

Advisory Committee on Academic Programs

Minutes of June 19, 2014

Members Present

Dr. MaryAnn Janosik, Chair
Dr. Richard Chapman, Francis Marion University
Dr. Ron Drayton, Midlands Technical College
Dr. Donna Elmore, Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College
Dr. Gordon Haist, University of South Carolina Beaufort
Dr. George Hynd, College of Charleston
Dr. Hope Rivers, S.C. Technical College System, via teleconference

Guests Representing Members

Dr. John Beard, Coastal Carolina University, representing Dr. Ralph Byington
Dr. Warren Carson, University of South Carolina Upstate, representing Dr. John Masterson
Mr. Tim Drueke, Winthrop University, representing Dr. Debra Boyd
Dr. Kris Finnigan, University of South Carolina Columbia, representing Dr. Michael Amiridis
Dr. Debra Jackson, Clemson University, representing Dr. Nadim Aziz
Dr. Learie Luke, South Carolina State University, representing Dr. W. Franklin Evans
Dr. Bob McNamara, The Citadel, representing Dr. Sam Hines
Mr. Tom Nelson, Lander University, representing Dr. David Mash
Dr. Darlene Shaw, Medical University of South Carolina, representing Dr. Mark Sothmann

Staff Present

Mr. Clay Barton	Dr. Rachel Harvey
Ms. Laura Belcher	Ms. Trena Houp
Dr. Paula Gregg	Dr. John Lane
Mrs. Lane Goodwin	Ms. Edna Strange

Guests

Ms. Marcia Berry, South Carolina Department of Education	Dr. Peter King, Francis Marion University
Dr. Pat Bohannon, Coastal Carolina University	Dr. Ruhullah Massoudi, South Carolina State University
Dr. D. Matthew Boyer, Clemson University	Dr. Mary Padua, Clemson University
Dr. Mikel Cole, Clemson University	Dr. Michael Roberts, Coastal Carolina University
Dr. Brian Conner, Medical University of South Carolina	Ms. Cathy Stark, South Carolina Department of Education
Dr. Joshua Davis, College of Charleston	Dr. Suzanne Thomas, Medical University of South Carolina
Dr. Linda Gambrel, Clemson University	Ms. Briana Timmerman, South Carolina Department of Education
Dr. Janie Hodge, Clemson University	Dr. Cindy Wright, Medical University of South Carolina
Dr. Edward Jadallah, Coastal Carolina University	
Dr. Ethel Jones, South Carolina State University	

1. Introductions

Dr. Janosik called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m. She welcomed all in attendance and asked institutional representatives and visitors to introduce themselves.

2. Consideration of Minutes of February 20, 2014

Dr. Janosik requested a motion to accept the minutes of February 20, 2014, as distributed. The motion was **moved** (Drueke) and **seconded** (Drayton) and the Committee **voted unanimously to accept the minutes as presented.**

3. Consideration of New Program Proposals

a. Clemson University, B.A., World Cinema

Dr. Jackson introduced the program proposal from Clemson University. A motion to approve the proposed program was **moved** (Jackson) and **seconded** (Chapman). Dr. Jackson explained that the program is designed to prepare students in both using and processing visual information. She stated that the program combines existing minor programs and builds on both the undergraduate Productions Studies in Art program and the graduate Digital Production Studies graduate program. She stated that a survey of students showed great interest in the program and that there are employment opportunities across the Southeast for graduates of the program.

Dr. Haist asked whether the program requires three years of foreign language. Dr. Jackson answered that students in Bachelor of Arts programs are required to take three years of foreign language. She also added that students in the program will either study abroad or complete an internship. Dr. Janosik asked why the program's title is not Film Studies. Dr. Jackson answered that the World Cinema title ensures that students begin to consider film in its broader impact; that the program focuses not on the study of film but more on the study of the world's reaction to film; and that the program encourages students to analyze how film influences culture and literature.

Dr. Jackson informed the Committee that the program will require a cognate so that students will learn specific skills related to employment in the current marketplace. Dr. Janosik asked Clemson to include a list of course titles and more employment options data in the proposal. Dr. Jackson agreed to add the requested information.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the new program proposal for Clemson University to offer a program leading to the Bachelor of Arts degree in World Cinema, to be implemented in Fall 2015.

b. Clemson University, M.A.T., Special Education with three concentrations

Dr. Jackson introduced the new program proposal from Clemson University. A motion to approve the proposed program was **moved** (Jackson) and **seconded** (Drueke). Dr. Jackson explained that part of the program's justification is the large number (2318) of special education teacher positions open in the state. She continued by stating that the program builds on the successful Master of Education program at Clemson. She explained that the Master of Arts in Teaching degree will allow individuals with undergraduate degrees in fields other than education

to enter the teaching profession. Dr. Beard asked whether the program limits the types of degrees potential applicants should possess and whether a graduate would be eligible for certification. Dr. Jackson responded that a student could have an undergraduate degree in any subject and upon completion of the M.A.T. will be eligible for certification.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the new program proposal for Clemson University to offer a program leading to the Master of Arts in Teaching degree in Special Education with concentrations in Learning Disabilities, Intellectual Disabilities, and Emotional/Behavioral Disorders to be implemented Summer 2015.

