

**Minutes  
Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing  
August 7, 2014**

**Members Present**

Dr. Bettie Rose Horne, Chair  
Admiral Charles Munns  
Mr. Kim Phillips, via teleconference

**Other Commissioners Present:**

Ms. Terrye Seckinger

**Staff Present**

Dr. Argentini Anderson  
Mr. Clay Barton  
Ms. Laura Belcher  
Ms. Camille Brown  
Ms. Renea Eshleman  
Mr. Gary Glenn  
Dr. Rachel Harvey  
Ms. Trena Houp  
Dr. MaryAnn Janosik  
Dr. John Lane  
Ms. Tanya Rogers  
Dr. Karen Woodfaulk

**Guests**

Mr. Jeremy Borden, The Post and Courier  
Dr. Matthew Boyer, Clemson University  
Ms. Audrey Breland, Remington College  
Ms. Olivia Burns, S.C. Senate Education Committee  
Dr. Warren Carson, U.S.C. Upstate  
Ms. Martha Casto, S.C. Senate Medical Affairs Committee  
Dr. Kathy Coleman, Clemson University  
Dr. Cherry Daniel, College of Charleston  
Dr. Joshua Davis, College of Charleston  
Mr. Tim Druke, Winthrop University  
Ms. Kimberly Epstein, Remington College  
Dr. Kris Finnigan, U.S.C. Columbia  
Dr. Lynne Ford, College of Charleston  
Dr. Susan Fullerton, Clemson University  
Dr. Danielle Herro, Clemson University  
Dr. John Hester, Francis Marion University  
Dr. Janie Hodge, Clemson University  
Dr. Laura Kasman, M.U.S.C.  
Dr. Antonis Katsiyannis, Clemson University

Dr. Lucas Kavlie, South University  
Dr. Peter King, Francis Marion University  
Dr. Debbie Jackson, Clemson University  
Dr. Jackie Malloy, Clemson University  
Mr. Glenn McConnell, College of Charleston  
Dr. Brian McGee, College of Charleston  
Dr. Bob McNamara, The Citadel  
Mr. Steve Osborne, College of Charleston  
Dr. Diane Perpich, Clemson University  
Dr. George Petersen, Clemson University  
Dr. Jeff Priest, U.S.C. Aiken  
Dr. Suzanne Rosenblith, Clemson University  
Dr. Alan Shao, College of Charleston  
Dr. Darlene Shaw, M.U.S.C.  
Dr. David Shoop, South University  
Dr. Aga Skrodzka, Clemson University  
Dr. Suzanne Thomas, M.U.S.C.  
Ms. Jane Turner, CERRA  
Dr. Cynthia Wright, M.U.S.C.

**Introductions**

Dr. Horne called the meeting to order at 1:11 p.m. and stated the meeting was being held in compliance with the Freedom of Information Act.

**1. Discussion Item: Processes for Substantive Mission Statement Changes and Sector Changes (For Information Only: No Action Required)**

Dr. Horne asked Dr. Janosik to provide a brief update on mission statement changes. Dr. Janosik provided background information on the Commission's authority to approve institution mission statement changes and specific information about mission statement changes that affect a sector change for the institution. She referred to the discussion in the morning's Commission on Higher Education meeting where President McConnell of the College of Charleston discussed the College's mission statement change request. Dr. Janosik informed the Committee that another institution is seeking a mission statement change in addition to the College of Charleston and that this second institution's proposed changes will affect its sector status as well. She explained to the Committee that both mission statement revision proposals present minor edits in regards to wording but have major implications for the institution's educational offerings.

She continued by stating that both institutions seek to offer doctoral programs which would constitute a change in educational sector as outlined in legislative statute, Act 359. Dr. Janosik explained that Act 359, passed in 1996, provides three sectors of higher education institutions and stipulates that only the research institutions in South Carolina (USC, Clemson and MUSC) are allowed to offer doctoral programs. She stated that two exceptions are outlined in the law allowing SC State University to offer an educational doctorate and Coastal Carolina University to offer a doctorate in marine science.

Dr. Janosik outlined processes used in the past in regards to sector changes and suggested a process to be used. She described the process used by the Commission when USC Beaufort changed from a two-year institution to a four-year institution. She stated that the process lasted approximately one year and included public forums; requests for additional information regarding the rationale for the change; and the submission of a detailed transition plan outlining the types of changes that would occur at the institution and a timeline for those changes.

Admiral Munns asked about the type of information included in the transition plan. Dr. Janosik answered that the plan outlined strategic details regarding the implementation of the first baccalaureate programs, including necessary facilities and sufficient faculty members.

Dr. Janosik explained that other comprehensive institutions might be interested in revising their mission statements in the near future to offer doctoral programs. To address those requests, she suggested the Commission consider revising the legislative statute to allow comprehensives to offer a limited number of doctoral programs. Such a change would also make the state's classification of institutions be better aligned with the classification systems used by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education.

Dr. Janosik asked the Committee about the process it would like to use to evaluate the current requests for mission statement change. Admiral Munns stated that the Commission should use the same process as it does with many other requests and proposals: the Commission receives a proposal, CHE staff evaluate and engage with institution about issues and concerns; CAAL reviews and recommends action; and CHE reviews and makes a final decision. He expressed support for the College's request, but then outlined his opinions on what the Committee needs to make a decision. He stated that the College should approximate which and how many doctoral programs it wants to implement in the next decade. Admiral Munns expressed support

for the submission of a transition plan with information about faculty, and he asked for information regarding any potential impact on undergraduate tuition and about the budget for the University of Charleston. He stated that he believed the Committee will support limited doctoral programs in Charleston. Dr. Horne and Mr. Phillips agreed with Admiral Munns. Dr. Horne expressed her support and stated that it was a question of how to approve the request, not if the request should be approved.

Admiral Munns asked about the timeline of events and supported calling a special CAAL meeting in late August to consider the request.

Dr. Horne asked for information regarding action required by SACS for approval of this mission change and expressed support for the development of a strategic plan for all comprehensive institutions who seek the ability to offer doctoral programs.

## **2. Consideration of Minutes of May 1, 2014, and May 19, 2014**

Dr. Horne requested a motion to accept the minutes of the May 1, 2014, and May 19, 2014, meetings as revised by Admiral Munns. The motion was moved (Munns) and seconded (Phillips), and the Committee voted unanimously to accept the minutes as revised.

## **3. Presentation on the Center for Educator Recruitment, Retention, and Advancement (CERRA) and Consideration of FY 2015-16 Appropriation Request for CERRA and FY 2013-14 Annual Report**

Dr. Horne introduced the item and the Committee moved (Munns) and seconded (Horne) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. She then introduced Ms. Turner to speak briefly about CERRA. Ms. Turner explained that in the past CERRA fell under the purview of the Student Services Committee of the Commission. She then informed the Committee that because the Division on Academic Affairs handles P-20 issues, it made more sense for CERRA to be considered by CAAL. She distributed program reports, a budget request, and a graphic illustrating CERRA's funding and explained that CERRA provides middle school, high school and college teacher recruitment programs.

Admiral Munns asked about CERRA's organizational structure. Ms. Turner responded that CHE created CERRA in 1987 and it is headquartered at Winthrop University which serves as CERRA's fiscal agency. She continued by stating that CERRA is governed by a Board of Directors. Admiral Munns asked who authorizes board members. Ms. Turner responded that currently members are elected but in the near future it will be an appointed board. Admiral Munns asked who will appoint board members. Ms. Turner answered that the plan is in process and will be presented to CAAL when complete. Admiral Munns asked how CERRA selects projects. Ms. Turner answered that CERRA does not regularly start new programs but instead strives to continue and enrich its core programs.

