

Minutes
Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing
September 2, 2005

Members Present

Dr. Vermelle Johnson-Chair
Ms. Cyndi Mosteller
Dr. Bettie Rose Horne

Staff Present

Ms. Joann Biga
Ms. Julie Carullo
Ms. Renea Eshleman
Ms. Lane Jeselnik
Dr. Lynn Kelley
Dr. Esther Kramer
Dr. Tajuana Massie
Dr. Gail Morrison
Dr. Mike Raley
Ms. De'Nitra Reese

Guests Present

Dr. Cheryl Cox (SC Tech College System)
Ms. Karen C. Jones (Winthrop University)
Dr. Aileen Trainer (USC-Columbia)
Ms. Rose Pelatti (Spartanburg Technical College)
Dr. Pete Barr (Coastal Carolina University)
Dr. Gib Darden (Coastal Carolina University)
Dr. Sara Sanders (Coastal Carolina University)
Dr. Ron Faulkenberry (Francis Marion University)
Dr. Sandra Lemoine (Lander University)
Dr. Leonard Lundquist (Lander University)
Dr. Danny McKenzie (Lander University)
Dr. Debra Jackson (Clemson University)
Dr. Katherine Wilson (Clemson University)
Dr. Bill Ferrell (Clemson University)
Dr. Imtraz Haq (Clemson University)
Dr. Walt Tobin (Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College)
Dr. Robert Schemel (South University)
Dr. Elise Jorgens (College of Charleston)
Ms. Betty Boatwright (South Carolina State University)
Dr. Thomas Thompson (South Carolina State University)
Ms. Miriam J. Evans (South Carolina State University)

Mr. Jonathan Walsh (South Carolina State University)
Dr. Patricia A. Frye (South Carolina State University)
Mr. Frank Mumby (South Carolina State University)
Dr. Suresh R. Londhe (South Carolina State University)
Dr. Gwendolyn D. Wilson (South Carolina State University)
Dr. Ghussan R. Greene (South Carolina State University)
Dr. Kenneth D. Lewis (South Carolina State University)
Dr. Leonard McIntyre (South Carolina State University)
Dr. Daniel Smith (South Carolina State University)
Mr. Ronald Ballance (ECPI College of Technology)
Mr. Mark Dreyfus (ECPI College of Technology)
Dr. Ted Little (ECPI College of Technology)

1. Consideration of Minutes of April 19, 2005

Dr. Horne **moved** that the minutes of April 19, 2005, be accepted as distributed with the editorial change that Ms. Mosteller be recorded as having been present. The motion was **seconded** by Ms. Mosteller and was **approved** unanimously.

2. Consideration of New Program Proposals

2.a. A.H.S. in Emergency Medical Technology, Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College

Dr. Horne congratulated Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College for developing the program proposal in Emergency Medical Technology (EMT.) She asked, however, if the institution had done any analysis to determine why there was such a high level of attrition among practitioners in the Orangeburg region. Dr. Walt Tobin stated that the employment of EMTs in Orangeburg-Calhoun's service area had suffered from relatively low salaries in the field, but more importantly from the fact that the personnel working in Orangeburg often times lived outside the county. He said that the administration of the Kuder preference examination as an advising tool and the development of a home-grown program at Orangeburg- Calhoun Technical College would work together to assure a larger pool of applicants for the program who were knowledgeable about the career's salary and work environment and, therefore, less likely to drop out of the program once having entered it in the Orangeburg-Calhoun service district.

Dr. Horne asked if the program were designed for transitioning to a four-year EMT program. Dr. Cox stated that there are no four-year EMT programs in South Carolina and that it was, therefore, not designed with transfer in mind. She added, however, that some health science degree programs might take some significant elements of this curriculum in transfer. It was **moved** (Mosteller) and **seconded** (Horne) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to A.H.S. degree in Emergency Medical Technology for implementation in January 2006.