c. Clemson University, Ph.D., Learning Sciences

Dr. Jackson introduced the new program proposal from Clemson University. A motion to approve the proposed program was **moved** (Jackson) and **seconded** (Beard). Dr. Jackson described the program as an interdisciplinary approach to train students' best teaching practices with a focus on the STEM fields. She stated that the proposed program builds on the strength of other Clemson programs and that the program encourages students to pursue a cognate area. She explained that graduates will have employment opportunities which align with their cognate areas in addition to opportunities in the education field as faculty members or researchers. Dr. Boyer expounded on interdisciplinary employment opportunities by explaining that graduates will have expertise in learning analytics, data use, data mining tools, and applied research, which may be applied in multiple employment fields.

Dr. Jackson explained that USC Columbia has a related Ph.D. in Educational Psychology but that Clemson's proposed program and USC's program have distinct foci. Dr. Finnigan informed the Committee that USC shared comments and concerns from its faculty with CHE staff and Clemson. She stated that USC was still concerned about the proposed program even though Clemson revised the proposal to address USC's concerns.. Dr. Finnigan explained that the curriculum for USC's Ph.D. in Education Psychology was recently revised, making the programs more similar. She expressed concern about the field's saturation point, as other schools in neighboring states offer similar programs. Dr. Finnigan asked specifically about anticipated enrollment, and Dr. Jackson replied that the program will be small, having a capacity for sixteen students. Dr. Finnigan stated that USC will be interested in collaborating on grants, especially since the student pool may decrease with a second program in the state. Dr. Jackson agreed on the importance of collaboration.

Dr. Janosik asked about the name differences. Dr. Boyer responded that a key difference regards the types of learning environments in that Education Psychology programs focus on formal learning environments like schools and Learning Sciences programs focus on informal learning environments like the healthcare and defense arenas. Dr. Jackson explained more of the differences between Educational Psychology and Learning Sciences by reading an excerpt from the program's external review:

One line of argument the proposal takes is to distinguish the Learning Sciences from Educational Psychology. The proposal is correct in making this distinction while also noting some common concerns (like a focus of theories of learning and cognition); Learning Sciences is interdisciplinary, more concerned with creating new learning tools and environments, and the Learning Sciences take a much more varied collection of settings as sites for research and design, spanning both schools and non-school

learning environments. The Learning Sciences is a growing 'brand', as evidenced by the list of national and international programs listed in the proposal. The number of universities on that list has probably tripled in the last ten years. Once we created the Learning Sciences program at the University of Washington, it became clear that PhD applicants to our Educational Psychology program (of which I was also a faculty member) and our Learning Sciences program were different sorts of people. And in just a couple years, the Learning Sciences program was receiving *much* stronger applicants (in terms of academic record) than was the Educational Psychology program. (Reed Stevens)

Mr. Nelson asked about the discrepancy between costs and revenues in the budget. He suggested that the proposal include an explanation about the offset of costs by other revenues at the school. Dr. Jackson agreed to provide an explanation.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the new program proposal for Clemson University to offer a program leading to the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Learning Sciences to be implemented January 2015.

d. Clemson University, Ph.D., Literacy, Language and Culture

Dr. Jackson introduced the new program proposal from Clemson University. A motion to approve the proposed program was **moved** (Jackson) and **seconded** (Finnigan). Dr. Jackson explained the impetus behind two of the three proposed Ph.D. programs. She stated that Clemson currently offers a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction with many concentrations, including literacy. She informed the Committee that Clemson concluded that taking the concentrations and making them stand-alone Ph.D. degrees would provide students a specialized degree and better serve research endeavors. Dr. Jackson explained that the program expands on the concentration to cover language and culture and will train students who are skilled in the ability of developing new knowledge and theories in regards to how to teach literacy.

Mr. Nelson referred to statements about assessment on page ten of the proposal and then asked about student learning outcomes. Dr. Jackson referred to page three of the proposal for a list of the student learning outcomes.

