South Carolina
Commission on Higher Education

Brig Gen John L. Finan, USAF (Ret.), Chair
Dr. Bettie Rose Horne, Vice Chair
Ms. Natasha M. Hanna
Ms. Elizabeth Jackson
Dr. Raghu Korrapati
Ms. Leah B. Moody
Vice Admiral Charles Munns, USN (ret.)
Mr. Kim F. Phillips
Mr. Y. W. Scarborough, III
Dr. Jennifer B. Settlemyer
Mr. Rodney A. Smolla
Mr. Hood Temple
The Honorable Lewis R. Vaughn

Ms. Julie J. Carullo
Acting Executive Director

CHE
10-04-2012
Agenda Item 7.02.G

October 4, 2012

MEMORANDUM

To: Chairman John L. Finan and Members, S.C. Commission on Higher Education

From: Dr. Bettie Rose Horne, Chair, and Members, Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing

Revisions to the *Policies and Procedures for New Academic Programs and Centers, Program Modifications, and Program Terminations*

In the spirit of regulatory relief for the institutions and Commission staff given financial exigencies confronting the state at the time, the Commission adopted significant revisions to the *Policies and Procedures for New Academic Programs and Centers, Program Modifications, and Program Terminations* (the *Policy*) on March 5, 2009. In this revision process, the *Policy* was modified to allow for the expansion of approved programs to new sites with only a Notification of Change required to be submitted. Prior to this revision, institutions were required to obtain Commission approval of a program modification if an institution proposed to offer 50 percent or more of any existing approved degree program off-site by traditional instruction within a three-year period for an associate's, baccalaureate, specialist, master's, and first professional programs or within a five-year period for doctoral programs. This policy revision produced unforeseen and unintended consequences which are not in the best interest of the state or the institutions. As a result, certain policy changes approved in March 2009 warranted reconsideration. The Commission, on May 3, 2012, passed a resolution requiring Commission staff to:

1. re-instate the requirements applicable to all public colleges and universities concerning the transfer or expansion of an approved program to a new site in place before March 5, 2009; and

2. undertake a review of the *Policy* and present recommendations for a modified *Policy* to the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing on or by its September 6, 2012, meeting.

Since the passing of this resolution on May 3, 2012, Commission staff have completed a thorough review of the *Policy* and made several substantive changes. At the July 12, 2012, ACAP meeting, the staff highlighted the revisions and explained that the staff changes would distribute the revised document to ACAP members for their review and feedback. Subsequently the staff

distributed a draft of the revised Policy to and solicited feedback from members of the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs (ACAP). Commission staff incorporated the edits suggested by ACAP members.

At its September 6, 2012, meeting, the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing (CAAL) considered the *Policy* and requested that the staff provide several amendments. The changes have been incorporated to make language consistent, describe ways for institutions to expedite approvals, and strengthen the description of how institutions justify programs and conduct program and student assessments. Following the meeting, the staff provided an amended proposed document to CAAL members who agreed to move the *Policy* to the consent agenda for the October 4 meeting of the Commission.

Some of the substantive changes to the *Policy* include:

- reorganizing the *Policy* for readability, accessibility, clarity, and concision;
- adding, deleting, clarifying, or strengthening definitions;
- reducing the credit hour threshold for institutions to submit a Program Modification Proposal for the addition of new concentrations, tracks, or options offered within an existing major to 12 credit hours, instead of 18, for master's, specialist, and doctoral programs (the credit hour threshold remains 18 for undergraduate programs in such cases);
- requiring institutions to submit a New Program Proposal when changing to or adding a second degree designation at the same level (e.g., B.A. to B.S. or M.A. to M.S.);
- requiring institutions to submit a New Program Proposal when adding a concentration to a program that prepares teachers and other school professionals which leads to a new certification;
- re-instating the requirements applicable to all public colleges and universities concerning the transfer or expansion of an approved program to a new site in place before March 5, 2009, with the exception that institutions with programs that prepare teachers and other school professionals at the graduate level may submit a Notification of Change instead of a Program Modification Proposal for programs offered off-site if the institution has a time-limited contract with a local education agency to offer the program;
- requiring institutions to submit a Program Modification Proposal for the extension of an approved program to a delivery site, regardless of delivery mode;
- emphasizing that when a program no longer satisfies requirements for necessary accreditation or approval by a state board or agency other than the Commission (e.g., State Board of Nursing or State Department of Education) or no longer meets the productivity standards set forth by the Commission, the institution should terminate the program;
- revising the program evaluation procedures so that both the Program Planning Summary and New Program Proposals are reviewed and commented upon by ACAP;
- adjusting the schedule of the program evaluation process so that there are three program review cycles each year instead of four and so that the three cycles are evenly spaced;
- requiring that proposals for new doctoral programs include a justification of the choice of evaluator as well as the educational qualifications and background of the evaluator;
- requiring that proposals for new academic programs show how graduates will contribute to the economic development of the state; and
- revising the proposal formats as appendices to fit the modified *Policy*.

The revised *Policy* (Attachment A) is included for review. The markup version with changes shown in context is posted on the web site with this agenda item.

Recommendation

The Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing recommends that the Commission approve the revised *Policies and Procedures for New Academic Programs and Centers, Program Modifications, and Program Terminations* to be implemented immediately upon approval.

CHE
10-4-12
Agenda Item 7.02.G -With Revisions Marked

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND CENTERS, PROGRAM MODIFICATIONS, AND PROGRAM TERMINATIONS

DRAFT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 3
II. DEFINITIONS 4
III. POLICIES 8
A. General Policies 8
B. Policy for Program Proposals Submitted by Colleges in the South Carolina Technical College System 10
C. Policy for Proposals Submitted for Programs that Prepare Teachers and Other School Professionals 11
D. Policy for Off-site Delivery of Existing Programs 12
E. Policy for Notification of Change in an Academic Program or Organizational Unit 14
F. Policy for the Notification of Termination of Academic Program, Concentration(s), or Organizational Unit 14
G. Strategic Planning Policy for Academic Programs 15
IV. PROCEDURES 16
A. Procedure for New Programs 16
B. Procedure for Program Modifications 19
C. Procedure for Notifications of Change in an Academic Program or Organizational Unit 20
D. Procedure for Notifications of Termination of Academic Program, Concentration(s), or Organizational Unit 20
E. Schedule of Evaluation Process for New Programs and Program Modifications 22
APPENDIX A: FORMAT FOR PROGRAM PLANNING SUMMARIES 24
APPENDIX B: FORMAT FOR NEW PROGRAM PROPOSALS 26
APPENDIX C: FORMAT FOR NEW CENTER, BUREAU, OR INSTITUTE PROPOSALS 38
APPENDIX D: FORMAT FOR PROGRAM MODIFICATION PROPOSALS 46
APPENDIX E: NOTIFICATION OF CHANGE IN AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM OR ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT FORM 53
APPENDIX F: NOTIFICATION OF TERMINATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM, CONCENTRATION(S), OR ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT FORM 55
APPENDIX G: ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PROGRAMS 57

DRAFT

I. INTRODUCTION

New academic program approval is one of the important functions that a higher education coordinating agency performs. The essential nature of this function was recognized in the 1967 legislation which created the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education. The enabling legislation requires that public institutions of higher education receive approval from the Commission or the General Assembly before any new academic program is implemented. This approval process was reemphasized in Act 359 of 1996 which specifically mandated that the Commission examine the curriculum offerings of each public college and university in the state as well as the respective relationships to services and offerings of other institutions. Act 359 also reaffirmed that no new program may be undertaken by any public institution of higher education without approval of the Commission.

The principal role of the Commission in program approval is to provide a statewide perspective (and, in some cases, a regional or national perspective). In reviewing proposals for new programs or certain modifications to existing programs, the Commission seeks answers to the following six broad questions concerning each proposed program:

1. What are the objectives of the proposed program?
2. Does the state need the program, and if so, are there alternative means of accomplishing the desired objectives?
3. Is the program compatible with the mission, role, and scope of the institution?
4. What is the estimated cost of the program?
5. Does the institution have the necessary personnel, facilities, library holdings, and other resources necessary to conduct a program of high quality? If not, is there a plan to acquire these resources?
6. How will graduates contribute to the economic development of the state?

The Commission recognizes the sensitive nature of its responsibility for program approval and. It also recognizes its obligation to assist public institutions in developing and maintaining programs of high quality while avoiding or reducing unnecessary program duplication. To make the process for program approval agile and efficient, the Commission will consider requests for deviations to the process or schedule for the evaluation of academic programs on a case-by-case basis.

Moreover, the Commission believes that with the advent of distance learning technology and global competition among higher education institutions, institutional collaboration and acceptance of non-traditional methods for student instruction are essential. For these reasons, the Commission strongly encourages collaboration among and between in-state, public institutions to develop and offer academic programs in order to ensure a more efficient use of state resources and afford greater accessibility for students.

The Commission encourages institutions to include, wherever appropriate, research experience, internships, cooperative education, service learning, and other work experiences in undergraduate programs.

DRAFT

II. DEFINITIONS

Academic discipline refers to a major area of study identified in the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP), that is, the first four digits of the CIP code, developed by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Academic programs refer to associate, baccalaureate, master's, specialist, and doctoral degree programs, program components (e.g., concentrations, options, and tracks), and certificates.

Accrediting agency refers to a national, regional, or special area accrediting body that has been approved by the Commission. A list of approved agencies can be found on the Commission's website. In the instance where a proposed new program is accreditable by an agency that is not on the approved list, the institution must follow the *Guidelines for Approval of Specialized Accreditation Agencies*, also located on the Commission's website.

~~**Administrative units** are commonly referred to as centers, bureaus, or institutes and are engaged in carrying out research, public service, or instruction, or any combination of the above as their primary purpose(s).~~

Advisory Committee on Academic Programs (ACAP) advises the Commission on all matters relating to academic affairs generally, and specifically on matters relating to new and existing programs (Appendix G).

Blended instruction is any combination of both traditional instruction and distance education.

Certificate in a four-year institution refers to an organized series of courses, which requires fewer credit hours~~is less~~ than a degree program and is offered for credit at either the undergraduate or graduate level of study for eligible students.

Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code is used to identify major areas of study. This classification system was developed by the National Center for Education Statistics to support accurate tracking, assessment, and reporting of fields of study and program completions activity.