2.b. B.A. Communication, Coastal Carolina University

Dr. Johnson introduced the program. Dr. Horne asked Drs. Barr and Sanders how they might respond to a critic of this program proposal who might call it "unnecessarily

duplicative” because there are already a number of these at South Carolina’s public institutions. Dr. Horne also asked how they might respond to that same critic asking why students interested in such a major should not be referred to one of the other public institutions’ programs in this same area of the curriculum. Dr. Barr introduced Dr. Sarah Sanders who stated that the program proposal is analogous to an English, political science or history major at a comprehensive teaching university, that is: an expected part of the academic curriculum of any such institution at the undergraduate level. She said that the programs at Longwood and University of Maryland were cited as similar in nature to this proposal because of their curricular emphases, which are based on human communication, not journalism, as some Communication majors are. Dr. Johnson asked why Coastal had had such a difficult time finding an appropriate accrediting body for this program. Dr. Sanders said that Coastal Carolina University had found an appropriate national professional association, not an accrediting agency, which “certifies” rather than “accredits” programs. Communication majors which are heavily based in journalism have accreditation agencies which they must satisfy, she said, but this program—like a major in History, English, Biology—is part of the liberal arts tradition which does not have national professional accreditation, but does have professional guidelines to which it refers reputationally. Dr. Morrison agreed with this assessment. It was **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to the B.A. degree in Communication for implementation in Spring 2006.

2.c. B.S., Recreation and Sport Management, Coastal Carolina

The program was introduced by Dr. Johnson. She stated that the program is centered on the development of management and leadership. The program will have two tracks: recreation and sport management. Ms. Mosteller asked how it can be known that the library process for building the library collection will actually occur. Dr. Gib Darden stated that there is an internal mechanism which will permit them to see if the library materials have been purchased. Dr. Morrison stated that the Commission, historically, has never gone back to check on an institution to see if it had done what it pledged to do with the program’s enrollment and funding. She said that the Commission and the Commission staff had, perhaps unfairly, always assumed that the institutions would employ the funds and resources they had estimated in the proposal to attain the estimated student enrollment and graduation results. She added that the Commission has always viewed the proposals as submitted as being analogous to a contract in that the institution commits to meet the obligations outlined in the proposal.

Dr. Horne asked Dr. Scott if the institution separates students for internships that work for them. Dr. Scott responded by stating that in the last academic year, 90% of the students were placed in positions related to their degree preparation upon completion of their internship. It was **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the Committee **voted to commend unanimously to the Commission** the program leading to the B.S. degree in Recreation and Sport Management at Coastal Carolina University for implementation in Fall 2006.

2.d. M.S. and Ph.D. in Automotive Engineering, Clemson

Dr. Johnson introduced the program proposal stating that the purpose of the program will be to address the new generation of engineers to be prepared for the challenges of automotive engineering. She said there is a void currently for this kind of specialization. Dr. Debra Jackson introduced Dr. Hall from Clemson's Engineering Department. Dr. Hall reiterated the comments that the program was designed to fill the void of engineers able to see cross-disciplinary issues and solutions. He said that the proposal was a recognition of how much things have changed and how important it is to prepare students to work across disciplines, so they can work on whole subsystems of modern automotive manufacturing. He said that BMW and smaller automobile manufacturers had given more than \$13 million because they believe the concept of these degrees is sound and necessary.

Dr. Horne asked if there is an essential link between the M.S. and the Ph.D. programs, since one reviewer did not see such a link. Dr. Hall stated that the M.S. degree program is not thesis-oriented, but rather project-based; however, the two degrees are very closely linked in all other aspects. In response to Ms. Mosteller's question as to whether the degree programs will specifically deal with alternative fuel utilization in automobiles, Dr. Hall stated that both will do so. Dr. Horne asked if the degrees will be nationally accredited and Dr. Hall stated that they will not be, since ABET (the national accrediting body for engineering and engineering technology programs) only accredits undergraduate programs in these fields.

