

Minutes
Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing (CAAL)
October 26, 2017

Members Present

Chair Terrye Seckinger
Ms. Allison Dean Love
Dr. Louis Lynn, via teleconference
Admiral Charles Munns, via teleconference
Mr. Kim Phillips, via teleconference

Staff Present

Dr. Argentini Anderson
Ms. Laura Belcher
Ms. Sandra Carr
Ms. Lane Goodwin
Ms. Anna Grubic
Ms. Trena Houp
Dr. John Lane
Ms. Peggy Simons
Mr. Jeff Schilz
Dr. Kimberly Walker

Guests

Dr. Connie Book, The Citadel
Dr. Kevin C. Bower, The Citadel
Dr. Rachel Burns, University of South Carolina Beaufort
Dr. Nancy Carson, Medical University of South Carolina
Dr. Tena Crews, University of South Carolina Columbia
Dr. Mary Anne Fitzpatrick, University of South Carolina Columbia
Dr. Rob Kilgore, University of South Carolina Beaufort
Dr. Peter King, Francis Marion University
Mr. Tom Nelson, Lander University, via teleconference
Dr. Chris Nesmith, University of South Carolina, Palmetto College
Dr. Jeff Priest, University of South Carolina Aiken
Dr. Eric Skipper, University of South Carolina Beaufort
Dr. Gordon Sproul, University of South Carolina Beaufort
Dr. Joseph Staton, University of South Carolina Beaufort
Dr. Suzanne Thomas, Medical University of South Carolina
Dr. Craig Velozo, Medical University of South Carolina
Dr. Ron Welch, The Citadel

Welcome

Chair Seckinger called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Ms. Goodwin took attendance via teleconference. Dr. Lane announced the meeting was being held in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act.

1. Minutes

- a. Consideration of Minutes of August 31, 2017
- b. Consideration of Minutes of September 27, 2017

Chair Seckinger requested a motion to accept the minutes of August 31, 2017 and September 27, 2017, as distributed. The motion was **moved** (Love) and **seconded** (Munns) and the Committee **voted unanimously to accept the minutes as presented.**

2. Program Proposals

a. The Citadel, B.S., Construction Engineering

Chair Seckinger introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Love) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Dr. Welch explained the development of the proposed program and noted it is different from civil engineering and project management. He stated that launching the program this Fall will align The Citadel with ABET accreditation cycle: The Citadel will begin with juniors and would need to graduate one by 2020. The Citadel is working on the junior coursework, including syllabi and assignments and hired a construction engineer last year who is involved with the coursework process. Dr. Welch then invited questions.

Chair Seckinger commented that The Citadel's project management program seems very successful. Dr. Welch agreed and noted the project management program averages 450 enrollments and 110 students currently in the program. He noted that the other master's degree program started last year and has about 30 students enrolled. Chair Seckinger commented about construction in the Charleston area due to people coming to the area. Dr. Welch added there were 54 companies at The Citadel's engineering career fair the past Tuesday night with one employer seeking 22 new hires. Chair Seckinger asked what percentage of the corps are engineer or engineering-related majors. Dr. Welch responded that 600 out of 2,400 of the corps are engineers, which is double the enrollment in the past six years. He stated there are 110 students in the graduate program and 100 students in the evening two-plus-two program. Chair Seckinger asked for clarification about the required freshman study program. Dr. Welch reported that The Citadel has Citadel 101 to help freshmen acclimate to the institution and the School of Engineering has a freshman experience program tied to the math and engineering courses they will take in the program. The Citadel's engineering school has an 80% retention rate which Dr. Welch attributes to the school's use of supplemental instruction, which includes a STEM lab, math lab, and freshman events. Chair Seckinger observed that The Citadel's freshman and supplemental study program means nothing but success to develop a culture of learning and giving students the tools they need if they have questions. Dr. Welch added that supplemental instruction is available to the evening two plus two students as well since it begins after the evening classes are complete. Chair Seckinger commented that the proposed program is an excellent one and that the proposal was written very well. Chair Seckinger opened the floor for questions.

