

**Minutes
Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing
January 8, 2015**

Members Present

Dr. Bettie Rose Horne, Chair
Ms. Natasha Hanna
Ms. Leah Moody, via teleconference
Admiral Charles Munns
Mr. Kim Phillips,

Other Commissioners Present:

General John Finan
Ms. Terry Seckinger

Staff Present

Mr. Clay Barton
Ms. Laura Belcher
Ms. Sandra Carr
Ms. Julie Carullo
Ms. Renea Eshleman
Mr. Gary Glenn
Ms. Lane Goodwin
Dr. Paula Gregg
Ms. Trena Houpp
Dr. MaryAnn Janosik
Dr. John Lane
Dr. Richard Sutton
Dr. Karen Woodfaulk

Guests

Dr. Hasanul Basher, S.C. State University
Dr. Ralph Byington, Coastal Carolina
University, via teleconference
Dr. Warren Carson, U.S.C. Upstate
Dr. Richard Chapman, Francis Marion
University
Dr. Gib Darden, Coastal Carolina University
Mr. Tim Drueke, Winthrop University
Dr. W. Franklin Evans, S.C. State University
Dr. Christine Ferguson, U.S.C. Beaufort
Dr. Kris Finnigan, U.S.C. Columbia
Dr. Bethany Fralick, U.S.C. Aiken
Dr. Gordon Haist, U.S.C. Beaufort
Dr. John Hester, Francis Marion University
Dr. Jae Hong, S.C. State University
Dr. Tara Hornor, The Citadel
Dr. Debbie Jackson, Clemson University,
via teleconference
Dr. Kenneth Lewis, S.C. State University
Mr. Derral Linder, S.C. State University

Dr. S. Littlejohn, S.C. State University
Dr. Learie Luke, S.C. State University
Mr. Todd Mathis, Womble Carlyle
Dr. Coker McGlone, Coastal Carolina
University
Dr. Jim Mensch, U.S.C. Columbia
Dr. Bridget Miller, U.S.C. Columbia
Mr. Alfred Moore, U.S.C. Columbia
Dr. Martha Moriarty, U.S.C. Beaufort
Dr. Jeff Priest, U.S.C. Aiken
Dr. Hope Rivers, S.C. Technical College
System, via teleconference
Dr. Randall Rowen, U.S.C. Columbia
Dr. Manuel Sanders, U.S.C. Beaufort
Dr. Preashant Sansginy, Coastal Carolina
University
Dr. Darlene Shaw, M.U.S.C.
Dr. Caughman Taylor, U.S.C. Columbia
Dr. Suzanne Thomas, M.U.S.C.
Dr. Joshua Thornhill, U.S.C. Columbia

Introductions

Dr. Horne called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. and stated the meeting was being held in compliance with the Freedom of Information Act.

1. Consideration of Minutes of August 7, 2014; Minutes of August 26, 2014 and Minutes of November 5, 2014

Dr. Horne requested a motion to accept the minutes of the August 7, 2014; August 26, 2014; and November 5, 2014, meetings. The motion was moved (Munns) and seconded (Phillips), and the Committee voted unanimously to accept the minutes as presented.

2. Election of Committee Vice-Chair

Dr. Horne introduced the item and the Committee moved (Munns) and seconded (Phillips) a motion to consider the election of a vice-chair.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to elect Ms. Hanna as Committee Vice-Chair.**

3. Information Requested by Commissioners to Address Specific Action Items on the 2014-15 CHE Strategic Agenda
(For Information, No Action Required)

Dr. Horne introduced the item, and Dr. Janosik then provided an overview. Dr. Janosik reminded the Committee that Agenda Items Three and Four are presented for information only and do not require a vote by the Committee. She reported to the Committee that staff was asked to research program productivity and how CHE monitors the success of programs and program costs, specifically tuition; and how CHE monitors non-public institutions as well as perform a review of licensing criteria.

Dr. Janosik explained that staff used current measuring criteria for program productivity, enrollment and completions, and then slightly altered the criteria to determine productivity. She stated that currently an academic program is considered productive if it meets either the enrollment OR completion metric, but then she explained that staff calculated the data in a different way by showing the results of programs which meet both enrollment AND completion metrics. She added that staff also calculated the data by increasing the completion metric from five to eight and then from five to ten. She presented to the Committee that the results of these new calculations decrease the number of academic degree programs considered productive. She stated that staff are not endorsing any of these new calculations but simply wanted to present possible alternatives to the current process.

