

Advisory Committee on Academic Programs

Minutes of February 20, 2014

Members Present

Dr. MaryAnn Janosik, Chair
Dr. Ralph Byington, Coastal Carolina University
Dr. Richard Chapman, Francis Marion University
Dr. Donna Elmore, Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College
Dr. Gordon Haist, University of South Carolina Beaufort
Dr. Sam Hines, The Citadel
Dr. David Mash, Lander University
Dr. John Masterson, University of South Carolina Upstate
Dr. Chris Plyler, University of South Carolina Palmetto College
Dr. Jeff Priest, University of South Carolina Aiken
Dr. Hope Rivers, S.C. Technical College System, via teleconference

Guests Representing Members

Dr. Diane Carr, Midlands Technical College, representing Dr. Ron Drayton
Mr. Tim Drueke, Winthrop University, representing Dr. Debra Boyd
Dr. Kris Finnigan, University of South Carolina Columbia, representing Dr. Michael Amiridis
Dr. Lynne Ford, College of Charleston, representing Dr. George Hynd
Dr. Stephanie Frazier, S.C. Technical College System, representing Dr. Hope Rivers
Dr. Debra Jackson, Clemson University, representing Dr. Nadim Aziz
Dr. Learie Luke, South Carolina State University, representing Dr. W. Franklin Evans
Dr. Darlene Shaw, Medical University of South Carolina, representing Dr. Mark Sothmann

Staff Present

Ms. Laura Belcher	Mrs. Lane Goodwin
Ms. Saundra Carr	Ms. Trena Houpp
Ms. Julie Carullo	Ms. Tanya Rogers
Ms. Renea Eshleman	Ms. Edna Strange
Dr. Paula Gregg	

Guests

Dr. Gina Barton, Lander University	Mr. Daniel Hannah, Lander University
Dr. Abdel Bayoumi, University of South Carolina Columbia	Mr. Lawson Holland, Horry-Georgetown Technical College
Dr. Truman Brown, Medical University of South Carolina	Dr. William M. Jones, Coastal Carolina University
Ms. Mary Ann Byrnes, University of South Carolina Columbia	Dr. Martine Laberge, Clemson University
Dr. Warren J. Carson, University of South Carolina Upstate	Ms. Kate Lenert, Medical University of South Carolina
Dr. Harry S. Carter, The Citadel	Dr. Mike Murphy, Coastal Carolina University
Dr. Alice Taylor Colbert, University of South Carolina Union	Dr. Michael Roberts, Coastal Carolina University
Dr. Rosetta Dingle, South Carolina State University	Dr. Prashant Sansgiry, Coastal Carolina University
Dr. Mary Anne Fitzpatrick, University of South Carolina Columbia	Dr. Susan Simonian, College of Charleston
Dr. Marilyn Murph Fore, Horry-Georgetown Technical College	Dr. Ben Snyder, University of South Carolina Upstate
	Dr. Donald Walter, South Carolina State University
	Dr. Frances Welch, College of Charleston

1. Introductions

Dr. Janosik called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. She welcomed all in attendance and asked institutional representatives and visitors to introduce themselves.

2. Consideration of Minutes of October 17, 2013

Dr. Janosik requested a motion to accept the minutes of October 17, 2013, as distributed. The motion was **moved** (Mash) and **seconded** (Priest) and the Committee **voted unanimously to accept the minutes as presented.**

3. Consideration of New Program Proposals

a. The Citadel, M.S., Leadership

Dr. Hines introduced the program proposal from The Citadel. A motion to approve the proposed program was **moved** (Hines) and **seconded** (Priest). Dr. Hines explained that substantial research was conducted in the creation of this program and the program's curriculum is based on the institution's certificate in the field, which has been successful. He stated that The Citadel considers this proposed program a critical component in building the area of leadership at the institution. He informed the Committee that the program will be offered traditionally on campus and will slowly transition to being offered online as well.

Dr. Ford expressed support for the program and then took the opportunity to raise a more general issue. She asked CHE staff about the differing definitions of online and blended instruction used by institutions, by SACS, and by staff. She asked that consistent definitions be used and that all terms be clarified clearly. Dr. Janosik responded by stating that the issue will be discussed in the academic degree program approval process analysis and revision.