Admiral Munns had three questions. 1) He asked for clarification about whether the student would move toward the proposed program objectives or whether the proposed program would fulfill the objectives. Dr. Welch confirmed that the student would move toward the program objectives. 2) Admiral Munns asked to what degree will students receive instruction in project management and should project management be one of the described student outcomes. Dr. Welch affirmed that students absolutely need project management experience and/or instruction and noted that the student outcomes outlined in the proposed program documentation align with ABET accreditation outcomes. He went on to state that the program criteria of the proposed program addresses project management instruction. Admiral Munns asked a follow-up question regarding whether there will be analysis of whether project management is covered in the proposed program. Dr. Welch replied that the project management area is

one of the three areas, along with business and construction engineering, that makes the proposed program unique. Admiral Munns asked whether The Citadel's assessment in four years will make sure that students have the skills outlined in the proposed program. Dr. Lane asked whether Dr. Welch would like to reference the Evaluation and Assessment section of the proposed program documentation to respond to Admiral Munns' inquiry. Dr. Welch directed attention to the program criteria section of the proposed program documentation, criterion 5, which describes the assessment. Dr. Book added that there is a senior-level class called project management which students would take in the proposed program. 3) Admiral Munns asked for more information on probability of success of the program. Dr. Welch reported on student interest in construction engineering, along with every construction company in the Charleston area requesting construction engineers. He explained that the list of employers included with the proposed program documentation were those who attended last year's career fair and were looking to hire. Dr. Welch added that The Citadel looked toward the two-plus-two students for enrollment numbers due to the day program being residential; he also stated they were mindful to the institution's bottom line. Admiral Munns inquired about the confidence that The Citadel will get the two-plus-two students to make the projected enrollment numbers. Dr. Welch stated he was 100% confident the two-plus-two students would meet the projected enrollment. Admiral Munns commented that he thinks the proposed program is great and he thanked Dr. Welch and Dr. Book for their answers.

Dr. Lynn asked whether there are formal articulation agreements between The Citadel and Clemson University (Clemson) and University of South Carolina (USC). Dr. Welch answered that The Citadel has articulation agreements with all of the technical colleges because they feed-in for their two-plus-two students. He added that very few students join The Citadel as cadets after freshman year. Dr. Welch added that the proposed program is completely different from USC's management degree, which is more focused on the executive management level. He also stated that Clemson's construction science program has fewer engineering courses than The Citadel's proposed program. He noted The Citadel has an articulation agreement with Clemson that focuses on graduate program course substitution. Undergraduate students fill out transfer credit forms for any courses taken at The Citadel to transfer to Clemson and vice versa. Dr. Lynn asked whether the course transfers would apply to evening students who may be mobile around the state as well. Dr. Welch stated the procedures are the same for all students. He added The Citadel hopes to move some courses online to allow students to take them in the summer, after completing coursework at the technical colleges, prior to full matriculation in The Citadel's program. Dr. Welch noted that The Citadel is committed to graduate students and two-plus-two students taking coursework at their own pace. Dr. Lynn then asked if the Armed Forces give any special preference for admittance to the program. Dr. Welch said a large number of ROTC scholarships are focused on STEM, and a large number of cadets receive those scholarships, and that The Citadel is very veteran-friendly. He stated there is a veteran on The Citadel's campus to make veterans' entry into the day or evening program a seamless process. Dr. Lynn asked for clarification on the significance of the reference to 17 on page 14 of the proposal documentation. Dr. Welch responded that it was a statement regarding the fact that there are 17 other ABET-accredited programs of this type around the country. Chair Seckinger clarified that the statement speaks to the market. Commissioner Phillips commented the proposed program is excellent.

Commissioner Love asked how the proposed program would impact The Citadel's existing project management program. Dr. Welch said the proposed program would increase the number of students moving into the master's-level project management program. Commissioner Love asked Dr. Welch to comment on the recent national rankings and asked about the metrics used in the rankings of the engineering school. Dr. Welch reported that The Citadel is ranked number 19 according to *US News & World Report* and the University is very excited about that. He explained the schools ahead of The Citadel

are the four military service academies and two other public schools in California, with the remaining schools being private. He stated the metrics used for ranking are the number of students per class, faculty credentials, the number of faculty with Professional Engineering licenses (PEs), and overall school endowments. Appearance and perception by peers, including faculty and student representation at conferences and student representation at competitions are also considered. He also noted that adding programs should not affect ranking assessment because "The more programs you have, the more robust assessment of your program." Dr. Lynn asked if any other military institutions are represented in the top 20. Dr. Welch supplied that West Point, the Air Force Academy at Annapolis, and the Coast Guard Academy are also in the top 20.

Chair Seckinger expressed her excitement for Dr. Book's upcoming March 2018 Presidency of Elon University. Dr. Book thanked Chair Seckinger and stated she enjoyed her time at The Citadel.