Dr. Janosik asked about enrollment. Dr. Jackson explained that twelve students are currently in the concentration of literacy under the Ph.D. for Curriculum and Instruction. She stated that Clemson predicts that at least three students will transfer to the Ph.D. in Literacy, Language and Culture, and that the program will grow slowly over five years to a capacity of sixteen students.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the new program proposal for Clemson University to offer a program leading to the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Literacy, Language and Culture to be implemented Fall 2015.

e. Clemson University, Ph.D., Special Education

Dr. Jackson introduced the new program proposal from Clemson University. A motion to approve the proposed program was **moved** (Jackson) and **seconded** (Shaw). Dr. Jackson explained the impetus behind two of the three proposed Ph.D. programs. She stated that

Clemson currently offers a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction with many concentrations, including special education. She informed the Committee that Clemson realized that taking the concentrations and making them stand-alone Ph.D. degrees would provide students a specialized degree and better serve research endeavors. Dr. Jackson spoke specifically to the Ph.D. in Special Education by describing that the program will train the next generation of faculty in the most advanced research and knowledge for the field. She stated that USC Columbia has a similar degree and that its faculty support Clemson's proposed program. Future collaborations are thus anticipated.

Dr. Beard asked whether there were other employment opportunities for a graduate who chose not to become a professor. Dr. Hodge answered that a graduate might pursue a research position including opportunities at state education departments and the federal education department. Dr. Janosik encouraged Clemson to stress partnership and collaboration with other institutions as a great benefit for the state as a whole. Dr. Jackson agreed and added that federal funding rarely is granted to single institutions and that grantors are more interested in collaborative groups and consortiums. She stated that collaborative work in the right area of research supported with federal funding leads to an improvement in education. Dr. Hodge explained that there is a critical need for Special Education faculty across the nation.

Dr. Beard recognized that Ph.D. programs usually have a discrepancy between costs and revenue, but he expressed concerns about Commissioners' reaction to an unbalanced budget table. Dr. Janosik replied that Clemson needs to be prepared to offer a full explanation as to the discrepancy and possibly include the explanation in the proposal. Dr. Jackson stated that the funding is complicated; faculty members are already paid and the M.A.T. program's revenue helps to offset the costs of the Ph.D. program, as graduate programs normally do at other institutions. Dr. Beard commented that programs on a university's campus do not exist in isolation, but the approval process for academic degree programs at CHE forces the program to be analyzed in isolation, leading to questions and concerns.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the new program proposal for Clemson University to offer a program leading to the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Special Education to be implemented Fall 2015.

f. College of Charleston, B.S., A.B., Supply Chain Management

Dr. Hynd introduced the new program proposal from the College of Charleston. A motion to approve the proposed program was **moved** (Hynd) and **seconded** (Chapman). Dr. Hynd informed the Committee that the College has recently created a new department of Supply Chain and Information Management, housed in the School of Business. He explained that the proposed program helps the College connect with various opportunities in the Lowcountry. He described the arrival of Boeing as changing the landscape of the Lowcountry and the workforce as well. Dr. Hynd also mentioned other high tech industries in the area, including BMW, Bridgestone and Michelin, which would benefit from well-trained employees in the field of supply chain logistics.

Dr. Elmore asked about articulation with technical colleges. Dr. Davis responded that the College has engaged in conversations with Trident Technical College about this degree program. Dr. Beard asked whether the College has had any issues with the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) regarding the program being housed in the School of Business. Dr. Davis answered that there are not any issues and that the College plans to use the AACSB assessment metrics for the program.

Dr. Rivers suggested that the College add a statement about collaboration with technical colleges to the paragraph about articulation. She also encouraged the College to consult with technical colleges about course development and creation. Dr. Elmore agreed and commented that collaboration is a benefit for students, institutions, the state and the workforce.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program proposal for the College of Charleston to offer a new program leading to the Bachelor of Science and Artium Baccalaureatus degrees in Supply Chain Management, to be implemented in Fall 2015.

g. Francis Marion University, M.S., Physician Assistant Studies

Dr. Chapman introduced the new program proposal from Francis Marion University. A motion to approve the proposed program was **moved** (Chapman) and **seconded** (Luke). Dr. Chapman explained that the program was developed in accordance with the strategic plan of the PeeDee Health Education Partnership, a consortium between the USC Columbia, FMU, McCleod Health and Carolinas Hospital Systems. He stated that the program was developed in consultation with the USC School of Medicine and that the final design and curriculum were developed in conjunction with the Wake Forest University School of Medicine. He informed the Committee that the program will be housed in a new health sciences facility located in downtown Florence.

Dr. Beard asked whether the program requires a specific undergraduate degree. Dr. King answered, "no," but added that the student must have taken certain science pre-requisites and have had clinical experience. Dr. Beard asked whether the clinical experience can be a volunteer experience. Dr. King answered that it can be a volunteer experience.

Dr. Janosik asked about enrollment projections. Dr. Chapman and Dr. King explained that the University anticipated enrolling 32 students a year in a 27-month program.

