand and enhance impact on the local educational community [to enhance teaching excellence and service to the State]. The College has begun exploring a relationship and exchange programs with Ewha Womans University [to enhance teaching and promote research reputation].

Plans.

- Determine how academic program curricula address the understanding of diversity and develop plans for strengthening this aspect of the curriculum [to enhance teaching, research, and service to the State]
- Collect data on personnel and student diversity and develop plans to address areas of need [to enhance teaching, research, and service to the State]
- Catalog partnerships and develop plans for strengthening existing partnerships and developing new partnerships, as needed [to enhance teaching and service to the State]

B. Five Year Goals

Goal #1: The College will regularly and effectively communicate to both internal and external audiences regarding instructional programs, research, community service, and operations. We hope to build stronger communication mechanisms within the College to promote our work [enhance teaching, research, and service] and to better communicate what we do and accomplish to external audiences [promote reputation and sustainability].

Goal #2: The College will be the state leader among colleges of education in utilizing technological innovations to improve instruction, research, and operational functions. This pushes us to adopt technological advances whenever these advances can lead to higher quality instruction, research, and more efficient operations [to promote teaching excellence, research quality, and sustainability].

Goal #3: The College will routinely consider new initiatives and address emerging State needs in a manner that capitalizes on strengths throughout the College community. This requires us to transform into a responsive and agile College that can take the lead in addressing State education issues with the full participation of our College community [to serve the State].

Goal #4: Programs within the College will be nationally recognized as consistent with those of a top-tier research university. This establishes our priorities not only as a professional school that provides the strongest teachers and educational leaders in the State, but also as a full player in a research university with some nationally recognized programs [to promote scholarship and research reputation].

Goal #5: The College will be a diverse and supportive community of teachers, researchers, and learners who promote educational practices based on the strengths of a diverse society.

This goal goes beyond acceptance of diversity, instead embracing diversity within our College, but also promoting educational practices that are stronger because of diversity [to promote teaching excellence, research, and service to the State].

IV. Appendices

A. Resources Needed

Goal #4: Programs within the College will be nationally recognized as consistent with those of a top-tier research university.

Type of Resource: Recurring Funding for Salary Enhancement
Additional funding needed from external (state or central administration) sources

Our current challenge is recruiting and retaining faculty members of national caliber, or who aspire to national prominence, with a salary structure that lags well behind that of peer institutions. The College has committed $200,000 in recurring funds to this purpose, but will need approximately twice that to address the major salary issues.

Goal #2: The College will be the state leader among colleges of education in utilizing technological innovations to improve instruction, research, and operational functions.

Type of Resource: Space and Technology for a State-of-the-Art "Classroom of the Future"
Additional space and technology needed from external sources

We are ill equipped to train teachers in the use of technology for the modern classroom. Indeed, school districts are typically ahead of us in terms of classroom equipment. As a teacher preparation unit, the reverse should be true. Teacher candidates should assume teaching positions with the knowledge and skills to use existing technology, as well as be promoting new technologies that they familiarized themselves with during their class experiences in the College of Education.

B. Benchmarking Information

Top Ten Colleges of Education

These are the institutions most frequently cited in the most recent poll of our college faculty.

University of Georgia
Ohio State University
Indiana University
Michigan State University
University of Wisconsin-Madison
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
University of Virginia
University of Texas
University of Illinois Champaign Urbana
University of Michigan

Peer Colleges of Education

These are the institutions most frequently cited in the most recent poll of our college faculty.

University of Alabama
University of Florida
University of Missouri
University of Tennessee
University of Nebraska

C. Top Strengths and Important Accomplishments

Strengths

A Diverse and Well-Trained Faculty. We have recruited graduates from highly ranked universities to join our faculty, almost always securing our first choice among the applicants. Our faculty membership includes a wide spectrum of demographic characteristics, scholarship, pedagogy, and philosophies. In terms of ethnic diversity, the College is not under-utilized in target areas based on availability data provided by the University Office of Equal Opportunity Programs. Our diversity also extends to the types of faculty members we employ that include a large clinical faculty with extensive school experience that adds to the strength of clinical supervision and other school-based efforts. The balance of a strong tenure-track research faculty with non-tenure track school-based faculty members strengthens our unique role as a professional school in a top-tier research university.

Faculty Engagement in Schools. Faculty members routinely work in schools, participating in teaching, research, and service activities. This work benefits both the faculty member and the school, while addressing every key performance parameter. We are also able to use school access as a recruiting tool, for school access is not always easy to obtain for the faculty of other universities.