Chair Seckinger noted that agenda item 6 would not be discussed, stating CAAL will review the revisions in one to two weeks in a subsequent telephone conversation. Chair Seckinger said she wanted all CHE program approvals to be provisional approvals for two years, and recommended an amendment to the proposed program's motion to reflect upcoming changes to the academic programs' policies and procedures. She explained the proposed policy revision would allow the Committee to monitor how a program performs once implemented versus what is written in the proposal with performance monitoring including actual enrollment, costs, and return on investment. Chair Seckinger recommended making all approvals provisional for two years, and stated staff would bring any major concerns about provisional programs to the Committee. Chair Seckinger went on to state that CHE wants to be a partner with institutions and assist them in the initial success of their programs. Commissioner Munns asked for clarification on the procedure for proposals moving from provisional to fully approved status. Chair Seckinger explained that once a program is deemed successful at the end of two years, the approval would automatically convert to non-provisional. A representative from The Citadel asked when the two years would start. Dr. Lane responded that the two years would begin at the program's implementation date.

Commissioner Munns asked how CHE would obtain the suggested program performance data. Dr. Lane explained that the institutions currently provide enrollment data to CHE. Commissioner Munns asked whether institutions would need to submit additional data to CHE and expressed concern about making work for the institutions. Dr. Lane invited Dr. Walker to respond. Dr. Walker explained CHE automatically collects annual enrollment and completion data by CIP code and level from the institutions. Staff may need to obtain two-year data from the institutions. A meeting attendee recommended CHE collect the data after institutions submit enrollment data. Discussion continued about using data automatically provided which would move a program's provisional status to the third year post implementation, so that the program would move to non-provisional status in the fourth year. Commissioner Munns recommended that be the procedure to minimize work for the institutions and Chair Seckinger agreed.

Dr. Lynn asked whether underperforming provisional programs would have the same teach-out requirements as terminated programs. Both Chair Seckinger and Dr. Lane confirmed that a teach-out plan would be required. The Commissioners discussed potential language for the recommendation, with Commissioner Munns suggesting it say provisional in accordance with policy change since the Committee cannot prescribe the exact nature of the change now because the revised policy has not yet been considered.

Commissioner Love asked for clarification about what standard institutions will be held to in order to determine whether there is a problem with a provisional program. Chair Seckinger responded that implemented programs will be evaluated against their submitted proposals. Commissioner Love asked if the Committee would look at vast deviations from the proposal and Chair Seckinger confirmed that fact. Dr. Lane added that the institutional proposal authors try to be conservative in the projections because of an accountability review within the first years of implementation.

Dr. Book commented she is very confident that all of the institutions are good stewards of their new programs and are pleased to participate in post-implementation reviews. She stated that institutions are used to a three-year compliance cycle as that is the culture of grants. She expressed concern about the licensing requirements of for-profit institutions and asked that they be held to a three-year review as well. Dr. Lane assured the Committee that licensing has a legacy of issuing conditional approvals to licensed institutions.

Commissioner Munns **amended his motion** to grant provisional approval of the proposed program for the period to be prescribed in the upcoming revision to *Policies and Procedures for New Academic Programs, Program Modifications, Program Terminations, and New Centers for SC Public Colleges and Universities*, and Commissioner Love **seconded** the amended motion.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the Bachelor of Science in Construction Engineering at The Citadel, to be implemented in August 2018.

- b. Clemson University, Ed.D., Education Systems Improvement Science

Chair Seckinger announced that the Clemson University withdrew the proposal from consideration and it will be considered at a future meeting.

- c. Medical University of South Carolina, Occupational Therapy Doctorate (O.T.D.), Entry Level
- d. Medical University of South Carolina, Occupational Therapy Doctorate (O.T.D.), Post-Professional

Chair Seckinger introduced the items, and the Committee **moved** (Love) and **seconded** (Munns) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for concurrent consideration of Agenda Items 2c and 2d. Dr. Lane introduced Dr. Suzanne Thomas from Medical University of South Carolina (MUSC) who in turn introduced her colleagues, Dr. Nancy Carson and Dr. Craig Velozo. Dr. Thomas explained that the doctoral degrees in occupational therapy (OT) will replace the Master of Science degree in occupational therapy in accordance with the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy expectation that the degree move to a doctorate by 2027. Dr. Thomas stated that MUSC has the faculty expertise, management, leadership, and research expectations to make this move now.