Dr. Priest asked about the addition of only one staff member over five years for the proposed program. Dr. Hines answered that this staff will serve in an administrative role and that necessary faculty members are already in place.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the new program proposal for The Citadel to offer a program leading to the Master of Science degree in Leadership, to be implemented in Fall 2014.

b. Clemson University, M.E., Biomedical Engineering

Dr. Jackson introduced the new program proposal from Clemson University. Due to the collaboration between the two programs, a motion to approve the proposed program at Clemson and the proposed program at USC Columbia was **moved** (Jackson) and **seconded** (Mash). Dr. Jackson explained that Clemson's Biomedical Engineering program and USC Columbia's Biomedical Engineering program are aligned to complement each other and that they should be considered together. She informed the Committee of the strength of bioengineering at Clemson, highlighting the Greenwood Patewood campus, research at the Greenville Hospital System, and a dual degree program with MUSC. Dr. Jackson explained that the proposed degree will not be geared specifically to research careers, but to practicing engineers in the medical technology industry.

Dr. Laberge informed the Committee that South Carolina is ranked number six in the country for being up and coming in the bio-medical, bio-technology industry. She stated that Clemson and USC Columbia brought their B.S. in Biomedical Engineering programs for approval together in 2005. She explained that the proposed graduate programs are aligned and will prepare graduates for work in the bio-technology industry. She added that Clemson, USC, and MUSC participate in a Bioengineering Alliance which started in 1985.

Dr. Bayoumi highlighted the differences in the proposed programs and stated that Clemson's curriculum will focus on biomaterials and bioelectrical engineering, while USC's curriculum will focus on biochemical and biomechanical engineering.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the new program proposal for Clemson University to offer a program leading to the Master of Engineering degree in Biomedical Engineering, to be implemented in Fall 2014 and the Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the new program proposal for the University of South Carolina Columbia to offer a program leading to the Master of Engineering degree in Biomedical Engineering, to be implemented in Fall 2014.

c. Coastal Carolina University, B.S., Information Technology

Dr. Byington introduced the new program proposal from Coastal Carolina University. A motion to approve the proposed program was **moved** (Byington) and **seconded** (Priest). Dr. Byington explained that the program was developed in partnership with Horry-Georgetown Technical College. He stated that the program meets the demand in computer science and information systems and more specifically in IT structure. He then emphasized the third objective of the program: students will be able to "integrate emerging information technologies into an organization." Dr. Byington informed the Committee that the University plans to submit the program for ABET accreditation.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program proposal for Coastal Carolina University to offer a program leading to the Bachelor of Science degree in Information Technology, to be implemented in Fall 2014.

d. College of Charleston, M.S., Child Life

Dr. Ford introduced the new program proposal from the College of Charleston. A motion to approve the proposed program was **moved** (Ford) and **seconded** (Luke). Dr. Ford explained that the program, if approved, will be the only master's program in the state in this field, and only one of three in the Southeast. She explained that the program core includes 33 credit hours with an emphasis on understanding through theory and application through a non-credit internship following a practicum. She stated that the program is designed to prepare students to work directly with children in hospital and healthcare settings. Dr. Ford introduced Dr. Welch and Dr. Simonian.

Dr. Jackson shared that other programs might exist in the state which are similar and simply do not have the same name of Child Life. She continued by asking what are the expectations of graduates in the healthcare settings. Dr. Simonian answered that there is one undergraduate program in the state which is similar and that throughout the nation, there are similar programs embedded in Family Studies. She explained that the national Child Life Council approves curriculum and offers a national certification exam.

Dr. Jackson asked about the role of the Child Life Specialist in a clinical setting. Dr. Simonian explained that the College developed the program in cooperation with the Department of Child Life at MUSC and practicums will take place at MUSC's children's hospital. She stated that graduates will work with children in a clinical setting and provide developmentally appropriate preparation for medical procedures; engage in interactive play and other types of modalities to foster normal development within a hospitalized setting; to help children and families to deal with the stress of medical procedures and hospital stays; and to help transition children to long-term care for chronic illnesses or back to "normal" life at home and school.

Dr. Jackson asked about the target audience of students. Dr. Welch answered that the target audience is students with degrees in sociology, psychology, and interdisciplinary programs that include child and adolescent development.

