

**Advisory Committee on Academic Programs
Minutes of November 30, 2017**

Members Present

Dr. John Lane, Chair
Dr. Connie Book, The Citadel
Dr. Ralph Byington, Coastal Carolina University
Dr. Donna Elmore, Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College, via teleconference
Dr. Clif Flynn, University of South Carolina Upstate
Dr. Peter King, Francis Marion University, via teleconference
Dr. Learie Luke, S.C. State University
Dr. Chris Nesmith, University of South Carolina, Palmetto College
Dr. Suzanne Ozment, Lander University
Dr. Jeff Priest, University of South Carolina Aiken
Dr. Hope Rivers, S.C. Technical College System

Member Designees

Dr. Jackie Blakley, Tri-County Technical College, representing Mr. Galen DeHay
Dr. Tena Crews, University of South Carolina Columbia, representing Ms. Joan Gabel
Mr. Tim Drueke, Winthrop University, representing Dr. Debra Boyd
Dr. Rob Kilgore, University of South Carolina Beaufort, representing Dr. Eric Skipper, via teleconference
Dr. Jeremy King, Clemson University, representing Dr. Robert Jones
Dr. Diane Carr, Midlands Technical College, representing Dr. Ron Drayton
Dr. Darlene Shaw, Medical University of South Carolina, representing Dr. Lisa Saladin

Staff Present

Dr. Argentini Anderson	Ms. Trena Houp
Mr. Clay Barton	Ms. Julissa Nixon
Ms. Sandra Carr	Ms. Tanya Rogers
Ms. Lane Goodwin	Dr. Regine Rucker
Ms. Anna Grubic	
Dr. Falcia Harvey	

Guests

Dr. Diane M. Burnette, S.C. State University	Dr. Judith Neufeld, Lander University
Dr. Michelle Cook, Clemson University	Dr. George J. Petersen, Clemson University
Dr. Barbara Ervin, Lander University	Ms. Terry Seckinger, SC Commission on Higher Education
Dr. Matthew Guah, S.C. State University	Ms. Jaclyn Walsh, S.C. Department of Education
Dr. Ben Jua, S.C. State University	
Dr. Debra Jackson, Clemson University	
Dr. Jeff Marshall, Clemson University	

Welcome

Dr. Lane called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. He welcomed all in attendance and took attendance via teleconference. He then introduced the newest member of the Academic Affairs Division, Ms. Julissa Nixon. Ms. Nixon confirmed Freedom of Information Act compliance.

1. Consideration of Minutes of September 14, 2017

Dr. Lane requested a motion to accept the minutes of September 14, 2017, as distributed. The motion was **moved** (Druke) and **seconded** (Priest) and the Committee **voted unanimously to accept the minutes as presented.**

Dr. Lane requested agenda items 7 and 8 be moved up on the agenda as Ms. Houp would need to leave to attend an 11:00 a.m. teleconference.

8. *Revisions to the Policies and Procedures for New Academic Programs, Program Modifications, Program Notifications, Program Terminations, and New Centers for SC Public Colleges and Universities*

Dr. Lane reviewed the recent history of revisions to the policies and procedures for new academic programs and acknowledged that ACAP members responded with comments since the September 14, 2017 ACAP meeting. Dr. Lane thanked Ms. Houp and the task force for their work on the revisions. Dr. Lane explained that CAAL members had been working in parallel with ACAP on the revisions for the past six weeks. Dr. Lane said he and Commissioner Seckinger had worked very closely on the revisions and Commissioner Seckinger recommended that ACAP see CAAL's ideas. Dr. Lane called attention to the cover memo and attachments included with the agenda item and invited Ms. Houp to summarize work on the revisions since September 2017.

Ms. Houp noted two of the main edits based on ACAP feedback: 1) "Or designee" was reinstated to the language so that proposals can be submitted by institutions' chief academic officer or their designee; and 2) All institutional, faculty, and administrative approvals are required prior to proposal submission, but board approval can be obtained before the proposal moves forward to CAAL. She also mentioned that some ACAP-suggested clean-up edits were executed. Dr. Lane explained that he wanted to provide ACAP with a context for the most recent revisions and opened the floor for comment.