Chair Seckinger asked if MUSC is on the leadership cusp of replacing the master's degree program with doctoral programs. Dr. Thomas added that MUSC has an emphasis on building public health and population health degree programs. She continued to say that with the expertise in place now, MUSC is well suited to move to the doctoral degree programs now and not five years from now. Commissioner Munns asked why MUSC would phase out the master's degree as the doctorate seems to be a higher bar for a student than before. Dr. Thomas responded that no one will be able to be licensed to practice occupational therapy after 2027 without a doctorate. Dr. Carson stated the doctorate would be the only

point of entry by 2027. Chair Seckinger asked for clarification about the number of additional credit hours for the doctorate. Dr. Carson answered that the doctorate is 27 hours more than the master's degree. Commissioner Munns noted that the additional credit hours equates to an extra year, which Dr. Carson confirmed. Commissioner Munns then noted that 2027 is 10 years away and anyone who wanted to go through the proposed programs now would have to have time and money to go through a doctoral program instead of the master's program. Chair Seckinger commented that students with a doctorate would be on the leading edge of employability. Dr. Velozo reported that MUSC's occupational therapy program ranks 17th in the nation and 14 of the 16 programs ahead of MUSC already offer have doctoral programs so MUSC is losing potential students to those programs. Commissioner Munns said he while he is not arguing there should not be a doctorate, he wanted to question the need for phase out of the master's program seven years before the accrediting body's mandate to do so. Dr. Carson clarified that the master's program would be a teach-out, with the last master's program graduating in 2020. Commissioner Munns said he thinks the proposed programs are good ones, but he asked MUSC to delay the phase-out of the master's program. Chair Seckinger asked if it was possible to delay the phase-out of the master's program. Dr. Carson answered that it would be very difficult to do so due to faculty resources. Dr. Carson explained there are other avenues into the OT profession, including occupational therapy assistant (OTA), which is at the associate level, because OTAs can later complete a bridge program to become professional OTs.

Chair Seckinger asked if the curriculum for the master's program is in line to continue on to the clinical doctorate. Dr. Carson replied that the content required for the accreditation standards for a doctoral program have been added to the proposed programs. Chair Seckinger asked for clarification about whether the proposed doctoral curricula duplicate or deviate from the master's program curriculum. Dr. Velozo answered there is duplication because students have to be trained to become clinicians. He went on to say the challenge is when the accreditation committee says a doctoral program has to look distinctly different from the master's program so therefore a considerable number of existing classes are being modified to meet the accreditation standards. There is also a capstone project for the doctoral program, which is a major distinction from the master's program. Commissioner Munns noted the proposal includes only four additional required courses and asked for clarification on the curricula. Dr. Velozo directed attention to the list of all courses being modified included in the proposal. Dr. T. Thomas added that the modified courses make it untenable to continue to offer a master's degree program. Commissioner Munns reiterated that it is harder now for a student who wants to get into occupational therapy as the accrediting body has raised the bar, which costs time and money. Dr. Velozo commented that when he came on board with MUSC four years ago, he noticed the demands on MUSC's master's-level occupational therapy students were excessive, with 106 required credits. Dr. Velozo noted that the credit hours were more in line with a Ph.D. so there was a real disconnect in terms of the degree they were getting. He stated that the students really were not getting the degree they deserved for all those credits.

Chair Seckinger asked if current master's program students could pursue the proposed clinical doctorate. Dr. Carson answered that someone who has completed the master's degree can apply for the post-professional doctorate. Chair Seckinger noted that for ranking purposes, these proposed programs are an important component for the university to remain excellent. Chair Seckinger invited additional questions. Commissioner Munns asked for clarification on projected enrollment numbers noted on page 21 of the proposal. Dr. Carson stated that first, second, and third year students are figured into the budget numbers and that master's program students are expected to complete the program in two years for budget purposes.

Chair Seckinger requested clarification on OTAs and bridge programs. Dr. Carson clarified that MUSC does not have a bridge program for OTAs, but there are programs that are available. Chair Seckinger asked if there is an opportunity for MUSC to have a bridge with Trident Technical College. Dr. Carson said there are many changes happening in the OT profession right now. The accrediting body mandated that the entry level for OT move from master's-level to doctoral-level and also mandated that OTAs move from associate's level to baccalaureate-level, but there has been some pushback from two-year institutions so that mandate is being debated by the accrediting body. Chair Seckinger asked if MUSC would be willing to work with Trident Technical College if OTAs must move from the associate's level to the baccalaureate level. Dr. Thomas confirmed that MUSC would work with the technical colleges and would be well-suited to offer a bachelor's degree.

Chair Seckinger asked whether the doctoral programs incorporate soft skills training. Dr. Carson stated soft skills are embedded in the majority of the coursework. She described experiences to work with clients in the community or the lab, including a therapeutic interaction course in the first semester of the proposed programs as well as professionalism components added into several of the courses. Dr. Velozo noted that MUSC's OT program is one of the few in the country that operates a free clinic that is managed by professional students. He stated that all OT students rotate through the clinic and all OT students also rotate through MUSC hospital's transitional care unit for acute care experience as part of a class. Commissioner Love commented that she is happy to see ethical leadership seminar in the curricula.