The Professional Development School Network. Much of the work in schools is in the context of our strong professional development school (PDS) network. The College of Education has a 20-year history of PDS engagement and was the recipient of the 2010 National Association for Professional Development Schools Award for Professional Development School Achievement. College faculty members work with P-12 PDS sites and mentor the university's teacher candidates as they enter the profession. Faculty members acquire practical knowledge as they work side-by-side with the faculty and staff in these schools.

Important Accomplishments

Increased Trust with External Stakeholders. A key accomplishment during the past two years is the participation in external education initiatives throughout the state. This participation in school districts, state agencies, and policy planning groups has resulted in increased trust by the educational community. District superintendents, State Department of Education directors, and community and business leaders have begun to recognize the College as a source of help and information when addressing tough educational issues.

Increased Faculty Governance. We have been actively working to establish a faculty governance structure that provides stronger participation of the faculty in decision-making, particularly when addressing core issues and external needs. Although this structure is still not agile, the activity of the faculty working on College issues has increased dramatically over the past 18 months. A draft revision of faculty by-laws to align the by-laws with the new governance structure is concrete evidence of this change.

D. Weaknesses and Plans for Addressing Weaknesses

Faculty Salaries. Faculty salaries at every rank lag substantially behind that of our peer institutions, as documented by the Oklahoma State Salary Survey. This is creating greater problems for recruiting and retention. Our recent recruiting efforts have only been successful by offering salaries that create a salary compression problem. Plan: The College is committing $200,000 in recurring funds to address the salary issue. At least another $200,000 will be needed to bring our salary distribution to align closer to that of our peers.

Lack of Resources for Transformation. Though our strategic planning is sensitive to both internal and external priorities, we frequently find ourselves stymied by the lack of personnel, space, and money to address these needs. Plan: Rather than address all the priorities that we could and should deal with, we are forced to settle on a select few.

Technology Deficits. The existing technological infrastructure is a barrier to our progress. An example is the difficult in retrieving program-level data that are at the core of our strategic planning for addressing dashboard items. As another example, our entrance into Palmetto College lacks the support services that students will expect (e.g. a call center). Plan: As in the past, we will have to do the best we can with shadow systems. These sap resources and never reach levels that would be optimal to our work.

Characteristics of Doctoral Student Population. Much of our doctoral student population is part-time, in part because of our inability to recruit full-time students. Our resources are insufficient for major recruiting efforts. Plan: We are devoting more funding to doctoral programs. Additionally, we will ask departments to develop recruitment plans that include multi-year funding for strong doctoral students. Finally, we will encourage more grant proposals that include research assistantship funds.

Mismatch of Faculty Expertise and Duties. Though we cite the various types of faculty members as a strength, in some cases there is a mismatch between faculty expertise and work load. Clinical faculty members hired to lead school-based initiatives are serving on, and in some cases leading, doctoral dissertations. Plan: We have begun to better define the role of each faculty member so that work placements are consistent with type and rank expectations. This requires a shift in assignments and also a potential shift in the balance of various types of faculty members in some departments.

Lack of Agility in Addressing External Needs. Our faculty governance structure is becoming stronger. Individual faculty members work in schools. What is still missing is an agile governance structure that brings together the wide variety of expertise in our College in order to systematically address educational priorities in the State. Plan: We will continue to encourage the evolution of faculty governance, in part by presenting not only internal issues, but external issues that must be addressed. We will likely need to construct a reward structure that places emphasis on College priorities.

E. Unit Statistical Profile

1) Number of Entering Freshmen and their average SAT and ACT scores

Level	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012
Undergraduate	577	642	642	666
Masters	339	359	364	380
Certificate	1	1	1	3
First Professional	0	0	0	0
Doctoral	150	106	137	77
Total	**1,067**	**1,108**	**1,144**	**1,126**

	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012
# New Fresh / ACT	154/24	158/25	164/24	177/25
# New Fresh / SAT	154/1121	158/1120	164/1139	177/1150

2) Freshmen retention rate

Starting in:	Ending in:	% 2009 Cohort Retained in 2008	% 2010 Cohort Retained in 2009	% 2011 Cohort Retained in 2010
Education	Education	75.2%	73.9%	68.5%
	Another school at USC	10.5%	15.9%	15.4%
TOTAL		**85.6%**	**89.8%**	**84%**