Dr. Horne said that it appeared from the proposal that the library resources for the proposed program were significantly less than what was necessary and wondered what was being done about this situation. Dr. Debra Jackson stated that the Clemson librarian is making the Greenville site the library for this program. She said that the institution was in the process of placing many resources into electronic databases specifically for the program, since most library resources for this type of program are electronically based now. Dr. Morrison stated that the institution is planning to put \$400,000 into the program's library resources over the next five years, because of the needs the institution itself acknowledges.

It was **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the program proposal leading to the M.S. and the Ph.D. degree in Automotive Engineering for implementation in Fall 2006.

2.e. Ph.D. in International Family and Community Studies, Clemson

Dr. Johnson introduced the program and called upon Ms. Mosteller for her observations. Ms. Mosteller asked for clarification about the proposal on several issues as follows: 1) it appears from the proposal's language that perhaps the principal reason for instituting it was simply to generate funding on a 6:1 ratio of research funding brought into the institution versus dollars spent on the program by the institution; 2) the program proposal makes the program appear to be "politically correct", i.e., that it appears to argue that wealthy countries have a moral obligation to share with poor countries; and 3) the program appears to be unfocused in curricular intent and purposes.

Dr. Debra Jackson introduced Dr. Kathy Wilson, head of the program, to respond. Dr. Wilson stated that already the institution is experiencing a 6:1 ratio of funds brought into the institution for an existing program versus funding provided by the institution for the existing program; she said this ratio is anticipated to continue. She said that the program is far from being nebulous in its purposes, since it is wholly involved in practical systems change based upon the best available research data. She said that the program has been developing for years and that tangible activities exist currently because of the program's precursor degree development and the existence of an Institute in this field. Currently, six other universities in three countries are part of the nexus that will be used for the Ph.D. program's research and implementation. These institutions had to be invited to participate in the degree program's activities by Clemson University. In order to receive an invitation to participate, the institutions had to adhere to the same themes of Clemson's program, demonstrate availability of resources locally, and have a record of their ability to develop suitable professional networks for development of research data and dissemination of useful results.

Ms. Mosteller asked if the program was based more upon gathering data or implementing ideas. Dr. Wilson said that the program is committed to making social change, based upon the finest available research data. For example, Dr. Wilson said, a major initiative of the program to date has been enlisting nongovernmental organizations to network for developing strategies to lower infant mortality rates, to substantially reduce bullying in schools, and to substantially reduce spousal abuse. She pointed to the name of one Clemson researcher, Dr. Sue Limber, just recognized by the American Psychological Association for her efforts against school bullying. Dr. Horne asked about whether "hot button" issues, such as religious organizations being involved in these issues of the family, might pose problems for this degree program. Dr. Wilson responded that it is axiomatic that the study of families necessarily involves linkages among economics, values, and religious institutions. Ms. Mosteller asked if the program intended to request special funding through the General Assembly. Dr. Wilson responded that the program would continue to solicit special funding only through the same channels it has done in the past, that is: Duke Endowment, Sisters of Charity, Healthy Communities with DHEC, etc.

It was moved (Mosteller) and seconded (Horne) and the Committee voted unanimously to commend to the Commission the program leading to the Ph.D. in International Family and Community Studies for implementation in January 2006.

2.f. Center for Supply Chain Optimization and Logistics, Clemson

Dr. Johnson introduced the program proposal, stating that it would not involve any state funding at the present time. She said it would have a complement of 17 faculty members working within it. Dr. Horne asked why the Center was going to work with Greenville Technical College, but not Tri-County Technical College. Dr. Debra Jackson responded that the institution had made a choice because of location and that the proposed Center would be working not only with Greenville Technical College but also with a similar Center at USC-Columbia, and with a group of institutions it would be joining under the auspices of the NSF. She said that the NSF group would also bring approximately \$250,000 to the Center for its operations. Clemson officials also indicated that the approval of the Center will permit it to receive state funds allocated for at least