Collaborative programs are programs offered by one or more institutional partners who contribute courses, faculty, or other resources and in which a lead institution confers the degree.

Concentrations, tracks, options, specializations, emphases, and cognates refer to a series of courses with a distinctive curricular pattern within a major.

Degree program, for purposes of Commission program approval, refers to a series of courses or activities that lead to an associate, baccalaureate, master's, specialist, or doctoral degree; or lead to a certificate or a diploma totaling more than 18 credit hours at a senior institution.

Delivery mode is the primary method by which students participate in a program. Delivery modes include:

1. **traditional instruction** in which significant site attendance is required;
2. **distance education**~~the **Internet**~~;

~~1) **Special Facilities** for site-to-site two-way audio-visual (compressed video);~~

DRAFT

~~2) satellite, cable TV, **TV/Radio**, closed circuit, video tape, digital media;**Correspondence**; and~~

3. or ~~a~~ **blended instruction**, which is any combination of both traditional and distance education~~the above~~.

Delivery site is a physical location within the state that:

1. is controlled or sponsored by a college or university or its agents (including foundations);
2. is not on that college or university's campus; and
3. is used to offer distance education to students who are physically present.

Distance education is coursework delivered ~~by electronic means, whether satellite transmission, Internet, fiber optics technology, digital media, videotape, or other specified technology that occurs at a place other than~~ by an instructor who provides instruction~~located~~ at a place or time other than ~~when the instructor teaches the class~~the place or time the instruction is received.

Duplication occurs when an academic program closely matches another academic program in content, location, and audience.

Joint programs are collaborative programs that have strong interdependence among the participants and their respective contributions to courses, faculty, or other resources. A joint degree may be conferred by one or more institutions and a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) must be in place.

Majors are composed of a series of courses, typically 30-40 credit hours, related by discipline and form a subject of academic study chosen as a field of specialization.

Minors are composed of a series of courses related by discipline and focus outside the baccalaureate major (typically 6-7 courses). Course coding for the minor cannot be from the same six-digit CIP code as the major. Commission approval for minors is not required.

New degree programs are:

1. offerings in any academic degree program that conclude with the conferral of a degree at any level in any field or major not previously offered;
2. courses constituting 50 percent or more of a program of study not previously approved by the Commission offered on-campus or off-site by any instructional modality within a three-year period for certificate, associate's, baccalaureate, specialist, or master's programs, or within a five-year period for doctoral programs;
3. certificates in any field or major not previously offered that total more than 18 credit hours (except diploma or certificate programs offered by the technical colleges);
4. any program approved at one degree level ~~(e.g., B.A.)~~ that is ~~moving to~~ adding another level (e.g., B.A. adding an M.A.);
5. any program approved at one degree designation that is changing to or adding a second degree designation at the same level (e.g., B.A. to B.S.~~,~~; M.A. to M.S.~~,~~; or A.A. to A.S);

~~5.~~6. any new center, bureau, or institute for which the institution requests or requires ~~additional~~ appropriations from the state;

~~6.~~7. new teacher certification programs including add-ons or endorsements; or

~~7.~~8. any existing program which changes to such an extent that a change in CIP code is required or for which a change to the CIP code is requested.

DRAFT

Off-site delivery or **off-site** means offering coursework at one or more sites that are separate from the institution's main campus, either by distance education or by traditional instruction.

Organizational units are administrative units such as colleges and departments, or centers, bureaus, and institutes that are engaged in carrying out research, public service, or instruction, or any combination of the above as their primary purpose(s).

Productivity standards are defined by the Commission such that:

1. each baccalaureate program must either produce an average of at least five (5) degrees awarded or enroll an average of 12.5 students (headcount) in the program over the most recent five-year period;
2. each master's program must either produce an average of at least three (3) degrees awarded or enroll an average of at least six (6) students (headcount) in the program over the most recent five-year period; and
3. each doctoral program must either produce an average of at least two (2) degrees awarded or enroll an average of at least 4.5 students (headcount) in the program over the most recent five-year period.

For more information about these standards, refer to the Commission's Program Productivity Policy.

Program modifications are:

1. the extension or transfer of an existing, approved program to a new site that is different from the location(s) or site(s) already authorized, including out-of-state or out-of-country sites, where instruction is delivered in primarily traditional format or in a combination of traditional and distance education~~electronic~~ formats, where over 50 percent of the curriculum is offered at the new site(s) within a period of three years for certificate, associate's, baccalaureate, specialist, master's and doctoral-professional practice programs, or within a five-year period for doctoral-research/scholarship programs.
2. the addition of new concentrations, tracks, options, specializations, emphases, or cognates offered within an existing major that total more than 18 credit hours for undergraduate programs or more than 12 credit hours for master's, specialist, and doctoral programs~~,~~ (except in the case of adding new concentrations to programs that prepare teachers and other school professionals for a new certification, which are to be treated as a new program);
3. substantive changes in program goal, purpose, curriculum, or target audience that do not require a change in the CIP code;
4. a change in the degree designation of a program when this change involves a significant shift in the program's purpose (e.g., B.A. to B.F.A.; M.A. to M.F.A.; or M.S. to M.B.A., but **not** B.A. to B.S.; M.A. to M.S.; or A.A. to A.S.); or,
5. the reconfiguration of a number of existing related degrees into a single degree (e.g., B.A. in French; B.A. in German; and B.A. in Spanish collapsed into a B.A. in Modern Languages).

Program notification is the required notification to the Commission of changes in existing programs that do not fall under the requirements for program modifications (Appendix E). Program notification is required for program changes involving:

1. off-site delivery of existing programs that are delivered through electronic formats in their entirety;
2. award of certificates of 18 hours or fewer from baccalaureate-granting institutions;
3. program or major consolidation; or

DRAFT

4. change in program title **without** any change in objectives, purposes, substantive changes in curriculum, or changes in CIP code.

Program termination is the discontinuation of a degree program, certificate, concentration, center, or other organizational unit by an institution (Appendix F).

Program title is the official title of the proposed program that will be used in the institution's catalog, the institutional program area of the Commission's *Inventory of Academic Programs*, and official communications about the program (e.g., communications with IPEDS; the SC Department of Education; regional accrediting bodies; and Specialized Professional Associations).

Site refers to the physical location at which an academic program is delivered, regardless of the delivery mode.

Site codes are numerical codes that represent locations where coursework and/or programs are offered by an institution, whether on-campus or at an off-site location.

Traditional instruction refers to coursework offered by faculty who are physically present at the same site and at the same time as students, whether the location is on-campus or off-site.

DRAFT

III. POLICIES

A. General Policies

The Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing establishes and maintains procedures designed to implement the following policies:

1. All new degree programs, no matter the mode of delivery or location, require Commission approval as defined by the policies and procedures in this manual. Authorized programs are identified in the Commission's *Inventory of Academic Degree Programs.*

2. No new program proposal will go before the Commission for approval without approval from the proposing institution's governing board when such approval is required by the institution's governing board. New program proposals from The Citadel, which does not require Board of Visitors approval for new programs, must meet all other institutional requirements for approval.

3. Proposals for program modifications follow a format and criteria similar to new program proposals (Appendix D). The Executive Director of the Commission has approval authority for program modifications. Final approval of appealed staff decisions rests with the Commission. Approval decisions regarding program modifications will be made within two months of the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs (ACAP).

4. Notifications of program changes and terminations must be submitted using the appropriate form (Appendices E and F). Notifications of change must be submitted at least three months prior to implementation. Notifications of termination must be submitted within three months of the termination.

5. Changes to program title, **without** changes in objectives, purposes, CIP Code, or substantive changes in curriculum, **do not** require Commission review and approval. However, institutions must inform the Commission in writing **three months prior to implementing the changes** using the *Notification of Change in an Academic Program or Organizational Unit* form (Appendix E).

6. At the will of the Commission, staff have the right to elevate any notification of change to a program modification or new program proposal, or any program modification to a new program proposal.

7. No program may be publicized as an approved program in the catalog of any institution or in any other manner prior to approval of the program by the Commission.

8. The Commission does not require approval of the creation of new academic departments, schools, or colleges within existing institutions. However, institutions shall notify Commission staff of any such changes by submitting an email or letter to the Commission's Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing.

9. New certificate programs offered by senior institutions in a field or major in which the institution already offers an approved degree program **do not** require Commission approval. New certificates requiring 18 or more credit hours in a field or major in which

DRAFT

the institution **does not** offer an approved degree program **do** require Commission approval. New certificates requiring **fewer than** 18 credit hours in a field or major in which the institution **does not** offer an approved degree program **do not** require Commission approval.

10. Compliance with the Commission's productivity standards for existing programs will be considered in determining an institution's request to establish a new program. New program proposal requests will be approved by the Commission **only** if the proposal contains reasonable assurances that enrollment projections will meet the minimum standards for degree productivity.

11. If implementation of a proposed program entails new capital construction~~, or~~ substantial modifications to existing facilities, or leasing of new or expanded facilities, an appropriate request for Commission approval of such construction or modification must be submitted through the Division of Finance, Facilities, and MIS concurrently with the proposal for the new program so that the Commission's Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing and Committee on Finance and Facilities may review the proposals simultaneously.

12. All proposals to establish new doctoral programs must be accompanied by an evaluation from a qualified out-of-state consultant which analyzes the merits of the proposed program, its potential effect on existing programs at the institution, its relationship to similar programs in the state, and the institution's readiness and ability to support the proposed program. The proposal must also include a justification of the choice of evaluator as well as the educational qualifications and background of the evaluator. ~~Also, colleges and universities should refer to the Commission's document *Priority Statements Relating to Offsite Doctoral Programs* for accepted best practices relating to doctoral programming.~~

13. An institution seeking approval to offer a program at a level above that which is included in its mission statement as previously approved by the Commission is required to seek approval for a change in mission and status (i.e., new level of degree offered) prior to or in conjunction with the submission of the related program proposal.

14. New centers, bureaus, and institutes for which the institution intends to request or receive~~additional~~ appropriations from the state require new program approval. Existing centers not approved by the Commission must gain Commission approval prior to requesting any special state funding. Commission approval is **not required** for units where no ~~additional~~ appropriation from the state is requested or required; however, institutions must still adhere to the Commission's Notification Policy for such centers. SmartState Centers, which undergo a separate external review process, will be considered to be in compliance with this policy if they are approved by the SmartState Review Board. Education Improvement Act (EIA) Centers of Excellence, which also undergo a separate external review process, will be considered to be in compliance with this policy if they are approved by the Commission.

