

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND LICENSING

Minutes of April 19, 2005

Members Present

Dr. Vermelle Johnson-Chair
Dr. Betty Rose Horne
Dr. Layton McCurdy-teleconference
Ms. Cynthia Mosteller
Ms. DeLoris Oliver

Staff Present

Ms. JoAnn Biga
Ms. Renea Eshelman
Dr. Conrad Festa
Ms. Lane Jeselnik
Dr. Lynn Kelley
Dr. Esther Kramer
Dr. Gail Morrison
Dr. Mike Raley
Ms. De'Nitra Reese
Dr. Donald Tetreault

Guests Present

Teresa Burns (Coastal)	Dr. Isaac Metts (The Citadel)
Dr. Cheryl Cox (SC Tech College System)	Dr. Christine Ebert (USC-Columbia)
Taylor Damonte (Coastal Carolina U.)	Linda Player (Williamsburg Tech)
Clifton Elliott (Williamsburg Tech)	Jenny Richardson (Williamsburg Tech)
Albert Hayward (SC State University)	Willis Ham (Webster University)
Sam Cooper (Webster University)	David Dunlap (Webster University)
Ken Kitts (Francis Marion University)	Dr. Sylvia Lufkin (Francis Marion University)
Dr. Peter Barr (Coastal Carolina U.)	Gardel Feurtado (The Citadel)
Paul Rosenblum (The Citadel)	Dr. Nancy Dunlap (Clemson University)
Karen C. Jones (Winthrop University)	Dr. Marilyn Fore (Horry-Georgetown Tech)

Announcements

Dr. Johnson called the meeting to order at 10:35 a.m. She welcomed those in attendance and requested that they introduce themselves. Dr. Morrison stated that Dr. McCurdy would join the Committee's discussions by telephone speaker-phone connection.

1. Consideration of Minutes of March 7, 2005

Dr. Johnson asked for a motion to approve the minutes as presented. It was **moved** (Mosteller) and **seconded** (Horne) and the Committee voted unanimously to **approve** the minutes as presented.

2. Consideration of New Program Proposals

In her introduction to the discussion of Committee approval of new program proposals, Dr. Johnson requested that Dr. Morrison first explain briefly what the MRR costs reflect and how the values for MRR calculations are derived in each program proposal. Dr. Morrison stated that it is important to remember that the MRR is an estimated figure, based upon many assumptions and calculated from estimated numbers of students, costs, and sources of state and other funding. She said that, in the end, the MRR provides the staff and other interested stakeholders with the MRR total cost (i.e., need) at 100% of funding, but that the MRR in actual practice only provides a certain percentage of funding based upon the total amount for higher education provided by the General Assembly in the budget. She also said that actual tuition costs, the headcount and FTE of students enrolled and faculty teaching in the program, actual expenditures on equipment, libraries, and facilities all figure into the actual cost of the program. She concluded her remarks by saying that the MRR table by itself is not a reason either to approve or disapprove a program, but it is an important tool for providing an objective, estimated total cost figure for a proposed program, if it were to be funded fully by state and institutional dollars.

In response to Dr. Morrison's comments, Ms. Mosteller asked what factors would lead to either cautionary or prohibitive responses in the staff's program analyses. As an example, she asked if a baccalaureate program might legitimately be extended to five years and an associate degree to three years in duration and number of credit hours; and how "new" program costs could be compared when some institutions incrementally mount a new program, whereas others present all their costs *de novo* for a new program, a practice that makes those institutions' new costs look comparatively higher. Dr. Morrison replied that Ms. Mosteller's observations were important to remember when reviewing program proposals and staff analyses, adding that for various reasons each program proposal has to be reviewed individually on its own substantive merits within the process and categories outlined in the *Guidelines*.

2. Consideration of New Program Proposals

a. A.I.T., Construction Management, Horry-Georgetown Technical College

Ms. Mosteller and Dr. Horne congratulated Horry-Georgetown Technical College for developing this program. Dr. Horne asked Dr. Marilyn Fore what level of attrition could be anticipated for a program like this. Dr. Fore responded that 33-40% attrition is common for reasons as varied as financial aid, academic rigor, and attractive offers in industry. Dr. Horne observed that while 15 semester hours of coursework were required in general education, only public speaking and English 101 are on the statewide transfer list of courses that will count toward meeting four-year general education requirements. She also commented that no Spanish was required for the program, when so many construction workers in the state are now first-language Spanish speakers. It was **moved** (Mosteller) and **seconded** (Horne) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the approval of Horry-Georgetown