Commissioner Love asked if there is a way to include the number of programs added or terminated for a given time period in the program proposal materials. Chair Seckinger specified that the additions and terminations be institution-specific. Dr. Lane affirmed that CHE will provide these numbers.

Dr. Thomas asked for clarification regarding provisional approval and if it would begin with implementation. Dr. Lane confirmed the provisional period would begin with implementation. Dr. Thomas requested that standard language be added to define provisional status showing it is an operational approval to allay accrediting bodies' concerns about provisional approval. Dr. Lane confirmed that the deliberation above applies to all proposals going forward.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the programs leading to the Doctorate degree in Occupational Therapy, Entry-Level and Post-Professional at the Medical University of South Carolina, to be implemented August 2019.

- e. University of South Carolina Beaufort, B.A., English, Secondary English Language Arts Licensure

Chair Seckinger introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Phillips) and **seconded** (Love) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval with provisional language. Dr. Skipper explained that the proposed program would prepare students for secondary education licensure and teaching careers. He stated the proposed program would respond to regional needs in University of South Carolina Beaufort's (USC Beaufort) service area of Beaufort, Hampton, Jasper, and Colleton counties. Dr. Skipper cited that current and anticipated secondary English teacher vacancies along with high population growth trends in the area were the driving forces behind this proposed program. He also added all funding for the program would be generated through tuition and fees. Dr. Skipper introduced Dr. Lauren Hoffer, Dr. Rob Kilgore, and Dr. Rachel Burns from USC Beaufort.

In response to a committee question about the proposed program's eligibility for supplemental Palmetto Fellows and LIFE scholarship awards, Dr. Lane clarified that statute specifies supplemental Palmetto Fellows and LIFE scholarships are for STEM and allied health majors only.

Dr. Burns asked how the provisional language may impact the proposed program's route through the South Carolina Department of Education. Chair Seckinger explained that the proposed program will be approved, but the term "provisional" should not be interpreted in the normal definition outside of the Commission's interactions with individual institutions. She said the Commission will be interacting with institutions to assess the proposal versus the implemented program. Commissioner Munns added that different language may help clarify and asked if setting a two-year or three-year approval is helpful. Dr. Burns explained that the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) operates on a 7-year review cycle. She stated that once a program has SCDE approval, it is still provisionally or conditionally approved until it receives specialized, professional association recognition on top of the provider accreditation. Chair Seckinger stated the CHE provisional approvals will not interrupt institutions' operations, just as the provisional approvals Dr. Burns described, do not interrupt institutions' operations. Commissioner Munns commented that he does not want the Commission's choice of words to be a hindrance to programs' accreditation review and requested that CHE use precise language. Dr. Kilgore added that USC Beaufort would like to advertise the proposed program without implying the program is in jeopardy. Chair Seckinger stated the review would be within the Commission and should not affect program marketing. Commissioner Munns commented the Commission would continue to approve programs, but the revision inserts a program review three years after program implementation. Chair Seckinger agreed. Commissioner Munns offered that this recommendation for program approval be consistent with our new policies and procedures which may require a program review. Commissioner Love noted that the recommendation should not include either provisional or conditional, but should call for a follow-up review. Dr. Lane proposed in response that staff capture thoughts and then provide language to the Committee to review. Commissioner Love recommended that the Commission consult with other states to investigate potential language.

Chair Seckinger invited questions on the proposed program. Commissioner Munns asked three questions. 1) He noted that the program-specific fees are higher than he normally sees for the proposed program's subject and asked for clarification about the proposed expense. Dr. Kilgore answered that some of the fees help defray costs associated with supervision of teacher candidates in local high schools and help to pay for such things as mileage for observations and other supplies. Dr. Burns also added that the higher program-specific fees will help offset the cost of maintaining a database for accreditation purposes. Commissioner Munns asked whether the added costs are unique to the field of study. Dr. Burns stated that K-12 needs do not always match higher education resources and therefore sometimes it is to supply those needs to the program to make sure they are instructionally appropriate when students are out in the schools. Commissioner Munns referenced USC Beaufort's below-average graduation rates and tuition increase noted in the statistical abstract. He asked whether the proposed program would aggravate the already poor graduation rate and/or exaggerate tuition growth. Dr. Skipper mentioned USC Beaufort had historically been perceived as a transfer institution for many students, in keeping with USC Beaufort's previous two-year mission. He stated the retention rate has been around 52% to 55%, but is in the mid-sixties now. Commissioner Munns then called attention to the graduation rate provided in the statistical abstract. Dr. Skipper noted that the institution has seen improvements in graduation rate as well. Commissioner Munns asked if the proposed program will have better retention and graduation than other programs. Dr. Hoffer noted that the English department's retention is 85% and that current and prospective students have been very vocal about their interest and excitement about the proposed