15. New program implementation may be deferred by the institution for up to three years following approval of the program. After that time, a new program proposal must be resubmitted and reauthorized if the institution wishes to implement the program.

DRAFT

16. The planning summary for any pending new program proposal will be considered active for no more than three years from the time of submission to the Commission. After three years, the institution must submit a new planning summary in order to have the new program proposal considered.

17. Exceptions to the schedule for submitting program planning summaries and new program proposals may be made by the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing on behalf of the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing.

18. For joint or collaborative programs, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that clearly delineates program responsibilities and fiscal arrangements among all participants must be developed and approved concurrently with the program proposal at the institutional level. The MOU, signed by the appropriate senior-level institutional officers, must be submitted with the final program proposal.

B. Policy for Program Proposals Submitted by Colleges in the South Carolina Technical College System

New program proposals submitted by colleges in the South Carolina Technical College System (SCTCS) must be evaluated by the SCTCS System Office.

1. Programs that are new to the SCTCS must adhere to the Commission's program approval process.

2. Programs that are already offered by one or more institutions within the SCTCS but are new to the proposing institution will be evaluated by SCTCS System Office staff to determine:

    a) if the proposed program is substantially the same as the existing program and conforms to the SCTCS template for that program;

    b) if the proposed program meets applicable accreditation requirements;

    c) if the proposing institution has the capacity to support the program; and

    d) if there is sufficient demand for the program.

3. If SCTCS System Office staff determine that the previously stated conditions are met, they will so certify to the Commission. The SCTCS System Office staff certification must include a brief program description and request for inclusion in the Commission's *Inventory of Approved Programs*.

4. Commission staff will review the SCTCS System Office request to determine if there are substantive questions that remain unanswered.

    a) If there are no substantive questions, Commission staff will notify SCTCS System Office staff and the proposing institution that the program has been added to the *Inventory*.

DRAFT

b) If there are substantive questions, Commission staff will transmit them in writing in a timely manner to SCTCS staff for review and written response. When the questions are addressed satisfactorily, Commission staff will notify the proposing institution and SCTCS System Office staff that the program has been added to the *Inventory*.

5. In the event that substantive questions remain unanswered, the SCTCS System Office staff will have the option to either:

   a) withdraw the program from consideration;

   b) defer consideration of the program until the questions can be answered and the program resubmitted; or

   c) request that the program proposal be submitted for consideration under the Commission's program approval process.

6. Diploma and certificate programs offered by the state's technical colleges which require less than two years to complete **do not** require Commission approval.

7. Programs approved for delivery by the technical colleges do not require approval for delivery at additional sites within the institution's Commission-approved service area. Programs offered outside the service area must comply with Commission policies for approval of off-site programs.

C. Policy for Proposals Submitted for Programs that Prepare Teachers and Other School Professionals

1. Education units in public institutions that offer State Board of Education-approved programs to prepare teachers and other school professionals must be fully accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Programs that prepare teachers and other school professionals which are recommended for approval by the Commission will only be recommended with the provision that NCATE accreditation be sought and/or maintained for the unit and the program receive national recognition from the appropriate Specialized Professional Association (SPA) or accrediting body~~immediately~~ upon Commission approval.

2. Should an institution's education unit lose NCATE accreditation or be accredited with conditions, the institution may not apply for any new programs that prepare teachers and other school professionals until the unit has acquired full accreditation.

3. Programs that prepare teachers and other school professionals should reflect prevailing national and state standards with respect to content and pedagogy. School personnel preparation programs are expected to meet the standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) or accrediting bodies within two years of initial approval and maintain them; failure to do so will result in the program being placed on provisional approval status.

DRAFT

4. All master's programs in education for advanced training of teachers are expected to incorporate the core propositions of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

5. For master's programs in education, coursework should be targeted to either those seeking an initial license or those already licensed, not both. Justification will be required for programs in which a limited number of courses serve to fulfill requirements for both M.A.T. and M.Ed. programs.

6. SC Department of Education (SCDE) staff will be notified and granted the opportunity to review all proposals for new programs related to the preparation of teachers and other school professionals, including but not limited to, teacher education, counseling, and education administration programs.

7. Proposals for new programs related to the preparation of teachers and other school professionals must be approved by the Commission **prior** to submission to SCDE for approval. New or modified program proposals from public institutions will not be considered by SCDE until program approval is granted by the Commission.

8. An institution changing the name of a program through SCDE, NCATE, a Specialized Professional Association (SPA), or any other accrediting body, must follow Commission policies on program modification, notification of change, or notification of termination, as appropriate.

9. Institutions adding a concentration to a program that prepares teachers and other school professionals which ~~that~~ leads to a new certification must submit a proposal for a new program.

10. Institutions with programs that prepare teachers and other school professionals at the graduate level may submit a notification of change instead of a program modification for programs offered off-site if the institution has a time-limited contract with a local education agency (LEA) to offer the program. In such cases, a copy of the contract or Memorandum of Understanding with the LEA must be submitted with the notification.

11. Notification of termination should be submitted immediately for programs that prepare teachers and other school professionals when the institution is notified by SCDE of program certification authority being terminated by the State Board of Education as such programs cannot admit new students and existing students have two years to complete the program.

D. Policy for Off-site Delivery of Existing Programs

1. Institutions may offer less than 50 percent of the total required program credit hours for any **approved** degree program off-site without Commission approval. Commission program modification approval is required if an institution proposes to offer 50 percent or more of an existing degree program off-site by traditional or blended instruction within a three-year period for associate's, baccalaureate, specialist, master's, and doctoral-professional practice programs, or within a five-year period for doctoral-research/scholarship programs.

DRAFT

2. Extension of an approved program ~~to additional sites~~ **solely** by distance education **does not** require Commission review and approval except for health professions~~medical~~ programs (#3 below) and in cases of an institution-sponsored in-state delivery site (#4 below) which both require a program modification. The institution must provide verification to the Commission **three months prior** to implementing the ~~program~~ change that all coursework offered off-site is delivered by distance education.

3. Extension of an approved ~~medical~~health professions program to additional sites, regardless of delivery mode, requires Commission review and approval as a program modification.

4. Extension of an approved program to a delivery ~~viewing~~ site, regardless of delivery mode, requires Commission review and approval as a program modification.

5. The Commission endorses the Southern Regional Education Board's (SREB) *Principles of Good Practice* regarding distance education and expects all public colleges and universities in the state to adhere to these *Principles*.

6. Programs approved for delivery by the technical colleges ~~and the two-year regional campuses of the University of South Carolina~~ do not require approval for delivery at additional sites within the institution's Commission-approved service area. Programs offered outside the service area must comply with Commission policies for approval of off-site programs.

7. Changing from one mode of distance delivery to another (e.g., satellite to internet) does not require Commission approval. Institutions are expected to report the revised method of course delivery to Commission staff by submitting a *Notification of Change in an Academic Program or Organizational Unit* form (Appendix E).

8. Commission approval is **not required** for any **existing** program or part of a program offered out-of-state or out-of-country entirely through ~~electronic means~~distance education if that program or part of a program requests, requires, or receives no ~~additional~~ appropriations from the state. The institution must inform the Commission using the *Notification of Change in an Academic Program or Organizational Unit* form (Appendix E) no later than three months prior to implementing the program or program components at the site(s) in question and must report the total number of students and the total number of in-state students enrolled in the program ~~separately from students enrolled in-state~~.

9. Commission policies on program approval apply to any **new** program proposed to be offered exclusively out-of-state or out-of-country through distance education~~electronic or other means~~.

10. Programs that prepare teachers and other school professionals at the graduate level may submit a notification of change instead of a program modification if the institution has a time-limited contract with a local education agency (LEA) to offer the program off-site. In such cases, a copy of the contract or Memorandum of Understanding with the LEA must be submitted with the notification.

DRAFT

E. Policy for Notification of Change in an Academic Program or Organizational Unit

The institution making a change to an academic program of organizational unit must inform the Commission's Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing of the change **three months prior to implementing the program** using the *Notification of Change in an Academic Program or Organizational Unit* form (Appendix E) which must be signed by the institution's Chief Executive or Chief Academic Officer. In all such cases, the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing will notify the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs at its next meeting.

1. Notifications of change must be submitted for any of the following:

    a) out-of-state or out-of-country delivery of **existing** programs, regardless of delivery mode;

    b) the award of certificates of 18 hours or less from baccalaureate-granting institutions;

    c) program or major consolidation;

    d) change in program title **without** changes in objectives, purposes, substantive changes in curriculum, or changes in CIP code;

    e) consolidation or termination of concentrations, specializations, options, or tracks within an existing program;

    f) addition of a concentration, specialization, option, or track of 18 hours or less to an existing undergraduate program or 12 hours or less to an existing master's, specialist, or doctoral program;

    g) addition of a new center, bureau, or institute if no state funds are requested or required; or

    h) change in name for a center, bureau, or institute.

2. Notifications from institutions must submitted using the *Notification of Change in an Academic Program or Organizational Unit* form (Appendix E).

F. Policy for the Notification of Termination of Academic Program, Concentration(s), or Organizational Unit

The institution terminating an academic program, concentration, or organizational unit must inform the Commission's Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing of the change **within three months of the termination** using the *Notification of Termination of Academic Program, Concentration(s), or Organizational Unit* form (Appendix F) which must be signed by the institution's Chief Executive or Chief Academic Officer. In all such cases, the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing will notify the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs at its next meeting.

DRAFT

1. When a program no longer satisfies requirements for necessary accreditation or approval by a state board or agency other than the Commission (e.g., State Board of Nursing, State Department of Education) or no longer meets the productivity standards set forth by the Commission, the institution should terminate the program and notify the Commission of such termination by submitting the *Notification of Termination of Academic Program, Concentration(s), or Organizational Unit* form (Appendix F). An institution may also terminate a program or organizational unit based on its own evaluation of that program or unit.

~~1.~~2. In the *Notification*, the institution must provide a date certain by which the program will be closed to new students and a date certain by which the CHEMIS data file will be closed (typically not longer than 150% of program duration, e.g., six years for a four-year program).