Dr. Janosik presented information about comparative costs for tuition, using other states' methods and data. She highlighted an article included in the packet of information about the connection between tuition costs and student engagement. She explained that the study shows that students who are more engaged in their studies and on campus tend to complete their degrees quicker and therefore avoid extra tuition burden.

Dr. Janosik relayed to the Committee information about the third item in the packet. She explained that information was provided on the current criteria for licensing in order to provide the Committee with opportunities to discuss possible changes to the licensing regulations.

Dr. Janosik asked for feedback and action steps from the Committee on any or all of the items presented. Dr. Horne responded that staff provided very valuable information which she hopes to study more in-depth, as certain actions would have large implications.

Admiral Munns stated that assessment of academic programming at both public and non-public institutions should be the main priority. He added that CHE should have a higher level of assessment which includes programs at both public and non-public licensed institutions and that the assessment should go beyond the current program productivity report. He explained that the assessment should cover costs, quality, affordability and efficiency of programs without demanding additional data be collected which would greatly increase staff workload. He continued by stating that criteria metrics could be culled from existing or past initiatives such as performance funding. Dr. Horne stated that the assessment would need to be on a rolling cycle to accommodate the sheer number of academic programs. Admiral Munns responded that he assumes that most of the data that would be necessary for the assessment is already being reported to CHE or to the federal government. He expressed concern about the costs of this type of assessment and stated that he hopes existing data could be utilized.

Dr. Janosik responded that staff could begin work on this type of assessment and develop a draft template. Mr. Phillips commented that this type of assessment might not be possible and the Committee and staff need to explore multiple options. Admiral Munns agreed. Dr. Horne acknowledged the hard work of the staff. Dr. Janosik explained that this topic will be discussed at an upcoming ACAP meeting to gather information from institutional representatives. Dr. Horne asked whether licensed institutions are well-assessed by this proposed assessment. Admiral Munns answered that he hopes the assessment criteria will apply to both public and non-public licensed institutions. He explained that CHE should have the authority to conduct this type of assessment for licensed institutions in order to insure quality.

4. Processes for Probation or Revocation of an Existing License-Update on the Status of the Charleston School of Law (For Information, No Action Required)

Dr. Horne introduced the item and mentioned the packet of information compiled by the staff. Admiral Munns expressed his appreciation for the materials provided and stated that the Commission has authority to move towards probation or revocation if a university does not comply with the steps of the process. He explained that he would like the Committee to make a plan so that if the institution does not comply with providing information regarding a letter of credit, the Committee can act as quickly as possible. He expressed his concern for the wellbeing of students and also stated that he has many questions for the institution. Dr. Horne, however, stated that she does not want the Committee to act until the institution is found non-compliant after the next missed deadline. Admiral Munns said that he would like to act on the matter within the month the information is received as compared to waiting to the next planned meeting of CAAL. Ms. Hanna asked whether the Committee should set a date and expressed concern that the institution missed two deadlines.

Admiral Munns stated that the Committee needs to determine the process in order to prepare for the possibility of non-compliance. Dr. Horne encouraged the Committee to not set a date yet and commented that staff will apprise members of any development so that a decision can be made rapidly at that point. Dr. Janosik agreed but also stated that it would be helpful if the Committee would determine a process and a possible meeting date now in order to prepare for the possibility of deciding probation or revocation. Admiral Munns proposed a possible plan of

action: staff to inform the Commissioners if next deadline is missed; CAAL takes responsibility of the issue and meets; an agenda for the meeting considers answers to questions posed to the institution; and then meet again shortly after to make a final decision. He expressed concern about the various consequences and the need to know about possible consequences before a decision is reached. Dr. Horne expressed agreement. Commissioner Finan encouraged staff to inform Committee members about the differences between probation and revocation. Admiral Munns responded that staff provided the information and that both actions would result in the institution being unable to recruit new students. Committee members discussed possible meeting dates.

Ms. Seckinger encouraged the Committee to make sure that the extensions be consistent in regards to criteria requested and time allotted. Dr. Janosik responded and stated that there is no set number of extensions in CHE policy. Admiral Munns commented that he would like to ask the institution what it would do if granted another extension and the probability of achieving a different result. Commissioner Hanna asked whether there has been recent discussion between CHE leadership and the institutional leadership about the likelihood of meeting the deadline. Dr. Sutton answered that there has been no more information since the update yesterday. In response to Dr. Horne's question, Dr. Janosik answered that she will inform the Committee about any action taken or not taken by the institution by the deadline date.