one of the endowed chairs which has been approved. Dr. Horne asked to what the term “Carolina Crescent” as a participating organization referred. Dr. Farrell, director of the institute, responded that the Carolina Crescent group was a consortium of Greenville-based companies with supply chain issues. The group includes Mitsubishi and Michelin. Ms. Mosteller stated that, in her opinion, the proposed Center goes beyond what students want to what South Carolina and its hosted corporations need. Dr. Farrell responded that the NSF portion of the Center was exceedingly important, since the NSF director has been there for thirty years, and Clemson’s participation in the Center will require it (and every other participating institution) to provide a middle school faculty member for a season to train and develop modules for inclusion in the coming school year.

It was then **moved** (Mosteller) and **seconded** (Horne) and **the Committee voted unanimously to commend to the Commission** the proposal leading to the establishment of a Center for Supply Chain Optimization and Logistics, to be implemented immediately.

3. Consideration of Requests to Amend License

3.a. Associate in Graphic Design; B.S. in Graphic Design; B.S. in Criminal Justice, South University (Columbia Campus)

Dr. Johnson introduced this agenda item and stated that South University was applying to add an Associate in Graphic Design degree and two B.S. degree programs in Columbia. In response to two questions that Dr. Horne posed, Dr. Morrison first stated that “duplication” of programs is not an issue germane to the licensing of proprietary or other out-of-state institutions. The legal opinions other state and federal jurisdictions have demonstrated that states may not deny licensure of an institution solely because the institution is offering an academic program already offered by public or private institutions with their principal locations in the state. Mr. Robert Schimmel, Academic Dean of South University, stated that South University employs consultants and high school focus groups to advise it on what programs should be offered. For that reason, South University decided to offer the Associate in Graphic Design, the B.S. in Graphic Design and the B.S. in Criminal Justice in Columbia.

Dr. Horne asked what the proposal meant by discussing a “University-administered admissions” test. Dr. Schimmel said that the admissions examination that South University has for students to take is the Accuplacer. Dr. Horne asked what the necessary score on that examination is for admission to the institution. Dr. Schimmel said he would get that information prior to the Commission’s vote on the requested program expansion. Ms. Mosteller commented that she was satisfied to know that the score on the Accuplacer was obviously commensurate with the institution’s ability to attract and graduate students and to survive in the marketplace to make a profit. Dr. Horne responded that the ability of a proprietary institution to remain solvent financially is not necessarily a guarantee of quality in academic programming.

It was **moved** (Mosteller) and **seconded** (Horne) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the expansion of the license of South Carolina to offer in Columbia programs leading to the Associate degree in Graphic Design, and to the B.S. degree in Graphic Design and the B.S. degree in Criminal Justice.

3.b. AAS degrees in (1) Computer and Information Science with concentration in Information Technology/Business Systems Administration, Information Technology/Networking & Security Management, and Medical Administration; (2) Computer Electronics Engineering Technology and (3) Health Science with a concentration in Medical Assisting, at New Location (Columbia), ECPI College of Technology, Virginia Beach, VA

Dr. Johnson introduced Mark Dreyfus, President, and Mr. Ronald Ballance (Vice President), and Dr. Ted Lyttle (head of the Columbia office) from ECPI. Dr. Horne asked what might make the institution consider that a significant number of enrolled students would be willing to pay fees of \$8,950 in the first year and \$9,500 in the second year for a degree from ECPI when they could get the same degrees so much more economically at a technical college in the area. Mr. Dreyfus responded by saying that these degree programs were in the top ten nationally for career demand. He added that enrollment of students alone often does not lead to degree completion. He emphasized that time to degree was a major factor of importance for the students at ECPI who tended to be full-time enrolled and ready to get to the marketplace within a year from first enrollment. It was **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the **Committee voted unanimously to commend** to the Commission the amendment of its license to permit ECPI to offer programs of study at a new location (Columbia) leading to the AAS degrees in (1) Computer and Information Science with concentrations in Information Technology/Business Systems Administration, Information Technology/Networking & Security Management and Medical Administration; and (2) Computer Electronics Engineering Technology; and (3) Health Science with a concentration in Medical Assisting, with the proviso that the Commission delegate to the staff authorization to license the site in Columbia when the facility is developed.

