

ACAP
Agenda Item 1
1/20/11

Advisory Committee on Academic Programs

Minutes of October 20, 2010

Members Present

Dr. T. Michael Raley, Chair
Dr. Joyce Blackwell, S.C. State University
Dr. Cheryl Cox, S.C. Technical College
System
Dr. George W. Hynd, College of Charleston
Dr. Danny McKenzie, Lander University
Dr. Tom Moore, Winthrop University (via
teleconference)
Dr. Gina Mounfield, Technical College of the
Lowcountry (via teleconference)
Dr. Suzanne Ozment, USC-Aiken
Dr. Harvey Varnet, USC-Beaufort

Guests Representing Members

Dr. Barbara Buckner, Coastal Carolina,
representing Dr. Robert Sheehan
Dr. Diane Carr, Midlands Technical College,
representing Dr. Ron Drayton
Dr. Warren Carson, USC Upstate,
representing Dr. Marsha Dowell
Dr. Kris Finnigan, USC-Columbia,
representing Dr. Michael Amiridis
Dr. Debbie Jackson, Clemson (via
teleconference), representing Dr. Doris
Helms
Dr. Darlene Shaw, MUSC, representing Dr.
Mark Sothmann (via teleconference)

Staff Present

Dr. Argentini Anderson
Ms. Laura Belcher
Mr. Arik Bjorn
Ms. Camille Brown
Ms. JoAnn Gardner
Ms. Lane Goodwin
Ms. Trena Houp
Mr. Clint Mullins

Guests

Dr. Justin Benefield, College of Charleston
Mr. Tim Drueke, Winthrop
Dr. Juan Gilbert, Clemson
Dr. Shawanna Helf, Winthrop University
Ms. Karen Jones, Winthrop University
Mr. Dan Lawless, Coastal Carolina
University
Ms. Georgia Mason, Lexington School
District One
Dr. Rick Maxey, Horry County Schools
Dr. Martha Moriarty, USC Beaufort
Dr. Mark Pyles, College of Charleston
Dr. Elke Schneider, Winthrop University
Mr. Dave Stanley, AcademyOne (via
teleconference)
Ms. Karen Todd, AcademyOne (via
teleconference)
Dr. Jonatha Vare, Winthrop University

Dr. Mike Raley called the meeting to order at 10:09 a.m. and welcomed all in attendance. He then asked the institutional and audience members to introduce themselves.

1. Consideration of Minutes of July 14, 2010

Dr. Raley requested a motion to accept the minutes of July 14, 2010, as distributed. The motion was **moved** (Buckner) and **seconded** (Cox), and the Committee **voted unanimously to accept the Minutes as distributed.**

2. Discussion of New Costs and Sources of Financing Information for New Program Proposals

Dr. Raley introduced this item and a handout was distributed to the Committee. It was **moved** (Hynd) and **seconded** (Buckner). Dr. Raley explained to the Committee that the Commission has consistently expressed concern over the current program costs and funding chart used in program analyses. He stated that the method used to create the chart became ineffective with the recent budget cuts and that the Commissioners have consistently asked for more information regarding the costs and funding of new programs.

Dr. Raley asked the Committee to review and provide feedback on the two sample tables provided in the handout. He also referenced a few necessary changes. He notified the Committee that on page one, in the first bullet point, second line, all text after the word "others" should be deleted and on page two, under "Sources of Financing by Year," the second row should read "Program-Specific Fees." Dr. Jackson asked Dr. Raley to define the category "Program-Specific Fees." Dr. Raley defined the category as fees that are charged to students enrolled in a particular program. Dr. Raley also referenced the asterisk associated with the category "Reallocation of Existing Funds" found in Table E and stated that the adjective "significant" be added to define "internal sources." He informed the Committee that the final category in Table E should read "Other Funding (Specify)."

Dr. Jackson asked where the institutions should list the internal sources of reallocated funds. Dr. Raley answered that additional rows should be inserted into the Table under "Reallocation of Existing Funds."

The Committee members responded positively to the new table. Dr. Cox clarified that the table is meant to illustrate a program's entire costs, not just new program costs. Dr. Raley responded that her interpretation of the table is correct. He also explained that the table columns are not meant to be cumulative, but simply portray costs for each year. Dr. Ozment suggested that the word "new" be deleted from the title of the table. Dr. Raley agreed.

Dr. Raley asked the institutions that have program proposals for the next Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing (CAAL) to provide financial data using the tables presented. Mr. Druke from Winthrop answered that he would provide the financial data using the new tables prior to the next CAAL meeting.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** Table E as modified as the template for presenting Estimated Costs and Sources of Funding for new programs, to be implemented as soon as possible.