Technical College's program leading to the A.I.T. degree program in Construction Management for implementation in Fall 2005.

b. A.P.S., Early Care and Education, Williamsburg Technical College

Dr. Morrison indicated that the reference to DHEC regulations should have been to Head Start and that the course requirement information has been corrected in a revision of the program analysis. She distributed the revised analysis. Dr. Johnson stated that the program was one which provided some important skills and knowledge in dealing with young children. She said it was not a credentialing program, but that it was also not a program meant for transfer to a four-year degree. Dr. Horne asked institutional representatives why the current "General Technology" concentration in Early Care was being terminated in favor of a new program. She also asked what the College's justification to taxpayers was for a program in education that for most of the program's coursework does not provide transfer to a four-year program of study. Dr. Cheryl Cox stated that Drs. Clifton Elliott and Ginny Richardson from the institution were present to respond. Dr. Richardson responded to Dr. Horne by saying that there was a move among virtually all the technical colleges to create this new major so that students would be clearer about the aims of the program than if they were taking it as a concentration within the General Technology degree.

Dr. Cox said that the majority of students in this program of study do not have aspirations, at least immediately, for going on to a four-year major. For those who do have such aspirations, advisors recommend that students take higher level general education courses. Dr. Richardson responded that current students in the General Technology concentration have transferred in some cases to Coastal Carolina University, Francis Marion University, and Charleston Southern University. It was **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the approval of Williamsburg Technical College's program leading to the A.P.S. degree in Early Care and Education for implementation in Fall 2005.

c. B.S.B.A., Resort Tourism Management, Coastal Carolina University

Dr. Horne inquired of Dr. Peter Barr, Coastal Carolina, if the budget for the library at Coastal Carolina has been increased for the new programs being presented in the present meeting of the Committee. Dr. Barr stated that this year the library has increased holdings for these areas this year, and will continue to do so with the next budget to academic division areas. Ms. Mosteller inquired about the internship required for graduation from the program and Dr. Horne asked if that internship could be paid. Dr. Taylor replied that the internship program was directed by a member of the professional staff selected to coordinate the internship experience. He also stated that all students were paid during their internships. It was **moved** and **seconded** (Horne) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission Coastal Carolina's program leading to the B.S.B.A. degree in Resort Tourism Management for implementation in Fall 2005.

d. B. S., Applied Physics, Coastal Carolina University

Dr. Johnson introduced the proposal. She asked Dr. Barr to explain how the program can be guaranteed to be of good quality when there is no accrediting association to review it. Dr. Barr deferred to Dr. Taylor Damonte who replied that the program's quality would be assured by the institution's: 1) comparing it against like programs at other institutions (e.g., Brigham Young University); and 2) monitoring the success of its graduates as they apply for and enter graduate programs in physics at places like Clemson. Dr. Horne asked if there are activities in place to promote this program. Dr. Damonte stated that teacher training programs are being alerted to the program's existence. He added that the Scholars' Academy on the Coastal campus is also being used to bring in high school students who could be advantaged by the program. Ms. Mosteller asked if Coastal would be working with the Army Corps of Engineers or the South Carolina DHEC to know what areas of applied research are most needed. Dr. Damonte stated that because students and faculty are very interested in working in applied research areas with immediate, tangible results, the faculty in the program will work closely with both the organizations cited by Ms. Mosteller. To Dr. Horne's inquiry of how the institution was hoping to recruit and retain faculty to teach in this area, Dr. Damonte stated that the location of Coastal and the leadership opportunities that this program necessarily contains are the chief objective indicators for developing interest on the part of potential faculty. The working environment of the institution then helps retain them, he added. It was **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to the B.S. degree in Applied Physics to be implemented in Fall 2005.

e. B.S.N., Nursing, Francis Marion University

Dr. Johnson introduced the program stating that by this program proposal the MUSC B.S.N. in Nursing at Francis Marion University would become a transitional program in 2005 and a stand-alone program of Francis Marion University in Fall 2006. She said there are two tracks (Generic and Completion), that there will be no programmatic duplication in the PeeDee region, and the program will apply for accreditation through the National League for Nursing Accreditation Commission (NLNAC) immediately upon approval of the proposal by the Commission on Higher Education.