Dr. Beard asked about the differences between a physician assistant and a nurse practitioner program. Dr. Chapman responded that a nurse practitioner must have a bachelor's degree in Nursing. He also explained that the two have different scopes of practice in that nurse practitioners have more autonomy in practice, including the ability to prescribe certain medications, while a physician assistant works more closely under the supervision of a physician.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program proposal for Francis Marion University to offer a new program leading to the Master of Science degree in Physician Assistant Studies, to be implemented in Fall 2016.

h. Medical University of South Carolina, M.S., Medical Sciences

Dr. Shaw introduced the new program proposal from the Medical University of South Carolina. A motion to approve the proposed program was **moved** (Shaw) and **seconded** (Beard). Dr. Shaw informed the Committee that MUSC hopes to transform its current successful certificate in Medical Sciences into Master of Science in Medical Sciences. She explained that the degree will prepare graduates to perform well in health sciences degree programs such as the M.D. and D.M.D. programs and will train graduates in technical skills which will be utilized in biomedical employment positions in the workforce.

Dr. Haist asked whether MUSC views the program as a bridge to industry. Dr. Wright responded that the program can be a bridge to the health and biomedical science industry, including pharmaceutical companies. Dr. Janosik asked whether the enrollment projections are robust enough to support the degree. Dr. Wright answered that that the enrollment projections are robust for MUSC.

Dr. Beard noted that the projected revenue for the program is four times the cost of the program. Dr. Shaw responded that the revenue will help to offset costs of more expensive degrees such as Ph.D. programs.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program proposal for the Medical University of South Carolina to offer a new program leading to the Master of Science degree in Medical Sciences, to be implemented in Summer 2015.

4. Consideration of Program Modifications

a. Clemson University, B.A., Landscape Architecture, Move from five-year degree to four-year degree

Dr. Jackson introduced the program modification from Clemson University. A motion to approve the proposed program modification was **moved** (Jackson) and **seconded** (Beard). Dr. Jackson explained that Clemson plans to reduce the number of credit hours, changing the program from a five-year degree to a four-year degree, without compromising its quality. She stated that the change is considered substantive according to SACS and therefore SACS will be notified. She commented that the change does not jeopardize the program's accreditation by the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board. Dr. Padua informed the Committee that Clemson has streamlined and strengthened the curriculum to concentrate on core ideas and reduced the number of required general education credit hours.

Mr. Nelson asked for more information regarding the changes to the curriculum. Dr. Padua answered that a table of courses could be provided.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program modification for Clemson University to modify its program leading to the Bachelor of Arts degree in Landscape Architecture to move from a five-year degree to a four-year degree, to be implemented in January 2015.

b. Coastal Carolina University, B.A., Special Education: Multi-Categorical, Program redesign

Dr. Beard introduced the program modification from Coastal Carolina University. A motion to approve the proposed program modification was **moved** (Beard) and **seconded** (Drueke). Dr. Beard explained that Coastal currently has a Special Education program with a focus on learning disabilities. He stated that the modification moves the program from this narrow focus to a broader one that includes other areas within Special Education. He added that school districts support the modification and that Coastal is confident students will be more employable as graduates of this modified program.

Dr. Harvey asked how the change will affect licensure. Dr. Jadallah answered that the graduates will be licensed in the multi-categorical focus.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program modification for Coastal Carolina University to modify its program leading to the Bachelor of Arts degree in Special Education: Multi-Categorical to redesign the program, to be implemented in Fall 2015.

c. Coastal Carolina University, B.S., Nursing, RN to BSN Completion, Add Online Delivery

Dr. Beard introduced the program modification from Coastal Carolina University. A motion to approve the proposed program modification was **moved** (Beard) and **seconded** (Hynd). Dr. Beard explained that the modification allows for online delivery in addition to the traditional delivery currently offered. He stated that increasing demand for this degree and the prevalence of students who are working full-time in the field led Coastal to pursue online delivery. He informed the Committee that Coastal executed a pilot program this past year which was successful.

Dr. Janosik asked whether the enrollment projection of 17 students is a maximum for the program. Dr. Bohannon answered that the number is based on the pilot project but that Coastal would welcome more students.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program modification for Coastal Carolina University to modify its program leading to the Bachelor of Science degree in Nursing, RN to BSN Completion to add online delivery, to be implemented in Fall 2014.

d. Medical University of South Carolina B.S., Nursing, RN to BSN Completion, Re-activate the program

Dr. Shaw introduced the program modification from the Medical University of South Carolina. A motion to approve the proposed program modification was **moved** (Shaw) and **seconded** (Jackson). Dr. Shaw informed the Committee that MUSC wishes to re-activate its RN to BSN Completion program and offer it online over three semesters. She explained that the program will help graduates achieve higher level positions in nursing and that there are approximately 800 potential students working in the MUSC Hospital System currently who are eligible for the program.