3. Discussion of Admissions Standards Exemptions

Dr. Raley introduced this discussion item regarding the *Annual Report on Admissions Standards for First-Time Entering Freshmen, FY 2009-10*. He stated that Commissioners expressed the need for more information regarding the admissions standards exemptions. More specifically, Dr. Raley addressed the definition of provisional students. He stated that Commission staff understand institutions operate with differing definitions of provisional student and staff are not requesting that institutions re-define the term. He then stated that staff will examine the data collected and possibly change the definition or language currently used by CHE in the *Annual Report on Admissions Standards for First-Time Entering Freshmen*.

Ms. Jones stated that institutions define a provisional student as one who must complete some activity or function or perform at a specified level during the first semester or the first year to formally move their acceptance to the university forward. She explained that some institutions do require students to re-take courses. She further stated that prerequisites are not considered in the definition of a provisional student.

Dr. Raley explained that the Commissioners are interested in data regarding those students who do not meet the prerequisites for college admission. He also explained that he wanted to discuss this topic with ACAP members so that they would know that the report will be modified next year.

Dr. Raley asked each institution to send CHE staff its definition of provisional student. Dr. Ozment stated that if prerequisite data is separated from the provisional student data, the provisional student data will still be inconsistent due to the differing definitions of the institutions. In response to a question, Dr. Raley explained that Commissioners would like to know the number of college freshmen who did not meet prerequisites for college admission and the differential retention rates of those students compared to those who did meet the prerequisite requirements.

Ms. Jones mentioned that the prerequisites for students entering as freshmen in Fall 2011 will include the fine arts requirements. Dr. Raley responded that the data will be differentiated between not meeting prerequisites in general and not meeting prerequisites exclusively on the basis of fine arts courses.

Dr. Raley thanked the Committee for its feedback and discussion and informed them that staff will begin revising the report.

4. Consideration of Program Planning Summaries

a. B.S., Finance, College of Charleston

Dr. Hynd introduced the planning summary from the College of Charleston. It was **moved** (Hynd) and **seconded** (Jackson). Dr. Hynd stated that the new program would be located in the School of Business. He informed the Committee that the School of Business's newly approved M.B.A. program is already a success with the first class meeting full capacity. Dr. Hynd explained that this new program has the support of local employers, including banks and various businesses, and that the program is unique in that students must pick an area of specialization.

Dr. Raley asked whether the new program might cause decreases in other currently offered majors. Dr. Hynd responded that the College anticipates little impact on other programs and that the College has witnessed a renewed interest on campus for business programs. Dr. Buckner asked whether the College has surveyed students to determine interest in the proposed program. Dr. Hynd replied affirmatively and stated that the results will be provided in the full proposal.

Dr. Raley referenced the section of the planning summary that states that the College would like to partner with other institutions in the region. He asked whether any official discussions with these institutions have occurred. Dr. Hynd responded that no formal discussions have been executed, but informal discussions have begun. Dr. Raley suggested that the results of these discussions be included in the full proposal. He also suggested that the College document any businesses which support the program.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the planning summary for the College of Charleston to develop a new program leading to the B.S. degree in Finance, to be implemented in Fall 2011.

b. Ph.D., Human-Centered Computing, Clemson University

Dr. Jackson introduced the planning summary from Clemson University. It was **moved** (Jackson) and **seconded** (Buckner). Dr. Jackson introduced Dr. Juan Gilbert who defined the phrase human-centered computing. Dr. Gilbert explained that Clemson has three divisions in its computing school: computer science, visual computing, and human-centered computing. He further stated that human-centered computing is a young discipline, which emerged to meet the needs of industry. He informed the Committee that industries were hiring technology experts to build systems but the systems were not effective for human use. He stated that this new program combines the instruction of policy relating to technology and technology itself so that a graduate will be able to address applied and real-world problems through the integration of people, information technology, and at times, policy and culture.

Dr. Jackson explained that the proposed curriculum includes courses from multiple disciplines. Dr. Raley inquired as to employment opportunities for graduates. Dr. Gilbert answered that graduates could become faculty members at other institutions in a variety of discipline areas. He stated that the graduates could also serve industry and government. Dr. Jackson explained that Clemson has already had success in a similar area in that the automotive engineering program at CU-ICAR involves research in automotive technology and the human interface required to run modern automobiles.

Dr. Buckner suggested that Clemson survey state and regional employers and place the results in the full proposal. Dr. Jackson expressed appreciation for the suggestion and added that Clemson hopes to attract a national market. Mr. Mullins asked whether this program is an outgrowth of Computer Human Interaction (CHI). Dr. Gilbert answered affirmatively. Mr. Mullins stated that the full proposal might be strengthened with tangible examples of the discipline.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the planning summary for Clemson University to develop a new program leading to the Ph.D. degree in Human-Centered Computing, to be implemented in Fall 2011.