program. Dr. Kilgore added that the proposed program would be a great recruiting tool for USC Beaufort because of the interest in the community. She also noted that the lack of the proposed program also motivated students to transfer. Commissioner Munns noted that USC Beaufort is the highest increase in tuition of all the schools and asked if the proposed program would lead to a tuition increase. Dr. Skipper confirmed that this proposed program is fully covered by tuition.

Commissioner Love asked for clarification about the inclusion of public relations specialist as one of the occupations in the proposed program rationale. Dr. Kilgore explained that the main objective of the program is to produce teacher candidates to work in South Carolina schools, especially those local to USC Beaufort. However, if students decide not to enter the classroom, this degree “will allow them to pivot and to use what they have gained in some other path in life.”

Commissioner Lynn asked why the proposed program does not have an online delivery component. Dr. Kilgore replied that face-to-face interaction is preferable when training students to interact in a classroom setting. Dr. Burns added that moving online would lose the bridge to connect theory with the practicum-based pre-professional coursework. Commissioner Lynn then asked whether core coursework will be available online, in keeping with SCCORE. Dr. Skipper confirmed that students are able to take 60 general education credits online. Commissioner Munns agreed that the rest of the coursework should be in the classroom. Chair Seckinger noted that SCCORE students will be able complete coursework as needed to strengthen their career path. Dr. Hoffer stated that English courses are offered online periodically, but the Education department is very invested in face-to-face course delivery.

Commissioner Phillips stated all his questions had been answered and the proposed program was commendable. Chair Seckinger asked whether the proposal includes the South Carolina ELA standards for high school. Dr. Burns referred Chair Seckinger to sections 3 and 4 of the proposal. Dr. Kilgore then directed attention to page 6 of section 3, point f, which delineates the proposed program’s alignment to SC-specific standards. Dr. Lane added that educator preparation program proposals presented to the Commission will continue to include sections 3 and 4, which are considered by SCDE.

Chair Seckinger questioned the NCTE standards language included in the proposed program documentation. Dr. Burns stated the national accreditation standards are included to satisfy the national accreditation requirements. Chair Seckinger encouraged USC Beaufort to look beyond the verbiage and focus on the at-risk population. Dr. Burns responded that Chair Seckinger’s concern is very common across education professionals as a whole. She went on to say that state team members from SC institutions conduct joint accreditation visits with national accreditors to provide state-specific context for national standards.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the Bachelor of Arts degree in English, Secondary Language Arts Licensure at the University of South Carolina Beaufort, to be implemented in Fall 2018.

- f. University of South Carolina Beaufort, B.S., Secondary Teacher Education, Biology

Chair Seckinger introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Love) a motion to accept the staff’s recommendation for approval with the provisional language discussed earlier in the meeting. Dr. Skipper introduced Dr. Gordon Sproul, chemistry professor and principal author of the proposal, Dr. Joseph Staton, Dean of Science and Mathematics, and Dr. Rachel Burns. Dr. Skipper

explained that the proposed program would help address the critical need for STEM teachers in the Lowcountry and would respond to the needs in USC Beaufort's regional service area of Beaufort, Hampton, Jasper, and Colleton counties. He noted that Biology is USC Beaufort's second largest major, and the institution believes that adding an education track is a natural fit because biology students would have a teaching pathway to allow them to remain in the area and begin work right away in this critical needs service area. He stated the proposed program would also address the need for physical sciences teachers, generally with add-ons from chemistry, physics, earth and space science. Chair Seckinger opened the floor for questions.

Commissioner Munns had three questions. Commissioner Munns asked about the implementation time since the Fall 2017 timeframe noted in the proposal documentation had passed. Commissioner Munns asked whether the one new hire mentioned in the proposal documentation would increase program costs. Dr. Skipper responded that Fall 2017 was the target, but USC Beaufort had to address some aspects of the proposed program which led to a delay in implementation. The updated proposal indicates a Fall 2018 implementation. Commissioner Munns asked whether the extra time spent on revisions to the proposal were valuable or bureaucratic. Dr. Sproul responded that USC Beaufort made some substantive changes to the proposal and the delay did not cause a problem for the institution. Chair Seckinger stated she had questions about the proposed program which led to its previous withdrawal. Dr. Lane turned the Committee's attention to the proposed program's executive summary which notes the proposal was withdrawn in March for revisions.