4. Consideration of Program Productivity Follow-Up: South Carolina State University

Dr. Johnson introduced the item, stating that it represents the staff's evaluation of South Carolina State's response to the lack of productivity in several programs in the curriculum. She said that the institution had earlier indicated that it was in the midst of a major process of administrative recruitment and institutional reorganization, so that it had taken the institution longer to respond than was true of other institutions whose programs had been similarly cited for lack of productivity. South Carolina State had six programs which did not meet the Commission's standards for productivity. Members of the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing thanked the institutional representatives present for the hard work they had put into developing a plan to address the issues of productivity. The Committee especially cited the institution's decision to offer majors only if there were a minimum of three faculty members hired in the discipline.

It was **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the Committee voted to commend favorably to the Commission to accept the plans of corrective action submitted by South Carolina State for programs leading to the bachelor's degree in Art Teacher Education, Health Teacher Education, and Physics; to accept the proposed terminations submitted by South Carolina State in programs leading to the Bachelor of Arts degree in Spanish Language and Literature, in French Language and Literature, and in Music

Performance (with a new program proposal for the Bachelors degree in Performing Arts to be submitted to CHE following established procedures); to accept the proposed program consolidation by South Carolina State of a Bachelor of Arts degree in Modern Languages with a concentration in Spanish and Spanish Education to be offered initially and a concentration in French and French Education to be added at a later time; and to recommend that the institutional administration ensure that each program area have adequate faculty, including new hires projected in the report, with the goal of a minimum of three faculty per program areas as enrollment expands.

5. Consideration of NCATE/State Partnership Program Evaluations for Francis Marion University, Lander University, and College of Charleston

At Dr. Johnson's request Dr. Morrison introduced this item. She pointed out several minor errors and asked that they be corrected. She said that progress reports would be required by Lander, and Francis Marion, until full approval is achieved through NCATE by each of these institutions. Dr. Horne asked Dr. Morrison why a three-year limitation has been set for this. Dr. Morrison responded that it is to prevent "eternal limbo" for programs. Dr. Horne asked why the NCATE team couldn't perceive that the Education Department at Lander was not clear about how to address the standard to improve the program. Dr. Lundquist stated that the Lander administration and faculty were doing all they could to assure a program of quality, as the student's professional examinations show. He said it was unfortunate that the institution was unable to articulate these successes adequately to the visiting team from NCATE, but that the institution hopes to meet the October deadline which has been set for the progress report. He asked Dr. Morrison if Lander would be able to receive a full approval status from the Commission by October 2006, assuming that the institution were able to meet the October 2005 deadline with NCATE and to receive full approval from that body. Dr. Morrison responded that the Commission would grant full approval in that instance. Dr. Lundquist said that Lander was ready to pursue this objective.

It was **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and **the Committee voted unanimously to commend favorably** the report, as corrected, and its accompanying recommendations to the Commission.

6. Consideration of Annual Budget for Research Centers of Economic Excellence/Endowed Chairs Program, FY 2005-2006

Dr. Johnson requested that Dr. Morrison review this item for the Committee. Dr. Horne inquired why a staff position was being added this year when none had specifically existed for the program before this time. Dr. Morrison said that the program has grown in complexity and in the time commitments of the staff. Four CHE staff, as well as several others, provides staffing for this program. It was **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the report and the recommendations for the FY 2005-2006 budget.