Dr. Horne expressed support for the center and remarked that Winthrop is a great home base for CERRA. Ms. Turner concluded her presentation by stating that SC loses 4000 teachers a year and only graduates 2000 per year and therefore the need to recruit SC citizens to be teachers is critical.

#### 4. Consideration of New Program Proposals

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

Dr. Horne introduced the item and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Horne) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Jackson informed the Committee that the interdisciplinary program involves faculty members and courses from English, Languages, History, Anthropology, and Political Science. Dr. Skrodzka explained that Clemson initiated the development and planning of new innovative programs in the humanities a few years ago, and film studies was one of the proposed programs. She stated that the university decided to pursue a global focus in its proposed film studies program and therefore the program developed into an interdisciplinary one.

Admiral Munns commented that he submitted three questions about software costs, feasibility of internships, and assessment and placement rate, and all three questions were answered prior to the meeting. He asked that the questions and the institution's responses be included in the meeting minutes. [Please see [page 1 of the Attachment.](#)]

Dr. Horne commented that the weakest section of the proposal is the data on employment opportunities. She asked that Clemson improve that section. Dr. Skrodzka referred to the chosen classification code and explained that the code highlights the program as theoretical and practical. She remarked that the program will train students in video production skills, allowing them to use practical skills in future employment. Dr. Jackson commented that Clemson will urge students to choose a minor in another discipline to provide for additional employment opportunities.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to a Bachelor of Arts in World Cinema at Clemson University to be implemented in Fall 2015.

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

Dr. Horne introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Phillips) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Hodge explained that the development team for the program examined the need for more special education teachers in the state and created a program whereby individuals without an undergraduate degree in education could be trained for certification through a master's in arts in teaching degree. Dr. Horne commented that the proposal's metrics are strong and then asked about initiatives to improve retention. Dr. Hodge responded that special education teacher turnover is a national issue and that the field of special education has a high burnout rate. She continued to explain that the education programs at Clemson will prepare students better to handle the stress of this specialized area. Admiral Munns asked how technology might aid the large paperwork demands of being a special education teacher. Dr. Hodge responded that the state is creating a new web-based software to address these demands. Dr. Jackson informed the Committee that the program will be offered at the University Center of Greenville.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to a Master of Arts in Teaching degree in Special Education with concentrations in Learning Disabilities, Intellectual Disabilities, and Emotional/Behavioral Disorders at Clemson University to be implemented in Summer 2015.

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

Dr. Horne introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Phillips) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Herro explained that Clemson researched various models in the creation of this interdisciplinary and innovative degree program.

Admiral Munns commented that he submitted a question about costs and it was answered prior to the meeting. He asked that the question and the institution's response be included in the meeting minutes. [Please see [page 2 of the Attachment](#).]

Dr. Horne asked what differentiates the proposed program from USC Columbia's program. Dr. Boyer responded that USC's Educational Psychology program is more clinical, traditional and focused on schools. He explained that Clemson seeks to offer an interdisciplinary, technology-imbedded program that analyzes learning in different ways and in different environments.

Admiral Munns asked a general question about the Committee's method in judging redundancy in Ph.D. programs offered in the state. Dr. Jackson responded that collaboration between programs and complementing faculty strengths are key elements in avoiding redundancy. She presented examples of various current collaborations between and among universities in the state. Admiral Munns asked whether collaboration should be required and shown through a formal agreement. Dr. Jackson responded that an informal agreement is preferred because it can be expedited.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Learning Sciences at Clemson University to be implemented in January 2015.

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

Dr. Horne introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Phillips) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Fullerton explained that the study of literacy now incorporates the study of multiple types of literacies, involving technology and culture. She stated that Clemson researched nationally recognized programs which focus on literacy and language or literacy, language and culture and realized that current Clemson faculty could excel at the same foci.

Admiral Munns commented that he submitted questions on a variety of topics and they were answered prior to the meeting. He asked that the question and the institution's response be included in the meeting minutes. [Please see [page 5 of the Attachment](#).]

Dr. Horne asked what makes this program different from a program about the training of reading teachers. Dr. Malloy responded that literacy is now defined more broadly than reading in that the world is full of messages, cultural and technological, that need to be understood. She also commented that literacy is embedded in culture, history, economics, and ethnic backgrounds and therefore the study of literacy requires an understanding of those elements.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to the Doctor in Philosophy degree in Literacy, Language and Culture at Clemson University to be implemented in Fall 2015.

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

Dr. Horne introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Horne) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Katsiyannis explained that Clemson has the necessary and nationally recognized faculty to lead this program which will prepare educators to train the next generation of special education teachers. He announced that Clemson has received a \$1 million grant from the US Department of Education to fund the first cohort of doctoral students.

Admiral Munns commented that he submitted questions about cost, student demand, and redundancy which were answered prior to the meeting. He asked that the questions and the institution's responses be included in the meeting minutes. [Please see [page 9 of the Attachment](#).] He then asked whether funds from undergraduate tuition will be used to supplement funding the three proposed Ph.D. programs. Dr. Jackson explained that all three programs exist as concentrations currently and then stated that Clemson funds doctoral programs through a block grant program. She said that Clemson gives a certain amount of funding to each college to operate and that the funds originate with graduate and undergraduate tuition, grants, contracts, housing and athletic revenue. She stated that in recent years the university has asked each college to divest a portion of its funding and re-invest in a new or more prioritized area. She concluded that the three proposed Ph.D. programs are a result of the teacher education faculty investing existing funds to these areas.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Special Education at Clemson University to be implemented in Fall 2015.

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

Dr. Horne introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Phillips) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Ford introduced Dr. Shao and Dr. Davis. Dr. Shao explained that the development of the proposed program has developed over five years and has an advisory council with representatives from Boeing, Blackbaud and BMW. He stated that the program will bring economic impact and fill workplace gaps.

Admiral Munns commented that he submitted questions and they were answered prior to the meeting. He asked that the question and the institution's response be included in the meeting minutes. [Please see [page 12 of the Attachment](#).]

Admiral Munns asked whether the College is collaborating with Clemson's SmartState Center in Supply Chain. Dr. Davis answered that the College has informal relationships with Clemson and USC, but that there are no formal collaborative agreements. Admiral Munns asked about redundancy between the College's proposed program and the others in the state. Dr. Davis answered that the programs are distinct and that the College's program will focus on global logistics, intermodal transportation and information management. Dr. Shao described the support the College has received from Clemson and USC.

Dr. Horne asked whether the program will be eligible for the scholarship enhancement for math and science programs. Dr. Ford responded that the program is not eligible because only a limited number of credit hours are taught by mathematics faculty.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to the Bachelor of Science and Artium Baccalaureatus degree in Supply Chain Management at College of Charleston to be implemented in Fall 2015.

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

Dr. Horne introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Phillips) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. King explained that the program has been in development for a few years as a recommendation from the PeeDee Health Education Partnership comprised of the USC School of Medicine, FMU, McLeod Health, and Carolinas Hospital System.

Admiral Munns commented that he submitted questions and they were answered prior to the meeting. He asked that the question and the institution's response be included in the meeting minutes. [Please see [page 14 of the Attachment](#).] He expressed concern about the accrediting agency's decision to not allow joint Physician Assistant programs and then asked whether CHE should take any action in response to this decision. Dr. King responded that the accrediting agency states the policy clearly in its guidelines. Dr. Janosik replied that staff will research the matter further.