Dr. Beard asked why MUSC closed the program initially. Dr. Conner answered that the program was not attracting enough students to continue offering it. She explained that the changes were made to the program to address this issue.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program modification for the Medical University of South Carolina to modify its program leading to the Bachelor of Science degree in Nursing, RN to BSN Completion to re-activate the program, to be implemented in Fall 2014.

e. South Carolina State University, B.S., Chemistry, Add four concentrations

Dr. Luke introduced the program modification from South Carolina State University. A motion to approve the proposed program modification was **moved** (Luke) and **seconded** (Drueke). Dr. Luke explained that the modification is the result of a need to correct discrepancies between S.C. State offerings and the CHE Inventory of Academic Programs.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program modification for South Carolina State University to modify its program leading to the Bachelor of Science degree in

Chemistry to add concentrations in Pre-Health Career, Graduate School /Industry, Radiochemistry, and Environmental Science, to be implemented in Fall 2014.

f. South Carolina State University, B.S., Nutritional and Food Management, Add two concentrations

Dr. Luke introduced the program modification from South Carolina State University. A motion to approve the proposed program modification was **moved** (Luke) and **seconded** (Drueke). Dr. Luke explained that the modification is the result of a need to correct discrepancies between S.C. State offerings and the CHE Inventory of Academic Programs.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program modification for South Carolina State University to modify its program leading to the Bachelor of Science degree in Nutritional and Food Management to add concentrations in Nutrition and Food Management, to be implemented in Fall 2014.

5. Consideration of revised *Policies and Procedures for New Academic Programs, Program Modifications, and Program Terminations*

Dr. Janosik introduced the agenda item. A motion to approve the revised *Policies and Procedures for New Academic Programs, Program Modifications, and Program Terminations* was **moved** (Drueke) and **seconded** (Hynd). Ms. Houpp explained the task force's strategy and process in revising the program proposal template and the *Policies and Procedures* document. She added that the task force determined that a few revisions required a more robust discussion with and input from Committee members. She shared that the task force decided to shorten the length of the proposal template and create a fillable form for the template in anticipation of adding online submission in the future.

Ms. Houpp asked for feedback regarding the delivery mode portion of the template and explained that currently the only programs listed as being offered online are programs that are offered 100% online. She stated that this definition differs from SACS which states that any program offered 80% or more online is considered an online program. Dr. Jackson suggested that the term "distance education" be used instead of online so that all distance education formats will be included. She suggested a concern that, if a threshold percentage for online was chosen, a definition of "blended" delivery would also need to be created. Ms. Belcher commented that the reason CHE uses the term "online" only to represent programs which are 100% online is that a prospective student looking for degree programs will know they can take a program without attending any portion of the program on a campus. She suggested that if the Committee determines a threshold to define online programs that the definition be clearly defined on the website for prospective students. Dr. Janosik responded that students need to be encouraged to contact the institution for more information regarding the delivery mode and that she would support using the threshold consistent with SACS. Dr. Luke expressed support for specific percentages being listed in regards to online programs in the CHE inventory. Ms. Houpp stated that the two options for delivery mode could be traditional/face-to-face instruction and distance education [with the subcategories of completely online (100%), online (80-99%), blended (less than 80% online) and other distance education]. The Committee agreed.

Ms. Houpp continued to explain the revisions in the template. She stated that the order of the template has been altered to more closely align with the SACS substantive change form. She addressed the Assessment of Need section and stated that if the proposed program has quantifiable workforce data, then the institution will provide the data in the table provided and if

the proposed program does not have quantifiable workforce data, the institution will explain in paragraph form the possible workforce opportunities for graduates. Ms. Houpp then informed the Committee that proposed curriculum could be presented by semester/year or by category. Dr. Jackson asked about a table more aligned to graduate programs. Ms. Houpp responded that another table option could be included. Committee members suggested that the tables be expandable and that the titles for the columns in the tables be open-ended/adjustable. Ms. Houpp agreed.

Ms. Houpp then asked for feedback regarding changes made to the Financial Support charts. She explained that the task force advocated for a change from presenting total costs to presenting new costs. She acknowledged that costs and financial sources are calculated differently at every institution, but she stated CHE staff would like to move towards consistency. Dr. Jackson asked that Excel spreadsheets be provided to report the budget data and that the spreadsheets for costs and financial sources be linked so that data can be calculated similarly. Ms. Houpp supported that suggestion.