Dr. Shaw expressed support for the program and asked about the employment prospects for graduates and the effects of the Affordable Care Act. Dr. Simonian responded that Child Life Specialists do not perform billable services, but the American Academy of Pediatrics stipulates that Child Life services are the gold standard and a necessary component of all pediatric care. She continued by stating that most hospitals incorporate Child Life Specialists. She added that the National Child Life Council, at the time of the proposal's creation, posted 45 job positions. She concluded by stating that there is a growing need for graduates with this degree. Dr. Welch responded by providing information about the results and benefits of utilizing a Child Life Specialist in a hospital setting.

Dr. Hines suggested that the curriculum include a course on child protection and legal boundaries. Dr. Simonian answered that these topics are embedded in several courses in the curriculum.

Dr. Janosik commented on the title of the program and wondered if it is understandable to potential students. Dr. Simonian responded that Child Life is the standard name used in the field and that the College will communicate to different departments at universities the nature of the field and program for recruitment purposes.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program proposal for the College of Charleston to offer a program leading to the Master of Science degree in Child Life, to be implemented in Fall 2014.

e. Horry-Georgetown Technical College, A.A.S., Sports Tourism

Dr. Frazier introduced the new program proposal from Horry Georgetown Technical College. A motion to approve the proposed program was **moved** (Frazier) and **seconded** (Byington). Dr. Frazier explained that the program is a partnership between the College and the city of Myrtle Beach which wants to increase sports tourism in the off-season. She stated that the five-semester program will prepare graduates for entry-level and mid-level positions in sports facilities' operations, sports event management, and sports direction. Dr. Frazier informed the Committee that the College conducted a needs-assessment survey which showed a strong demand for the program with approximately 600 positions over the next three years.

Dr. Jackson asked about articulation to Coastal Carolina University. She then suggested a potential partnership with Clemson in regards to articulation to its successful and strong Parks, Recreation, and Tourism program. Dr. Fore stated that articulation with Coastal Carolina University was already in process and responded positively to potential articulation with Clemson. She added that Myrtle Beach indicated that it would not build an indoor sports arena

without the support of both Coastal Carolina University and Horry-Georgetown Technical College. Dr. Byington expressed his support for the program and the strong collaborative partnership between Coastal and Horry-Georgetown.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program proposal for Horry-Georgetown Technical College to offer a program leading to the Associate in Applied Science degree in Sports Tourism, to be implemented in Fall 2014.

f. Lander University, M.S., Athletic Training

Dr. Mash introduced the new program proposal from Lander University. A motion to approve the proposed program was **moved** (Mash) and **seconded** (Drueke). Dr. Mash presented three reasons for the creation of the proposed program: 1.) the profession is projected to grow by 21% in the next 10 years; 2.) the National Athletic Trainers' Association has recommended that entry level training be at the Master's level; and 3.) there are no other graduate level degrees in Athletic Training in the state.

Mr. Drueke expressed support for the program and stated that Winthrop is considering proposing a similar program. Dr. Finnigan expressed support for the program and stated that USC Columbia is also considering a similar program.

Dr. Jackson explained that as Clemson explores proposing a similar program, there is concern about practicum placements in light of the limited number of placements for Clemson's major sports. She asked whether Lander had issues with practicum placement. Dr. Mash responded that practicums are a challenge. Then, Mr. Hannah answered that the true challenge lies with how many practicum students a clinical preceptor can supervise. He stated that Lander is working with local high schools and other colleges for practicum placement.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program proposal for Lander University to offer a new program leading to the Master of Science degree in Athletic Training, to be implemented in May 2015.

g. Medical University of South Carolina, Ph.D., Biomedical Imaging

Dr. Shaw introduced the new program proposal from the Medical University of South Carolina. A motion to approve the proposed program was **moved** (Shaw) and **seconded** (Jackson). Dr. Shaw explained that the program will provide students with skills in research design, data analysis, and imaging-acquisition skills using tools such as pet scans and MRI scans. She stated that the field of biomedical imaging is growing and that graduates could be employed as independent researchers in academia, in industry with product design, or in government organizations.