~~2.~~3. Termination of any approved program, center, bureau, or institute does not require prior Commission approval, but notification of such changes shall be made to the Commission staff using the *Notification of Termination of Academic Program, Concentration(s), or Organizational Unit* form (Appendix F).

4. Termination of any academic school, department, or college does not require Commission approval or formal notification; however, the institution should notify the Commission staff of such changes by submitting the *Notification of Termination of Academic Program, Concentration(s), or Organizational Unit* form (Appendix F).

~~3.~~5. For programs subject to approval by a state board or agency other than the Commission (e.g., State Board of Nursing, State Department of Education), the appropriate board or agency will be informed of notification of terminations received for such programs.

G. Strategic Planning Policy for Academic Programs

1. In the event of any specific review of academic programs conducted by the Commission, the Commission will make recommendations regarding the future status of programs and fields of study under review statewide. These recommendations will be based on three main sources of information:

   a) a peer-review document developed by ~~out-of-state~~ consultants hired by the Commission;

   b) supplemental qualitative and quantitative data relating to the field of study collected from statistically reliable sources; and

   c) the institution's strategic plan and the statewide strategic plan for higher education.

2. The Commission may also make recommendations regarding the articulation of programs under review at the undergraduate level.

DRAFT

IV. PROCEDURES

A. Procedure for New Programs

New programs will be evaluated in accordance with the following procedures: the institution submits~~sion of~~ a Program Planning Summary to be reviewed by ~~Commission staff and~~ the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs (ACAP); Commission staff transmit substantive comments, questions, or concerns received from ACAP members to the proposing institution; and the institution submits~~sion of~~ a New Program Proposal to be~~;~~ reviewed by ACAP~~review by~~, the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing (CAAL)~~;~~, and ~~review by~~ the Commission. ~~The Advisory Committee on Academic Programs reviews Program Planning Summaries each quarter and will review final proposals only if it wishes to raise specific questions about, or objections to, any given proposal.~~

To make the process for program approval agile and efficient while taking its responsibility for program approval seriously, the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing will consider requests for deviations to the process or schedule for the evaluation of academic programs. For example, the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing may waive the requirement to submit a Program Planning Summary and allow an institution to begin the approval process with the submission of a New Program Proposal in the following cases: the institution needs to implement the proposed program quickly to meet business and industry needs; the institution is modifying an existing program such that a New Program Proposal is required; or the institution has a program approved at one degree designation and is changing to or adding a second degree designation at the same level (e.g., B.A. changing to or adding a B.S.). Each request for deviations to the process or schedule will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

1. For planned programs, a Program Planning Summary must be submitted to Commission ~~staff for review and approval~~. Program Planning Summaries should be submitted as soon as is practicable in the institution's internal planning process.

2. The following parameters apply to Program Planning Summaries:

   a) Each Program Planning Summary is limited to one program.

   b) Program Planning Summaries are valid for three years. After that period, Program Planning Summaries must be updated and resubmitted.

   c) Program Planning Summaries must be signed by the institution or system President or Chief Executive Officer. Summaries must be submitted electronically **in Word format** to the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing.

   d) The Program Planning Summary must follow the format provided in Appendix A and should not exceed three pages in length.

3. Commission staff will make Program Planning Summaries available electronically to ACAP members for review. Each ACAP member must provide comments about, or indicate acceptance of, each Program Planning Summary according to the schedule provided.

DRAFT

4. Commission staff will review comments, questions, or concerns from ACAP members and transmit those deemed significant to the institution. The institution must address these comments, questions, and concerns in the New Program Proposal.

~~4. **The Advisory Committee on Academic Programs will review the Program Planning Summary and recommend approval or disapproval of the proposed program to the Commission.** An institution may not submit draft proposals until the Advisory Committee has considered the related Program Planning Summary.~~

5. It is important for Commission staff to have the opportunity to consult with an institution early in the consideration and planning of new programs or program modifications. Institutions may submit a draft of the proposal for review by Commission staff well in advance of due dates for proposals.

6. Proposals for new programs must be submitted in the appropriate format by the President or Chief Executive Officer of the institution or system to the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing with a letter of transmittal (Appendix B). Please note the following:

   a) All required institutional approvals, including approval of the institution's governing board, must be obtained prior to submission of final proposals to the ~~Commission.~~Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing for consideration. Proposals may be presented to ACAP without the required institutional approvals in order to expedite the evaluation process.

   b) Commission staff will review final proposals to ensure that required components are included. Failure to address all required components adequately may delay the program's submission to ACAP.

   c) New program proposals should not exceed 20 pages in length and should be written in Georgia 11 font, single-spaced, using one inch margins on all sides.

   d) ~~Ten unbound copies~~One original, signed copy of each New Program Proposal must be mailed to the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing according to the schedule provided. In addition, proposals must be submitted electronically **in Word format** to the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing.

   e) Proposal for programs that prepare teachers and other school professionals must also include the additional information required by the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE): SCDE Requirements (section III) and SPA or Other National Specialized and/or Professional Association Standards (section IV) ~~(sections III and IV)~~. These requirements can be found at http://www.ed.sc.gov/agency/se/Educator-Certification-Recruitment-and-Preparation/Ed-Prep/documents/educatorguidelines.pdf~~http://www.scteachers.org/Educate/edpdf/educatorguidelines.pdf~~. The proposal will be forwarded to SCDE upon approval by the Commission.

   f) All doctoral program proposals must be accompanied by a single copy of an assessment by an out-of-state~~external~~ consultant of the merits of the proposed program, its potential effect on existing programs at the proposing institution, its relationship to similar programs in the state, and the proposing institution's

DRAFT

readiness and ability to support the proposed program. The proposal must also include a justification of the choice of evaluator as well as the educational qualifications and background of the evaluator. In addition, the proposal must be accompanied by a brief institutional summary outlining changes made to the proposal in response to the ~~external~~ consultant's evaluation.

g) Appendices, including letters of support should not be included and will not be sent to Commissioners.

h) Programs which require a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with another institution or agency for implementation (e.g., joint programs and programs which require internships or clinical placements outside the institution) must include a signed copy of the MOU with the New Program Proposal.

7. The institution must present the New Program Proposal to ACAP. If ACAP recommends approval of the new program, the proposal and the Commission staff analysis of the proposal will be presented to the ~~review. At the request of the Advisory Committee, the Committee may vote by ballot prior to each quarterly meeting whether to discuss a final proposal at the quarterly meeting. At the request of any individual member, the Advisory Committee shall review the final program proposal. If no member of the Committee requests a review of the final proposal, the staff will consider the Committee's favorable recommendation of the Program Planning Summary as a positive one for purposes of the staff program summary. In the case of new programs, the staff may forward its recommendation to the~~ Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing (CAAL) at its next scheduled meeting. **If ACAP does not recommend approval of the new program,** the institution may elect to: send the proposal and staff analysis of the proposal to CAAL with a negative recommendation; withdraw the New Program Proposal; or revise the New Program Proposal based on feedback received from ACAP and present the revised proposal to ACAP for reconsideration.

8. Commission staff will prepare a written analysis and recommendation for each proposal for CAAL, in advance of its meetings. The analysis and recommendation will also be provided to the Chief Academic Officers of the institutions.

9. The institution must present the New Program Proposal to CAAL. The chairperson of CAAL will submit findings and recommendations to the Commission.

10. The Commission on Higher Education will review and take action on the New Program Proposal. The Executive Director of the Commission will notify the President or Chief Executive Officer of the institution or system in writing regarding the action the Commission has taken. Proposals for programs that prepare teachers and other school professionals will be forwarded to the Office of Educator Certification, Recruitment, and Preparation at the SC Department of Education after Commission approval.

11. An institution that wishes to appeal the Commission's action on any proposal for a new program may do so, provided a written notice stating the reason(s) for the appeal is submitted to the Executive Director of the Commission by the President or Chief Executive Officer of the institution or system within 30 calendar days after receipt of written notice of the Commission's action. Appeals will be referred to the CAAL for consideration at a regularly scheduled meeting. CAAL will undertake any further study or action it deems appropriate. Should CAAL find in favor of the appeal, the proposal will

DRAFT

be submitted to the Commission for reconsideration. If CAAL's decision is unfavorable, the institution must wait one full calendar year before submitting a new proposal for the program or a similar program.

B. Procedure for Program Modifications

Program modifications will be evaluated in accordance with the following procedures: the institution submits~~sion of~~ a Program Modification Proposal for review by ACAP and Commission staff, then ~~and~~ staff ~~review and~~makes a determination about the proposed modification within two months of the recommendation of ACAP, with appeal to CAAL and the Commission in the event of an unfavorable staff decision.

1. Program Modification Proposals must be submitted by the President or Chief Executive Officer of the institution or system to the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing with a letter of transmittal (Appendix D). Please note the following:

   a) All required institutional approvals, including approval of the institution's governing board, must be obtained prior to submission of final proposals.

   b) Staff will review the proposals to ensure that required elements are included. Failure to address all required components adequately may delay the program's submission to ACAP.

   c) Program Modification Proposals should not exceed ~~20 ten~~ pages in length and should be written in Georgia 11 font, single-spaced, using one inch margins on all sides.

   d) One original, signed copy of each proposal must be mailed to the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing~~Ten unbound copies of each new proposal should be submitted~~ according to the schedule provided. In addition, Program Modification Proposals must be submitted electronically **in Word format** to the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing.

   e) Proposals for programs that prepare teachers and other school professionals must also include the additional information required by the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE): SCDE Requirements (section III) and SPA or Other National Specialized and/or Professional Association Standards (section IV). These requirements can be found at http://www.ed.sc.gov/agency/se/Educator-Certification-Recruitment-and-Preparation/Ed-Prep/documents/educatorguidelines.pdf. The proposal will be forwarded to SCDE upon approval by the Commission. ~~teacher education program proposals, whether for a new program or a program modification, must also include the additional information required by the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) (sections III and IV), which can be found at http://www.scteachers.org/Educate/edpdf/educatorguidelines.pdf. This packet will be forwarded to SCDE upon complete approval by CHE.~~

   f) Appendices, including letters of support, will not be considered.

DRAFT

g) Program modifications which require a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with another institution or agency for implementation (e.g., joint programs and programs which require internships or clinical placements outside the institution) must include a signed copy of the MOU with the Program Modification Proposal.