3) Sophomore retention rate

Starting in:	Ending in:	% 2008 Cohort Retained in 2008	% 2009 Cohort Retained in 2009	% 2010 Cohort Retained in 2010
Education	Education	79.7%	79.6%	80.1%
	Another school at USC	11.0%	14.5%	11.8%
TOTAL		90.7%	**94.1%**	**91.9%**

4) Majors Enrolled

Level	Fall 2009		Fall 2010	
	# FTE Enrollment	# Headcount Enrollment	# FTE Enrollment	# Headcount Enrollment
Undergraduate	789	1,067	856	1,095
Masters	547	583	527	541
Specialist	No Data	119	No Data	127
Certificate	No Data	36	No Data	34
First Professional	0	0	0	0
Doctoral	211	368	222	385
Total	**1,547**	**2,173**	**1,595**	**2,182**

Level	Fall 2011		Fall 2012	
	# FTE Enrollment	# Headcount Enrollment	# FTE Enrollment	# Headcount Enrollment
Undergraduate	796	1034	868	1119
Masters	460	469	433	462
Specialist	No Data	165	No Data	139
Certificate	No Data	17	No Data	19
First Professional	0	0	0	0
Doctoral	192	380	189	347
Total	**1,448**	**2,065**	**1490**	**2,086**

5) Number of Entering Grad. Students with avg. GRE, MCATE, LSAT scores

Phil Moore determined that the test data appears to be suspect for the College of Education, and is therefore not included.

6) Graduates by Level

Level	# Fall 2011	# Spring 2012	# Summer 2012
Undergraduate	35	143	11
Masters	23	159	56
Specialist	6	28	4
Certificate	15	2	1
First Professional	0	0	0
Doctoral	16	19	29
Total	**95**	**351**	**101**

7) Four-, Five-, & Six-Year Graduate Rates

Starting in:	Ending in:	2004 Cohort			2005 Cohort			2006 Cohort		
		4-yr grad	5-yr grad	6-yr grad	4-yr grad	5-yr grad	6-yr grad	4-yr grad	5-yr grad	6-yr grad
Education	Education	43.7	48.9	49.6	48.7	54.7	54.7	44.7	50.0	50.0
	Another school at USC	10.4	17.0	17.8	6.0	14.0	15.3	12.1	18.2	18.9
TOTAL		**54.1**	**65.9**	**67.4**	**54.7**	**68.7**	**70.0**	**56.8**	**68.2**	**68.9**

8) Total Credit Hours

Level	# Fall 2011	# Spring 2012	# Summer 2012
Undergraduate	11,944	12,485	519
Masters	5,521	5,798	4,178
First Professional	0	0	0
Doctoral	1,730	1,690	860
Total	**19,195**	**19,973**	**5,557**

9) Percent of credit hours, by undergraduate major, taught by faculty with highest terminal degree

Fall 2011

Undergraduate Major	# Highest Terminal Degree	%Credit Hrs
Early Childhood Education, B.A.	41	46.33%
Elementary Education, B.A.	25	35.08%
Middle Level Education, English, B.A.	53	59.89%
Middle Level Education, English, B.S.	53	59.89%
Middle Level Education, Mathematics, B.A.	51	35.78%
Middle Level Education, Mathematics, B.S.	96	46.87%
Middle Level Education, Science, B.A. or B.S.	206	83.10%
Middle Level Education, Social Studies, B.A. or B.S.	91	72.18%
Physical Education, Athletic Training, B.S.P.E.	26	30.47%
Physical Education, Teaching Certification, B.S.P.E.	29	58.14%

Spring 2012

Undergraduate Major	# Highest Terminal Degree	%Credit Hrs
Athletic Training, B.S.	21	31.06%
Early Childhood Education, B.A.	40	42.94%
Elementary Education, B.A.	23	35.74%
Middle Level Education, English, B.A.	63	66.28%
Middle Level Education, English, B.S.	61	65.45%
Middle Level Education, Mathematics, B.A.	50	34.98%
Middle Level Education, Mathematics, B.S.	85	40.29%
Middle Level Education, Science, B.A.	170	81.27%
Middle Level Education, Science, B.S.	170	81.27%
Middle Level Education, Social Studies, B.A.	83	69.14%
Middle Level Education, Social Studies, B.S.	83	69.14%
Physical Education, Teaching Certification, B.S.P.E.	33	72.17%