5. Consideration of New Program Proposals

a. University of South Carolina Columbia, M.S., Advanced Athletic Training

Dr. Horne introduced the item and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Phillips) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Finnigan explained that the University has been offering a concentration by the same name in its Physical Education degree but that the University proposes to change its classification code and make the degree program a stand-alone one, in part for specialized accreditation. She added that if the program is approved, the degree in Physical Education will be terminated. Dr. Mensch added there is strong student interest in the stand-alone degree.

Admiral Munns commented that he submitted questions, 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 1 of the Attachment.]

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to a Master of Science degree in Advanced Athletic Training at University of South Carolina Columbia, to be implemented in Fall 2015.

b. University of South Carolina Columbia, B.S., Pharmaceutical Sciences

Dr. Horne introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Phillips) and **seconded** (Munns) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Finnigan explained that the University seeks to re-instate the program and that there is no undergraduate degree in pharmacy in S.C. She stated that currently students must major in Chemistry or Biology and then "drop out" of those programs in order to pursue the PharmD degree. Admiral Munns asked why the initial program was terminated. Dean Rowen answered that the undergraduate degree was phased out for the PharmD degree, which was newly required by the accrediting agency as

the initial degree in Pharmacy. Admiral Munns asked why it is being proposed again. Dean Rowen responded that the University wants to recognize the hard work of students.

Admiral Munns commented that he submitted questions, 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 2 of the Attachment](#).] He then asked a follow-up question about the enrollment chart. He asked that the University submit a new chart which includes the gross number of students and faculty and not simply a cohort. Admiral Munns asked about costs for the program. Dean Rowen responded that the costs associated with the degree are nominal and cover a new assistant dean. Dr. Finnigan clarified that the University is re-allocating the budget to cover the salary of a new assistant dean.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to a Bachelor of Science degree in Pharmaceutical Sciences degree at University of South Carolina Columbia, to be implemented in Fall 2015.

- c. University of South Carolina Beaufort, B.S., Mathematics, with tracks in Mathematical Sciences and Secondary Mathematics Certification

Dr. Horne introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Phillips) and **seconded** (Hanna) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Haist introduced the Chair of the Department, Dr. Sanders, who explained that the University currently offers two Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) degrees in Biology and Computational Science and brings forward a third STEM degree, Math, for review and approval. Dr. Sanders stressed the continued student interest and demand for STEM degrees.

Admiral Munns commented that he submitted questions, 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 5 of the Attachment](#).] He asked again about the timing of the different process steps and expressed the Committee's hope that the process of program approval be effective and efficient. Dr. Sanders expressed the University's hope that CHE is successful in moving towards an online submission process for program proposal applications.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to a Bachelor of Science degree in Mathematics with tracks in Mathematical Sciences and Secondary Mathematics Certification at University of South Carolina Beaufort, to be implemented in Fall 2015.

- d. University of South Carolina Aiken, B.S., Industrial Process Engineering

Dr. Horne introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Phillips) and **seconded** (Hanna) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Priest explained that the program has been developed over time with leading scientists from local organizations and businesses including the Savannah River Site and that the local area has repeatedly asked the University to create the degree program. He stated that the University will seek specialized accreditation with ABET and that local businesses have raised \$400,000 to support the program.

Dr. Horne expressed her appreciation for the program being a great example of collaboration between the University, Aiken Technical College and local businesses. She asked about an advisory committee. Dr. Priest responded that the advisory committee is in place already and

will help guide the implementation of the program. Both Admiral Munns and Mr. Phillips expressed their support for the program.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to a Bachelor of Science degree in Industrial Process Engineering at University of South Carolina Aiken, to be implemented in Fall 2015.

e. Coastal Carolina University, M.S., Sport 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. Byington explained that the proposed program is consistent with the University's regional focus. Dr. Darden commented that the University has a successful undergraduate program and that the department has been developing the proposed degree program for several years. He stated that the University has collected anecdotal information from current undergraduate students who are interested in the graduate program. Dr. McGlone reported to the Committee that the Greater Myrtle Beach area has experienced a growth in sports infrastructure totaling \$75 million in three years and that right now the University is only providing the education for students for entry-level jobs at those complexes. He explained that the field of sports management has grown significantly nationwide and that the University has received requests for graduate-level students to serve as interns at sites across the country.

Admiral Munns commented that he submitted questions, 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 7 of the Attachment](#).]

