

Minutes
Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing
April 1, 2010

Members Present

Mr. Hood Temple, Acting Chair
Ms. Cindy Mosteller
Mr. Bill Scarborough
Mr. Neal Workman, via teleconference
Dr. Bettie Rose Horne, via teleconference

Members Absent

Staff Present:

Ms. Laura Belcher
Ms. Renea Eshleman
Ms. JoAnn Gardner
Ms. Lane Goodwin
Dr. Paula Gregg
Ms. Trena Houpp
Mr. Clint Mullins
Dr. Gail Morrison
Dr. T. Michael Raley

Other Commission Members Present

Guests

Dr. Michael Amiridis, University of South Carolina-Columbia
Dr. Mark Bebensee, The Citadel
Dr. Mary Ann Byrnes, University of South Carolina-Columbia
Dr. Kris Finnigan, University of South Carolina-Columbia
Dr. Mary Anne Fitzpatrick, University of South Carolina-Columbia
Ms. Stephanie Frazier, S.C. Technical College System
Dr. Katherine Hawkins, Clemson University
Dr. George Hynd, College of Charleston
Dr. Debbie Jackson, Clemson University
Dr. Sheryl Kline, University of South Carolina-Columbia
Dr. Rhonda Mack, College of Charleston
Mr. Bobby Marlowe, College of Charleston
Dr. Brian Mihalik, University of South Carolina-Columbia
Dr. Charles Partlow, University of South Carolina-Columbia
Mr. Dan Ravenel, Former CHE member
Dr. Alan Shao, College of Charleston
Dr. Ercan Turk, University of South Carolina-Columbia

Mr. Temple called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. and stated that the meeting was being held in compliance with the Freedom of Information Act.

1. Consideration of Minutes of February 4, 2010

Mr. Temple requested a motion to accept the Minutes of February 4, 2010, as distributed. The motion was **moved** (Scarborough) and **seconded** (Mosteller), and the Committee **voted unanimously to accept the Minutes as distributed.**

2. Consideration of New Program Proposals

a. M.A., Communication, Technology, and Society, Clemson

Mr. Temple introduced the item and recognized Dr. Jackson and Dr. Hawkins. It was **moved** (Mosteller) and **seconded** (Scarborough) to accept the staff's recommendation for approval.

Dr. Jackson explained that Clemson was presenting this program for approval because of the rapid technological changes in society and the ways those changes affect and change communication. Dr. Hawkins further described the program by stating that new technologies would not be created but that the program would teach students to use current technologies more effectively. She provided an example of a business approaching the department to ask how to use social media to communicate with both clients and employees. Dr. Hawkins also added that the program would research decision-making software and work efficiency.

Mr. Temple discussed the cost effectiveness of the program and asked for the source of new state funding. Dr. Jackson responded by stating that he must be referring to the analysis produced by CHE staff and not the full program proposal submitted by Clemson. She stated that Clemson is not requesting any new funds. She continued by informing the Committee that all funds for the program are being reallocated from another program.

Dr. Morrison then explained that CHE staff are in the process of revising the chart in the staff analysis to show zeroes in the column entitled "New State Funding." She notified the Committee that the analysis for this particular program was completed prior to the revision decision and therefore, the estimates found in the "New State Funding" should be disregarded. Dr. Morrison also informed the Committee that the analysis would be changed prior to the Commission meeting. Dr. Morrison continued by explaining that the MRR estimates are theoretical numbers in this economic climate and reflect what the state should provide to an institution for mounting a new program of appropriate quality.

Dr. Jackson relayed a conversation she had with Ms. Houp about the possibility of placing Clemson's reallocated funds under the column of additional revenue. Dr. Morrison responded by stating that the suggestion was great and that the issue needs to be addressed by ACAP. Dr. Morrison continued by suggesting the possibility of labeling the column to read "Additional and Reallocated Revenue." Dr. Jackson agreed to submit the specific reallocated fund sources to CHE staff for inclusion in the analysis report for the Commission meeting.