Admiral Munns expressed concern about MUSC's program and the proposed program needing clinical spots at the same hospitals. Dr. King answered that the capacity is large enough to cover both programs. Dr. Horne expressed support for the proposed program's assessments and then asked for more information about the local and regional need for the program to be added to the proposal.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to the Master of Science degree in Physician Assistant Studies at Francis Marion University to be implemented in Fall 2016.

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

Dr. Horne introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Phillips) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Shaw explained that that the proposed program builds on the success of a certificate program in Biomedical Sciences and that the two main goals are to prepare students to be successful in terminal degree programs in medical professions and to provide students with skills to enter technical positions that require biomedical sciences knowledge.

Admiral Munns asked about research and a connection with the SmartState program. Dr. Kasman responded that the degree does not have a research or thesis component. Dr. Horne expressed concern about students who finish the proposed program but still are unable to succeed at entering a terminal medical degree program. Dr. Wright responded that the certificate program has a graduate placement rate for entrance into a terminal medical degree program of 93%. She then explained that graduates who do not continue to a terminal medical degree program have opportunities to use their education in research coordinator or biologic technician positions in academic or medical settings.

The Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission approval of the program leading to the Master of Science degree in Medical Sciences at the Medical University of South Carolina to be implemented in Summer 2015.

**5. Consideration of Request for Amendment to License to Add New Programs: A.S., Occupational Therapy Assistant; A.S., Physical Therapist Assistant; and D.N.P., South University, Savannah, GA at its Columbia campus**

Dr. Horne introduced the item and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Phillips) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Kavlie explained that these programs have been successful at South's other campuses.

Admiral Munns commented that he submitted questions and they were answered prior to the meeting. He asked that the question and the institution's response be included in the meeting minutes. [Please see [page 17 of the Attachment](#).] He expressed concern about the rise in default rates and suggested that the recommendation be revised to require an annual reporting and assessment of the default rate. Dr. Kavlie asked whether the default rates for only the Columbia campus or for all South University campuses should be reported. Admiral Munns answered that the default rates for all South University campuses should be reported.

Admiral Munns asked about South University's ability to administer a doctorate program. Dr. Shoop responded that South University has both the financial resources and the faculty credentials to administer a doctorate program. He noted that South has experience in executing accredited degree programs that lead to doctorates of professional practice. Dr. Kavlie informed the Committee that the institution's SACS Level Six Accreditation has been recently re-affirmed.

Dr. Horne expressed concern about the costs of a two-year degree. Dr. Kavlie explained that South offers highly individualized attention and industry-current technology. Dr. Shoop added that South brings significant resources to all its programs so that students receive superior experience in the classroom and the lab. Dr. Kavlie commented that scholarships are available for students who cannot afford program costs. Dr. Horne asked about the number of students who have Pell grants. Dr. Kavlie responded that he did not have that specific information.

Admiral Munns **moved to amend the recommendation** to require an annual reporting and assessment of cohort default rates for the system and for the Columbia campus. Phillips **seconded** the motion.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted to commend favorably with a vote of two to one** (Admiral Munns and Mr. Phillips voted to commend favorably, while Dr. Horne voted to not commend) to the Commission an amendment to the existing license of South University to offer programs leading to the A.S. degree in Occupational Therapy Assistant; A.S. degree in Physical Therapist Assistant; and Doctor of Nursing Practice degree to be implemented in January 2015, April 2015, and October 2016, provided that no state funding be required or requested.

Further, the Committee recommends that the approval of the amendment include conditions that the institution:

1. Implement its plan to attain programmatic accreditation by the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE) for the OTA program; Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education (CAPTE) for the PTA program; and Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) for the DNP program. Institution officials must keep the staff of CHE informed about the status and progress of accreditation and, if it becomes apparent that it cannot meet the standards for accreditation within its

timeline, the institution must cease recruiting and enrolling new students into the programs and immediately advise enrolled students of the status of accreditation.

2. Include in its annual report to the Commission updated cohort default rates for the system and for the Columbia campus.
3. Include in its annual report to the Commission attrition, completion, and pass rates for the OTA and PTA programs.

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

Dr. Horne introduced the item and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Phillips) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Ms. Houpp explained that the revisions help to streamline the approval process, make the process more efficient for universities and insure quality degree programs. Mr. Drueke commented that the revised forms are similar to forms that universities must already submit to SACS. Dr. Shaw commented that the elimination of the three-page planning summary helps institutions process through the approval stages more quickly. Dr. Janosik stated that staff will work with ACAP members to develop a strategic plan for new program proposal submissions. Admiral Munns asked about meeting schedules. Ms. Houpp explained that the task force determined that the program approval cycle of dates works best for institutions in developing, submitting and implementing new degree programs. Dr. Horne expressed her appreciation to Dr. Janosik and the task force and especially acknowledged the inclusion of representatives from all institutional sectors in the task force.

The Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission approval of the revised *Policies and Procedures for New Academic Programs, Program Modifications, Program Notifications, Program Terminations, and New Centers*

**7. Consideration of *Annual Report on Admissions Standards for First-Time Entering Freshmen, FY 2013-14***

Dr. Horne introduced the item and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Phillips) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Horne expressed her great interest in the report. She then questioned the timing of the report and specifically asked why the report is not presented ten months earlier. She asked that it be presented to CAAL at a Spring CAAL meeting. Dr. Janosik responded that staff will consider the suggestion and determine whether an earlier date is possible. Admiral Munns thanked staff for adding a staff assessment and then asked whether universities are asked to comment on their results. Ms. Houpp responded that in the past universities have been asked to review the data for accuracy but not asked for comment on the assessment. Admiral Munns expressed his support for asking universities to comment on their status in the report. Dr. Horne commented on the huge disparity between universities for the percentage of applicants offered admission. Dr. Horne asked whether sophomore to junior attrition data could be added to the report. Dr. Janosik answered that the data could be added.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission endorsement of the *Annual Report on Admissions Standards for First-Time Entering Freshmen, FY 2013-14* for transmittal to the South Carolina Department of Education and the chairs of the House and Senate Education Committees.

**8. Consideration of *Report on Program Productivity, Fall 2008-Fall 2012***

Dr. Horne introduced the item and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Phillips) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Admiral Munns expressed concern about the number of unproductive programs at USC and about the length of time that they have been unproductive. He then relayed a discussion he had with Dr. Janosik about the Commission not having the authority to terminate unproductive programs. He suggested that the Commission ask about the status of these programs every year as compared to every other year. Dr. Janosik clarified that the Commission can recommend termination, but the decision is made by the institution. Ms. Houpp added that if the Commission wants the authority to terminate, then it must seek statutory change. The Committee discussed possible legislative options.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission acceptance and approval of the staff recommendations in the *Report on Program Productivity, Fall 2008-Fall 2012*.

**9. Presentation of *Annual Report on Terminated and Approved Programs, FY 2013-14***

Dr. Horne introduced the item as information.

**10. Presentation of *Annual Report on Staff-Approved Mission Statement Modifications, FY 2013-14***

Dr. Horne introduced the item as information.

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

Dr. Horne introduced the item as information.

**12. Presentation of *Annual Report on Licensing Activities, FY 2013-14***

Dr. Horne introduced the item as information. Admiral Munns commented on the Commission's plan to place more emphasis on auditing or monitoring the success of academic programs in the future. He stated that monitoring information on default, graduation and placement rates might be placed in this type of report in the future.

**13. Presentation of *Report on Program Modifications, May 1- July 31, 2014***

Dr. Horne presented the item for information only.