Dr. Priest asked about the low costs in executing the program. Dr. Brown responded that the Center for Biomedical Imaging has recruited six new faculty members in three years. Dr. Priest then asked about costs regarding materials. Dr. Brown answered that the budget allows for \$15,000 a year for materials but that some funding would come from other sources.

Dr. Janosik asked about a stopgap option for those students who do not finish the degree. Dr. Brown stated that a specific option has not been established yet but that credits would be transferrable to other graduate programs at MUSC.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program proposal for the Medical University of South Carolina to offer a new program leading to the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Biomedical Imaging, to be implemented in Fall 2015.

h. University of South Carolina Columbia, B.A., Chinese Studies

Dr. Finnigan introduced the new program proposal from the University of South Carolina Columbia. A motion to approve the proposed program was **moved** (Finnigan) and **seconded** (Chapman). Dr. Finnigan explained that the 120 credit hour program requires a cognate which gives students opportunities to diversify in other disciplines and opportunities to double major. She reported to the Committee that enrollment in the Chinese language courses have increased 276% and that the University currently has 109 students minoring in Chinese Language. Dr. Finnigan added that the University has a partnership with the Beijing Language and Culture University (BLCU) through the Confucius Institute at the University.

Dr. Haist asked whether the language taught is Mandarin. Dr. Byrnes and Dr. Fitzpatrick answered affirmatively. Dr. Haist asked whether the courses in the proposed program are taught in English or Chinese. Dr. Byrnes answered that the courses are taught in English. Dr. Janosik asked about employment opportunities for graduates. Dr. Fitzpatrick responded that any individual with a mastery of Mandarin here in South Carolina as well as internationally is almost assured of employment. She gave an example of students hired in Beijing to read contracts and informed the Committee that the University's Moore School of Business has a partnership in Hong Kong. Dr. Fitzpatrick concluded by stating that the S.C. Department of Commerce is supportive of the program.

Dr. Ford asked whether a student can complete the proposed program and graduate without achieving the intermediate to advanced level in language proficiency. Dr. Fitzpatrick answered that a student would not be able to complete the program if grade levels in certain classes are not met. Dr. Byrnes then stated that the ACTFL test will not be used as an exit exam.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program proposal for the University of South Carolina Columbia to offer a new program leading to the Bachelor of Arts degree in Chinese Studies, to be implemented in Fall 2014.

i. University of South Carolina Columbia, M.E., Biomedical Engineering

[See discussion and vote under Agenda Item 2b.]

j. University of South Carolina Upstate, B.S., Exercise and Sport Science with tracks in Exercise Science, Medical Fitness, and Strength and Conditioning

Dr. Masterson introduced the new program proposal from the University of South Carolina Upstate. A motion to approve the proposed program was **moved** (Masterson) and **seconded** (Carr). Dr. Masterson explained that with this proposal, the University seeks to transform a concentration in an existing Physical Education program to free-standing degree program with three tracks.

Dr. Elmore asked about articulation to this program from the technical colleges. Dr. Snyder answered that the University is in discussion with Greenville Technical College and its Physical Therapist Assistant program.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program proposal for the University of South Carolina Upstate to offer a new program leading to the Bachelor of Science degree in Exercise and Sport Science with tracks in Exercise Science, Medical Fitness, and Strength and Conditioning, to be implemented in Fall 2014.

3. Consideration of Program Modifications

a. Clemson University, M.S.-Ph.D., Bioengineering , add delivery site

Dr. Jackson introduced the program modification from Clemson University. A motion to approve the proposed program modification was **moved** (Jackson) and **seconded** (Hines). Dr. Jackson explained that Clemson seeks to offer 100% of the Bioengineering degree at the Clemson University Biomedical Engineering Innovation Campus in Greenville (CUBEInC).

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program modification for Clemson University to modify its program leading to the Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy degrees in Bioengineering to add a new delivery site, to be implemented in Fall 2014.

b. South Carolina State University, B.A., Studio Art, Add three concentrations

c. South Carolina State University, B.S., Music Education, Add three concentrations

d. South Carolina State University, B.S., Physics, Add three concentrations

Dr. Luke introduced the program modifications from South Carolina State University. A motion to approve the proposed program modifications was **moved** (Luke) and **seconded** (Drueke). Dr. Luke explained that the three modifications on the agenda to add concentrations to established degree programs were prompted by the need to be consistent with CHE's Inventory of Programs. He clarified that the concentrations in each of the degree programs are already being offered, but have recently been re-authorized by the University's Board of Trustees and need to be approved by CHE.