Ms. Mosteller asked about the large number of electives for the program. Dr. Jackson explained that graduate students gain flexibility in their degree focus by choosing from many electives; students are allowed to focus on their individual interests through elective choices. Dr. Hawkins added that offering electives from other departments allows graduate students to participate in a more interdisciplinary degree and the University to draw from existing resources rather than creating new courses which require additional resources.

Ms. Mosteller asked whether there would be a professional accreditation associated with this program. Dr. Jackson responded that the program would not seek professional accreditation. Dr. Hawkins further explained that an Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications (ACJMC) accreditation is associated with a professional master's degree but that this degree would not be considered a professional master's degree.

Mr. Workman offered his support for the program by referencing the need of small businesses to reconsider traditional advertising and to utilize social media more effectively to re-package their branding. Dr. Horne asked how Clemson plans to provide faculty office space for new hires. Dr. Jackson stated that the offices would be reallocated from existing offices. She continued by stating that Clemson has lost 90 faculty members in the last year due to budget cuts.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to the Master of Arts degree in Communication, Technology, and Society at Clemson University to be offered on-campus and at the University Center of Greenville, to be implemented in Fall 2011, provided that no “unique cost” or other special state funding be required or requested.

b. M.B.A., Business Administration, College of Charleston

Mr. Temple introduced the item and recognized Dr. Hynd, Dr. Shao, and Dr. Mack. It was **moved** (Scarborough) and **seconded** (Mosteller) to accept the staff’s recommendation for approval. Dr. Hynd described the program as a one-year, full-time program with a required “boot camp” for non-business majors. He informed the Committee that the program would be fee-based and that no state revenues would be needed to support the program.

Mr. Temple commended the quality of work found in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) agreement between the College and The Citadel and asked why the program is not a more unified joint program of the two schools. Dr. Hynd informed the Committee that the schools saw two different conceptual frameworks. Dr. Shao explained that the College’s program would be a full-time, daytime program, while The Citadel’s program is a part-time, evening program. Dr. Morrison added that the two schools’ programs would have a common advisory group and would look to future collaboration.

Mr. Temple referenced the high tuition and asked whether it might serve as an impediment for interested students. Dr. Shao responded that the College does not believe that the proposed tuition would be an impediment. He further explained that as described in the MOU, The Citadel requested that tuition and entrance requirements be higher than those for its own program. Dr. Shao added that the expectation is for the majority of the students to be recent College of Charleston graduates. Dr. Mack also informed the Committee that the College studied comparable programs and the College’s proposed tuition rates are lower than the majority of similar programs offered nationally.

Ms. Mosteller asked what the goal of the three-week study abroad program would be. Dr. Hynd reported that the College’s newly approved strategic plan places an emphasis on internationalization. Dr. Shao explained that the three-week, non-credit study-abroad program would give students a taste of the global market and different industries and cultures.

Dr. Horne asked for more information about the “boot camp’s” costs and curriculum. Dr. Shao explained that the costs of the boot camp would be part of tuition costs and that the boot camp would be available for any interested student but would be required for students with undergraduate degrees in areas other than business. Dr. Mack explained that the boot camp’s curriculum would cover the functional areas of statistics and business and offer the same material for a student who has an undergraduate degree in English as for a student with a math degree. Mr. Temple asked whether the boot camp would be graded. Dr. Mack answered that the program would not be graded and that students’ progress would be measured by completion or non-completion.

Dr. Horne asked what percentage of the estimated enrollment of 100 students would be international students. Dr. Shao explained that the College hopes to offer the global program in the future. He also clarified the statement about new enrollment by stating that a maximum of 100 students would be Charleston-based.

Mr. Scarborough asked how Boeing’s move to the area would affect the program. Dr. Hynd explained that the College’s program might not be attractive to Boeing employees or Boeing supplier employees but possibly to family members of those employees. Dr. Shao reiterated that the College’s primary market for this new program would be current students.

Mr. Scarborough recognized Dr. Bebensee from The Citadel in the audience for a comment. Dr. Bebensee stated that The Citadel supports the College’s program and that The Citadel sees the College’s program as complementary, not competitive.