Dr. Horne thanked those in attendance for their participation and staff for their work. Hearing no further business, she adjourned the meeting at 3:57 p.m.

**Commissioner Munns' Questions and CHE/Institutional Responses:  
Clemson University, B.A., World Cinema**

QUESTION: Adobe Create Cloud Cost... Pg 9 states that all Faculty, staff and students have access to Adobe Creative Cloud. This could be a significant cost driver for the school and for tuition/fees. Is this a significant cost?

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: The University received a \$11.3M gift from Adobe and our information technology department covered the balance of the costs from their operating budget for a three year period. Prior to this arrangement, departments and individuals had to contract directly with Adobe to pay for individual software packages from the company. The enterprise license agreement makes the costs go away for individuals and departments and there is no intent to add this charge back at the unit or individual level. It should be noted that our IT unit has a very active Student Advisory Group and the students provide direct input into the services requested for and provided by the IT group at the University. IT fees do not go up with tuition increases and the only increases proposed reflect student recommended increases for specific services. The last time the fees were increased was implemented in Fall 2012 and it was increased \$3/semester.

QUESTION: Internships... Pg 12 states that students will engage in summer study abroad or internships. Are these programs arranged? Do you foresee any difficulty in arranging for the internships or paying for summer study?

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: We have already arranged the study abroad program in film production with Marconi University in Rome. The terms of this study abroad are standard for Clemson University and undergo regular (formal) review by the Office of Global Engagement (includes Study Abroad). The specific course of study at Marconi University, in terms of cost, is comparable to studying at Clemson. We are in the process of establishing internship relationships with the local production companies, media businesses, cultural centers, non-profit organizations. We do not foresee any difficulties fostering these connections. The University has a longstanding commitment of providing internship programs for students. The requirement of study abroad experiences is part of most BA degrees in the College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities and students are aware of the requirements on admission. Opportunities vary from semester abroad to academic year to short summer experiences. Financial aid and scholarships are available.

QUESTION: Assessments.. Page 17 states that placement rate will be an additional indicator of program success. Will this be a large or small factor?

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: The department will monitor the placement rates closely and consider it carefully. It is very important that our graduates are marketable and in that, placement is a large factor. However, it is more than just "getting a job", placement rates and input from students about their placement and their success in their first position is important to adjusting the curriculum and preparing students for an evolving employment environment. It is also important that we prepare students for the present and the future, so we need to know if our graduates have the skills to continue to learn, problem solve, think critically, and communicate effectively. Our graduates (through alumni surveys) help to address those questions for us as well.

**Commissioner Munns' Questions and CHE/Institutional Responses:  
Clemson University, Ph.D., Learning Sciences**

QUESTION: Cost of programs... The three proposed PHD programs are expensive. Pg 17 shows that only 10% of the cost will be paid by PHD student tuition, most of the remaining 90% (nearly \$2M over 5 years) will come from reallocation – presumably undergraduate tuition. Please justify the value of these programs in light of their cost and its effect on undergraduate tuition. Same comment for all three PHD proposals.

**INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE:**

**COST OF THE PhDs AND ENROLLMENT QUESTIONS:**

**University Focus:**

First, it is important for CAAL and CHE to have a full understanding of the University's budget strategies since the downturn in the economy in 2008. The President (James Barker) took three steps to address the state budget cuts. Category one addressed the immediate shortfall through mandatory furloughs, delays in projects, and travel restrictions in 2008-09. Category two involved multi-year budget reductions, voluntary retirement and severance incentives, and a series of task forces to find ways to cut costs and increase revenues. Category three was to develop a new long-term plan to transform the economic and funding climate at the university. Second, the end result was a new planning tool, DIVEST to INVEST. Faculty, department chairs and deans were provided with guidelines and goals on divestments from current activities and programs to invest in new programs and activities that support and drive the 2020 Strategic Plan of the University. Faculty were also given guidance in positive ways of generating new revenue that would support departments in moving forward. One strategy was developing new graduate degree programs. Non-traditional graduate programs, such as those taught online or off-campus, were encouraged and if self-sufficient, any generated revenue beyond operating costs could be used to support the department (a new revenue source). The 2020 Road Map states: "The new model requires time and patience. It would be faster to slash degree programs, close academic departments, lay off faculty and staff, eliminate hundreds of course sections and either curtail or rapidly grow enrollment. The challenge in the 2020 Road Map is to focus on students, enhance quality, drive economic growth and protect as many jobs as possible." (2020 Road Map, April 2011) These financial directions have not changed under President Clements's leadership.

**Departmental Focus:**

The Teacher Education department of the Eugene T. Moore School of Education is investing funds that they have divested from existing programs and revenue generated by off-campus and online courses. Faculty have grown their research programs, including a recently funded federal grant supporting the doctorate in Special Education. The budget line in the CHE proposals is called reallocation. Our divestment and investment is your reallocation. The faculty have determined by studying other schools of education with top ranked programs, by attending professional meetings, and by examining student interest that they can provide a stronger, more focused curriculum for doctoral studies by redesigning a current PhD program.

A significant reason behind creating the separate PhD program in Learning Sciences, Special Education and LLC, is that the current Curriculum & Instruction degree is not meeting the diverse needs of our learners. While C&I programs seem to function best as discipline-specific programs (e.g., math, science, social science), these three new programs cut across subject areas to provide opportunities for learning and research in the interdisciplinary fields of Learning Sciences, Special Education, and Literacy, Language, & Culture. The enrollment in the PhD in

C&I over the last five years: 2009: 53; 2010: 44; 2011: 42; 2012: 45 and 2013: 41. It is also difficult to judge programs for teachers by examining just graduation rates. Most of these students are part-time graduate students and full time teachers in K-12 schools in South Carolina.

We are aware of the concerns that CAAL members may have regarding the cost of three new doctoral degree programs. First, it is important to realize that the faculty are currently teaching students in the PhD program in Curriculum and Instruction and its array of concentrations. There are no new hires needed. The FTE teaching requirements are exceeded by the number of faculty, and because these same faculty teach undergraduate and master's students across the teacher education programs, conduct research and advise students they are fully engaged. The C&I concentrations in the proposed areas have had lower enrollments than we would like, but it's hard to recruit for a concentration. It is, in fact, that these concentrations have had low enrollment that we seek to pull these concentrations out into separate doctoral programs. If one examines top Schools of Education, the stand alone programs have better enrollments and prepare graduates in the specific disciplines than when included in broader programs.

In addition, with the PhD program in Curriculum and Instruction, these three doctoral degrees will share core courses: research method courses, statistics, and dissertation seminars and will not add further teaching cost. In further detail,

Learning Sciences: Of the 8 required courses, 6 are shared with at least one other PhD program and more often with all 4. The cognate courses are from existing offerings within departments across the campus;

Literacy, Language and Culture: Of the three core courses, 1 is shared with at least one other PhD program. Two of the four cognate courses are shared courses with at least one other PhD. Of the 16 hours in research methods all courses are shared with all other PhD programs.

Special Education: All but one research method course is shared with all other PhD programs. The one not shared is already required of SPED doctoral students in the C&I program. Of the six specialty courses, one is shared with other PhD programs. The other 5 are already required of SPED Doctoral students in the C&I concentration. Of the remaining 6 courses that students might take, three are outside of the school of Education, 5 are shared with all other PhD programs, and 4 others are currently offered to SPED doctoral students.

The overall number of graduate student assistants has not increased. The assistantships have been aligned to the specific degree program rather than to one (C&I); the graduate students will continue to serve as graduate graders, teaching assistants, and research assistants.