Dr. Mash asked why the changes in these programs had to be submitted as modifications. Ms. Houp responded that the number of concentrations, and therefore, the total number of credit hours being changed in the programs prompted a modification be brought forward as compared to a staff-approved Notification of Change.

Dr. Chapman commented that all three program modifications indicate that the programs are eligible for scholarship enhancements. Dr. Luke clarified that only the B.S. in Physics is eligible and that the other two indications are incorrect.

Dr. Gregg asked about the concentrations in the Music Education program. Dr. Dingle responded that the University has recently been renewed for National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) accreditation. She stated that the curriculum is the same but that NASM requires a breakdown of a choral concentration into two separate concentrations, one for piano and one for voice.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program modification for South Carolina State University to modify its program leading to the Bachelor of Arts degree in Studio Arts to add three concentrations, implemented in December 2013; the program modification for South Carolina State University to modify its program leading to the Bachelor of Science degree in Music Education to add three concentrations, implemented in December 2013; and the

program modification for South Carolina State University to modify its program leading to the Bachelor of Science degree in Physics to add three concentrations, implemented in December 2013.

e. University of South Carolina Union, A.A.-A.S., Add delivery site

Dr. Plyler introduced the program modification from the University of South Carolina Union. A motion to approve the proposed program modification was **moved** (Plyler) and **seconded** (Jackson). Dr. Plyler informed the Committee that the University serves a six-county service area in the Upstate and has had a presence in Laurens since 1983. He explained that the modification asks for approval to move the University's current Laurens location to a new one which would allow the program to expand as part of Palmetto College. He stated that the modification also asks for approval to offer more than 50% of the associate degree at the new location.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program modification for the University of South Carolina Union to modify its program leading to the Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degrees to add a new delivery site, to be implemented in Spring 2014.

5. Discussion Item: State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA)

Dr. Janosik introduced the discussion item and explained that CHE staff and a few university representatives recently attended an information conference regarding the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA) in Atlanta. She introduced Ms. Eshleman who offered an Update on the subject matter through a Power Point Presentation. [Please refer to Attachment A.] Ms. Eshleman also distributed handouts.

An ACAP member asked about the timeline for South Carolina's participation given the SARA start date of December 2013. Ms. Eshleman responded that staff is still considering the consequences of participation and non-participation. Dr. Jackson commented that she views competition in a positive light and that outside competition will spur in-state institutions to better communicate the quality of our programs. She expressed her and Clemson's support for the state to move forward to participate in SARA. ACAP members discussed the varied administrative elements of SARA participation. Dr. Jackson commented that most of the requirements for SARA are similar to requirements for SACS and therefore universities could submit their SACS documentation to CHE to satisfy SARA's requirements. Dr. Ford commented that SARA participation would provide monetary and administrative relief to in-state institutions which currently must contact and pay fees to every state in which the university seeks to have online students.

Dr. Sutton responded to the discussion by stating that the administrative functions at the CHE level can and will be worked out if the state participates in SARA. He clarified that CHE staff seek to understand whether institutions are supportive of the state participating in SARA since CHE has not initiated discussion among the institutions before this meeting. He mentioned that strong exporters of online programs could benefit from participation but other in-state institutions that are not exporting online programs could suffer. He added that Commissioners are looking to institutions to help guide the decision making process.

Dr. Jackson asked if Dr. Sutton wanted the ACAP members to vote on whether CHE should move forward with an application to SARA. Dr. Sutton asked ACAP members whether all of them were prepared to vote at this point. Dr. Chapman answered that he was not in a

place to vote on behalf of Francis Marion University. He asked for a delay in the vote in order to analyze the information set before them. He then asked whether participation in SARA would allow an increase in proprietary institutions in the state. ACAP members answered affirmatively and commented that institutions have adjusted to the influx of non-profit universities operating and advertising in the state.