2. The institution will present the Program Modification Proposal to the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs (ACAP). If ACAP recommends approval, the proposal will be reviewed by Commission staff. **If ACAP does not recommend approval,** the institution may elect to withdraw the Program Modification Proposal or revise the Program Modification Proposal based on the feedback received from ACAP and present the revised proposal to ACAP for reconsideration.

~~2.~~3. After review by ACAP, program modification proposals will be reviewed by Commission staff. Approval authority rests with the Executive Director of the Commission for all program modifications. Institutions may appeal the Executive Director's decision to CAAL. The Commission retains final approval authority in appeals cases.

C. Procedure for Notifications of Change in an Academic Program or Organizational Unit

1. The institution making the change in question must inform the Commission's Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing of the change **three months prior to implementation** using the *Notification of Change in an Academic Program or Organizational Unit* form (Appendix E) which must be signed by the institution's Chief Executive or Chief Academic Officer.

2. One original, signed copy of the form must be mailed to the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing. In addition, the form must be submitted electronically **in Word format** to the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing.

3. The Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing will notify ACAP at the meeting subsequent to receiving notification from the institution making the change.

D. Procedure for Notifications of Termination of Academic Program, Concentration(s), or Organizational Unit

1. The institution terminating an academic program, concentration(s), or organizational unit must inform the Commission's Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing **within three months of the termination** using the *Notification of Termination of Academic Program, Concentration(s), or Organizational Unit* form (Appendix F) which must be signed by the institution's Chief Executive or Chief Academic Officer.

2. One original, signed copy of the form must be mailed to the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing. In addition, the form must be submitted electronically **in Word format** to the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing.

DRAFT

3. The Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing will notify ACAP at the meeting subsequent to receiving notification from the institution.

DRAFT

E. Schedule of Evaluation Process for New Programs and Program Modifications

Schedules for the evaluation process of new programs and program modifications are displayed in the following tables. The Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing will consider requests for deviations to the schedule on a case-by-case basis.

Please note that the Committee and Commission meeting dates vary from year to year. Updated schedules and meeting dates are posted on the Commission's website (www.che.sc.gov/New_Web/ForInstitutions/AcadProg.htm).

COMMISSION EVALUATION PROCESS FOR NEW PROGRAMS FOR SC PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS
(Undergraduate and Graduate Programs and Centers, Bureaus, and Institutes)

Program Planning Summary Due	Comments on Program Planning Summary Due From ACAP	Comments Sent to Institutions	Final Proposal Due	Advisory Committee on Academic Programs (ACAP) Meeting	Committee on Academic Affairs & Licensing (CAAL) Meeting	Commission on Higher Education (CHE) Meeting
June 15	July 30	Aug. 15	Sept. 15	October	January	February
Oct. 15	Nov. 30	Dec. 15	Jan. 15	February	May	June
Feb. 15	Mar. 30	April 15	May 15	June	September	October

PROGRAM MODIFICATIONS

Final Proposal Due to CHE	Advisory Committee on Academic Programs (ACAP) Meeting	Staff Determination
Sept. 15	October	December
Jan. 15	February	April
May 15	June	August

DRAFT

Schedule of Program Evaluation Process

Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
(6) CAAL Meeting (4) New Program Proposal Due	(7) CHE Meeting (5) ACAP Meeting **(1) Program Planning Summary Due**	(2) ACAP Comments on Program Planning Summary Due	(3) Comments Sent to Institution	(6) CAAL Meeting (4) New Program Proposal Due	(7) CHE Meeting (5) ACAP Meeting **(1) Program Planning Summary Due**	(2) ACAP Comments on Program Planning Summary Due	(3) Comments Sent to Institution	(6) CAAL Meeting (4) New Program Proposal Due	(7) CHE Meeting (5) ACAP Meeting **(1) Program Planning Summary Due**	(2) ACAP Comments on Program Planning Summary Due	(3) Comments Sent to Institution

Cycle A = Orange Cycle B = Blue Cycle C = Red

Program Evaluation Cycle	Program Planning Summary Due	Comments on Program Planning Summary Due From ACAP	Comments Sent to Institutions	Final Proposal Due (may be submitted up to three years after the Program Planning Summary)	Review by Advisory Committee on Academic Programs (ACAP)	Review by Committee on Academic Affairs & Licensing (CAAL)	Review by Commission on Higher Education (CHE)
Cycle A	Feb. 15	Mar. 30	April 15	May 15	June	September	October
Cycle B	June 15	July 30	Aug. 15	Sept. 15	October	January	February
Cycle C	Oct. 15	Nov. 30	Dec. 15	Jan. 15	February	May	June

DRAFT

APPENDIX A: FORMAT FOR PROGRAM PLANNING SUMMARIES

Failure to address the following components adequately may delay the program's submission to the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs.

1. Cover Page

The cover page must include:

a) name of the proposing institution;

b) program title, including concentrations, options, and tracks;

c) date of submission;

d) signature of the President or Chief Executive Officer of the institution or system; and

e) program contact name and contact information.

2. Classification

This section must include:

a) program title;

b) concentrations, options, and tracks;

c) designation, type, and level of degree (if baccalaureate, specify four- or five-year);

d) proposed date of implementation;

e) whether the program qualifies for supplemental Palmetto Fellows Scholarship and LIFE Scholarship awards; and

f) delivery mode.

3. Justification

This section must include:

a) a discussion of the need for the program in the state;

b) a discussion of the relationship of the proposed program to existing programs at the proposing institution; and

c) an assessment of the extent to which the proposed program duplicates existing programs in the state.

DRAFT

4. Program Demand and Productivity

This section must include:

a) a discussion of the anticipated enrollment in the planned program in its fourth year; and

b) a discussion of the anticipated number of annual completions in the planned program after its fourth year.

5. Employment Opportunities for Graduates

This section must include a discussion of either anticipated employment opportunities for graduates supported by the most current U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, state, and~~or~~ regional employment data; local or regional employment opportunities as advertised in newspapers, the employment office, or other sources; or demand for graduate supported by community and business surveys. This data must be quantified to the maximum extent possible, cover a reasonable period in the future beyond the anticipated date of graduation of the first classes, and must include sources of the data. Programs that prepare teachers and other school professionals must cite the most recent data published by the Center for Educator Recruitment, Retention, and Advancement (CERRA).

6. Curriculum

This section must provide an outline of the curriculum for the planned program.

7. Articulation and Inter-institutional Cooperation

This section must describe the institution's efforts to link the proposed program to similar programs offered by other institutions in the state either through articulation agreements or inter-institutional cooperation.

8. Estimate of Costs

This section must provide a general estimate of the total costs associated with implementing the planned program.

DRAFT

APPENDIX B: FORMAT FOR NEW PROGRAM PROPOSALS

Failure to address the following components adequately may delay the program's submission to the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs.

1. Cover Page

The cover page must include:

a) name of the proposing institution;

b) program title, including concentrations, options, and tracks;

c) date of submission;

d) signature of the President or Chief Executive Officer of the institution or system; and

e) program contact name and contact information.

2. Classification

This section must include:

a) program title;

b) concentrations, options, and tracks;

c) academic unit in which the program resides;

d) designation, type, and level of degree (if baccalaureate, specify four- or five-year);

e) proposed date of implementation;

f) CIP code from the current U.S. Department of Education's Classification of Instructional Programs;

g) site;

h) whether the program qualifies for supplemental Palmetto Fellows Scholarship and LIFE Scholarship awards;

i) delivery mode; and

j) area of certification (only for programs that prepare teachers and other school professionals).

DRAFT

3. Institutional Approval

This section must include:

a) a list of titles of all internal institutional approvals (e.g., faculty committees, institutional governing board, President or Chief Executive Officer); and

b) date of each institutional approval.

4. Purpose

This section must include:

a) a statement of the purpose of the program; and

b) a discussion of the objectives of the program.

5. Justification

This section must include:

a) a discussion of the need for the program in the state and an explanation of how graduates will contribute to the economic development of the state. This discussion should include, but is not limited to student demand or interest, anticipated employment opportunities for graduates supported by the most current U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, state, and~~or~~ regional employment data; local or regional employment opportunities as advertised in newspapers, the employment office, or other sources; ~~,~~ or demand for graduates supported by community and business surveys. This data must be quantified to the maximum extent possible, cover a reasonable period in the future beyond the anticipated date of graduation of the first classes, and must include sources of the data. Programs that prepare teachers and other school professionals must cite the most recent data published by the Center for Educator Recruitment, Retention, and Advancement (CERRA);

NOTE: Student demand or interest may be cited in this section but, unsupported, does not constitute evidence of need. If student demand survey data is included, a copy of the survey (and basic survey methodology) must be provided.

b) a discussion of the centrality of the program to the Commission-approved mission of the institution;

c) a discussion of the relationship of the proposed program to other related programs within the institution;

~~e)~~d) a comprehensive list of similar programs in the state; and

~~d)~~e) a description of similarities and differences between the proposed program and those with similar objectives offered at other institutions in the state, the region, and the

DRAFT

nation. The discussion should include programs offered by independent institutions headquartered in South Carolina, the Southern Regional Education Board's Academic Common Market, and institutions that offer online programs to SC residents.

6. Admission Criteria

This section must address the admission criteria specific to the program.

7. Enrollment

This section must contain:

a) a Projected Total Enrollment table showing projected total student enrollment in each term for at least the first three years for associate degree programs or five years for all other degree programs (Table A). These figures should enumerate all students, including those who are already enrolled at the institution, those who transfer into the new program from other degree programs within the institution, and those who will be new to the institution and to the program (Example 1);

b) a discussion of the process by which these estimates were made, including the academic origin of students to be served; and

~~b)~~c) a discussion of the number of new students projected to enroll in the program and the number projected to transfer into the new program from other degree programs within the institution as well as the effect such transfers will have on those degree programs.