5. Consideration of Program Modifications

a. B.S., Nuclear Engineering, S.C. State University

Dr. Blackwell introduced the program modification from S.C. State University. It was **moved** (Blackwell) and **seconded** (Buckner). Dr. Blackwell explained to the Committee that the program was originally approved by CHE in 2000 with an articulation agreement with the University of Wisconsin. She further stated that the University now seeks to offer the program independently without jeopardizing the opportunities for collaboration with the University of Wisconsin and other institutions. She informed the Committee that the University has the necessary faculty, support from industry, and proven track record of success with graduates to offer the degree program independently. She also introduced Dr. Charles Warner who serves as a faculty member in this discipline.

Dr. Raley explained briefly the history of this program and its process of modification. He stated that in order to approve this modification, the University first had to seek approval from the Commission for a mission statement change. Dr. Raley added that the mission change was approved in May 2010 by the Commission.

Dr. Jackson asked whether the University is prepared to offer the degree with the proper technology and lab space to provide the credits previously provided by the University of Wisconsin. Dr. Raley referenced the fact that the laboratory space has already been built. Dr. Warner shared that the University is working on collaborations with N.C. State, Clemson, Texas A& M, and the University of Florida.

Dr. Finnigan asked about future levels of funding. Dr. Blackwell responded that the University will seek funding through grants and an increase in the number of students as the program grows. Dr. Raley asked how the University plans to handle any instruction involving a reactor. Dr. Warner answered that 25% of the schools offering the degree do not have access to a reactor, but are able to use computer simulations.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program modification for S.C. State University to offer a Bachelor of Science in Nuclear Engineering.

b. M.Ed., Literacy, Winthrop University

Mr. Drueke introduced the program modification from Winthrop University. It was **moved** (Drueke) and **seconded** (Buckner). Dr. Drueke informed the Committee that Winthrop seeks to modify its current M.Ed. in Reading program with a change in title and a few courses. He further explained that the University seeks to modify the title to a M.Ed. in Literacy.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program modification for the M.Ed. in Literacy program at Winthrop University.

6. Notifications of Program Changes and/or Terminations, March-May, 2010

Dr. Raley presented the report for information.

7. Review of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate Equivalencies in SC TRAC

Dr. Raley introduced this topic for discussion and distributed related information to the Committee members. He explained that the Advanced Placement (AP) policy is set in law and requires that institutions accept AP credit for test scores of 3 and above. Dr. Raley informed the Committee that SC TRAC shows that there are some students who are not receiving proper credit for their AP courses. He referenced Table I in the handout entitled “2009-10 Advanced Placement Courses Accepted for Credit” and then referenced a statistic on page one of the handout which reads “Number of Denied AP Courses: 96.” In response to a question, Dr. Raley clarified that SC TRAC reported 96 separate incidences of credit for an AP course being denied. Dr. Raley also explained the International Baccalaureate (IB) policy of the state and referenced page two of the handout, reporting that credit for 277 IB courses has been denied in the SC TRAC system.

Dr. Raley further explained that each institution will receive an individualized report in regards to accepted and denied AP and IB credits. Mr. Mullins suggested that the Committee members review carefully these individualized reports in order to understand the current equivalencies and make necessary changes.

Mr. Mullins presented and reviewed the handout entitled “International Baccalaureate (IB) History Credits.” He told the Committee that the handout should facilitate a better understanding of the ways in which an institution could accept IB history credits.

8. Review of SC TRAC User Group Conference Plan

Mr. Mullins introduced this topic for discussion and introduced Karen Todd from Academy One who participated in the meeting via conference call. He explained that in response to many requests, the SC TRAC Project Team has decided to host a one-day User Group Conference in February 2011, where institutional representatives can share their thoughts, ideas, and success stories regarding SC TRAC. Mr. Mullins and Ms. Todd explained the timeline presented and referenced the need for institutions to provide input as to conference topics. Ms. Todd then described some possible topics for discussion during the conference. Dr. Ozment expressed a desire to have a specific date for the conference chosen as soon as possible in order to ensure adequate participation at the conference.

9. Review of SC TRAC Universally Transferable Course Equivalency Project

Dr. Raley introduced this topic for discussion and referenced an informational overview provided in the mailout packet. He explained that the Project Team is beginning to define and link all 86 Universally Transferable Courses between and among S.C. institutions, including two-year and four-year institutions.

Mr. Mullins further explained that SC TRAC will be utilized to implement fully the S.C. Universally Transferable Course policy already established. He also referenced and explained the spreadsheet which was provided in the packet for this agenda item. Mr. Mullins explained that the team is requesting that each institution complete the third column in the spreadsheet with its equivalent course for the 86 Universally Transferable Courses listed in the first column. He also informed the Committee that once an institution determines a contact person for this project, a representative from Academy One will contact that person with further details.

CHE staff clarified that CHE staff and Academy One will work with institutions to provide a more flexible timeline for completion, if such is needed. CHE staff also took the opportunity to express their deep appreciation to Committee members for their consistent support, dedication, and hard work towards the entire SC TRAC project.

10. Other Business

Dr. Raley thanked everyone for attending the meeting and reminded them that the next Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for January 20, 2011. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m.