Dr. Rivers referenced CAAL's inquiry about non-transferable programs noted on page 8 of the revisions. Dr. Rivers recognized colleagues from the technical colleges present in person and via teleconference. Dr. Rivers explained that the technical colleges have never requested a signature from students to verify their understanding that a program is non-transferable. She said this practice had not been discussed among technical college staff and is not something the technical colleges intend to do. She stated "I think that it's clear when a student is majoring in welding, that they know that those courses will not transfer." Dr. Rivers added that it is the scope of the four-year institutions to determine what coursework they will accept. Dr. Lane thanked Dr. Rivers for her input and committed to relaying her feedback to the Committee. The representatives from Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College and Midlands Technical College (Midlands Tech) concurred with Dr. Rivers' statement.

Mr. Drueke referred to the new addition with regard to reporting on the K-12 core subject standards on page 9. He said he had spoken with Winthrop University's (Winthrop's) Dean of the College of Education, who has had conversation with other Deans around the state, and she indicated that the addition would generate a lot of extra work for the education programs, "probably to the point of a new person in each program to track all of that." Mr. Drueke asked whether it is the purview of CHE to review programs in this manner, as opposed to accreditors or the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDOE). Dr. Jeremy King concurred with concern expressed by Mr. Drueke.

Dr. Jeremy King asked for clarification on page 6 of the program policy, the policy for modifications number 1b, which talks about the addition, deletion, or consolidation of concentrations, tracks, options, cognates, and emphasis areas. He asked for a clarification because thereafter the word "concentration" is exclusively used. Dr. Lane and Ms. Houp answered that it is meant to be collective and the document will be revised to state "hereafter referred to as 'concentration'". Dr. Book stated that The Citadel shared Clemson's concern and that the hereafter referred to will cover that concern.

Dr. Book made four observations: 1) Dr. Book referred to page 6, 6 Bi and C, and recommended the SACSCOC standard of a 25% change would constitute a substantive program change since The Citadel does not use credit hours. She explained that a credit hours change does not always fully describe a program modification; 2) Dr. Book requested that the dual enrollment program policy follow the SACSCOC standard which states that 25% of coursework must be completed at the student's home institution, where the student is registered; 3) Dr. Book referred to page 10, e3 regarding distance delivery. She recommended that 100% online delivery changes to existing programs constitute a program notification versus a program modification stating that South Carolina institutions' participation in SARA for online delivery would not be duplication in-state due to national recruiting efforts and 4) Dr. Book recommended that CHE and institutions both maintain proactive communications within the three-month timeframe proposed within the policies. Dr. Lane thanked Dr. Book for her feedback and asked for additional feedback on interstate recruiting. Mr. Drueke recommended adding another ACAP meeting to the calendar due to the time period between the March and fall meetings which "basically preclude any late additions to going online." Mr. Drueke also noted that most institutional program approvals occur in the spring. Dr. Lane invited members to transmit any additional feedback after the meeting as well and again committed to relaying to CAAL comments from the meeting.

7. CHE Inventory Comparison

Dr. Lane invited Ms. Houp to present the agenda item. Ms. Houp noted that she distributed copies of the institutional offerings as currently recorded in the CHE *Inventory* and informed committee members that electronic copies will be sent via e-mail as well. She asked that institutional representatives review their respective lists for accuracy and report any discrepancies to CHE staff.

2. Program Proposals

- a. Clemson University, M.A.T., Teacher Residency in Early Childhood Education
- b. Clemson University, M.A.T., Teacher Residency in Elementary Education
- c. Clemson University, M.A.T., Teacher Residency in Secondary Education

Dr. Lane thanked Dr. Jeremy King and Clemson University's (Clemson's) delegation for their attendance. Dr. Lane invited Dr. King to introduce the proposed programs together due to their similarity. A motion to

approve the proposed programs was **moved** (J. King) and **seconded** (Priest). Dr. King explained that the proposed programs seek to establish M.A.T. degrees to provide initial certification to a target population: Clemson undergraduates in Clemson's teacher preparation programs. The proposed programs were developed in the spirit of a combined bachelor's/M.A.T. program in which Clemson's senior undergraduates referenced in the proposed programs would take 12 hours of graduate coursework in the second semester of their senior year. Students would subsequently enroll in a two-semester teacher residency course to complete the remaining hours toward the M.A.T.