Commissioner Munns asked why a student only needs a 2.5 GPA in the science criteria. Dr. Sproul responded that 2.5 is the minimum expectation for education majors. Dr. Burns noted the program admission criteria requires a minimum 2.75 GPA and the faculty is considering requiring a 3.00 cohort GPA by subject area. The Committee and USC Beaufort representatives discussed the differences between course and program GPA requirements. Dr. Burns stated that if a candidate educator were to add-on science, biology, the state minimum expectation is a grade of C or better, so the requirement for a course grade of C or better is right in line with the add-on requirement at the state level for add-on certification. Chair Seckinger stated that she thinks the minimum GPA should be 2.75 and asked what score USC Beaufort uses to define course mastery. Dr. Burns relayed that course mastery depends on individual course standards. She commented that the proposed program will also work in conjunction with SCDE to ensure coursework is aligned with K-12 and national standards. Chair Seckinger questioned the high need for remediation in the content area if teachers are mastering content area coursework. Chair Seckinger stated she believes raising content area standards will alleviate the need for future teacher remediation. Dr. Sproul then reviewed reasons why it would be difficult to increase the GPA requirement at USC Beaufort at this time given the major requirements.

Commissioner Munns recommended an amendment to the motion which would have USC Beaufort justify the minimum required program GPA at the three-year program review. Dr. Sproul expressed concern that the proposed program is being singled out for because of challenges at other institutions and asked if other schools will be held to the same minimum GPA requirement. Chair Seckinger assured USC Beaufort the institution is not being singled out, but the three-year benchmark has to start somewhere. Dr. Sproul agreed that USC Beaufort should aim for a higher minimum GPA. Commissioner Munns reiterated his dissatisfaction with the minimum GPA requirement. Dr. Burns said USC Beaufort will track student GPA every semester.

Chair Seckinger questioned how a student can be certified to teach add-ons with minimal coursework. Dr. Burns clarified that SCDE certification areas changed in 2013 and the proposed program reflects current SCDE certification requirements. Chair Seckinger then asked why, when surveyed, more of USC Beaufort's 288 biology majors did not indicate interest in the proposed program. Dr. Sproul replied that since USC Beaufort does not have a major leading to certification students interested in that go elsewhere. He reported that a number of USC Beaufort's biology graduates go on to obtain alternative certification and are teaching in the Beaufort County school system. Dr. Sproul added that biology students were surveyed again this semester and the interest has "basically doubled" and biology majors are asking when the program will begin. Dr. Burns commented that USC Beaufort has become the new sponsoring institution for the Teacher Cadet program. She noted 13 local high schools are connected with the Teacher Cadet program and USC Beaufort believes the program will foster recruitment for the proposed program. Dr. Lane encouraged USC Beaufort to provide CHE staff with the second survey results to supplement the proposed program documentation.

Chair Seckinger expressed her disagreement with the NCTE social justice language. She also asked whether and how USC Beaufort plans to incorporate all of the SC biology standards, specifically a critical analysis of Darwin, into the proposed program. Dr. Sproul reported that USC Beaufort chose to promote critical thinking as the focus of its last self-study. Dr. Burns stated that USC Beaufort addresses all of SC's standards. Chair Seckinger encouraged USC Beaufort to obtain material she and Dr. Lane worked on to incorporate a critical analysis of Darwin into the proposed program's curriculum. She encouraged the faculty to prepare science teachers who are dedicated to inquiry and who will generate more discussion of what we do and do not know and how knowledge evolves in a biological context.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the Bachelor of Science degree in Secondary Teacher Education, Biology at University of South Carolina Beaufort, to be implemented in Fall 2018.

Commissioner Love asked whether all institutions should expect to address the state standards, program objectives, and student learning outcomes for proposed teacher preparation programs. Dr. Lane answered that the expectation will be included in the revised policies and procedures.

Dr. Sproul requested clarification as to whether "conditional or provisional" will be included in the approval letter. Chair Seckinger confirmed that such a term will be included. Dr. Sproul then recommended the approval letter note that the phrase is standard for the Commission going forward.