Ms. Hanna expressed her support for the program especially in light of the growth of sports tourism in the local area. She also commented on the strong collaboration with Horry Georgetown Technical College (HGTC). Dr. Darden added that with the addition of this program, it will be possible for a student to articulate from earning an A.A.S. degree from HGTC to a B.S. and M.S. degree at Coastal Carolina.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the program leading to a Master of Science degree in Sport Management at Coastal Carolina University, to be implemented in Fall 2015.

6. Program Modifications

- a. University of South Carolina Columbia, M.D., add clinical site in Florence, SC

Dr. Horne introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Phillips) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Taylor explained that the University is seeking approval to allow a small number of its third and fourth year medical students to complete their clinical rotations in Florence. He stated that this effort is due partly to USC's partnership in the Pee Dee Health Education Partnership. He stated that the Pee Dee region is medically underserved and therefore the clinicals will provide more opportunities for healthcare in the region. Dr. Taylor continued to state that medical students make choices about careers based on role models, and people to whom they are exposed, and therefore placing medical students in Florence might lead to medical student graduates remaining in the area to practice medicine. He stated that USC wants to serve all of South Carolina and that this modification is a huge opportunity to increase the number of physicians practicing in our rural areas and hopefully choosing primary care for their careers.

Dr. Horne asked whether the University is anticipating adding Years One and Two of medical school for this site in the future. Dr. Taylor answered that there are no plans to expand but this modification will allow for additional and appropriate training sites for medical students. Dr. Horne asked about the University's relationship with MUSC. Dr. Taylor answered that the USC School of Medicine collaborates with MUSC through its tele-health network across the state. He added that the USC School of Medicine has different foci from MUSC. He commented that the USC School of Medicine supports the continued collaboration of the Deans Committee on Medical Education.

Admiral Munns commented that he submitted questions, 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 why the program requires the hiring of three to four new people even though there will not be any new students. Dr. Thornhill responded that the accrediting agency requires administrative personnel and student services to be provided at a new clinical site which is located apart from the main campus. Dr. Taylor commented that the initiation of the program will be funded by a grant from DHHS. Admiral Munns asked what funding source will be used once the grant monies are expended. Dr. Taylor answered the funding will be provided through tuition dollars, clinical faculty productivity and possibly support from local medical systems. Admiral Munns expressed concern about the substantial costs that will need to be covered in three to five years' time.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission a modification to add a clinical site in Florence, SC, for the program leading to the Doctor of Medicine degree at University of South Carolina Columbia, to be implemented in July 2015.

- b. South Carolina State University, B.S., Industrial Engineering Technology, develop into B.S., Industrial Engineering

Dr. Horne introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Hanna) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Evans introduced other University representatives. Dr. Evans explained that the University proposes to change its current B.S. in Industrial Engineering Technology degree to a B.S. degree in Industrial Engineering. He stated

that state laws in regards to the engineering profession require an engineer to have an engineering degree as compared to an engineering technology degree in order to be licensed in the state. Dr. Lewis shared that the University has the necessary faculty and facilities for the program and that the program will be implemented with no new costs. He added that the U.S. Bureau of Labor indicates that in the next ten years there will be at least 10,000 new engineering jobs in the United States and the job growth rate will be 5-6% annually.

Admiral Munns commented that he submitted questions 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 10 of the Attachment.](#)]

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission a modification to develop the program leading to the Bachelor of Science degree in Industrial Engineering Technology into a Bachelor of Science degree in Industrial Engineering at South Carolina State University, to be implemented in Fall 2015.

7. New Federal *Improving Teacher Quality* Competitive Grants Awards, FY 2015-16

Dr. Horne introduced the item and the Committee **moved** (Phillips) and **seconded** (Munns) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Gregg described the program and explained that all ten projects submitted were of merit and if there had been ample funds available, all the proposals would have been funded. She stated that with limited funds, the review panel identified four STEM-focused projects for funding.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the continuing Federal *Improving Teacher Quality* Competitive Grants Awards, FY 2015-16.

8. LIFE/Palmetto Fellows Scholarship Enhancement Program Eligibility Process

Dr. Horne introduced the item and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Phillips) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Janosik provided background information on the inconsistency of determining eligibility for programs in the past. She then introduced Dr. Lane who spearheaded the project. Dr. Lane presented an overview of the process and explained the work of the task force to develop the new policy. Admiral Munns asked why every institution needs to submit an application for program eligibility. He asked if a program is approved at one institution, then why is it not universally approved at other institutions. Dr. Lane responded that the task force did discuss this issue and determined that the Advisory Committee would make the determination. He added that programs by the same name do not always include the same curriculum, i.e., one program might be considered eligible for enhancement while another one with the same name might not include the same degree of math/science curriculum to warrant eligibility.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the implementation of the process for the review and approval of programs for scholarship enhancement eligibility, including the *Instructions for Institutional Application for Degree Programs and Individual Courses*, and the commencement of the review committee (SEER) to evaluate academic program and course eligibility.