Ms. Mosteller asked what entity would serve as a mediator if a possible misunderstanding arose between the two schools. Dr. Hynd explained that the advisory board would not be a governing board, but if the board reached an impasse of disagreement, it would most likely seek the guidance of the Commission. Dr. Morrison clarified that the Commission would need to approve any changes made to the MOU, as stated in the staff recommendation for the program’s approval.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to the Master of Business Administration degree at College of Charleston, to be implemented in Summer 2010, provided that no “unique cost” or other special state funding be required or requested and provided further that the College of Charleston adhere to the Memorandum of Understanding with The Citadel signed on February 15, 2010, and that any changes to this Memorandum of Understanding be submitted to the Commission for approval.

c. Ph.D., Hospitality Management, USC-Columbia

Mr. Temple introduced the item and recognized Dr. Amiridis and Dr. Mihalik. It was **moved** (Scarborough) and **seconded** (Mosteller) to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Amiridis stated that if approved, this program would be the only doctoral degree in Hospitality Management in South Carolina. He further explained that there is a related degree at Clemson which focuses on Parks and Recreation. He informed the Committee that there are only 13 doctoral degree programs in Hospitality Management in the nation and that the proposed degree program at USC would complement the strong hospitality industry in the state. He stated that USC-Columbia has strong undergraduate and master's degree programs in this field. Dr. Amiridis further explained that the doctoral degree program would allow USC-Columbia to be more efficient in teaching its undergraduate students and grant USC-Columbia the opportunity to promote and utilize its research Center of Economic Excellence (CoEE) in Tourism and Economic Development under the guidance of endowed chair Dr. Simon Hudson. In regards to costs, Dr. Amiridis reported that funds would be reallocated internally to support the new program.

Mr. Temple referenced the chart which illustrates that the program would lose money in Years Three and Four. Dr. Mihalik responded that the negative figures in Column G for Years Three and Four are a result of the theoretical MRR figures in Column A. He then assured the Committee that tuition and reallocated funds would cover the costs of the program. Dr. Morrison stated that this doctoral degree program addresses a criticism by external evaluators of the CoEE program which lamented the lack of newly developed graduate programs.

Ms. Mosteller asked whether the doctoral graduates would leave the state once they received their degrees. Dr. Amiridis responded that most of the doctoral students would become academics and would leave USC, but they may stay in the state to teach at another institution.

Mr. Scarborough asked whether the program would have a distance education component to be utilized by the tourism professionals in Charleston and on the coast. Dr. Amiridis referred to the partnership that USC-Columbia has with Coastal Carolina through the CoEE. He also mentioned to the Committee that the College of Hospitality, Retail, and Sports Management is building a distance education component, but finding adequate resources has been a challenge in the current economic climate.

Ms. Mosteller suggested that CHE staff invite Dr. Simon Hudson to address the Commission. Dr. Amiridis responded that Dr. Hudson would be glad to speak to the Commission.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to the Doctor of Philosophy in Hospitality Management at USC-Columbia, to be implemented in Fall 2010, provided that no "unique cost" or other special state funding be required or requested.

d. Ph.D., Spanish, USC-Columbia

Mr. Temple introduced the item and recognized Dr. Amiridis and Dr. Fitzpatrick. It was **moved** (Mosteller) and **seconded** (Scarborough) to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Amiridis informed the Committee that this program would be the first and only Ph.D. program in the state in Spanish. He explained that the use of the Spanish language is increasing throughout the state and nation and therefore there is an increasing need for well-qualified Spanish teaching both at the secondary and post-secondary levels. He continued by stating that all public institutions of higher education offer Spanish classes and therefore need well-qualified professors to teach students. He notified the Committee that the costs of the program would be covered by internal reallocation of funds.

Mr. Temple called attention to the deficit figures in Column G. on page five of the staff analysis. Dr. Fitzpatrick explained that due to strict CHE restrictions on the types of funding that can be included in the Estimated Program Costs and Revenue chart, USC-Columbia was unable to provide funding amounts from specific supplemental revenue. Dr. Morrison asked that USC-Columbia send information regarding the additional revenue to CHE staff to be placed in the document submitted to the Commission for review. Dr. Fitzpatrick agreed to do so.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to the Doctor of Philosophy in Spanish at USC-Columbia, to be implemented in Fall, 2010, provided that no "unique cost" or other special state funding be required or requested.