Dr. King stated the proposed teacher residency programs are the first of their kind in the state and the proposed programs' goal is to develop long-term teaching leaders by attracting, developing, and retaining high quality educators. He said the goal will be reached in two ways: 1) the proposed programs will provide year-long apprenticeships with trained master teachers that will allow students to integrate their graduate coursework and clinical experience prior to employment as teachers of record; and 2) the proposed programs will address the teacher shortage problem by increasing the initial population of undergraduates who are interested in becoming educators, along with increasing the retention rates of teachers in-service. Dr. King said, "the evidence shows, from national teacher residency programs, that time is expanded to typically 7-8 years, so that's a 50-100% increase." He also noted initial feedback from students, prospective undergraduates, and their families has been positive. Dr. King introduced Dr. Michelle Cook, Associate Dean in the College of Education, Dr. Debbie Jackson, faculty consultant on the project, Dr. George Petersen, Dean of the College of Education, and Dr. Jeff Marshall, Chair of the Teaching and Learning Department.

Dr. Crews stated that she and Dr. King had spoken about the University of South Carolina's (USC's) initial questions about the proposed programs and that USC has no problems with them due to Clemson's plan to recruit internally. Dr. Crews said, "I think it will be an asset to the state." Dr. Lane acknowledged CAAL chair, Commissioner Seckinger. Commissioner Seckinger asked for clarification on the mentoring component during student teaching of the proposed programs. Dr. King responded that the hope and intent of the teacher residency is that students will develop and maintain a great mentoring relationship with a master teacher. Dr. Marshall added that the master teachers will receive a year of preparation to host teacher residents, which consists of a two-course sequence plus a one week summer commitment. He also stated Clemson has worked with seven contiguous districts on the proposed programs and all seven districts have agreed to provide support, up to \$5,000 per student, for master teacher preparation. Master teachers will have to demonstrate leadership capability, the ability to mentor one-on-one, the ability to interact, and the ability to provide thoughtful and meaningful co-teaching experiences. He emphasized that Clemson seeks to provide a quality experience for teacher residents as opposed to simply more time in the classroom. Commissioner Seckinger asked whether teacher residents will be trained to access wraparound services for students. Dr. King affirmed that Dr. Petersen is committed to this issue.

Dr. Lane asked about the status of external funding noted in the proposal documentation. Dr. Marshall explained the endowment will be in operation in 2019. He also said, "There is a commitment from our donor and from our Dean and our board of trustees, that a portion of that endowment will be used to support this program going forward and for the long term." Dr. Lane asked for clarification on a budget reallocation in the first two years to help with startup of the proposed programs. Dr. Petersen confirmed that reallocation, which is coming from his office.

Dr. Blakley asked whether Clemson will work with school districts local to Clemson or throughout the state. Dr. Marshall reported that currently the proposed programs will be exclusively in the Upstate region

in the seven to eight districts local to Clemson and that any further implementation would have to be in collaboration with other institutions of higher education. He also stated that any additional districts would be in the highest critical need districts within the state. Dr. Marshall reiterated that the intent of the program is not a statewide recruiting tool, because current undergraduates in the College of Education will be recruited for this program. He also stated they would gradually move to the highest need districts with support of other higher education institutions, but such efforts would require funding.

Dr. Lane inquired about the proposed programs' target recruitment demographic. Dr. J. King responded that any interested student from another institution would have to have the prerequisites and content knowledge to allow them to move forward in the program. He said the majority of the proposed programs' demographics would come from Clemson's undergraduates, but the institution would not exclude other students.

Mr. Drueke commented that the proposed programs are going to be similar to Winthrop's one-year M.A.T., which Winthrop is building on to design a five-year program. He noted the upcoming five-year program does not have a full year residency, but Winthrop may look into adding one. He then summarized the expectations of Winthrop's program where students complete certain prerequisites in their sophomore, junior, and senior year to go into the field, both in the content area and prior to time in the classroom, so that they are not just coming in for a semester or a year at the M.A.T. level for the first time student teaching.

Dr. Lane asked whether the proposed programs match Clemson's undergraduate programs that lead to certification from the state and a Clemson representative confirmed this fact. Dr. Lane asked whether substantial advising would be necessary for a student who entered one of the proposed programs from another pathway and a Clemson representative agreed that advising would be necessary.