9. Annual Evaluation of Associate Degree Programs, FY 2012-13

Dr. Horne introduced the item and the Committee **moved** (Phillips) and **seconded** (Munns) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Lane presented a brief overview of the report and addressed Admiral Munns's question about providing more job placement data in the report. Dr. Lane continued by stating that the report is being revised to provide requested data. Dr. Janosik commented that the report will be amended before it is distributed to the full Commission. Admiral Munns referred to an earlier discussion on program productivity and stated that he envisions that this report's data would be combined with data from other sectors and included under the program assessment initiative being created by the staff.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission this report's designation of programs for the current reporting year as shown in **Tables 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, and 9**. Because of the importance of certain associate degree programs to economic development in South Carolina, the staff further recommends that the Committee and Commission encourage the State Technical College system to continue to explore ways to increase enrollments and retention to graduation in programs in Engineering Technology and the USC system campus in Beaufort to increase enrollment and retention to graduation in its associate degree program.

10. Presentation of Report on Program Modifications, August 1- December 31, 2014

Dr. Horne presented the item for information only.

11. Revised Mission Statement for Coastal Carolina University

Dr. Horne presented the item for information only. Dr. Janosik provided background information and explained that CHE staff wanted to present this staff-approved mission statement change as a courtesy to the Committee, given the increased recent attention paid to institutional mission statements. Admiral Munns asked Dr. Byington about the rationale of the change in mission. Dr. Byington responded that changes made over time have created a convoluted statement. He continued to explain that the University wanted to streamline the mission statement, and be clear about the University's focus as an institution of higher education in South Carolina. Admiral Munns expressed his agreement with the staff in approving this mission statement revision.

Dr. Horne thanked those in attendance for their participation and staff for their work. Hearing no further business, she adjourned the meeting at 3:12 p.m.

**Commissioner Questions and CHE/Institutional Responses:
University of South Carolina Columbia, M.S., Advanced Athletic Training**

QUESTION: pg 1.. Why 3 years from planning summary to program proposal?

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: In our initial planning, we pursued the MS in Athletic Training as a name change for the existing MS in Physical Education degree. However because the change resulted in the need for a new degree CIP code, we began the new program process. After the program planning summary was submitted, leadership changes in the College and Department led to a College-wide reevaluation of degree programs, which delayed progress on the proposal. The Department subsequently decided to institute curriculum changes affecting the future program, and these needed to be fully implemented before finalizing the new MS degree proposal.

QUESTION: Pg 6 says "most students will Work as a BOC certified athletic trainer while earning an advanced MS degree. " but pg 13 says students will take a full academic load. Is this consistent?

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: Yes it is consistent. Almost all of the graduate students pursuing this degree option are funded by external contracts for athletic training services, and work part-time (20 hours) as Graduate Assistants. Their "work as a BOC certified athletic trainer" refers to their duties as Graduate Assistants, and NOT to their being employed full-time in the community while pursuing their MS degree. We have had only a few students in the past 10 years in this degree option who were not on a funded assistantship as a GA.

**Commissioner Questions and CHE/Institutional Responses:
University of South Carolina Columbia, B.S., Pharmaceutical Sciences**

QUESTION: pg 4, section 4 b, the three objectives: 1) please explain the drop out problem this is designed to fix, 2) even if fixing the accounting peculiarity is a valid objective, I would think that it would rank behind providing post graduate opportunities, and opportunities for career changes (i.e., student outcomes prioritized over administrative accounting) -- please discuss.

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: The “drop out problem” may be described as follows. Because there currently exists no undergraduate degree in Pharmacy, freshmen students intending to pursue a career in pharmacy must declare a major in some other field, usually biology or chemistry. At the point where these students are accepted into the Doctor of Pharmacy (PharmD) program as rising juniors or seniors, they drop out of their previous biology or chemistry major, and thus are not eligible to be counted in university baccalaureate graduation rates. They are in effect deprived of a USC credential that acknowledges the first part of their undergraduate work. The “institutional graduation rates” objective was added to address this institutional concern, and the proposed B.S. in Pharmaceutical Sciences will enable offering a baccalaureate degree for admitted PharmD students at the end of their second professional year.