3. Consideration of Revised *Guidelines for Federal Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grants Program, FY 2011-2012*

Mr. Temple introduced the item and recognized Dr. Morrison. It was **moved** (Scarborough) and **seconded** (Mosteller) to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Morrison explained that the revised *Guidelines* document does not contain substantive changes from last year's revisions. She informed the Committee that dates have been changed in the document. She pointed out a state map on page 15 which highlights the districts currently funded through the grant program and districts that are eligible for funding. Dr. Gregg notified the Committee that the scoring metrics used for evaluating grant proposals were included in this year's *Guidelines*, per a past request of Dr. Horne.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission approval of the revised *Guidelines for Federal Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grants Program, FY 2011-2012*.

4. Consideration of Revised *Guidelines for EIA Centers of (Teacher Education) Excellence Competitive Grants Program, FY 2011-2012*

Mr. Temple introduced the item and recognized Dr. Gail Morrison. It was **moved** (Workman) and **seconded** (Mosteller) to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Morrison introduced the document for consideration. She referred to a substantive change on page five and informed the Committee that the focus areas for grant proposals have been broadened. Ms. Mosteller asked for more information on the focus area of English language learning. Dr. Morrison explained that English language learning refers to programs which help students whose first language is not English. Ms. Mosteller asked why the focus area of the STEM disciplines was not listed first, before the other areas, given the great need for teachers and students of STEM disciplines. Dr. Morrison and Dr. Gregg explained that there are several grants currently funded in the STEM disciplines.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission approval of the Revised *Guidelines for EIA Centers of (Teacher Education) Excellence Competitive Grants Program, FY 2011-2012*.

5. Consideration of *Annual Report for AP Course Acceptance Policies, FY 2009-2010*

Mr. Temple introduced the item. It was **moved** (Scarborough) and **seconded** (Mosteller) to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Morrison referenced additional handouts with revised report data.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission approval of the *Annual Report for AP Course Acceptance Policies, FY 2009-2010*.

6. Other Business

Dr. Morrison requested a special meeting of the Committee on May 6, 2010, directly prior to the CHE meeting. She explained that S.C. State University seeks approval for a mission change. She informed the Committee that the substantive change involves adding Engineering as a discipline to the institutional mission.

Dr. Morrison described the nuclear engineering program currently offered at S.C. State, explaining that it began as a joint program with the University of Wisconsin, but in recent years the partnership with Wisconsin was dropped and ABET accreditation for a free-standing program was sought and given without notification to CHE. Dr. Morrison clarified that this mission change would not affect S.C. State's status as a four-year university under S.C. Code of Laws, Section 59-103-15.

Mr. Temple asked whether CHE has data related to board certification exam pass rates for engineers. Dr. Morrison responded that CHE collects pass rates for any type of licensing exam, but she did not know whether there was a licensing exam for nuclear engineering. She assured the Committee that CHE staff would research the issue.

Ms. Mosteller asked whether other schools' support has been garnered. Dr. Morrison explained that all the institutions have been notified and will be informed of the special CAAL meeting. She reported that Clemson is supportive of the mission change. She further explained that CHE staff have not received feedback from USC or The Citadel.

Ms. Mosteller asked about acceptance criteria for the engineering program at S.C. State as compared with other engineering schools in the state. Dr. Morrison responded by stating that this type of question is good and needs to be asked of S.C. State when it presents its revised mission statement for approval. Dr. Morrison also stated that CHE staff could provide enrollment and graduation data for the Nuclear Engineering program at S.C. State.

Dr. Morrison suggested that the special CAAL meeting on May 6 begin at 9:30 a.m. The Committee members agreed to the meeting time and date.

Mr. Temple thanked those in attendance for their participation and staff for their work. Hearing no further business, Mr. Temple adjourned the meeting at 2:42 p.m.