Dr. Lane asked for clarification on the exact number of graduate credit hours students will take in the proposed programs: while the proposed programs' documentation references Clemson's [G6 policy](#), it is unclear whether the credit count is analogous to high school dual credit or would set a credit precedent. Dr. Lane went on to ask whether compatible programs at College of Charleston (C of C), Winthrop, and Coastal Carolina University (Coastal) have combination M.A.T.s as well. Mr. Drueke responded that Winthrop allow students to take up to nine hours of graduate work that would apply to a few graduate programs, including the M.A.T. He said a lot of those classes are combined undergraduate/graduate courses with more expectations and different assignments and policies for students taking the course for graduate credit. Dr. J. King said Clemson's undergraduate students can take 18 graduate credit hours, but for the proposed program, it has to be with the understanding that 12 credits contribute to both programs. Dr. J. King then noted Clemson's policy has a lower ceiling than the 20 shared credits SACSCOC allows. Dr. Jackson then explained that University policy, which follows SACSCOC policy, allows students to graduate with a combined degree with 150 total credit hours. She said students complete their undergraduate degree with 120 credits, then complete graduate credit hours for the M.A.T. She also stated that at Clemson, most students with more than 120 credits at the undergraduate level take graduate hours, not undergraduate hours for additional credit. She then reiterated that students will complete a total of 150 credit hours for the M.A.T and current students would have at least 124 credit hours when entering their second semester senior year, so the combined program is within both SACSCOC and Clemson's policies. Dr. Lane thanked Dr. Jackson and Mr. Drueke for their comments. He noted the Commission and Clemson have been collaborating on the proposed programs since summer 2017 and stated it has been great to work together. Commissioner Seckinger asked if SACSCOC would consider

credit hours for graduate level student teaching. Dr. Jackson informed her that it is not an issue. Commissioner Seckinger then said that the proposed programs are exactly the kind of thing for which she is looking.

Dr. Lane thanked Clemson for providing revised program proposals that disaggregated the budget per program. Dr. Lane inquired whether any students will have difficulty getting from a 2.75 GPA at the 60-credit threshold to a 3.4 by program admission. Dr. Marshall explained that a 2.75 GPA allows students in the teacher education program and a 3.4 GPA is the university's minimum GPA to allow undergraduates to take master's level courses. He also stated he does not think GPA will be a barrier or an issue moving forward. In response to a question from Dr. Lane, Clemson representatives confirmed that the latest version of the program proposals omits the condition of no waivers of tuition will be provided unless grant funding is secured and information stating students are not remunerated for their teacher residency for that year. Dr. Lane noted the proposed programs look popular in terms of recruitment. A Clemson representative confirmed this is the case.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the new program proposals for Clemson University to offer programs leading to the Master of Arts in Teaching degree in Teacher Residency in Early Childhood Education; the Master of Arts in Teaching degree in Teacher Residency in Elementary Education; and the Master of Arts in Teaching degree in Teacher Residency in Secondary Education, to be implemented Fall 2018.

3. Program Modifications

- a. Clemson University, M.S., Bioengineering, add Clemson University at MUSC site

Dr. Jeremy King introduced the program modification from Clemson University. A motion to approve the proposed program modification was **moved** (J. King) and **seconded** (Shaw). Dr. King explained that the proposed modification seeks to extend Clemson's currently approved M.S. program in bioengineering to the bioengineering building at the Medical University of South Carolina (MUSC). Dr. King explained that the M.S. program is a research-focused advanced degree for students who are interested in a fundamental research career including subsequent doctoral studies. He stated the modification expands the reach of the current M.S. degree to students in the Lowcountry and supports the state's growing bioengineering knowledge discovery industry. The proposed site location would provide students with a superior education by affording them access to MUSC clinicians and healthcare practitioners.

Dr. Lane inquired as to the proposed modification's implementation date, as the documentation references November 2017. Dr. King responded that Clemson proposes to implement the modification in Spring 2018. Dr. Shaw stated MUSC does not have any questions and is very supportive of the proposed program modification. Dr. Crews then stated that USC does not have any problems with the proposed modification and is happy to see it move forward.

Dr. Lane asked for clarification about the incremental costs versus the full costs referenced in the program modification documentation. Dr. King stated he had both full and incremental funding data added to the proposed modification, but noted that the incremental cost accounting was more important. He explained the full cost accounting includes expenditures that already exist so it shows a deficit when the program is not running in deficit and there is no intention of running a deficit.