It was not the intention of the College of Pharmacy to rank the purposes of the B.S. in Pharmaceutical Sciences in order of importance. Section 4 b) is a listing, not a ranking, of the objectives behind offering the degree. The “post-graduate opportunities” and “career changer” objectives address the interests of students, whereas the “institutional graduation rates” objective addresses those of the institution.

While the PharmD is the required degree to practice pharmacy in the U.S., there will be students who would like to earn a baccalaureate degree in addition to their PharmD for sentimental reasons. There will be a small number of students who plan to pursue a post-Doctor of Pharmacy degree program not offered by the College of Pharmacy (e.g. law, medicine, or biological sciences). The B.S. in Pharmaceutical Sciences degree will be helpful for career changers who withdraw prior to earning the PharmD who plan to pursue occupations or graduate and professional programs in which a baccalaureate is required.

QUESTION: Pg 7, total enrollment matrix. Please explain. The enrollment numbers imply that USC will only accept students to this program every four years, and it presents a very uneven work load (3405 credit hours of production one semester, all the way down to only 924 teaching hours in another semester). But the staffing on page 17 is flat at 4 FTE for every semester. Please explain how this works, and how it can be an efficient use of resources.

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: USC accepts students into the program every year. The enrollment numbers in section 7 represents one cohort group of students that begins with the freshmen year and ends with the second year of the professional program when the B.S. degree in Pharmaceutical Sciences is conferred. At the end of the second professional year the student would have completed 128 credit hours to earn the BS in Pharmaceutical Sciences degree. The 3405 hours represents the average number of new freshmen and transfer students multiplied by average number of class hours (15) these students will take in their first semester at USC. Admission into the professional program is highly competitive. Based on past admissions data, slightly over half of the number of pre-pharmacy students who apply are accepted into the professional program their junior year. The 924 teaching hours is reflective of

the number of students in that cohort who are projected to enroll into the professional program. The difference in credit hours load will not impact existing university resources since the enrollment numbers are reflective of the average number of pre-pharmacy students accepted into the SCCP, are accepted into other colleges of pharmacy, or who change major as undergraduates since the 2010-2011 academic year.

The FTE totals are representative of new and continuing cohorts of pre-professional and professional students. For example, faculty who primarily serve the professional students through instruction will instruct first or second year pharmacy students each semester. Staff who primarily serve pre-professional students through academic advisement will advise freshmen and sophomore pre-pharmacy students each semester. Since the FTE totals are representative of the teaching, administrative, and advisement loads for the past several years, the COP does not foresee that the B.S. degree will impact existing university resources.

QUESTION: Pg 8. Note J does not seem to be referenced anywhere. Please delete or explain.

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: J represents a new cohort. If the j population needs to be referenced on the projected total enrollment table (7a), j can be added to the first box in the 2019-20 year under Fall Headcount. The other letters in the 2019-20 row can be deleted since those letters are already defined in the previous years.

QUESTION: Pg 16. If there are no new students, no new courses, no new facilities, why does the administration need to grow by one assistant dean? What does this cost?

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: While the B.S. degree will not require additional resources in terms of courses or facilities, it would require the addition of someone to administer and manage the program. With the addition of a new program in the College of Pharmacy, the need for oversight, coordination, problem resolution, student advising, etc., requires the appointment of a 0.5 FTE Assistant Dean.

As indicated in section 16 b), administration costs are projected by the salary and fringe benefits of the Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Programs.

QUESTION: Pg 18. Accreditation. Makes the case that pre-professional courses do not need to be accredited as long as they are consistent with curriculums of peer institutions. But the proposal makes the point in page 6 that USC requires only 66 credit hours and others require 90 hours. This does not seem to be consistent with peer programs. Please explain. Additionally, even if accreditation were not to be a problem, how can USC achieve the same quality, scope and depth of curriculum in 66 hours as others do in 90 hours?

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: The difference in credit hours within the undergraduate components of the B.S in Pharmaceutical Sciences versus the programs at peer institutions is indicative of the number of years students spend in the professional program. USC will offer the baccalaureate degree after two professional years of professional study while peer institutions require just one year of professional study. Since most baccalaureate degree programs in the state require at least 120 credit hours, peer institutions must require an additional year of undergraduate study so their students can meet minimum credit hour requirements after one year of pharmacy school.