The reallocation of costs is not from Undergraduate Tuition to Graduate education. It is a reallocation of faculty and administrative costs that are currently funded under the PhD in Curriculum and Instruction being moved into each of the separate degree programs. There are no new personnel needed to make these curricula changes. It should also be noted that the MAT in Special Education is expected to generate funds for the department when fully enrolled. These graduate tuition dollars can be used by the department to support all graduate and undergraduate programs as necessary. In these past years of budget cuts, any revenue generated by the department through off-campus teaching has been used to replace departmental cuts.

Once you consider the enrollment in the current C&I program, we do not anticipate an enrollment issue. Nor do we anticipate an enrollment issue between Clemson and University of South Carolina. The current forty plus students at Clemson will have four degrees and will select one of the four. The C&I degree has concentrations and focus areas (with concentrations in: elementary education, English education, mathematics education, science education, social studies education, literacy education or special education and a range of scholarly focus areas including academic and behavioral interventions for diverse learners; early childhood learning and development; informal education; STEM; international-global education; learning technologies and educational psychology; legal and policy issues in education; mixed methods and design-based research; motivation and learning; professional development and educational quality; qualitative research methodologies; research, evaluation, measurement and statistics; social, historical and philosophical foundations of education; social justice and educational equity; and sustainability education).

**Commissioner Munns' Questions and CHE/Institutional Responses:  
Clemson University, Ph.D., Literacy, Language and Culture**

QUESTION: Cost of programs... The three proposed PHD programs are expensive. Please justify the value of these programs in light of their cost and its effect on undergraduate tuition.

COST OF THE PhDs AND ENROLLMENT QUESTIONS:

University Focus:

First, it is important for CAAL and CHE to have a full understanding of the University's budget strategies since the downturn in the economy in 2008. The President (James Barker) took three steps to address the state budget cuts. Category one addressed the immediate shortfall through mandatory furloughs, delays in projects, and travel restrictions in 2008-09. Category two involved multi-year budget reductions, voluntary retirement and severance incentives, and a series of task forces to find ways to cut costs and increase revenues. Category three was to develop a new long-term plan to transform the economic and funding climate at the university. Second, the end result was a new planning tool, DIVEST to INVEST. Faculty, department chairs and deans were provided with guidelines and goals on divestments from current activities and programs to invest in new programs and activities that support and drive the 2020 Strategic Plan of the University. Faculty were also given guidance in positive ways of generating new revenue that would support departments in moving forward. One strategy was developing new graduate degree programs. Non-traditional graduate programs, such as those taught online or off-campus, were encouraged and if self-sufficient, any generated revenue beyond operating costs could be used to support the department (a new revenue source). The 2020 Road Map states: "The new model requires time and patience. It would be faster to slash degree programs, close academic departments, lay off faculty and staff, eliminate hundreds of course sections and either curtail or rapidly grow enrollment. The challenge in the 2020 Road Map is to focus on students, enhance quality, drive economic growth and protect as many jobs as possible." (2020 Road Map, April 2011) These financial directions have not changed under President Clements's leadership.

Departmental Focus:

The Teacher Education department of the Eugene T. Moore School of Education is investing funds that they have divested from existing programs and revenue generated by off-campus and online courses. Faculty have grown their research programs, including a recently funded federal grant supporting the doctorate in Special Education. The budget line in the CHE proposals is called reallocation. Our divestment and investment is your reallocation. The faculty have determined by studying other schools of education with top ranked programs, by attending professional meetings, and by examining student interest that they can provide a stronger, more focused curriculum for doctoral studies by redesigning a current PhD program.

A significant reason behind creating the separate PhD program in Learning Sciences, Special Education and LLC, is that the current Curriculum & Instruction degree is not meeting the diverse needs of our learners. While C&I programs seem to function best as discipline-specific programs (e.g., math, science, social science), these three new programs cut across subject areas to provide opportunities for learning and research in the interdisciplinary fields of Learning Sciences, Special Education, and Literacy, Language, & Culture. The enrollment in the PhD in C&I over the last five years: 2009: 53; 2010: 44; 2011: 42; 2012: 45 and 2013: 41. It is also difficult to judge programs for teachers by examining just graduation rates. Most of these

students are part-time graduate students and full time teachers in K-12 schools in South Carolina.

We are aware of the concerns that CAAL members may have regarding the cost of three new doctoral degree programs. First, it is important to realize that the faculty are currently teaching students in the PhD program in Curriculum and Instruction and it's array of concentrations. There are no new hires needed. The FTE teaching requirements are exceeded by the number of faculty, and because these same faculty teach undergraduate and master's students across the teacher education programs, conduct research and advise students they are fully engaged. The C&I concentrations in the proposed areas have had lower enrollments than we would like, but it's hard to recruit for a concentration. It is, in fact, that these concentrations have had low enrollment that we seek to pull these concentrations out into separate doctoral programs. If one examines top Schools of Education, the stand alone programs have better enrollments and prepare graduates in the specific disciplines than when included in broader programs.

In addition, with the PhD program in Curriculum and Instruction, these three doctoral degrees will share core courses: research method courses, statistics, and dissertation seminars and will not add further teaching cost. In further detail,

**Learning Sciences:** Of the 8 required courses, 6 are shared with at least one other PhD program and more often with all 4. The cognate courses are from existing offerings within departments across the campus;

**Literacy, Language and Culture:** Of the three core courses, 1 is shared with at least one other PhD program. Two of the four cognate courses are shared courses with at least one other PhD. Of the 16 hours in research methods all courses are shared with all other PhD programs.

**Special Education:** All but one research method course is shared with all other PhD programs. The one not shared is already required of SPED doctoral students in the C&I program. Of the six specialty courses, one is shared with other PhD programs. The other 5 are already required of SPED Doctoral students in the C&I concentration. Of the remaining 6 courses that students might take, three are outside of the school of Education, 5 are shared with all other PhD programs, and 4 others are currently offered to SPED doctoral students.

The overall number of graduate student assistants has not increased. The assistantships have been aligned to the specific degree program rather than to one (C&I); the graduate students will continue to serve as graduate graders, teaching assistants, and research assistants.

The reallocation of costs is not from Undergraduate Tuition to Graduate education. It is a reallocation of faculty and administrative costs that are currently funded under the PhD in Curriculum and Instruction being moved into each of the separate degree programs. There are no new personnel needed to make these curricula changes. It should also be noted that the MAT in Special Education is expected to generate funds for the department when fully enrolled. These graduate tuition dollars can be used by the department to support all graduate and undergraduate programs as necessary. In these past years of budget cuts, any revenue generated by the department through off-campus teaching has been used to replace departmental cuts.

Once you consider the enrollment in the current C&I program, we do not anticipate an enrollment issue. Nor do we anticipate an enrollment issue between Clemson and University of South Carolina. The current forty plus students at Clemson will have four degrees and will select

one of the four. The C&I degree has concentrations and focus areas (with concentrations in: elementary education, English education, mathematics education, science education, social studies education, literacy education or special education and a range of scholarly focus areas including academic and behavioral interventions for diverse learners; early childhood learning and development; informal education; STEM; international-global education; learning technologies and educational psychology; legal and policy issues in education; mixed methods and design-based research; motivation and learning; professional development and educational quality; qualitative research methodologies; research, evaluation, measurement and statistics; social, historical and philosophical foundations of education; social justice and educational equity; and sustainability education).

QUESTION: Student Demand... Pg 9. Please explain why you believe there exists sufficient demand given that the concentration produced only 12 completions in 10 years, and this program now project 4-5 new students per year (50 in 10 years).

**INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE:**

We firmly believe that having an expanded focus on Literacy with Language and Culture will shift the interest in program when it was primarily a curriculum and instruction degree. In the past, we have been limited in our ability to admit more Ph.D. students in literacy because we did not have sufficient faculty with expertise in literacy. This has changed over the past 5 years as we have hired a number of faculty with expertise in literacy and the number of applicants for our existing Ph.D. in C & I with an emphasis in Reading/Literacy has steadily increased. We did see an increase in Literacy M.Ed. program and this may encourage more students to move toward the doctoral degree. Thirty students graduated with the M.Ed. in Literacy in 2013. With the emphasis on Read to Succeed in our state we anticipate that there will be an increasing demand for a Ph.D. in LLC.

A major reason for the move to a stand-alone program Ph.D. program in LLC is to make the program more competitive nationally. Research shows that Doctoral students prefer a Ph.D. in LLC as opposed to Curriculum and Instruction. This bears out when one looks nationally at Schools of Education. Our peer institutions have made the move to stand alone Ph.D. programs in LLC.

QUESTION: Redundancy in light of low student demand... given that there appears to be a limited number of candidates (at least historidall), please explain why this new program would not be redundant to USC's PHD program and starting this program would not adversely affect enrollment in both programs.

**INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE:**

We view the program at USC and Clemson's programs as being complimentary and both institutions have had existing Ph.D. programs in Reading/Literacy. Because of the current emphasis on Literacy (Read to Succeed legislation) we anticipate an increase in the demand for the degree in literacy.

QUESTION: President's approval... Page 4 indicates the President approved on 15 May, significant revisions seem to have been made after that date after the ACAP review, and the President's signature is blank on Pg 3 for the Revised Program. Has the President approved the new revisions?

**INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE:**

The changes made in the revisions were not major but clarifying based on questions at ACAP and by the Staff; a request for a new signature page was not made and therefore not provided. The President, Provost and Dean continue to be supportive of the new degree programs.

**Commissioner Munns' Questions and CHE/Institutional Responses:  
Clemson University, Ph.D., Special Education**

QUESTION: Same set of questions as for the previous program: Cost of programs; Student Demand; Redundancy in light of low student demand; President's approval.

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE:

COST OF THE PhDs AND ENROLLMENT QUESTIONS:

University Focus:

First, it is important for CAAL and CHE to have a full understanding of the University's budget strategies since the downturn in the economy in 2008. The President (James Barker) took three steps to address the state budget cuts. Category one addressed the immediate shortfall through mandatory furloughs, delays in projects, and travel restrictions in 2008-09. Category two involved multi-year budget reductions, voluntary retirement and severance incentives, and a series of task forces to find ways to cut costs and increase revenues. Category three was to develop a new long-term plan to transform the economic and funding climate at the university. Second, the end result was a new planning tool, DIVEST to INVEST. Faculty, department chairs and deans were provided with guidelines and goals on divestments from current activities and programs to invest in new programs and activities that support and drive the 2020 Strategic Plan of the University. Faculty were also given guidance in positive ways of generating new revenue that would support departments in moving forward. One strategy was developing new graduate degree programs. Non-traditional graduate programs, such as those taught online or off-campus, were encouraged and if self-sufficient, any generated revenue beyond operating costs could be used to support the department (a new revenue source). The 2020 Road Map states: "The new model requires time and patience. It would be faster to slash degree programs, close academic departments, lay off faculty and staff, eliminate hundreds of course sections and either curtail or rapidly grow enrollment. The challenge in the 2020 Road Map is to focus on students, enhance quality, drive economic growth and protect as many jobs as possible." (2020 Road Map, April 2011) These financial directions have not changed under President Clements's leadership.

Departmental Focus:

The Teacher Education department of the Eugene T. Moore School of Education is investing funds that they have divested from existing programs and revenue generated by off-campus and online courses. Faculty have grown their research programs, including a recently funded federal grant supporting the doctorate in Special Education. The budget line in the CHE proposals is called reallocation. Our divestment and investment is your reallocation. The faculty have determined by studying other schools of education with top ranked programs, by attending professional meetings, and by examining student interest that they can provide a stronger, more focused curriculum for doctoral studies by redesigning a current PhD program.

A significant reason behind creating the separate PhD program in Learning Sciences, Special Education and LLC, is that the current Curriculum & Instruction degree is not meeting the diverse needs of our learners. While C&I programs seem to function best as discipline-specific programs (e.g., math, science, social science), these three new programs cut across subject areas to provide opportunities for learning and research in the interdisciplinary fields of Learning Sciences, Special Education, and Literacy, Language, & Culture. The enrollment in the PhD in C&I over the last five years: 2009: 53; 2010: 44; 2011: 42; 2012: 45 and 2013: 41. It is also difficult to judge programs for teachers by examining just graduation rates. Most of these

students are part-time graduate students and full time teachers in K-12 schools in South Carolina.

We are aware of the concerns that CAAL members may have regarding the cost of three new doctoral degree programs. First, it is important to realize that the faculty are currently teaching students in the PhD program in Curriculum and Instruction and it's array of concentrations. There are no new hires needed. The FTE teaching requirements are exceeded by the number of faculty, and because these same faculty teach undergraduate and master's students across the teacher education programs, conduct research and advise students they are fully engaged. The C&I concentrations in the proposed areas have had lower enrollments than we would like, but it's hard to recruit for a concentration. It is, in fact, that these concentrations have had low enrollment that we seek to pull these concentrations out into separate doctoral programs. If one examines top Schools of Education, the stand alone programs have better enrollments and prepare graduates in the specific disciplines than when included in broader programs.

In addition, with the PhD program in Curriculum and Instruction, these three doctoral degrees will share core courses: research method courses, statistics, and dissertation seminars and will not add further teaching cost. In further detail,

Learning Sciences: Of the 8 required courses, 6 are shared with at least one other PhD program and more often with all 4. The cognate courses are from existing offerings within departments across the campus;

Literacy, Language and Culture: Of the three core courses, 1 is shared with at least one other PhD program. Two of the four cognate courses are shared courses with at least one other PhD. Of the 16 hours in research methods all courses are shared with all other PhD programs.

Special Education: All but one research method course is shared with all other PhD programs. The one not shared is already required of SPED doctoral students in the C&I program. Of the six specialty courses, one is shared with other PhD programs. The other 5 are already required of SPED Doctoral students in the C&I concentration. Of the remaining 6 courses that students might take, three are outside of the school of Education, 5 are shared with all other PhD programs, and 4 others are currently offered to SPED doctoral students.

The overall number of graduate student assistants has not increased. The assistantships have been aligned to the specific degree program rather than to one (C&I); the graduate students will continue to serve as graduate graders, teaching assistants, and research assistants.

The reallocation of costs is not from Undergraduate Tuition to Graduate education. It is a reallocation of faculty and administrative costs that are currently funded under the PhD in Curriculum and Instruction being moved into each of the separate degree programs. There are no new personnel needed to make these curricula changes. It should also be noted that the MAT in Special Education is expected to generate funds for the department when fully enrolled. These graduate tuition dollars can be used by the department to support all graduate and undergraduate programs as necessary. In these past years of budget cuts, any revenue generated by the department through off-campus teaching has been used to replace departmental cuts.