Dr. Ford asked what types of consequences would institutions that are not strong exporters of online programs experience. Dr. Sutton answered that institutions that do not have established online programs outside of state borders will be more effected by the competition generated through participation in SARA. Dr. Jackson commented that currently students have a choice between online learning and traditional classroom instruction. She continued by stating her opinion that students who seek traditional classroom instruction would not automatically choose online learning as a result of the state's participation in SARA. She added that SARA will provide more choices of online learning and will not affect attendance at institutions which have a majority of students who choose traditional classroom instruction. Mr. Druke responded to the discussion by stating that participation in SARA will allow Winthrop to begin to develop more online programs because it will not be hampered by the administrative and financial burden of seeking authorization from other states.

Dr. Hines suggested holding a vote at ACAP's June meeting. Other ACAP members stated that their institutions do not need any more review and that they support moving towards participation. Dr. Jackson stated that Clemson wants to know how quickly the state can join. Other members echoed her statement. Ms. Eshleman reminded the Committee that the Commission might have to seek statutory change to be able to enter into a reciprocity agreement, which could take substantial time.

Dr. Janosik asked the Committee what action it would like to take on the matter. Dr. Jackson asked whether it would be helpful to take a straw vote even if some members could not vote due to the need for more review time. Dr. Sutton asked the Committee members to show by way of raised hands if they believe their institutions would support participation. A large majority of Committee members raised their hands. Dr. Chapman expressed a need for more discussion and deliberation. Dr. Sutton thanked the Committee for their feedback and announced that he would take what he learned from the discussion to the Commission. Dr. Janosik asked whether CHE staff needs Commission approval prior to the June ACAP meeting to act on the will of ACAP members to move forward towards SARA participation. Dr. Sutton answered that staff can move forward in preparation but that the Commission will make the ultimate decision about participation in SARA. Dr. Janosik clarified that staff do not need Commission approval to prepare. Dr. Sutton agreed.

6. Discussion Item: Academic Program Proposal Process and Content

Dr. Janosik provided a presentation on the discussion item. [See Attachment B.] She highlighted a few aspects of the process that need to be reviewed and possibly revised in order to assure transparency, efficiency, and quality of the process. She stated that the objective of her presentation is to form a task force of several ACAP members and CHE staff to study and revise the process, the application template, and the policies and procedures.

Dr. Janosik spoke to information regularly requested by CAAL members regarding proposed programs. She specifically mentioned that CAAL members seek data, especially workforce development data, to be presented in clear and consistent formats in every program

proposal. Dr. Jackson expressed her concern regarding the demand for workforce development for every program and stated that not all academic degree programs are developed specifically to increase the workforce. Dr. Janosik stated that she understands that point and has discussed this issue with Commission members. Dr. Janosik also shared that Commission members are concerned about the cost analysis of the programs. She expressed her desire for institutions to use one clear and consistent format and clear definitions to present cost analysis data so that Commission members and others outside of academia understand the costs of the proposed program.

Dr. Janosik asked the Committee for feedback. Dr. Ford suggested that the task force consider reviewing the timeline and then she expressed support for a shorter timeline so programs are approved faster. Dr. Jackson asked whether the program planning summary is necessary. Dr. Priest commented that the summary does not provide a lot of information about the program in part because the curriculum is not presented. Dr. Janosik asked whether the summary might be replaced with a simple notification of intent letter or be eliminated altogether. Dr. Byington responded that Coastal considers the summary a helpful step. Dr. Jackson shared that Clemson submits an expanded program planning summary to its Board of Trustees for consideration. Other ACAP members added that their institutions follow the same process as to approval from their Boards of Trustees. ACAP members also stated that it would be helpful if the application template continue to be similar to required SACS documentation so that one document could be used to satisfy both SACS and CHE requirements. Dr. Janosik concluded the discussion by asking the Committee for volunteers to serve on the task force. She added that she would be in contact with members in the next few weeks.

7. Discussion Item: Common Core

- CHE's Role in College Readiness
- Consistency in Reporting Provisional Students

Dr. Janosik introduced discussion on the Common Core. She informed the Committee that CHE staff in 2006 worked with the State Department of Education to identify a list of high school courses which prepared students to be college-ready. She explained that with school districts transitioning to curriculum standards under Common Core, the list needs to be updated in order to sync with the new curriculum. Dr. Janosik plans to bring various stakeholders together to begin the process of updating the list. She specifically suggested holding a meeting with Provosts and Student Services representatives in the next month to begin discussion.