~~A table showing the estimated **new** student enrollments, by headcount and credit hours generated (see Table B, next page). This table is different from the one above in that the enrollments projected represent only **new** enrollments at the institution as opposed to students enrolled in other programs who change their majors (i.e., students already enrolled at the institution who transfer to the program must be excluded from this table). Use the data from this table to figure new costs and revenues attributed to the proposed new program.~~

~~(NOTE: New students should be counted in the semester they initially enroll and in subsequent semesters in which they are expected to attend. See Example 1)~~

Table A – Projected Total Enrollment

PROJECTED TOTAL ENROLLMENT						
YEAR	**FALL**		**SPRING**		**SUMMER**	
	Headcount	Credit Hours	Headcount	Credit Hours	Headcount	Credit Hours

DRAFT

20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						

Example 1 – Projected Total Enrollment Table

Assumptions for the example:

1. the program is a four-year program;
2. ten students from other programs within the institution will enter the new program in the first year as sophomores;
3. ten students new to the institution will enroll in the program each year;
4. new students will enter the program in the fall semester;
5. there will be some attrition between academic years;
6. students will take a full academic load; and
7. some students in the program will take summer courses.

Example 1 – Projected Total Enrollment Table

PROJECTED TOTAL ENROLLMENT						
YEAR	**FALL**		**SPRING**		**SUMMER**	
	Headcount	Credit Hours	Headcount	Credit Hours	Headcount	Credit Hours
2010 – 11	20*	300	20	300	1	3
2011 – 12	29**	435	29	435	2	6
2012 – 13	38	570	38	570	3	9
2013 – 14	37***	555	37	555	3	9
2014 – 15	36	540	36	540	3	9

*Ten new freshmen and ten internal transfer sophomores.
**Students who completed the first year plus ten new students. No internal transfer students.
***Internal transfers graduate at end of the third year and are replaced by ten new students.

DRAFT

8. Curriculum

This section must include:

a) a sample curriculum for undergraduate programs and for those graduate programs that use a required core of courses; and

b) a list of **all new courses** with catalog type descriptions that are to be added to the institution's course catalog within three years for associate degree programs or five years for all other degree programs. New courses must be clearly identified as such.

9. Assessment

This section must include:

a) a brief explanation of the assessments of student learning outcomes, other than normal grading and testing, that will be used;
b) a detailed discussion of the plan for programmatic assessment with a description of the program learning outcomes to be assessed and identification of multiple data to be collected (e.g., graduates' scores on the Graduate Record Examination or other exams used for admission to graduate and professional schools; graduates' scores on certification exams; employment data for graduates; surveys sent to employers, graduates, or admissions committees for graduate and professional schools to which graduates apply); and
c) an explanation of how program evaluation and student performance assessment data will be used to initiate changes to the program, if needed.

10. Faculty

This section must contain:

a) a Faculty List table detailing the rank (not name) and academic qualifications of each faculty member who will be involved in the proposed program (Table B);

DRAFT

Table B– Faculty List

List Staff by Rank (e.g. Professor #1, Professor #2, Associate Professor #1, etc.)	Highest Degree Earned	Field of Study	Teaching in Field (Yes/No)

DRAFT

b) enumeration and discussion of the necessary qualifications of new faculty and staff who will be added in support of the proposed program;

c) in the case of currently-employed faculty and administrators, an explanation of proposed changes in assignment and of the extent to which each new assignment may require the addition of new positions to fulfill the former assignment;

d) a description of the institutional plan for faculty development as it relates specifically to the proposed program, including but not limited to, release time for research, consulting, conferences, and curriculum development;

e) the institutional definition of full-time equivalent (FTE); and

f) a Unit Administration, Faculty, and Staff Support table (Table C), which lists new and currently employed faculty, administrators, and staff for the proposed program. The table should include the number (headcount) and the full-time equivalent (FTE) of faculty, administrators, and staff for the proposed program for at least the first three years for associate degree programs or five years for all other degree programs. An example for "Faculty" is shown in Example 2.

Table C – Unit Administration, Faculty & Staff Support

UNIT ADMINISTRATION, FACULTY, AND STAFF SUPPORT						
YEAR	**NEW**		**EXISTING**		**TOTAL**	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Administration						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
Faculty						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
Staff						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						

DRAFT

Example 2 – Sample Data for Faculty Section of Example

UNIT ADMINISTRATION, FACULTY, AND STAFF SUPPORT						
YEAR	**NEW**		**EXISTING**		**TOTAL**	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Faculty						
20xx – xx	2	.75	3	1.5	5	2.25
20xx – xx	0	0	5	2.25	5	2.25
20xx – xx	2	1.0	5	2.25	7	3.25
20xx – xx	1	.75	7	3.25	8	4.00
20xx – xx	0	0	8	4.00	8	4.00
TOTAL	**5**	**2.5**	**3**	**1.5**	**8**	**4.00**

DRAFT

11. Physical Plant

This section must include:

a) an explanation of whether or to what extent the existing physical plant will be adequate to provide space for the proposed program for at least the first three years for associate degree programs or five years for all other degree programs; and

b) a discussion of any additional physical plant requirements that will result from implementing the proposed program, including any modifications to existing facilities and an explanation of how these requirements or modifications are to be financed.

12. Equipment

This section must include a brief discussion and identification of major equipment items which will be needed for at least three years for associate degree programs or five years for all other degree programs. Normal acquisitions of commonly used items for instruction and research may be excluded.

13. Library Resources

This section must include:

~~A quantitative comparison of the institution's current holdings with a standard guide (such as the American Library Association's *Standards for College Libraries*) in relationship to the new program being proposed;~~

a) a qualitative and quantitative (i.e., number of monographs, number of serials, etc.) assessment of current holdings in view of the new program being proposed;

b) a quantitative estimate of independent acquisitions needed annually for at least the first three years for associate degree programs and for the first five years for all other degree programs and the estimated additional cost of these acquisitions; and

c) a description of how the statewide higher education electronic library (PASCAL) impacts the proposed program (include both PASCAL's universal borrowing and electronic databases). PASCAL should be included as part of the library's resource base when making calculations of need for library resources for a new program and should be noted in the proposal narrative. Although PASCAL brings substantial resources to bear, it does not obviate the need or desirability of additional library resources for a new program.

14. Accreditation, Approval, Licensure, or Certification

The section must include:

a. if the proposed program is subject to specialized or professional accreditation or approval by any entity other than the Commission (including other state agencies or boards), a brief description of the accreditation or approval process, a statement as to whether such accreditation or approval will be sought, and a statement of when that accreditation or approval may be reasonably expected;

b. if graduates of the proposed program are subject to licensure or certification by any public or private agency, a brief description of the licensure or certification process and of the ways in which the proposed program will ensure that such certification or licensure can reasonably be expected to be achieved by graduates; and

c. for programs at the graduate level that focus directly on teacher education (not educational leadership, etc.), a concise but complete description of how the proposed program addresses the core propositions of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

15. Articulation

This section must describe the institution's efforts to link the proposed program to similar programs offered by other institutions in the state.

a) Proposed associate-level programs should show a path for graduates to move into a related baccalaureate program, as appropriate.

DRAFT

b) Proposed baccalaureate-level programs should show an entry path for students from two-year institutions, as appropriate.

c) The institution should state if the proposed program leads to a degree that is normally considered to be a terminal degree.

d) Institutions should highlight collaboration with other state institutions. If the collaboration requires an MOU, a signed copy of the MOU must be provided.

e) If an institution cannot provide articulation agreements or demonstrate inter-institutional collaboration, an explanation should be provided. Institutions are encouraged to review the State Policy on Transfer, available on the Commission's website and on the South Carolina Transfer and Articulation Center at www.sctrac.org.

f) Within 18 months of the implementation of a new academic program, articulation information regarding the program must be posted to the online South Carolina Transfer and Articulation Center, www.sctrac.org, in keeping with the intent and provisions of the State Policy on Transfer, available on the Commission's website and on www.sctrac.org.

16. Estimated Costs and Sources of Financing

This section must contain:

a) an Estimated Costs and Sources of Financing by Year table, which shows estimated annual costs for at least the first three years for associate degree programs and for the first five years for all other degree programs (Table D);

DRAFT

Table D – Estimated Costs and Sources of Financing by Year

ESTIMATED COSTS BY YEAR						
CATEGORY	**1st**	**2nd**	**3rd**	**4th**	**5th**	**TOTALS**
Program Administration						
Faculty Salaries						
Graduate Assistants						
Clerical/Support Personnel						
Supplies and Materials						
Library Resources						
Equipment						
Facilities						
Other (Identify)						
TOTALS						
SOURCES OF FINANCING BY YEAR						
Tuition Funding						
Program-Specific Fees						
State Funding*						
Reallocation of Existing Funds**						
Federal Funding						
Other Funding (Specify)						
TOTALS						

*Special legislative appropriations to support the program.
**Specify significant internal sources of reallocated funds. Add additional rows as necessary.

b) a statement about the assumptions for Table D, including the estimated number of students, both in-state and out-of-state, enrolled in the proposed program;

DRAFT

c) a statement as to whether or not any unique cost or other special state appropriations will be or have been required or requested; and

d) information regarding how estimated program costs will be financed. In this section, institutions should estimate tuition funding; other state funding (e.g., special legislative appropriations); reallocation of existing funds from within the institution, including sources of the reallocated funds; federal funding; and other funding.

17. Programs for Teachers and Other School Professionals (only)

This section must address:

a) South Carolina Department of Education Requirements; and

b) SPA or Other National Specialized and/or Professional Association Standards.

DRAFT

APPENDIX C: FORMAT FOR NEW CENTER, BUREAU, OR INSTITUTE PROPOSALS

Failure to address the following components adequately may delay the center or institute's submission to the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs.

1. Cover Page

The cover page must include:

a) name of the proposing institution;

b) name of the proposed center, bureau, or institute;

c) date of submission;

d) signature of the President or Chief Executive Officer of the institution or system; and

e) center or institute contact name and contact information

2. Classification

This section must include:

a) academic unit involved;

b) proposed date of implementation; and

c) site

3. Institutional Approval

This section must include:

a) a list of titles of all internal institutional approvals (e.g., faculty committees, institutional governing board, President or Chief Executive Officer); and

b) date of each institutional approval

4. Purpose

This section must include:

a) a statement of the purpose of the center, bureau, or institute; ~~and~~

b) a discussion of the objectives of the center, bureau, or institute; and

DRAFT

~~b)~~c) a description of the plan for assessing the center, bureau, or institute after a reasonable time.