Dr. McCurdy asked if the funding beyond the MRR was recurring or non-recurring. Mr. Ken Kitts from FMU responded that they were recurring. Dr. McCurdy asked if they were below-the-line requests. Dr. Morrison checked the budget and responded that the House budget contains two funding lines for this program below-the-line and a third one was above- the-line as a non-recurring item for construction of the nursing building.

Dr. Horne asked if the transition from MUSC to FMU would result in lower costs to the state and students. Dr. Lufkin replied that most students, except a few seniors, were enthusiastic about the change to FMU stewardship. Dr. Horne noted the requirement of two chemistry courses at FMU and none at MUSC and asked which institution was "out of step." Dr. Lufkin said that FMU faculty will examine this requirement in depth; she noted that it was important for students to have chemistry as a prerequisite for physiology.

Dr. Horne also asked about any service learning requirement for the program. Mr. Kitts said that will be considered, but that initially the institution wished to be minimize changes in the curriculum from what MUSC had required. It was **moved**

(Mosteller) and **seconded** (Horne) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to the Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN) degree in Nursing.

f. M.A.T., Secondary Education, Clemson University

Dr. Johnson introduced the proposal as a program which will be “blended” (i.e., not just all on-line) and shared amongst several participating institutions. Dr. Horne stated that the Committee was very happy to see the interinstitutional collaboration in this proposal. She asked if Clemson had been required to get additional SACS approvals beyond one for technology. Dr. Dunlap answered that the institution still has to receive approval for the technological delivery part of the program. She also said that the program is using shared adjunct faculty members at each of the host institutions. Dr. Dunlap explained the division of the state for this program into several geographical regions served by Clemson, USC-Columbia, The Citadel, and SC State. Dr. McCurdy said that Clemson should be commended for such a unusual program. It was **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to the M.A.T. in Secondary Education by Clemson University with participation by USC-Columbia, The Citadel, and South Carolina State University.

g. M.A., Biology, The Citadel

The program proposal was introduced by Dr. Johnson. She stated that the M.A. in Education in Biology had been closed to enrollments this academic year and that College of Charleston has a master’s degree in Marine Biology, but not in general biology. Dr. Horne asked if a nonthesis degree might be considered of lesser academic quality than one with a thesis. Dr. Metts stated that while the program is intended to have a strong research focus, it is anticipated it will have an even greater emphasis on content. It was **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to the M.A. in Biology at The Citadel for implementation in Fall 2005.

h. M.A., Social Science, The Citadel

Dr. Johnson introduced the program proposal, stating that this degree will replace the M.A. in Education in Social Science. Dr. Horne asked if the program, since it will not be accredited by NCATE nor approved by the State Department of Education, would be less than effective for teachers. Dr. Metts said that this degree is meant to be content rich for teachers who are already certified in field. Dr. Horne then asked if the courses in the degree program would be able to be used for recertification and Dr. Metts answered that they would be. Dr. Horne suggested changing the staff write-up so that it was clear that no new faculty would be hired for this program. With this change made, it was **moved** (Mosteller) and **seconded** (Horne) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** the program leading to the M.A. in Social Science to be implemented in Fall 2005.

i. M.A.T., Physical Education, The Citadel

Dr. Johnson introduced the program proposal. Ms. Mosteller asked if the program was NCATE accredited. Dr. Metts stated it was not, but that the program has to meet both NCATE standards and the specialty standards for the teaching field of sports. Ms.

Mosteller then asked if The Citadel might have a duplication of effort with this program at the College of Charleston. Dr. Metts stated that The Citadel offered to do a joint program in this degree with the College of Charleston, but that at this time the College of Charleston declined. He said that the program is providing a necessary path into the teaching profession for those who want to teach in physical education. It was **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to the Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) degree in Physical Education to be implemented Fall 2005.

3. Consideration of Amendment to License to Add Programs at Webster University

Ms. Eshleman was asked to introduce this section. Ms. Eshleman noted that this request by Webster was to add a variety of new programs (B.A. in Management and Psychology; B.S. in Accounting, Business Administration, Computer Science) at several sites in South Carolina. At Dr. Horne's request, Ms. Eshleman stated that the curricula for the B.S. in Accounting and the B.S. in Business Administration could be found on page 7 of the staff analysis. Dr. Horne asked if there would be any distance education delivery of the programs. Dr. David Dunlap from Webster University stated that there would not be any distance education delivery. Dr. Horne asked what the average salary for teaching a three-semester hour course in the program would be. Dr. Dunlap said that, depending upon the qualifications of the adjunct instructor, the compensation would be between \$1,800-2,600 per course section taught. It was **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission licensing of the program leading to the B.A. in Management and Psychology and to the B.S. in Accounting, Business Administration, and Computer Science, by Webster University, beginning in Columbia in Fall 2005, and phasing in the programs at its other locations in Charleston, Greenville, and Myrtle Beach.