Whether a student enrolls into the SCCP from one of the 90 hour programs or from USC's pre-pharmacy program), ALL students must take the 66 hours of pre-requisite requirements outlined in the pre-pharmacy curriculum – see undergraduate requirements in section 8 a). The bulk of the undergraduate coursework in the B.S. in Pharmaceutical Sciences and the programs at the peer institutions will be the same.

In terms of undergraduate coursework taken in addition to the 66 hours in the pre-pharmacy curriculum, programs at peer institutions may encompass coursework (e.g. math courses beyond the calculus and statistics SCCP requirement) that are required to obtain a baccalaureate degree at the respective institution, but may not have any impact on the ability of incoming students to progress through the professional program.

**Commissioner Questions and CHE/Institutional Responses:
University of South Carolina Beaufort, B.S., Mathematics with tracks in Mathematical
Sciences and Secondary Mathematics Certification**

QUESTION: Pg 3 and 16, process time... why did it take so long from the planning summary to submittal of the proposal?

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: Item 17: Programs for Teachers and Other School Professionals (only) in Appendix B of the Commission's document Policies and Procedures for New Academic Program Approval and Program Termination is required for this proposal. Items 17a and 17b address SCDE and SPA (NCTM) requirements. These two items account for the final 85+ pages of the proposal. As such, time addressing these items thoroughly and carefully was deemed necessary and appropriate.

QUESTION: Pg 4, name... why not change the name?

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: We will change the track name *Secondary Mathematics Certification* to *Secondary Teacher Education* as has been suggested.

QUESTION: Pg 9, program changes... please justify the belief that there is no opportunity for a school to make changes once a proposal is submitted

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: SCCHE guidelines (October 2012, 2014) state that: Proposals for new programs must be submitted in the appropriate format ("online" added in 2014) by the President or Chief Academic Officer of the institution or system to the Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing with a letter of transmittal.

Once the USC President and Board of Trustees sign the proposal and send it to the SCCHE, substantive changes in the program proposal are not considered. Changes that are deemed non-substantive may be and have been made after that date, for example, in response to ACAP suggestions. Following the USC Board of Trustees approval, however, substantive changes would alter the original intent or design of the degree. This would require us to submit a revised proposal through faculty and administrative offices and CHE committees, putting us back another two years. The tracking document for the program is provided to illustrate the steps in the approval process (attached).

QUESTION: Pg 9, number of electives. It appears that 1/4 of the curriculum is elective (30 of 120)... It's claimed that this is more than other peer schools and that this is good. What courses are USCB not requiring that the peer schools do, and why?

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: It has not been claimed that USCB offers more or less in free electives in the Mathematical Sciences degree track than similar institutions. For example, while our proposal lists 22-32 hours of free electives, the College of Charleston offers 24-29 hours of free electives in their program. It is claimed, however, that differences in free electives at similar institutions are accounted for primarily by General Education/Liberal Arts Core requirements rather than by mathematics requirements. For example, while USCB's proposal lists 27-32 credit hours in General Education requirements, the College of Charleston lists 36-41 hours, Winthrop University lists 38-54 (including Foreign Language), and Charleston Southern University lists 48 hours. Moreover, the mathematics and associated curricular components (e.g., statistics, programming, etc.) requirements for the Mathematical Sciences track in our proposal are strong by any reasonable standard. The degree will require as much or more in

these areas than seven similar peer programs in the state. The curriculum design was guided by the Mathematical Association of America's recommendations from the Committee on the Undergraduate Program in Mathematics. That committee's purpose is to make recommendations to guide mathematics departments in designing quality curricula for their undergraduate students.

QUESTION: Pg 31, cost. Program plans 3 new faculty for the period and only 8 new students each year. Is the ratio of three faculty for 32 students an appropriate and cost effective ratio?

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: We used a conservative growth model to cover costs. Eight students per year in the program is really a breakeven point. We fully expect many more students to enroll in the program as has been our experience in Computational Science. In Computational Science we have more than doubled our original projections for student growth each year.

**Commissioner Questions and CHE/Institutional Responses:
Coastal Carolina University, M.S., Sport Management**

QUESTION: Pg 4, productivity.... If available, please provide productivity numbers for the similar programs of the listed SC institutions.