10) Percent Credit Hours by Undergraduate Major, Taught by Full-time Faculty

Fall 2011

Major	# FT Instructors	% Credit Hrs
Early Childhood Education, B.A.	64	46.04%
Elementary Education, B.A.	47	44.34%
Middle Level Education, English, B.A. or B.S.	59	51.75%
Middle Level Education, Mathematics, B.A.	70	35.71%
Middle Level Education, Mathematics, B.S.	120	44.94%
Middle Level Education, Science, B.A. or B.S.	212	74.91%
Middle Level Education, Social Studies, B.A. or B.S.	64	38.79%
Physical Education, Athletic Training, B.S.P.E.	39	55.71%
Physical Education, Teaching Certification, B.S.P.E.	41	56.94%

Spring 2012

Major	# FT Instructors	%Credit Hrs
Athletic Training, B.S.	40	61.54%
Early Childhood Education, B.A.	68	50.37%
Elementary Education, B.A.	52	52.00%
Middle Level Education, English, B.A.	76	61.29%
Middle Level Education, English, B.S.	74	60.66%
Middle Level Education, Mathematics, B.A.	80	40.20%
Middle Level Education, Mathematics, B.S.	119	45.08%
Middle Level Education, Science, B.A.	163	68.78%
Middle Level Education, Science, B.S.	163	68.78%
Middle Level Education, Social Studies, B.A.	79	50.97%
Middle Level Education, Social Studies, B.S.	79	50.97%
Physical Education, Teaching Certification, B.S.P.E.	41	63.08%

11) Number of Faculty by Title

Fall 2010

Faculty Rank	Tenure-track	Research	Visiting	Clinical	Instructors	Lecturers	Adjunct
Professor	19	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assoc. Professor	29	1	0	5	0	0	0
Asst. Professor	22	3	0	5	0	0	0
Other rank	0	0	0	12	1	0	101
Total	**70**	**4**	**0**	**22**	**1**	**0**	**101**

Fall 2011

Faculty Rank	Tenure-track	Research	Visiting	Clinical	Instructors	Lecturers	Adjunct
Professor	18	0	0	1	0	0	0
Assoc. Professor	26	2	0	4	0	0	0
Asst. Professor	20	2	0	6	0	0	0
Other rank	0	0	0	12	1	0	105
Total	**64**	**4**	**0**	**23**	**1**	**0**	**105**

Fall 2012

Faculty Rank	Tenure-track	Research	Visiting	Clinical	Instructors	Lecturers	Adjunct
Professor	21	0	0	3	0	0	0
Assoc. Professor	32	1	0	2	0	0	0
Asst. Professor	19	2	0	7	0	0	0
Other rank	0	0	0	12	4	0	110
Total	**72**	**3**	**0**	**24**	**4**	**0**	**110**

[1] Faculty reports by Departments not available via University reports.

12) Current Number and Change in Number of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty from Underrepresented Minority Groups from FY2011.

Ethnicity	Fall 2011	Fall 2012 Current Number	Change in Number
Hispanic	3	3	0
American Indian/Alaska Native	1	1	0
Asian	1	2	+1
Black or African American	6	8	+2
White	46	52	+6
Two or More Races	0	1	+1
NR/Alien	4	5	+1
Unknown	0	0	0
Total	**61**	**72**	**11**

F. Statistical Research Data

1) The total number and amount of external sponsored research proposal submissions by funding source for FY 2012.

PROPOSAL SUBMISSIONS BY SOURCE			
DESCRIPTION	**DEPARTMENT**	**SUBMISSIONS**	**AMOUNT 1ST YEAR**
Federal - (FED)	*Educational Studies, Department of*	*14*	*1,853,506*
	Instruction & Teacher Education	*15*	*3,745,391*
	Office of Program Evaluation	*1*	*10,000*
State - (STA)	*Education Leadership & Policies*	*1*	*147,978*
	Educational Studies, Department of	*2*	*44,281*
	Instruction & Teacher Education	*1*	*182,761*
	Office of Program Evaluation	*4*	*162,434*
	SC Educational Policy Center	*3*	*193,208*
	SC School Improvement Council	*3*	*136,303*
Local Government - (LOC)	*Education Leadership & Policies*	*1*	*255,740*
	Instruction & Teacher Education	*1*	*23,000*
	Office of Program Evaluation	*1*	*43,190*
	Physical Education	*6*	*139,000*
Non-Profit - (PHI)	*Education Leadership & Policies*	*1*	*3,250*
	Instruction & Teacher Education	*4*	*107,379*
	Physical Education	*4*	*33,595*
Other - (OTH)	*Education Leadership & Policies*	*4*	*432,808*
	Instruction & Teacher Education	*25*	*423,402*
	Physical Education	*16*	*174,500*
TOTAL PROPOSAL SUBMISSIONS		**107**	**8,111,726**

2) Summary of external sponsored research awards by funding source for FY 2012.