Dr. Lane asked for information about MUSC's facility. Dr. Shaw explained MUSC's bioengineering building is a nice, new facility with approximately 30,000 square feet that is very popular with students. Dr. Lane asked whether the memorandum of understanding (MOU) referenced in the program modification documentation would be accessible for the CHE approval letter. Dr. J. King confirmed the MOU is available. The committee continued to discuss full cost accounting. Dr. Peter King requested clarification on which costs institutions should provide with proposals. Dr. Lane assured the committee that the Commission will continue to work toward a solution for operational costs and revenue it prefers to assess during program proposal consideration.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program modification for Clemson University to modify its program leading to the Master of Science degree in Bioengineering to add a new delivery site at MUSC, to be implemented Spring 2018.

b. Clemson University, M.Engr., Biomedical Engineering, add Clemson University at MUSC site

Dr. Jeremy King introduced the program modification from Clemson University. A motion to approve the proposed programs modification was **moved** (J. King) and **seconded** (Shaw). Dr. J. King explained that the proposed program modification seeks to extend the currently approved program to the bioengineering building at MUSC. He explained the master's of engineering program is intended as a professional terminal degree to further the careers of those interested in applying biomedical engineering knowledge. He went on to say the program provides an integrated education and internship experience which has more of an engineering focus, such as product and technology development. The proposed modification expands Clemson's reach to students in the Lowcountry and supports the biomedical technology workforce in the state. Finally, Dr. King said the engineering students' access to MUSC clinicians and healthcare practitioners may be more important than for the M.S. program. Dr. Lane commented that a lot of the discussion from agenda item 3a applies to this proposed modification. Dr. Crews agreed with Dr. Lane's comment and stated that USC has no comments or concerns about the proposed modification. She continued and said that Clemson's programs deal with two different concentrations than USC's program. Dr. Shaw stated that MUSC enthusiastically supports this modification as well. Dr. Lane inquired whether the proposed modification would service Lowcountry-area identified students who would then provide services in the Lowcountry-placed biomedical industry. Dr. J. King said while a significant concentration of the industry is in Charleston, Clemson will let the market determine that.

Commissioner Seckinger asked for clarification on students' ability to pursue doctoral study. Dr. J. King explained the M.Engr. degree would be highly attractive to those individuals who are already in the workforce and want to further develop themselves and the M.S. degree, through the doctorate, leads to teaching.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program modification for Clemson University to modify its program leading to the Master of Engineering degree in Biomedical Engineering to add a new delivery site at MUSC, to be implemented Spring 2018.

c. Lander University, M.Ed., Montessori Education, add emphasis in Elementary II (Grades 4-6)

Dr. Ozment introduced the program modification from Lander University (Lander). A motion to approve the proposed program modification was **moved** (Ozment) and **seconded** (Byington). Dr. Ozment explained that Lander is proposing to add a third Montessori concentration to their existing M.Ed. in Montessori

education. She said Lander has been offering the M.Ed. in Montessori Education for over ten years and it is a very strong program and one of which Lander is very proud. She stated the two existing concentrations are both based on standards established by the Montessori Accreditation Council for Teacher Education, Early Childhood and Elementary I (grades 1-3), which recently authorized a credential for elementary II, grades 4-6, and Lander thinks it will serve their students well. She noted the courses and faculty are already in place to deliver the Elementary II concentration with no significant additional costs. Dr. Ozment introduced Dr. Judy Neufeld, Dean of the College of Education and Professor Barbara Ervin, Director of the Montessori program to answer questions.

Dr. Lane inquired about the over 1200 clock hours of instruction noted in the program modification documentation. A Lander representative explained the required clock hours are determined by MACTE. She noted that clock hours have been detrimental to recruiting teacher candidates because of all of all of the required coursework to get the full certification to teach at that Elementary II level. The Lander representative went on to say the proposed concentration will lead to greater enrollment in Montessori elementary education and will also fill a need for school districts that cannot find credentialed elementary school teachers.