7. Consideration of Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grants Program

7.a. Consideration of New Ward, Project Year 2005-06

Dr. Johnson requested that Dr. Morrison review this material with the Committee. Dr. Morrison stated that the item involved both the awards for the current academic year (i.e., 2005-2006) and the proposed Guidelines, 2006-2007. Francis Marion recommended for an award of \$124,848 for year #1, contingent upon submission of revised budgets. Dr. Horne asked when year #1 began, to which Dr. Morrison replied that it can begin on a flexible time line. Dr. Horne asked why the funding for this program was being placed with the Commission on Higher Education as opposed to the State Department of Education. Dr. Morrison responded that the State Department of Education receives approximately 80% of the funds for this program from the USDOE, which it “passes through” to school on a formula bases. However, she added, the USDOE provides about 20% of the funds to higher education offices nationally, because it wants to see collaborations between K-12 and higher education in favor of better preparation of teachers. Dr. Morrison also stated that the CHE staff has invited unsuccessful candidates to revise their proposal submissions and bring in upgraded proposals. This invitation, she said, has now produced a total of six substantially revised proposals, for which there is a total of \$2 million to be distributed to at least some of these. To Ms. Mosteller’s questioning whether mentoring of students is part of the Francis Marion grant, Dr. Faulkenberry from Francis Marion responded that it is not. He added that teachers are actually paid for participating.

It was **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the **Committee voted to commend favorably** the report and its recommendations to the Commission.

7.b. Proposed New Guidelines, Project Year 2006-2007

Dr. Morrison explained that the only substantive revision to the *Guidelines* involved limiting for school district eligibility to participate in the program to the federal government’s definition of “poverty” as related to students able to receive free or reduced cost lunches and districts meeting the federal standard. Dr. Morrison explained that the staff has now revised the *Guidelines* to match the federal requirement, and to emphasize the federal eligibility criterion. It was **moved** (Mosteller) and **seconded** (Horne) and the **Committee voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the revised *Guidelines* for Project Year 2006-2007.

8. Consideration of Centers of Excellence (Education)

8.a. Budget Allocations, FY 2005-06/Appropriations Request, FY 2006-07

Dr. Morrison discussed this item. She stated that the funding for any new Center depends upon receiving a grant from the Education Oversight Committee. In response to questions posed by Dr. Horne, Dr. Morrison stated that the goal of this funding is to develop a network of centers of excellence throughout the state to function as a major resource centers under the old program, and under the new program to work directly with low performing schools to improve student learning and teaching.

It was **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and **the Committee voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the request for permission to request from the Education Oversight [\$448,466], Committee an increase of \$13,624 (19%) over last year's allocation for a new Center of Excellence in Teacher Education and to distribute funding for the FY 2005-06 in accordance with the table contained in the staff documents.

8.b. New *Guidelines* for Centers of Excellence (RFP), FY 2006-07

Dr. Morrison introduced this item. Dr. Horne noted that page 2 of the document contains a set of statements. She asked if the institutional officers have reason to believe that the proposals they submitted are viable, given these statements. Dr. Morrison assured her that they were. It was **moved** (Mosteller) and **seconded** (Horne) and the **Committee voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the *Guidelines* for 2006-2007 for the Centers of Excellence Competitive Grants Program (Teacher Education.)

9. Consideration of the Annual Report on English Language Fluency Act, FY 2004-2005

Dr. Johnson introduced this item and asked Dr. Morrison to discuss the origin of the legislation for the Committee. Dr. Morrison stated that, as the report shows, the legislation was passed in 1991 because of concerns that some faculty members, whose first language is not English, were said to have difficulty in communicating in classroom discussions with their students. Dr. Horne noted that if this were the case, a significant number of cases should have been reported by now under the policy. Since a total of only six cases have been reported, and all have been reported to have been amicably resolved, under this policy since the passage of the legislation, she suggested it is perhaps appropriate to recommend repeal of the legislation. She said that the efforts of staff to inquire into this issue and for the institutions to comply both in annual reporting and printing the necessary regulations in the catalogue and student handbook of each institution represent significant costs to the state. After a thorough discussion of the matter, the Committee decided not to recommend to the Commission that the Commission request repeal of the legislation. Instead, they requested that Dr. Morrison and staff explore wording to present to the Commission for options for minimizing institutional reporting. With that caveat, it was **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the **Committee voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the Annual Report on English Fluency in Higher Education Act.