Mr. Drueke expressed concern about financial charts being misleading to Commissioners. He explained that if CHE asks for tuition income as a financial source, it will include the funding that supports non-academic services and when the costs of the degree program are listed, it will appear that the institution is asking for far more in tuition than the costs of the program. He added that Winthrop has used a percentage of total tuition as the financial source for the academic degree program or Winthrop has included a note detailing the other areas funded by total tuition. Dr. Shaw responded that she supports using the total tuition figure with a note detailing the other areas funded. Dr. Beard asked the purpose of the budget in the program proposal if an institution is not requesting additional funds from the state to operate said program. Ms. Houpp responded that Commissioners have expressed concern about costs and sources of finance regardless of the program asking for additional state funding. Dr. Jackson added that the critical and straightforward pieces of the budget for a new program are the costs associated with new faculty members, new staff and facilities, while the sources of funding are difficult to communicate given the small state portion of funding, tuition that covers more than academic programming, and the need for institutions to re-allocate existing funds. Dr. Shaw asked specifically about the Commissioners' concerns over costs. Dr. Janosik responded that some Commissioners express concern in order to support good stewardship of state funding and some Commissioners' want to know whether a program is too expensive and already offered by another institution in the state. Committee members shared that each institution has multiple levels of oversight, will not allow a program to continue if it loses money and any additional money over direct program costs will be reinvested in lower funded areas of the institution. Dr. Hynd recommended that a footnote be included with the chart that states the percentage of funding that the institution receives from state. Dr. Janosik responded that the issue may need to be addressed with Commissioners more thoroughly through education.

Dr. Jackson asked for more information regarding the online submission of program proposals. She explained that Clemson faculty members need to be able to complete the form and then submit it to the Provost's office for review and edits and for submission to CHE. Ms. Houpp responded that the division is working with IT personnel at CHE to aid the process. She mentioned the possibility of user accounts and passwords and clarified that the Provost's office would be the only entity allowed to submit the final program proposal. She added that the President's signature will no longer be required because the Provost's submission of a program proposal will indicate institutional approval. Committee members discussed other necessary options in regards to the online form: ability to create/edit; ability to view/print without editing; ability to track changes; ability to save to PDF; and the ability to submit.

Ms. Houp reviewed the various revisions made to the *Policies and Procedures for New Academic Programs, Program Modifications, and Program Terminations* as listed in the agenda item document. She addressed the shortened approval cycle for new programs by reviewing the recommended months for proposal submission, ACAP, CAAL and CHE meetings. She then referred to about a statement on new program proposals found in Section II.A.1.b on page four. She specifically asked whether any Committee member recalled the purpose of that statement. Dr. Jackson responded that it aligns with SACS standards but it does not seem to be necessary in CHE's policies. The Committee agreed to strike the statement.

Dr. Jackson asked about a statement on page 21 regarding full-time equivalency (FTE) student enrollment and stated that Clemson defines full-time undergraduate enrollment as 12 credit hours as compared to the CHE policy of 15 credit hours. She expressed concern about the amounts being higher than most institutions. Ms. Houp responded that the definition in the CHE policy is one used by CHEMIS and IPEDS. Mr. Nelson suggested that the CHE policy differentiate between full-time student and full-time equivalent for federal reporting. After discussion, the Committee agreed to keep the definition as presented.

Ms. Houp presented provisional approval as another revision for discussion and asked specifically for ideas regarding the development of a process for provisional approval. Committee members expressed confusion over the term and its use with academic degree programs. Mr. Druke explained its use in regards to teacher education programs. The Committee decided to keep the statement but agreed there was no need to create a process at this time.

The Committee had a general discussion regarding the Commission's strategic priority of auditing or monitoring existing programs. Staff indicated that processes and procedures will be analyzed and developed in the future to measure the success of programs. Ms. Houp explained that the *Policies and Procedures for New Academic Programs, Program Modifications, and Program Terminations* might be revised when program assessment tools or policies are adopted. Dr. Jackson expressed support for a past CHE practice whereby all institutional programs were reviewed and evaluated by topic area with a few topic areas being addressed each year.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the draft of the revised *Policies and Procedures for New Academic Programs, Program Modifications, and Program Terminations* with the allowance of small edits to be made during the final task force meeting on July 8, 2014.

6. Consideration of Statement on Academic Freedom

Dr. Janosik introduced the agenda item and presented an overview of the purpose and work of the Task Force on Academic Freedom. She **moved** to consider the statement on academic freedom and the motion was **seconded** (Rivers). She referred to the distributed memo, which aligns the Commission's statement on academic freedom statements with those issued by SACS and AAUP. She explained that Dr. Sutton indicated his intention to broaden the scope of academic freedom and create guidelines that also included the rights and protections of students and staff at an institution in addition to faculty members. She reported that the task force did not want to include students and staff since academic freedom protection has, historically, been intended for faculty members and is generally viewed as a First Amendment rights issue. Dr. Janosik then asked for feedback on the statement from the Committee.