Dr. Lane asked the Lander representatives to summarize the impact of Montessori education on the state of SC. A Lander representative stated SC has more children enrolled in public Montessori programs than any state in the United States' with over 6,000 SC students enrolled in public Montessori programs, many in Title I districts, and spread throughout rural areas, which is very unique compared to the rest of the country since most Montessori programs are in urban areas. She also stated research has shown that Montessori children excel in the areas of executive function, stimulation, and impulse control so Montessori is a teaching method positioned to help build the 21st century skills that SC is emphasizing right now.

Dr. Lane asked about the program's decrease in enrollment and whether it is due to the prohibitive clock hours requirement. A Lander representative confirmed this information and also explained that school districts often break up that 4-6 grade classroom that is the traditional Montessori Elementary II. The representative also mentioned that middle school Montessori programs are growing and Lander expects the growth to continue.

Dr. Lane stated he will get in touch with the institution if there are any follow up questions.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** the program modification for Lander University to modify its program leading to Master of Education degree in Montessori Education to add an emphasis in Elementary II (Grades 4-6), to be implemented Spring 2018.

- d. SC State University, B.A., Political Science, revise curriculum of and add online delivery to the Public Administration concentration

Dr. Luke introduced the program modification from South Carolina State University (SC State). A motion to approve the proposed program modification was **moved** (Luke) and **seconded** (Rivers). Dr. Luke explained that the proposed modification would revise the curriculum to increase public administration courses by 12 credits and management courses by six credits, which would include organization theory and behavior as well as human resource management. Based on SC State's research, he said there were almost 400 advertised public administration positions in SC at the time they conducted their study. He

also noted that none of the similar programs in the state offer their programs online so SC State is in a unique position to attract students to an online program in public administration. Dr. Luke explained the university recently signed articulation agreements with three technical colleges which they anticipate will help with enrollment in the program. Dr. Luke stated that SC State estimates the program will begin with 20 students and will move up to 80 students with recruitment efforts. He also mentioned that all three faculty members currently in the program have been certified to teach online. Dr. Luke then introduced Dr. Diane Burnette, Executive Director for the Center for Teaching and Learning and Dr. Benedict Jua, chair of the department and Coordinator of the Political Science program. He said the finance section of the modification documentation shows the program will generate revenue for the university. He also noted SC State plans hire four adjuncts in years two and three and a full-time professor by year four if the enrollment projections remain accurate.

Dr. Lane asked for more information on the projected enrollment and the articulation agreements. Dr. Luke confirmed the articulation agreements are with Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College, Aiken Technical College, and Midlands Technical College. Dr. Lane asked whether the projected enrollment numbers are specific to the concentration. Dr. Luke confirmed this fact. Dr. Ozment said that Lander has no objection whatsoever to the program modification, however, she noted a minor correction for the modification: Lander's degree is a B.S. in political science with a concentration in public administration. Dr. Lane asked Dr. J. King if he had any comment on the proposed modification. Dr. J. King stated Clemson did not have any comment on the modification. Dr. Byington remarked that Coastal has an upcoming program proposal in applied politics. Dr. Lane commented that there would be a potential opportunity for SC State and Coastal to collaborate in the future on these programs. Dr. Rivers noted that online delivery is key for technical college students. Dr. Lane asked about projected enrollment and funding noted in the program modification documentation. Dr. Luke confirmed that the projections in the documentation are correct.

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 Political Science to revise its curriculum and add online delivery, to be implemented Fall 2018.

4. *Annual Report on Admission Standards for First-Time Entering Freshmen, Fall 2015*

Dr. Lane introduced Dr. Rucker. He noted that the annual report on admissions standards for first-time entering freshmen had not been brought to ACAP in the past seven or eight years, and that he wanted to resume this practice to ensure engagement and accuracy. He invited Dr. Rucker to introduce the annual report on admissions standards for first time entering freshmen, Fall 2015. A motion to approve the annual report for Fall 2015 was **moved** (Drueke) and **seconded** (Shaw).

Dr. Rucker explained the annual report is a summary of self-reported data from the 12 SC public senior colleges and universities. The report focuses on five specific topics: 1) applications acceptances and enrollment; 2) college preparatory course prerequisites; 3) SAT and ACT scores; 4) provisionally admitted students; and 5) minimum admission standards. In Fall 2015, the reporting institutions received over 101,000 applications, with 62% of applicants offered admission and noted nearly 30% of those who were offered admission enrolled. She also explained the percentage of students meeting college preparatory prerequisites increased from 85.4% to 91% from Fall 2014 to Fall 2015. Dr. Rucker then stated the majority of students attending the reporting institutions take the SAT rather than the ACT and the minimum SAT and ACT scores are generally lower for students with a higher GPA and class rank at reporting institutions.