Once you consider the enrollment in the current C&I program, we do not anticipate an enrollment issue. Nor do we anticipate an enrollment issue between Clemson and University of South Carolina. The current forty plus students at Clemson will have four degrees and will select

one of the four. The C&I degree has concentrations and focus areas (with concentrations in: elementary education, English education, mathematics education, science education, social studies education, literacy education or special education and a range of scholarly focus areas including academic and behavioral interventions for diverse learners; early childhood learning and development; informal education; STEM; international-global education; learning technologies and educational psychology; legal and policy issues in education; mixed methods and design-based research; motivation and learning; professional development and educational quality; qualitative research methodologies; research, evaluation, measurement and statistics; social, historical and philosophical foundations of education; social justice and educational equity; and sustainability education).

Student Demand: Twenty students have completed Clemson's C & I program with the special education emphasis over the last five years, and this number is expected to increase with the stand-alone program. There are several reasons the move to a stand-alone program Ph.D. program in special education will enhance the number and quality of our applicants to the program compared to the Ph.D. in C & I. First, the stand-alone program will allow us to recruit high quality candidates at a broader national level. Individuals pursuing doctoral level degrees in special education, and specifically those interested in research, don't often look for C & I programs. Second, the stand-alone program will likely facilitate additional funding to support full-time doctoral students, which in turn, increases the number of students in the program. In fact, the special education faculty has received notification in July that we have been awarded a \$1.1 million dollar federally funded leadership grant to support five doctoral students across five years toward completion of their doctoral degrees in special education.

Redundancy: Based upon the national shortage of special education faculty (as evidenced in the full proposal) and according to Dr. Yell's letter of support, the Ph.D. in special education will not reduce the number of scholars at USC, and in fact will complement the program there. Our faculty work closely with the special education faculty at USC and will continue to collaborate to support our students at both institutions. Our graduates, and those from USC, who have completed the programs have been successful in securing university positions in South Carolina as well as other states across the country. We are confident that the stand-alone Ph.D. in special education will not replicate the program at USC and will enhance the ability of our state to produce high quality leaders in special education to meet the demands identified nationally.

**Commissioner Munns' Questions and CHE/Institutional Responses:  
College of Charleston, B.A., A.B., Supply Chain Management**

QUESTION: New hires... pg 16, pg 18. Please explain the need for new hires. The proposal states that there will be no new students, Pg 16 says there will be 2 New Faculty hires, Pg 18 Table shows no new hires?

**INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE:**

Thank you for this point of clarification. These two lines are not requests for new faculty positions but rather they are existing vacant positions with searches already underway in 2014-15 for faculty hired to begin coincident to the start of the program in 2015-16. "New Hire #1" will provide 3 courses per semester that directly support the proposed major in Supply Chain Management (DSCI 232, DSCI 304, SCIM 360, and other SCIM courses). "New Hire #2" is a line that was allocated to the Department last year to reinforce the School's Business Analytics curriculum. This position supports the proposed major through the general business curriculum (e.g., DSCI 320) and the development of an elective course in supply chain management (e.g., DSCI 360).

QUESTION: Curriculum... Pg 22, Table shows only 2 math courses MAT 120/130. This seems insufficient for the BS degree. Please justify.

**INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE:**

It is correct that the required mathematics courses *housed within the Department of Mathematics* are Math 104/250 (Statistics) and Math 105/120 (Calculus). Completing these courses will satisfy the general education requirement in mathematics as well as meet School of Business core requirements. The table is meant to demonstrate the most efficient path for students transferring from a two-year institution. The required mathematics coursework is consistent with requirements in other approved B.S. majors in the School of Business (e.g. Accounting, Finance, Marketing, and Economics). However, there are a number of additional quantitative courses required as part of the Supply Chain Management major that extend well beyond statistics and calculus. Examples include:

**DSCI 232 – Business Statistics:** Advanced statistical analysis with applications in business and economics utilizing relevant computer software. Topics include business applications in descriptive and inferential statistics emphasizing selected topics such as simple and multiple regression, analysis of variance, time series analysis and non-parametric techniques.

**DSCI 406 – Quantitative Methods and Decision Making:** Students are introduced to quantitative modeling techniques and to the role quantitative models play in the decision-making process. Emphasis will be placed on the understanding of tools necessary to qualify decision making, with extensive use of computer-assisted solution methods.

**SCIM 366 – Lean and Six Sigma:** This course will provide students with an introduction to Lean Six Sigma and the tool sets of Team Work and Time Management, Statistical Analysis, Elimination of Waste, process mapping, dashboards and other business improvement techniques. There is emphasis on voice of the customer and tools needed to measure those needs.

**SCIM 373 – Supply Chain Planning and Analysis:** Covers the primary methods of analysis required for supply chain planning, with a special emphasis given to the quantitative

modeling techniques used in developing and managing the performance of supply chain systems. Students will gain experience using the tools (e.g., analytical models) that generally qualify decision-making in supply chain environments. Consistent with the emphasis on quantitative analysis in the proposed major, the first learning goal for this program (see pg. 11) is that students “Demonstrate the ability to use quantitative models in solving business-related problems in the field of supply chain management.” We certainly share your interest in promoting mathematical and quantitative literacy among program graduates. We believe that we have engineered a B. S. degree program that emphasizes these skills.

**Commissioner Munns' Questions and CHE/Institutional Responses:  
Francis Marion University, M.S., Physician Assistant Studies**

QUESTION: Clinical sites. . .one factor for success for this program will be the degree of achievement of clinical sites. Please justify the ability to obtain sufficient sites, and also explain the impact of these new sites on current MUSC programs. Is there a need for MOU with MUSC around clinical sites?

**INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE:**

This program was developed under the auspices of the Pee Dee Health Education Partnership, a consortium of the University of South Carolina, Francis Marion University, and the two large regional medical centers in Florence, McLeod Health and Carolinas Hospital System. The Pee Dee Health Education Partnership was approved by the Commission on Higher Education in October 2008 to serve as a framework for graduate health care programs, such as this PA program, that are intended to serve the Pee Dee region and the state of South Carolina. McLeod Regional Medical Center and Carolinas Hospital System, which are members of the Pee Dee Health Education Partnership, are completely in support of this program. With the cooperation and collaboration of the two regional medical centers and the additional hospitals and clinics that they operate, we see no difficulty in identifying sufficient clinical sites in northeastern South Carolina. Although our first clinical rotations will not take place until 2018, we are already in discussion with Carolinas and McLeod. In addition, the Pee Dee AHEC is also involved and committed to finding clinical sites for FMU's PA students.

FMU is unaware of any effects of the FMU Physician Assistant program on the MUSC program. When then MUSC President Ray Greenberg was informed several years ago by President Fred Carter about FMU's plans for a Physician Assistant program, President Greenberg did not indicate that a Francis Marion Physician Assistant program would affect the MUSC program. Indeed, since the FMU program will be only the second PA program in the state, it is extremely unlikely that the FMU program will have any significant effect on MUSC activities. Furthermore, with the advice and assistance of our consulting partner, the Wake Forest University Department of Physician Assistant Studies, who assisted in the design of this program, we are confident that FMU will meet accreditation requirements without any additional MOUs.

It is important to remember that, as the I-95 Corridor Study demonstrated when it was released in 2009, the rural areas of northeastern South Carolina are severely underserved in medical practitioners. Thus it is vital that PAs be educated locally with the goal that they remain to practice in northeastern South Carolina.

QUESTON: Joint PA programs... Pg 6. it seems strange that the accrediting agency would disallow a joint program. Should Francis Marion reclama this decision? Should CHE intervene?

**INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE:**

The Accrediting Review Commission for the Education of Physician Assistants (ARC-PA) is a national accrediting body with stringent accreditation standards and requirements. The ARC-PA was adamant that it does not consider joint programs. ARC-PA has little need to consider proposals of change from outside the organization, and any attempt to bring about change in ARC-PA procedures would almost certainly have little effect and could delay accreditation of the FMU program by removing Francis Marion from the ARC-PA March 2016 meeting agenda. As noted above, with the assistance of the Wake Forest University Department of Physician

Assistant Studies, this program has been designed from its inception to meet ARC-PA accreditation standards.

QUESTION: Impact to Nurse Practitioner... Pg 8 states that there will be no impact to any existing FMU program. Please justify why this new program would not adversely affect the FMU Family Nurse Practitioner program.

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: Enrollment in the Nurse Practitioner program will not be affected because NP graduate students come from a different pool of applicants. Graduate students seeking admission to the NP program must be registered nurses who hold Bachelor of Science in Nursing degrees. Graduate students applying to the PA program must hold baccalaureate degrees, but those degrees will include a variety of majors (typically the sciences, although qualified PA students who have taken the required prerequisites may be from any major).

One positive effect of the new PA program on the existing NP program will be the creation of opportunities for interprofessional training in the new FMU Health Sciences facility that will be constructed in downtown Florence. Interprofessional education and training will be part of the new PA program and an addition to the current NP program.

With respect to clinical sites, the needs and educational models of the two programs are different and thus there will be little or no conflict over clinical sites, which in any case will be coordinated through the Pee Dee Health Education Partnership (by McLeod Health and Carolinas Hospital System). Most of the NP clinicals are in Family Practice with some requirements with geriatric and pediatric patients. PAs are required to do month-long rotations in 8 different areas of medicine and there will be limited overlap. The structures of the clinical experiences are also different. NP clinicals are 1-3 days per week for a semester, while clinical experiences for PAs involve 4 weeks of full-time attendance for each rotation. As noted above, in some instances having opportunities to engage in clinical training together (interprofessional education) will be an advantage.

QUESTION: New Courses... the program plans for 27 new courses. Does FMU have sufficient time and resources to get these courses operational in a year?

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE:

Yes. Please note that we have two years to prepare for the beginning of the program in Fall 2016. In fact, accreditation requirements make it clear that a PA program must begin in exactly this way. FMU's PA program director will commence his duties on September 16, 2014, almost two years before the program begins.

Francis Marion will start hiring new faculty to teach most of the courses, although some classes may be taught by existing NP faculty. The ARC-PA will not give provisional accreditation until Francis Marion furnishes evidence that we will have sufficient staff to teach all the courses and provide sufficient clinical sites.

QUESTION: Assessment.. Two important parameters of success seem to be missing from the Program Assessment Plan; graduate placement rate, and student clinical availability. Do you consider this important to success, and if so would you include them in the assessment program?

**INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE:**

Clinical site availability will not be assessed per se as sufficient sites must be provided for accreditation purposes, but there will be ongoing evaluation of the quality of the student experience at individual sites. The design of this evaluation tool will be the responsibility of the PA program clinical coordinator.

Graduation placement rate is very important and we will gather this information. We are also very interested in where our graduates will be employed. On page 15 under Program Assessment we tried to describe our attention to employment with ...3) Employer satisfaction will be collected by survey six month post graduation ...6) Alumni satisfaction 6-months post graduation and; 7) Employment location/specialty.

**QUESTION:** State support... Please explain the need for State support of \$500,000 a year. Page 22 shows the program self-sufficient after program year 2 without this state investment.

**INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE:**

Francis Marion appreciates the endorsement and support shown for this program by the South Carolina General Assembly with a recurring appropriation of \$357,000 to defray costs. The General Assembly has recognized that the FMU PA program is an important workforce development initiative with enormous potential benefits for the Pee Dee region and the state of South Carolina. The costs for this program involve, as already noted, the hiring of a PA program director, the hiring of PA faculty members, and other direct and indirect costs before any student tuition is received. The support provided by the General Assembly will help Francis Marion move ahead during the next two years with the implementation of this program and support its continued success.

**Commissioner Munns' Questions and CHE/Institutional Responses:  
South University, A.S., Occupational Therapy Assistant; A.S., Physical Therapist  
Assistant; and D.N.P., Columbia campus**

QUESTION: Default rate... I note the worsening trend in Loan Default rate. Please provide you assessment of this trend. I'd like to modify the staff recommendation to add an annual report from Southern on this trend, what they are doing about it and their prognosis for improvement.

**INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE:**

South University's Cohort Default Rate (CDR) is inclusive of each of its 15 campuses. Nonetheless, South University tracks its CDR by program and by campus. The three-year CDR for the Columbia campus as of July 1, 2014 (defined as borrowers who entered repayment from 10/1/2011 and 9/30/2012 who can default by 9/30/2014) is only 9.9%. In December of 2012, South University received Department of Education approval to merge with The Art Institute of Charlotte and The Art Institute of Raleigh-Durham. These mergers resulted in the merging of their historical CDRs (which were over 20% each). Thus, the overall, reported CDR for South University has shown a negative trend.

QUESTION: Board pass rate... would you please provide the rate at which students in this program at other areas pass the certification board. How many start the program, complete the program, pass the exam?

**INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE:**

We do not have data for the OTA program presently, for they are just now sitting for their board examinations at our campuses in Florida. Early results are promising. The results for our PTA programs, by campus location are as follows (note that newer rates are not yet available from the Federation of State Boards of Physical Therapy—these include the newer programs for South University):

Location	Pass Rates 2009-2011	Pass Rates 2010-2012
Montgomery	93.33	88.64
West Palm Beach	94.23	94.27
Tampa	92.75	94.83
Savannah	84.71	90.10

QUESTION: Tuition... pg 14... please explain the term of the \$43,335 tuition – ie semester, annual or whole program?

**INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE:**

I do not believe we inserted tuition information in our amendments. With a \$50 application fee and a \$125 graduation fee, you are discussing the overall cost of the associate programs. Each one charges \$5,395 per quarter for eight (8) quarters.

QUESTION: PT program... Page 3, Justification para 1. How many openings in the Midlands area? Please also address for this program the same board pass rate and tuition question from above.

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE:

Sorry to have missed that. When the research was first conducted in 2013, there were 13 open positions in the Midlands. When the search was re-conducted on 8/4/2014, there were 15 open positions in the Midlands. The Board pass rates are included in the response to #2 above, and the tuition is included in the response to #3 above.

QUESTION: Doctor of Nursing Practice:

- Please discuss your expectation of outcome metrics from this program... use data from other programs you operate which will be similar to this Doctorate. Include expected: number admitted, number retained, number graduated, number placed in a job in the field.
- Please discuss your capacity and your capability to direct a successful program at the Doctorate level.

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE:

The Doctor of Nursing Practice is new to South University. The first students started in 2013 at our campus in Tampa. As the program is designed to be completed in 5-8 quarters, the first students have yet to complete the program. Presently, the program is offered in Savannah and Tampa with a total of 17 students. There have been 21 students in the program, for a persistence rate of 81.0% (17/21). We do not believe that this program will grow to the size of the pharmacy program at the campus, but we do anticipate enrolling up to 10 students per year.

One main difference between the DNP and our PharmD program is that the PharmD is the entry degree into the profession of pharmacy whereas the DNP is the pinnacle degree for the profession of nursing. DNP students must be presently in practice (or able to practice with an unencumbered license). Therefore, the program will have many working individuals (students in our pharmacy program cannot work outside the program). It would be unfair to compare the two programs' admissions, retention, graduation, and placement rates. It would, however, be fair to state that South University presently directs a successful program at the doctorate level; therefore, the addition of a second program should have similar success.