Dr. Jackson expressed confusion because her expectation regarding the intention of the task force was different than what the task force produced. She understood that the task force would have included in its statement expressions of support for the College of Charleston and USC Upstate. She stated that the current statement draft does not aid universities in moving forward with the concerns of the General Assembly. She expressed her wish for the Committee to create a best practices document that may aid universities in how to handle current issues such as summer reading lists or the use of warning labels for courses. Dr. Hynd responded as a member of the task force that the task force was adamant in its decision to not include students or staff in the statement. He also stated that the task force did not want to address any particular issue in the statement because the task force recognizes that each institution has its own procedures and policies.

Dr. Finnigan asked why the statement was created. Dr. Hynd responded that the task force hoped CHE would take the lead in communicating the need for re-affirming academic freedom with Commissioners as well as Board of Trustee candidates. Dr. Janosik responded that Committee members at the February 2014 ACAP meeting expressed an interest in having CHE create a statement of support for academic freedom. Dr. Jackson asked whether the Commissioners want to affirm academic freedom and if so the statement should originate with them. She added that the statement is more of a communications statement to the general public as compared to a policy that needs to be approved. Members discussed simplifying the statement to one sentence which highlights CHE's support of academic freedom at colleges and universities. Members expressed support for a simplified statement such as: "The Commission supports academic freedom by affirming the SACS and AAUP statements about academic freedom that are already in place."

Dr. Finnigan asked about the target audience for the statement. Dr. Janosik answered that the intention was for the statement to be issued by the Commission to those outside academia. Dr. Haist suggested that freedom of expression be addressed in the statement.

Dr. Janosik asked whether members wanted to table the item or approve the statement with revisions. Dr. Beard stated that the statement needs to include the statement made previously by Dr. Janosik but also include the SACS and AAUP statements as well with an introduction phrase such as "For your information, colleges and universities must comply with the following standards." Dr. Janosik **moved that the original motion be amended** to support that the draft statement be used as a piece of information for the Commission and to suggest that the Commission create a statement on academic freedom similar to the one suggested by Dr. Janosik: "The Commission supports academic freedom by affirming the SACS and AAUP statements about academic freedom that are already in place."

Dr. Jackson suggested that any language referring to Commission action, including endorsement, be removed and specifically suggested that the following sentence be removed: "Further, the Commission endorses the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in its *Statement of Principle on Academic Freedom and Tenure*." Dr. Hynd asked why ACAP would not want to ask the Commission to affirm or endorse the SACS and AAUP statements. Dr. Jackson responded that she was unsure whether the Commission would indeed endorse or affirm the statements and that it is better to provide information regarding what colleges and universities must comply with now and allow the Commission to decide whether to affirm the same statements. She further commented that she would support a statement that reads that ACAP endorses the SACS and AAUP statements. Dr. Haist agreed with Dr. Jackson to include a statement about ACAP endorsement. Dr. Hynd asked whether there was a consensus that

ACAP members affirm these academic freedom principles as representing the standards by which ACAP members live. Members expressed their agreement. Dr. Jackson amended the motion by **moving that the document be re-drafted to include today's discussion points and that the document be distributed to members who would then vote to approve electronically.** Dr. Carson **seconded** the motion. The Committee **voted unanimously to approve the motion.**

7. Discussion of Current Issues in Academic Affairs

a. Scholarship Enhancements

Dr. Janosik introduced the discussion item and provided a brief overview of scholarship enhancement issues. She explained that CHE reviews requests from universities regarding math and science degree programs that are eligible to receive state scholarship enhancements. She commented that the review process is not a formalized one but that staff seek to develop a formal process. She asked the Committee to nominate institutional representatives to serve on a temporary task force to study the scholarship enhancement issue and revise the process as necessary.

b. College Pre-requisite Courses for Students in High School

Dr. Janosik introduced the discussion item and asked Dr. Gregg to speak about the issue. Dr. Gregg presented a brief review of the last revisions made to the College Preparatory Course Prerequisite Requirements. She explained that high schools have been preparing to implement the Common Core Standards for the FY2014-15 school year and consequently have developed different courses and changed the names of courses to align with the standards. Dr. Gregg added that school districts have sought feedback from CHE regarding how these new courses align with the College Preparatory Course Prerequisite Requirements. She then stated that CHE staff would like to create a temporary task force to review and analyze the current list of pre-requisites in case they need to be revised. Dr. Janosik asked members to nominate institutional representatives by June 30 to serve on the task force.

c. Request for Assistance from SCDE on Development of College-Ready Standards

Dr. Janosik introduced the discussion item and called on Dr. Gregg to introduce the two representatives from the S.C. Department of Education (SCDE). Dr. Gregg introduced Ms. Brianna Timmerman and Ms. Cathy Stark who work in the Standards and Curriculum office. Ms. Timmerman explained that the Standards and Curriculum office oversees the development of standards and educator evaluation system. She briefly described the activities of the General Assembly regarding Common Core. She then explained that Act 200 requires SCDE to develop standards which will replace the Common Core standards and be in place by August 2015. She referred to a memo distributed previously which asked for volunteers to serve on the standards writing panels. Ms. Timmerman then specifically asked for participation from post-secondary faculty members to serve on the panels so that the state would not lose its ESEA waiver and that the standards for math and English language would be college and career ready. She explained the timeline for developing the standards which includes a public review period. She informed the Committee that in addition to participation on the writing panels by faculty members, she is requesting that the Committee certify the revised standards as college and career ready prior to the final approval of the standards in February/March 2015.