She said at least 50% of the reporting institutions indicate admitting provisional students, however, all the reporting institutions have some level of first-time freshmen who are not meeting all of the college preparatory course prerequisites and institutions continue to adjust their entrance requirements for first-time freshmen. She mentioned future iterations of the annual report may include demographic data related to first-time freshmen, trend analysis, and more investigation on the definition of provisional students and how that impacts the outcome of the report. Dr. Rucker then opened the floor for questions and discussion.

Dr. Priest asked how to provide feedback if there are discrepancies in reported information. Dr. Rucker responded that members can contact her and Dr. Lane. Dr. Lane thanked Dr. Priest and noted that the value of bringing the report to ACAP is to clarify inaccuracies in reported data prior to the report's submission to the state legislature.

Representatives discussed the numbers reported for provisional programs. Commissioner Seckinger asked if there is any mentoring or remediation for provisional students. Dr. Priest stated there is academic counseling available at University of South Carolina Aiken (USC Aiken). Commissioner Seckinger asked as a follow-up how many provisional students persist through to graduation. Dr. Priest responded USC Aiken has a bridge program that will graduate its first cohort this year and approximately 65% of the original cohort has persisted to graduation, which is about the same as USC Aiken's general population graduation rate. Commissioner Seckinger then asked about the cost of the bridge program. Dr. Priest stated the bridge program cost is about \$150,000 and USC Aiken may have to add more counselors. Commissioner Seckinger asked whether USC Aiken sees the bridge program as a good return on investment and Dr. Priest affirmed this statement. Dr. Rivers commented that the term provisional must be used carefully since there are guidelines attached to that term. She said students who need a lot of remediation, versus a student who is "right there" and can be remediated quickly, are not supposed to be at four-year institutions. Dr. Lane added there is CHE policy about developmental courses and remediation. Commissioner Seckinger said high school students need to be either remediated or in a dual credit program in their second semester of senior year so that higher education institutions do not need to remediate students.

Dr. Lane invited committee members to work together with the Commission to ensure the annual report's accuracy. Dr. Blakley requested clarification that the report uses numbers and not names. Dr. Lane confirmed that the report uses numbers for a variety of reasons, including security.

The Committee **voted unanimously to accept** to move the annual report on admissions standards for first time entering freshmen, Fall 2015 forward to CAAL.

Dr. Lane thanked Dr. Rucker for her work on the annual report and informed the committee she will begin work on the Fall 2016 report.

5. *Annual Report on the 2016 Academic Common Market Program*
(For information, no action required)

Dr. Lane invited Ms. Carr to summarize the annual report on the 2016 Academic Common Market Program (ACM). Ms. Carr thanked the institutional coordinators for their assistance. She noted SC continues to recruit more students in the state and CHE continues to work with SREB to ensure data accuracy and relevance. She then stated Coastal Carolina's bachelor of science in marine science remains one of the

most popular ACM programs, but USC continues to lead the state in the number of ACM students who come to the state. Ms. Carr also stated that when she speaks with students, parents, and legislators, she envisions ACM as a leader in connecting CHE to the economic growth of local and global communities. Ms. Carr opened the floor for comments.

Dr. Byington pointed out a few programs listed are not actually ACM programs and that a delay between when someone is in the ACM program and then changes their degree program at the end of that same semester is causing some data error. Dr. Crews concurred with Dr. Byington's assertion and mentioned she thinks some students are double majors, and issues arise when one of the double majors is not an ACM major. Dr. Byington also noted Coastal has been a member of the ACM program since 1997. Dr. Byington and Dr. Crews requested receiving early drafts of the report prior to the regular posting schedule for both review and to provide feedback. Dr. Lane then acknowledged that SREB is still reviewing the data it sends to states including SC for CHE reporting because of the distinctions between fiscal, academic, and calendar year reporting.

6. Notifications of Program Changes and/or Terminations, September 1 – November 17, 2017
(For information, no action required)

Dr. Lane asked the committee members to review the notifications of program changes and/or terminations for accuracy and to contact CHE staff with any additional changes.

7. Other Business

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.