Total extramural funding processed through SAM: $7,437,746

Total Federal extramural funding processed through SAM: $5,392,916

Amount of sponsored research funding per faculty member in FY 2012:

Faculty Rank	Federal/Flow-through	Other	Non-Profit	State	Local	Total	Amount per Faculty Member
Physical Education & Athletic Training	**$8,595**	**$95,500**	**$0**	**$0**	**$119,000**	**$223,095**	**$22,310**
Professor	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Associate Professor	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Assistant Professor	$8,595	$0	$0	$0	$0	$8,595	$4,298
Non-Tenure Track	$0	$95,500	$0	$0	$119,000	$214,500	$53,625
Educational Leadership & Policies	**$160,000**	**$688,548**	**$3,250**	**$162,908**	**$0**	**$1,014,706**	**$59,689**
Professor	$0	$593,448	$0	$0	$0	$593,448	$296,724
Associate Professor	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Assistant Professor	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Non-Tenure Track	$160,000	$95,100	$3,250	$162,908	$0	$421,258	$46,806
Educational Studies	**$801,780**	**$59,400**	**$0**	**$90,559**	**$0**	**$951,739**	**$41,380**
Professor	$348,865	$59,400	$0	$90,559	$0	$498,824	$62,353
Associate Professor	$275,450	$0	$0	$0	$0	$275,450	$30,606
Assistant Professor	$177,465	$0	$0	$0	$0	$177,465	$35,493
Non-Tenure Track	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Instruction Teacher Education	**$4,187,881**	**$458,774**	**$0**	**$45,700**	**$23,000**	**$4,715,355**	**$124,088**
Professor	$0	$458,774	$0	$0	$23,000	$481,774	$80,296
Associate Professor	$2,188,478	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,188,478	$168,344
Assistant Professor	$20,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$20,000	$2,222
Non-Tenure Track	$1,979,403	$0	$0	$45,700	$0	$2,025,103	$202,510
Office of Program Evaluation	**$234,660**	**$43,190**	**$0**	**$223,518**	**$0**	**$501,368**	**$167,123**
Research Professor	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Research Associate Professor	$154,304	$0	$0	$84,700	$0	$239,004	$239,004
Research Assistant Professor	$80,356	$43,190	$0	$138,818	$0	$262,364	$131,182
College Total (All units Included)	**$5,392,916**	**$1,345,412**	**$3,250**	**$522,685**	**$142,000**	**$7,406,263**	**$81,388**
Note: These figures do not include the following dept totals:					15200	$883	
					15280	$30,600	
						$31,483	

3) Total sponsored research expenditures per tenured/tenure-track faculty for FY 2012:

Total Faculty by Department			Research Expenditures		Amount
Department	Number by Rank	Percentage by Rank	Dollar Amount Expended	Percentage by Rank	Per Faculty Member
Physical Education	6	100%	$103,254	100%	$17,209
Professors	1	17%	$0	0%	$0
Associate Professors	3	50%	$0	0%	$0
Assistant Professors	2	33%	$103,254	100%	$51,627
Educational Leadership & Policies	8	100%	$297,847	100%	$37,231
Professors	2	25%	$295,333	99%	$147,667
Associate Professors	2	25%	$0	0%	$0
Assistant Professors	4	50%	$2,514	1%	$629
Educational Studies	22	100%	$1,243,473	100%	$56,522
Professors	8	36%	$446,373	36%	$55,797
Associate Professors	9	41%	$797,100	64%	$88,567
Assistant Professors	5	23%	$0	0%	$0
Instruction and Teacher Education	28	100%	$2,631,148	100%	$93,970
Professors	6	21%	$180,974	7%	$30,162
Associate Professors	13	46%	$2,274,668	86%	$174,974
Assistant Professors	9	32%	$175,506	7%	$19,501
COE TOTAL	64	100%	$4,275,722	100%	$66,808
Professors	17	27%	$922,680	22%	$54,275
Associate Professors	27	42%	$3,071,768	72%	$113,769
Assistant Professors	20	31%	$281,274	6%	$14,064

4) Number of Patents, Disclosures, and Licensing Agreements in fiscal years 2010, 2011 and 2012

2010: 0 Patents; 1 Disclosure; 0 Licensing Agreements

2011: 0 Patents; 4 Disclosures; 2 Licensing Agreements

2012: 0 Patents; 0 Disclosures; 0 Licensing Agreements