5. Justification

This section must include:

a) a discussion of the need for the center, bureau, or institute in the state;

b) a discussion of the centrality of the center, bureau, or institute to the Commission-approved mission of the institution;

c) a discussion of the relationship of the proposed center, bureau, or institute to other related centers or institutes within the institution; and

d) a description of similarities and differences between the proposed center, bureau, or institute and those with similar objectives at other institutions in the state, the region, and the nation.

6. Faculty

The section must contain:

a) a table detailing the rank (not name) and academic qualifications of each faculty member who will be involved in the center, bureau, or institute (Table E);

Table E – Faculty List

List Staff by Rank (e.g. Professor #1, Professor #2, Associate Professor #1, etc.)	Highest Degree Earned	Field of Study

DRAFT

b) enumeration and discussion of the necessary qualifications of new faculty and administrators who will be added in support of the proposed center, bureau, or institute;

c) in the case of currently-employed faculty and administrators, an explanation of proposed changes in assignment and of the extent to which each new assignment may require the addition of new positions to fulfill the former assignment;

d) the institutional definition of full-time equivalent (FTE); and

e) a Unit Administration, Faculty and Staff Support table (Table F), which lists new and currently employed faculty, administrators, and staff for the proposed center, bureau, or institute. The table should include the number (headcount) and the full-time equivalent (FTE) of faculty, administrators, and staff for the proposed center, bureau, or institute for the first five years. An example for "Faculty" is shown in Example 3.

DRAFT

Table F – Unit Administration, Faculty, and Staff Support

UNIT ADMINISTRATION, FACULTY, AND STAFF SUPPORT						
YEAR	**NEW**		**EXISTING**		**TOTAL**	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Administration						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
Faculty						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
Staff						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						

DRAFT

Example 3 – Sample Data for Faculty Section of Table

UNIT ADMINISTRATION, FACULTY, AND STAFF SUPPORT						
YEAR	**NEW**		**EXISTING**		**TOTAL**	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Faculty						
20xx – xx	2	.75	3	1.5	5	2.25
20xx – xx	0	0	5	2.25	5	2.25
20xx – xx	2	1.0	5	2.25	7	3.25
20xx – xx	1	.75	7	3.25	8	4.00
20xx – xx	0	0	8	4.00	8	4.00
TOTAL	**5**	**2.5**	**3**	**1.5**	**8**	**4.00**

DRAFT

7. Physical Plant

This section must include:

- an explanation of whether or to what extent the existing physical plant will be adequate to provide space for the proposed center, bureau, or institute; and

- a discussion of any additional physical plant requirements that will result from implementing the proposed center, bureau, or institute, including any modifications to existing facilities and an explanation of how these requirements or modifications are to be financed.

8. Equipment

This section must include a brief discussion and identification of major equipment items which will be needed to support the center, bureau, or institute for at least the first five years. Normal acquisitions of commonly used items for instruction and research may be excluded.

9. Library Resources

This section must include the following:

a) a qualitative and quantitative (i.e., number of monographs, number of serials, etc.) assessment of current holdings in view of the center, bureau, or institute being proposed;

b) a quantitative estimate of independent acquisitions needed annually for at least the first five years and the estimated additional cost of these acquisitions; and

c) a description of how the statewide higher education electronic library (PASCAL) impacts the proposed center, bureau, or institute (include both PASCAL's universal borrowing and electronic databases). PASCAL should be included as part of the library's resource base when making calculations of need for library resources and should be noted in the proposal narrative. Although PASCAL brings substantial resources to bear, it does not obviate the need or desirability of additional library resources for a new center or institute.

10. Estimated Costs and Sources of Financing

This section must contain the following:

a) an Estimated Costs and Sources of Financing by Year table, which shows estimated annual costs for the first five years (Table G);

DRAFT

Table G - Costs to the Institution and Sources of Financing

ESTIMATED COSTS BY YEAR						
CATEGORY	**1st**	**2nd**	**3rd**	**4th**	**5th**	**TOTALS**
Program Administration						
Faculty Salaries						
Graduate Assistants						
Clerical/Support Personnel						
Supplies and Materials						
Library Resources						
Equipment						
Facilities						
Other (Identify)						
TOTALS						
SOURCES OF FINANCING BY YEAR						
Tuition Funding						
Program-Specific Fees						
State Funding*						
Reallocation of Existing Funds**						
Federal Funding						
Other Funding (Specify)						
TOTALS						

*Special legislative appropriations to support the program.
**Specify significant internal sources of reallocated funds. Add additional rows as necessary.

b) a statement as to whether or not any unique cost or other special state appropriations will be or have been required or requested; and

DRAFT

c) information regarding how estimated center, bureau, or institute costs will be financed. In this section, institutions should estimate other state funding (e.g., special legislative appropriations); reallocation of existing funds from within the institution, including sources of the reallocated funds; federal funding; and other funding.

DRAFT

APPENDIX D: FORMAT FOR PROGRAM MODIFICATION PROPOSALS

Failure to address the following components adequately may delay the program's submission to the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs.

1. Cover Page

The cover page must include:

a) name of the proposing institution;

b) program title, including concentrations, options, and tracks;

c) date of submission;

d) signature of the President or Chief Executive Officer of the institution or system; and

e) program contact name and contact information.

2. Classification

This section must include the following information:

a) program title;

b) concentrations, options, and tracks;

c) academic unit in which the program resides;

d) designation, type, and level of degree (if baccalaureate, specify four- or five-year);

e) proposed date of implementation;

f) current CIP code of the program to be modified;

~~Proposed CIP code of the program after modification~~

g) site;

h) whether the program qualifies for supplemental Palmetto Fellows Scholarship and LIFE Scholarship awards;

i) delivery mode; and

j) area of certification (only for programs that prepare teachers and other school professionals).

DRAFT

3. Institutional Approval

This section must include:

a) a list of titles of all internal institutional approvals (e.g., faculty committees, institutional governing board, President or Chief Executive Officer); and

b) date of each institutional approval.

4. Purpose

This section must include:

a) a detailed description of the proposed modification;

b) a statement of the purpose of the modified program; and

c) a discussion of the objectives of the modified program.

5. Justification

This section must include:

a) a discussion of the need and rationale for the proposed modification; and

b) a discussion of the centrality of the modified program to the Commission-approved mission of the institution.

6. Enrollment

This section must contain:

a) a discussion of the impact of the proposed modification on student enrollment; and

b) an Estimated New Enrollment table showing the estimated **new** student enrollment by headcount and credit hours generated (Table H). The table must represent **only new enrollments** at the institution resulting from the proposed modification (i.e., students already enrolled at the institution who transfer to the program must be excluded).

NOTES:

1. New students should be counted in the semester they initially enroll and in subsequent semesters in which they are expected to attend.
2. This table may be omitted if no new enrollment is expected because of the modification. In such cases, an explanation for the absence of the table is required.

DRAFT

Table H – Estimated New Enrollment

ESTIMATED NEW ENROLLMENT						
YEAR	**FALL**		**SPRING**		**SUMMER**	
	Headcount	Credit Hours	Headcount	Credit Hours	Headcount	Credit Hours
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						
20xx – xx						

DRAFT

7. Curriculum

This section must include:

a) a discussion of curricular changes required for the proposed modification; and

b) a list of **all new courses** with catalog type descriptions that are to be added to the institution's course catalog as a result of the modification within three years for associate degree programs or five years for all other degree programs. New courses must be clearly identified as such.

8. Faculty

This section must discuss faculty changes, including the addition of new faculty necessary to support the proposed modification.

9. Physical Plant

This section must include:

a) an explanation of the proposed modification's effect on the physical plant's ability to support the program; and

b) a discussion of any additional physical plant requirements resulting from the modification, including any changes to existing facilities and an explanation of how these requirements or changes are to be financed.

10. Equipment

This section must include a brief discussion and identification of major equipment items which will be needed to support the modification for at least three years for associate degree programs or five years for all other degree programs. Normal acquisitions of commonly used items for instruction and research may be excluded.

11. Library Resources

This section must include:

a) a statement of the proposed modification's effect on the library's ability to support the program;

b) a quantitative estimate of independent acquisitions needed annually for at least the first three years for associate degree programs and for the first five years for all other degree programs and the estimated additional cost of these acquisitions; and

c) a description of how the statewide higher education electronic library (PASCAL) impacts the proposed modified program (include both PASCAL's universal borrowing and electronic databases). PASCAL should be included as part of the library's resource base when making calculations of need for library resources for a modified program and should be noted in the proposal narrative. Although PASCAL brings substantial resources to bear, it does not obviate the need or desirability of additional library resources.

12. Accreditation, Approval, Licensure, or Certification

This section must include:

a) a discussion of the proposed modification's impact on program accreditation;

b) if the proposed modification results in the program's being subject to specialized or professional accreditation or approval by any entity other than the Commission (including other state agencies or boards), a brief description of the accreditation or approval process, a statement as to whether such accreditation or approval will be sought, and a statement as to when that accreditation or approval may be reasonably expected; and

c) if graduates of the program are made subject by the proposed modification to licensure or certification by any public or private agency, a brief description of the licensure or certification process and of the ways in which the proposed program will ensure that such certification or licensure can reasonably be expected to be achieved by graduates.

For programs that prepare teachers and other school professionals, modifications which include changes in the curriculum should also contain the following:

DRAFT

d) for modifications to programs that lead to initial teacher certification or to licensure or certification of other school professionals (e.g., principals, superintendents, and counselors), a concise but complete description of how the proposed program modification addresses national Specialty Professional Association standards and State Content Standards; and

e) for modifications to programs at the graduate level that focus directly on teacher education (not educational leadership, etc.), a concise but complete description of how the proposed program modification addresses the core propositions of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

13. Estimated Costs and Sources of Financing

This section must contain:

a) a discussion of the proposed modification's cost to the institution;

b) an Estimated Costs and Sources of Financing by Year table, which shows estimated annual costs for at least the first three years for associate degree programs and for the first five years for all others (Table I);

DRAFT

Table I - Costs to the Institution and Sources of Financing

ESTIMATED COSTS BY YEAR						
CATEGORY	**1st**	**2nd**	**3rd**	**4th**	**5th**	**TOTALS**
Program Administration						
Faculty Salaries						
Graduate Assistants						
Clerical/Support Personnel						
Supplies and Materials						
Library Resources						
Equipment						
Facilities						
Other (Identify)						
TOTALS						
SOURCES OF FINANCING BY YEAR						
Tuition Funding						
Program-Specific Fees						
State Funding*						
Reallocation of Existing Funds**						
Federal Funding						
Other Funding (Specify)						
TOTALS						

*Special legislative appropriations to support the program.
**Specify significant internal sources of reallocated funds. Add additional rows as necessary.