(At this point in the meeting, Dr. McCurdy ended his telephonic participation in the proceedings.)

4. Consideration of New Center of Excellence (Education) Award, FY 2005-20006

Dr. Morrison explained that three proposals had been received, one from South Carolina State University, one from USC-Columbia, and one from Clemson. She stated that it was the recommendation of the review panel that Clemson's project be funded and that the other two proposals be revised and be resubmitted under another grant funded by the United States Department of Education, known as the Improvement of Teacher Quality ("ITQ") program. Dr. Johnson read the staff recommendation. Dr. Morrison stated that the actual award of funds depends upon Clemson's making the changes recommended by the review panel to assure that the Center works with low-performing schools, that the institution make certain changes in nomenclature, and that CHE staff approve the Center's budget. Once these changes have been satisfactorily completed, the grant will be made. It was **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the creation of the Center of Excellence in Education for Adolescent Literature and Learning at Clemson University, with the understanding that the details of budget, personnel nomenclature, and working relationships with appropriate schools must first be satisfactorily negotiated with Commission staff.

5. Consideration of the NCATE/State Partnership Program Evaluations

Dr. Morrison pointed out that on page 7 of the document there is a correction to make: NCATE gave Coastal Carolina an “approval with conditions”, to be followed either by a focused visit by NCATE in October 2006 or a resubmission of documentation. Dr. Horne said that she found the report generally to be “atrocious.” Dr. Morrison stated that since there has been a new assessment plan in place since 2000, she found the report “disappointing.” Nevertheless, she stated, she felt that the 2006 revisit by NCATE would see improvements in meeting all the standards. Most of the institutions reviewed under the current NCATE cycle are having deficiencies cited in meeting the NCATE standards.

Dr. Festa said that he is working with the institutional presidents on a solid program of assessment and accountability. He suggested that the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing should bring before the Commission whatever very strong concerns it might have in regard to the assessment of quality in academic programs. Discussion then followed about ways in which the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing should proceed to strengthen quality in the state’s public institutional programs in a timely fashion. Discussion centered on the necessity of what was called “timely interim reports” to the Commission when an institutional program subject to national professional accreditation through NCATE is given less than full accreditation (i.e., either provisional approval or probationary status.) Dr. Morrison suggested that the subject institution should report its interim progress toward full NCATE approval and on improvements made in their 2006 Institutional Effectiveness report, due August 1, 2006. Ms. Mosteller suggested placing language to this effect in the recommendation.

The Committee members delegated to staff the responsibility to craft a revision of the recommendation containing language which would meet their concerns to assure accountability for program quality. It was then **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the revised recommendation.

6. Consideration of New Guidelines for Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grant Cycle, FY 2005-2006

The recommendation was read by Dr. Johnson. It was **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the *Guidelines* as written.

7. Consideration of Revised Mission Statement: Spartanburg Technical College

The recommendation was read by Dr. Johnson. It was **moved** (Mosteller) and **seconded** (Horne) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the change in mission statement for Spartanburg Technical College.

8. Reports on New Program Approvals and Program Terminations, FY 2003-2004;FY 2004-2005

This report was submitted for information only to the Committee. Members of the Committee expressed their satisfaction with the report’s presentation and thanked staff for their care in putting it together. No discussion was held on the report. No action was taken on it.

9. Meeting Dates FY 2005-2006

The following dates were determined to be the scheduled meetings for the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing for the 2005-2006 academic year:

- **September 1, 2005, (Thursday) at 1:30 p.m.**, after the Commission on Higher Education meeting.
- **October 11, 2005, (Tuesday) at 10:30 a.m.**
- **February 2, 2006, (Thursday) at 1:30 p.m.** after the Commission on Higher Education meeting.
- **April 6, 2006 (Thursday) at 1:30 p.m.** after the Commission on Higher Education meeting.

10. Other

There being no other items for discussion or action, the meeting of the Committee was adjourned by the chairman at 2:10 p.m.