Dr. Janosik also mentioned the need for using a consistent definition of provisional student so that all institutions are reporting comparable data. Dr. Jackson gave her opinion that updating the list of college prerequisite courses for high schools students seemed to be a priority over the inconsistent definitions of provisional student.

8. Information Item: Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)

Dr. Janosik introduced Dr. Gregg who provided an update on Smarter Balanced. Dr. Gregg announced that the next national meeting is in April. She reminded members that they will be asked for feedback on certain issues in the weeks before the national meeting. She reminded the Committee that South Carolina remains a Common Care state and is still participating in the Smarter Balanced Consortium. Dr. Gregg distributed a talking points

handout on Smarter Balanced which she asked members to share with their education faculty. She explained that field testing on Common Core curriculum will begin in March.

Dr. Gregg reported that Smarter Balanced is developing a career readiness definition. She stated that Smarter Balanced will ask for feedback on the draft statement. She informed the Committee that a new Center of Teaching Excellence will be awarded soon and will be centered on college and career readiness.

9. Presentation of Notifications of Program Changes and/or Termination, October 2013 through January 2014

Dr. Janosik presented the report for information only.

10. Other Business

- SC TRAC conference information
- Legislative Update

Dr. Janosik introduced Ms. Houp for an update on the upcoming SC TRAC conference. Ms. Houp announced that the conference will be held in Columbia on March 27, starting at 9 am and registration for the conference will begin soon. She reported that the conference will include a preview of the virtual transfer advisor feature. Ms. Houp then demonstrated the feature and asked for feedback specifically about the progress bars. ACAP members stated that the progress bars were confusing and misleading and should be reconsidered for inclusion in the final version.

Dr. Janosik introduced Ms. Carullo to give a legislative update. Ms. Carullo explained that she wanted to speak regarding a few legislative issues but that she would be open to discussing other legislative matters. She briefly spoke to the recent issue regarding the House Ways and Means Committee discussing possible appropriation reductions for the College of Charleston and USC Upstate in reaction to books read in freshmen seminar courses. Ms. Carullo then reported on the provision in the law requiring institutions to teach courses on the Constitution and other documents involved in the creation of the country. She thanked the ACAP members regarding information provided by their institutions in regards to what each institution offers on the aforementioned subject matter. She distributed a summary of that survey and asked members to review it and provide any additional information if available.

Dr. Jackson commented on the possible appropriation reductions in reaction to controversial freshmen seminar reading material and expressed support for CHE voicing the counter argument in favor of the intellectual value of university education. She added that if CHE does not take a stand, then universities will use their large governmental affairs staff to independently speak on behalf of intellectual value. Ms. Carullo agreed that CHE must be a voice that supports the institutions.

Dr. Mash expressed support for CHE making a healthy response of helping legislators to understand more clearly the organization, policies, and processes of a university in relation to academic freedom. Other ACAP members supported an educational and positive approach with legislators. Dr. Hines suggested that the response utilize the role of SACS and SACS accreditation guidelines which requires Boards of Trustees to ensure that there is not undue legislative pressure. He encouraged a response by CHE in stressing the importance of academic

freedom in higher education. He also suggested that CHE engage Boards of Trustees in conversation regarding their roles according to SACS guidelines. Ms. Carullo responded that CHE has hosted Board conferences in the past and stated that it might be a good idea to consider planning one for the future. Other ACAP members suggested a stronger engagement of CHE with Boards.

Dr. Jackson stressed the importance of accreditation and gave an example from the K-12 realm of a school district being at risk of losing its accreditation because politicians were found to be directing activities of the school system. Ms. Carullo recognized the importance of the issue and thanked ACAP members for their comments. She assured the Committee that CHE would continue to work with the Committee and the governmental affairs staff at the universities on this issue.

Dr. Jackson asked about the task force on the required efficiency study. Ms. Carullo explained that there is a proviso to conduct an efficiency study for higher education and a committee has been formed to oversee the process of the study. Ms. Carullo informed the Committee of the bill's status.

Dr. Janosik suggested that the June 19th meeting of ACAP resemble this one in format and length. ACAP members agreed. Dr. Janosik then thanked everyone for attending the meeting. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:21 p.m.