Dr. Beard asked whether the new standards must be created from scratch or could be based on previous standards. Ms. Timmerman responded that SCDE is studying standards of other states that are not participating in Common Core and studying SC's 2007-2008 standards as a basis for the development of revised standards.

A Committee member asked about college readiness assessment tools. Ms. Timmerman responded that legislation prohibits the state from using the Smarter Balanced assessment tools and that a panel has been convened to determine how the Common Core curriculum will be assessed for the 2014-2015 school year. She continued by stating that once new standards are created and implemented, the state will need to find another vendor to assess those standards.

Dr. Jackson stated that faculty members who have participated in the S.C. Course Alignment Project (SC CAP) would be good candidates for the writing panels. Dr. Gregg asked ACAP members for permission to forward the email regarding the writing panels to the faculty members involved with SC CAP. ACAP members gave staff permission to forward the email.

Dr. Rivers and Dr. Elmore explained that the S.C. Technical College System has college-ready standards and an assessment tool to measure a student's capability of meeting those standards. They both expressed a hope that the college-ready standards and related assessments being developed now by the S.C. Department of Education would align with the ones already in place at the S.C. Technical College System.

Dr. Janosik suggested that the S.C. Department of Education produce and submit a draft of the college-ready standards when ready and then ask ACAP members to review and consider certifying the standards in order for the state to keep the ESEA waiver. Dr. Jackson added that ACAP members will need faculty members at their respective universities to review the standards as well.

8. Updates on Issues and Projects in Academic Affairs

a. SCTRAC's Transfer Check Functionality

Dr. Janosik introduced the discussion item. Ms. Houpp referred to the discussion at the last ACAP meeting and explained that the feedback given in February was incorporated into the system. She informed the Committee on the success of the User Group Conference, attended by approximately one hundred institutional representatives. She stated that the anticipated implementation for the transfer check functionality is October 1, 2014.

b. Reporting Undeclared Majors for Federal Loans

Dr. Janosik introduced Ms. Brown to discuss the next agenda item. Ms. Brown informed the Committee that the CIP code (000000) used by many institutions to indicate students who were undecided/undeclared in regards to majors would no longer be accepted by the federal government for student aid. She then reported that the federal government will accept the CIP Code 240102 (Liberal Studies) as one to use for those students who are undecided/undeclared and presented the CHE's suggested options for using that CIP Code to distinguish between 240102 being used for actual degree programs offered and for undecided/undeclared.

c. State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement

Dr. Janosik introduced the discussion item and informed the Committee that the CAAL recommendation to CHE to support the continued investigation and creation of the SARA

application was not accepted as presented at its June 5th meeting. She explained that the recommendation was amended to state that CHE staff can continue to collect data but may not move forward in preparation of a proposal. Dr. Hynd asked whether Commissioners understand how vitally important participation in SARA is to the state's institutions. Dr. Janosik responded that the discussion was among Commissioners and that they did not ask for input from institutional representatives present at the meeting. Committee members who were present at the June 5th CHE meeting expressed their disappointment regarding the misinformation about SARA that was discussed by Commissioners.

9. Presentation of *Annual Report on Academic Common Market, 2014*

Dr. Janosik introduced the report as information only.

10. Presentation of Notifications of Program Changes and/or Terminations, February through June 6, 2014

Dr. Janosik introduced the report as information only.

11. Other Business

a. Reminder: Changes to Advanced Placement

Dr. Janosik asked Ms. Houpp to review the Advanced Placement changes. Ms. Houpp distributed informational material regarding AP Seminar, AP Research and AP Physics. She explained that the Committee will discuss course equivalencies for these new AP courses at a future ACAP meeting.

Dr. Janosik suggested that the October 16 meeting of ACAP resemble this one in format and length. She also explained that Commissioners will have completed their strategic planning retreat by the next meeting which will allow ACAP members to plan strategically as well. ACAP members agreed. Dr. Janosik asked the Committee to consider its interest in an ACAP retreat for the Spring/Summer of 2015. She added that further discussion and planning will take place at the October 16th meeting. Dr. Janosik then thanked everyone for attending the meeting. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:06pm.