10. Consideration of Policy and Procedures for Approval of New or Revised Mission Statements

Dr. Johnson asked Dr. Morrison to explain this proposed change to the Committee. Dr. Morrison stated that there are issues where changes in of mission statements are clearly substantive in nature. The proposed change in policy would not affect those kinds of issues; i.e., all substantive changes in mission would have to be approved by the Commission on Higher Education. Other issues regarding changes in mission statements were characterized by Dr. Morrison very minor and not I need of major change, such as edits and wordsmithing. These are the kinds of changes that the proposed policy change would permit the staff to approve immediately. In some cases, these minor changes are exceedingly important for purposes of having a finished, approved document available to be reviewed by a visiting Southern Association of

Colleges and Schools (SACS) team or a national professional accrediting association, or for getting a catalogue printed on time. It was **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the **Committee voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the proposed new Commission policy for approval of new or revised institutional mission statements.

11. Consideration of Revised Mission Statements: Central Carolina Technical College and Spartanburg Technical College

The two institutional mission statements were presented with the proposed changes by Dr. Morrison. The Committee reviewed them. It was **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the **Committee voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the proposed changes in these two mission statements.

12. Consideration of Annual Report on Admissions Standards for First-Time Entering Freshmen, Fall 2004 (corrected)

Dr. Johnson asked Dr. Morrison to discuss this item. Dr. Morrison reviewed the materials in the report, noting that several institutions submitted corrected data. She said that staff has recommended that certain actions be undertaken by any institution with a score of less than the statewide average of 95.26 percent of compliance with the pre-college course requirements for direct entrance as freshmen into a four-year public institution in South Carolina. Specifically, Dr. Morrison said staff is recommending that such an institution be required to work with neighboring high schools to impress upon them the need to have their students take the proper coursework in high school. Noting that Lander is one of the institutions, Dr. Horne questioned whether the students who did not meet the pre-college curriculum requirements were necessarily from the high schools within the immediate geographic proximity of Lander. Dr. Morrison said that while it is not always true that the local high schools are at fault, regional high schools do contribute inordinately to the local institutions' freshman base of students, so that it is a good place to communicate the importance of high schools offering a complete college-preparing curriculum and stressing appropriate course selection. She said that it is becoming increasingly clear that underprepared students in our colleges as freshmen have been coming out of high schools which are not offering or requiring the coursework students need for entry into a public institution with the standards South Carolina's have. Dr. Horne and Dr. Aileen Trainer suggested that institutions like Lander go to high school districts with data in hand and suggest changes. Dr. Horne suggested that, for example, USC-Aiken might go to schools not only in Aiken County, but also to schools in McCormick. They would be joined by educators from Piedmont Tech, Aiken Tech, and Lander, which receive significant percentages of their students from this county. It was then **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) to commend favorably to the Commission the report with recommendations that senior institutions whose compliance rate falls below the state average of 95.26% examine their data, communicate the importance of compliance to the high schools and work with them to improve compliance, and submit a plan of action to correct their compliance rate; and that Lander University adjust its admissions process so that provisional acceptances fall within the CHE approved guideline of 15% for comprehensive teaching institutions.

13. Annual Report on Academic Common Market, FY 2004-2005

Dr. Vermelle Johnson introduced this item and thanked Dr. Morrison and the staff for preparing it. A discussion ensued on the value of the Academic Common Market as a resource both to South Carolina's students and other state's students in the Southern region served by SREB.

The report was presented for information only.

14. Other: Next meeting

Dr. Johnson announced that the next meeting of the Committee will take place on October 11 at 10:30 a.m

15. Adjournment

Hearing no further business, Dr. Vermelle Johnson asked for a motion to adjourn. It was **moved** (Horne) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and **the Committee voted to adjourn** at 4:20 p.m.