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE:

Headcount Enrollment (Fall Term)					
Institution	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
The Citadel: M.A., Sport Management¹					1 1
USC Columbia: MSEM, Sport and Entertainment Management	3 3	4 4	5 4	5 2	4 6
Winthrop: M.S., Sport and Fitness Administration /Management²		1 3	2 0	1 8	1 6

Completions					
Institution	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
The Citadel: M.A., Sport Management¹					4
USC Columbia: MSEM, Sport and Entertainment Management	1 3	2 3	2 5	3 2	2 1
Winthrop: M.S., Sport and Fitness Administration /Management²		3	7	6	7

1. The Citadel's program was approved by CHE in June 2013.

2. Winthrop's program was approved by CHE in January 2010.

QUESTION: Pg 13, course development ... the program will require a number of new courses, please justify that there exists capacity to develop these courses on the needed time line.

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: The program will require ten (10) new courses be established in order to meet the accreditation content area guidelines. The program is designed to be completed in no less than three (3) semesters; therefore, the courses will rotate, indicating that not all ten (10) courses will be offered each semester. Currently, the program has six (6) tenured or tenure-track faculty and one full-time lecturer in place. The new faculty positions will be staggered with one tenure-track faculty to begin in Fall 2015 (the first semester of the program, if approved), and a second new tenure-track line to be added the following year. Any additional faculty will be based on program growth and enrollment over time. With the current

faculty and the addition of the two new faculty members within the first two years, there will be enough support to cover the course load requirements of the master's program. Each of the courses will be taught by a faculty member (existing & new) who has expertise in the area, and each course listed has at least two faculty members who have both the academic and applied background to teach that specific course.

QUESTION: Pg 14, employer feedback. Will your program assessment include feedback from employers concerning the breadth, depth and quality of the curriculum?

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: Yes. This will occur in multiple ways. First, while this was not addressed in detail in the proposal, part of the assessment for any student who participates in the internship course includes two assessments which require employer feedback during the internship. One occurs at the midpoint of the internship, and one is completed at the end. These assessments ask for feedback in several professional areas specifically, as well as ask for the employer to rate the student as compared to other employees & interns coming out with the same educational background. In addition, the program will elicit feedback from both employers and students after graduation through interviews and surveys. This is already in place for the undergraduate program and will continue for the new graduate program.

**Commissioner Questions and CHE/Institutional Responses:
University of South Carolina Columbia, M.D., addition of M.D. clinical site in Florence**

QUESTION: Cost.... Please explain the projected incremental cost of \$1.4M a year for 12 students. The proposal states there will be no growth in student enrollment, presumably the USC program currently has management, facility and resources to cover the cost of clinicals; why then is there a need to grow management and to expend additional dollars beyond the current program?

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: The LCME requires clinical locations to have management, facilities, and resources comparable to those available at the campus offering the medical degree. It would be incorrect to assume that USC has the management, resources and facilities to cover the cost of clinical rotations in Florence. The bulk of the budget goes to pay for preceptors in Florence which we do not pay for in Columbia. All of the preceptors in Florence are in private practice or are employees of the hospital, and thus expect payment to teach our students.

**Commissioner Questions and CHE/Institutional Responses:
South Carolina State University, B.S., Industrial Engineering Technology, develop into
B.S., Industrial Engineering**

QUESTION: Pg 8, second chart. How should we interpret the drop in enrollment from 68 to 52 between 2011 and 2013?

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: The drop in enrollment is explained by these facts:

After nearly two years of negotiations with then Dean Esin Gulari, in 2009 an Articulation Agreement for a joint bachelor's degree program in Civil Engineering was signed by the Presidents, Provosts, Deans, and relevant chairs of SC State and Clemson Universities. The Agreement was based on the same model that SC State has with the University of Wisconsin for the nuclear engineering program. SC State student interest rose in 2008 in anticipation of potentially having the option to obtain a BS degree in Civil Engineering. Student interest continued to increase in light of the ABET-EAC accreditation of the nuclear engineering program, as students now saw the possibility of having a fully accredited BSCE degree.

However in 2011 through 2012, nearly all of the signatories of the Agreement has changed: at SC State, I left in June as Dean, the VPAA was replaced in December, and the SC State President stepped down the following March. At Clemson, Dean Esin Gulari, a champion for the joint program, stepped down as Dean due to illness, and shortly thereafter the Clemson President, Dr. Barker stepped down, along with Provost Helms, who also supported the initiative. With these changes, and relative inaction on continuing the joint degree effort, student optimism diminished, which is what the chart in question shows.

The Agreement was never implemented or presented to CHE for final approval. However one of the students that we had identified to pilot the program is now a third year doctoral student in the civil engineering program at Clemson. She also passed the EIT exam for eventual professional licensure.