DRAFT

c) a statement about the assumptions for Table I, including the estimated number of students, both in-state and out-of-state, enrolled in the proposed program;

~~c)~~d) a statement as to whether or not any unique cost or other special state appropriations will be or have been required or requested; and

~~d)~~e) information regarding how estimated program costs will be financed. In this section, institutions should estimate tuition funding; other state funding (e.g., special legislative appropriations); reallocation of existing funds from within the institution, including sources of the reallocated funds; federal funding; and other funding.

14. Programs for Teachers and Other School Professionals (only)

This section must address:

a) South Carolina Department of Education Requirements; and

b) SPA or Other National Specialized and/or Professional Association Standards.

DRAFT

APPENDIX E: NOTIFICATION OF CHANGE IN AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM OR ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT FORM

The *Notification of Change in an Academic Program or Organizational Unit* form must be submitted **electronically in pdf format** to the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing and must include the appropriate signature.

Technical Colleges must submit the form to the South Carolina Technical College System (SCTCS) at the address below:

Office of Academic Affairs
South Carolina Technical College System
111 Executive Center Drive
Columbia, SC 29210

The SCTCS will then send the form to the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing at the Commission. All other institutions must send the form directly to the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing.

DRAFT

S.C. Commission on Higher Education
Notification of Change in an Academic Program or Organizational Unit
(One Program per Form)

Institution: _____

Implementation date for change: _____

Current program title, including concentrations, options, and tracks: _____

_____

Degree designation, type, and level (if baccalaureate, please specify four- or five-year): _____

_____

Site of delivery:_____

Mode of delivery and percentage of coursework offered by each mode: _____

_____

CIP code (confirmed by CHE): _____ Site code (assigned by CHE):_____

Nature of change and summary of the rationale for and objectives of the program:
(Please include the number of credit hours the change entails.)

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Course required for new certificates, concentrations, option, or tracks (prefix, number, title, and credit hours):

_____
_____
_____
_____

Information on courses in major, general education and electives requirements, and the number of credits required for graduation, if changing:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

_____ _____
Signature of Chief Executive or Chief Academic Officer Date

DRAFT

APPENDIX F: NOTIFICATION OF TERMINATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM, CONCENTRATION(S), OR ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT FORM

The *Notification of Termination of Academic Program, Concentration(s), or Organizational Unit* form must be submitted **electronically in pdf format** to the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing and must include the appropriate signature.

Technical Colleges must submit the form to the South Carolina Technical College System (SCTCS) at the address below:

Office of Academic Affairs
South Carolina Technical College System
111 Executive Center Drive
Columbia, SC 29210

The SCTCS will then send the form to the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing at the Commission. All other institutions must send the form directly to the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing.

DRAFT

S.C. Commission on Higher Education
Notification of Termination of Academic Program, Concentration(s), or Organizational Unit
(One Program per Form)

Institution terminating the program: _____

Degree designation: _____

Program title and concentration(s), if applicable: _____

_____

CIP code: _____

Site code(s): _____; _____; _____

Distance delivered program? Yes _____ No _____

Date program will be closed to new students: (mo/year) _____

Date data file will be closed: (mo/yr) _____
(Date by which all currently enrolled students will have graduated or transferred to other programs)

Reason for termination: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Discussion of plan to teach out students currently enrolled: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____ _____
Signature of Chief Executive or Chief Academic Officer Date

DRAFT

APPENDIX G: ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The purpose of the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs (ACAP) is to advise the Commission, principally through the staff and the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing, on all matters relating to academic affairs generally, and specifically to advise these bodies on matters relating to new and existing programs.

The members of ACAP shall consist of the following persons *ex officio*:

a) The Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing of the Commission, who shall serve as Chair;
b) The Chief Academic Officer (CAO) of each of the public senior colleges and universities;
c) The CAO of the staff of the SC Technical College System;
d) The CAO from three technical colleges, to be appointed for two-year terms by the Technical College Chief Academic Officers Peer Group, to take effect on July 1st ; and
e) The Vice Provost for System Affairs and Executive Dean for Regional Campuses and Continuing Education representative of the two-year institutions of the USC System.

Program Planning Summaries will be made available to ACAP for review with comments required from each member. ACAP will meet regularly at least ~~four~~ three times annually for the purpose of reviewing proposals for new and modified programs. Meeting dates will be set at the beginning of each fiscal year. Special meetings may be called by the Chair or at the request of a majority of members. The meeting agenda and supporting materials will be mailed to ACAP members by the Chair at least one week in advance of each meeting. A majority of the membership will constitute a quorum at any meeting. Non-recommendation for approval of a proposal by ACAP will not remove a proposal from the approval process. The proposing institution may elect voluntarily to withdraw its proposal.

ACAP may undertake such studies and make such recommendations to the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing (CAAL) as it deems necessary. Matters may also be referred to ACAP for its study and advice by CAAL or by the Commission.

DRAFT

South Carolina
Commission on Higher Education

Brig Gen John L. Finan, USAF (Ret.), Chair
Dr. Bettie Rose Horne, Vice Chair
Ms. Natasha M. Hanna
Ms. Elizabeth Jackson
Dr. Raghu Korrapati
Ms. Leah B. Moody
Vice Admiral Charles Munns, USN (ret.)
Mr. Kim F. Phillips
Mr. Y. W. Scarborough, III
Dr. Jennifer B. Settlemyer
Mr. Rodney A. Smolla
Mr. Hood Temple
The Honorable Lewis R. Vaughn

Ms. Julie J. Carullo
Acting Executive Director

CHE
10-04-2012
Agenda Item 7.02.G

October 4, 2012

MEMORANDUM

To: Chairman John L. Finan and Members, S.C. Commission on Higher Education

From: Dr. Bettie Rose Horne, Chair, and Members, Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing

Revisions to the *Policies and Procedures for New Academic Programs and Centers, Program Modifications, and Program Terminations*

In the spirit of regulatory relief for the institutions and Commission staff given financial exigencies confronting the state at the time, the Commission adopted significant revisions to the *Policies and Procedures for New Academic Programs and Centers, Program Modifications, and Program Terminations* (the *Policy*) on March 5, 2009. In this revision process, the *Policy* was modified to allow for the expansion of approved programs to new sites with only a Notification of Change required to be submitted. Prior to this revision, institutions were required to obtain Commission approval of a program modification if an institution proposed to offer 50 percent or more of any existing approved degree program off-site by traditional instruction within a three-year period for an associate's, baccalaureate, specialist, master's, and first professional programs or within a five-year period for doctoral programs. This policy revision produced unforeseen and unintended consequences which are not in the best interest of the state or the institutions. As a result, certain policy changes approved in March 2009 warranted reconsideration. The Commission, on May 3, 2012, passed a resolution requiring Commission staff to:

1. re-instate the requirements applicable to all public colleges and universities concerning the transfer or expansion of an approved program to a new site in place before March 5, 2009; and

2. undertake a review of the *Policy* and present recommendations for a modified *Policy* to the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing on or by its September 6, 2012, meeting.

Since the passing of this resolution on May 3, 2012, Commission staff have completed a thorough review of the *Policy* and made several substantive changes. At the July 12, 2012, ACAP meeting, the staff highlighted the revisions and explained that the staff changes would distribute the revised document to ACAP members for their review and feedback. Subsequently the staff

distributed a draft of the revised Policy to and solicited feedback from members of the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs (ACAP). Commission staff incorporated the edits suggested by ACAP members.

At its September 6, 2012, meeting, the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing (CAAL) considered the *Policy* and requested that the staff provide several amendments. The changes have been incorporated to make language consistent, describe ways for institutions to expedite approvals, and strengthen the description of how institutions justify programs and conduct program and student assessments. Following the meeting, the staff provided an amended proposed document to CAAL members who agreed to move the *Policy* to the consent agenda for the October 4 meeting of the Commission.

Some of the substantive changes to the *Policy* include:

- reorganizing the *Policy* for readability, accessibility, clarity, and concision;
- adding, deleting, clarifying, or strengthening definitions;
- reducing the credit hour threshold for institutions to submit a Program Modification Proposal for the addition of new concentrations, tracks, or options offered within an existing major to 12 credit hours, instead of 18, for master's, specialist, and doctoral programs (the credit hour threshold remains 18 for undergraduate programs in such cases);
- requiring institutions to submit a New Program Proposal when changing to or adding a second degree designation at the same level (e.g., B.A. to B.S. or M.A. to M.S.);
- requiring institutions to submit a New Program Proposal when adding a concentration to a program that prepares teachers and other school professionals which leads to a new certification;
- re-instating the requirements applicable to all public colleges and universities concerning the transfer or expansion of an approved program to a new site in place before March 5, 2009, with the exception that institutions with programs that prepare teachers and other school professionals at the graduate level may submit a Notification of Change instead of a Program Modification Proposal for programs offered off-site if the institution has a time-limited contract with a local education agency to offer the program;
- requiring institutions to submit a Program Modification Proposal for the extension of an approved program to a delivery site, regardless of delivery mode;
- emphasizing that when a program no longer satisfies requirements for necessary accreditation or approval by a state board or agency other than the Commission (e.g., State Board of Nursing or State Department of Education) or no longer meets the productivity standards set forth by the Commission, the institution should terminate the program;
- revising the program evaluation procedures so that both the Program Planning Summary and New Program Proposals are reviewed and commented upon by ACAP;
- adjusting the schedule of the program evaluation process so that there are three program review cycles each year instead of four and so that the three cycles are evenly spaced;
- requiring that proposals for new doctoral programs include a justification of the choice of evaluator as well as the educational qualifications and background of the evaluator;
- requiring that proposals for new academic programs show how graduates will contribute to the economic development of the state; and
- revising the proposal formats as appendices to fit the modified *Policy*.

The revised *Policy* (Attachment A) is included for review. The markup version with changes shown in context is posted on the web site with this agenda item.

Recommendation

The Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing recommends that the Commission approve the revised *Policies and Procedures for New Academic Programs and Centers, Program Modifications, and Program Terminations* to be implemented immediately upon approval.