3. Revised Guidelines for Teacher Education Competitive Grants:

a. *EIA Centers of (Teacher Education) Excellence FY 2018-19*

Chair Seckinger introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Love) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval. Chair Seckinger invited Dr. Lane to speak. Dr. Lane introduced Dr. Falicia Harvey to present the item. Dr. Lane thanked Dr. Harvey for her very close work with the Education Oversight Committee staff. Dr. Harvey presented the revised guidelines and noted the guidelines would normally have been presented in Spring 2017, but was delayed due to funding issues. She stated no center was awarded during this year's center selection process, and the Commission is requesting the funds carry over, with one of next year's centers a four-year, which would start with more money in the beginning to keep up the rotation of centers. She stated the *Guidelines* propose the creation of three centers that will address recruitment, retention, and attrition of teachers. Dr. Harvey went on to say the four-year center would be a center for research in teacher education, specifically regional research into teacher education in South Carolina. She stated a second center would be a center of excellence for alternative certification because there is not an alternative program based on SC's higher education campuses. She noted that nationwide, higher education alternative programs produce 25,000 teachers a year and SC should be a part if implemented correctly. She added that the third center would be a center of excellence for recruitment of minority teachers for a number of reasons, but important among them: first when minority students have a minority teacher, studies show their dropout rate decreases by as much as 29%; and, minority teachers make a very positive developmental impact on non-minority students also.

Commissioner Munns inquired whether a consortium of schools can apply for a single center. Dr. Harvey responded that the goal of the centers is that an institution or consortium of institutions establish expertise that then is shared with our other teacher education programs in the state. Commissioner Munns also asked about the operational overhead involved in center creation. Dr. Harvey explained that there are seldom separate building costs and usually centers are required to partner with the work of other centers. Commissioner Munns asked for clarification on whether an existing center can apply to add new center objectives. Dr. Harvey said one campus can house up to two centers. Dr. Lane explained that existing centers evolve over time. Commissioner Munns reiterated he wants to prevent the proliferation of centers if one center can do two or three projects. Dr. Harvey noted there are centers still in existence without state funding. She agreed that an existing center can build on its expertise through a partnership, and further clarified she believed the review panel would consider a proposal from an existing center that is not currently funded because of the value in the process to partnerships. Regarding the topic of sustainability, Dr. Lane added that centers do not automatically shutter after five years and they procure other resources to continue their work. Dr. Lane commended Dr. Harvey's leadership focusing attention on what the centers' purpose should be, which is student impact. Dr. Harvey stated the Education Oversight Committee is asking all current centers to add student impact to their measures. Commissioner Munns expressed the hope that current centers can apply for new center funds, as long as the mission is compatible. Dr. Harvey said current successful centers in their fifth year have been asking about new proposals, looking for ways to extend their work or take it a different angle. Commissioner Munns requested that implementation and advertising of centers of excellence make it clear that current and former centers can apply. CHE staff agreed.

Chair Seckinger asked about centers' reporting requirements. Dr. Harvey responded that centers provide two reports per year, an interim and final report, and four budget reports per year. Chair Seckinger

expressed concern that factors outside the classroom are contributing to teachers leaving the profession. She asked if anyone is looking into the issue. Dr. Harvey described some of the initiatives in the state, including the recruitment and retention committee that came out of proviso 1.92 last year. She recounted discussions about giving teachers more autonomy, taking away some of the paperwork, and changing the whole culture of the leadership in the school. Chair Seckinger requested Dr. Harvey create a report about the top four issues related to teachers leaving the profession for Board members to refer to in their conversations with legislators. Dr. Harvey reported that there is some data available now and the center for excellence and research in teacher education will provide more, regionally-specific, data for the state as well as propose solutions.

Chair Seckinger also recommended a center focus on recruiting veterans into the classroom. Commissioner Munns recommended the University of South Carolina Aiken (USC Aiken) as a good resource regarding veteran recruitment, due to its higher percentage of veteran students. Chair Seckinger suggested USC Aiken's Director of Veteran and Military Student Success, Robert Murphy, present to the Commission and Commissioner Munns agreed.

Dr. Lynn asked if the proposed minority teacher recruitment center would overlap with the Call Me MISTER® program. Dr. Harvey noted any of, or a consortium of, the public and private institutions in the state with the Call Me MISTER® program can apply. She went on to say the goal of the proposed center would be to get students interested in the teaching profession prior to college. Dr. Harvey added that there is a lot of room for partnership and cited Spartanburg 7's partnership with Call Me MISTER® as a big part of the discussion at one of the recruitment and retention meetings. She noted there is a 95% retention rate in the classroom with Call Me MISTER®. Dr. Lane added that staff had recently been in contact with Dr. Roy Jones, Executive Director of Call Me MISTER® because CHE has been working with the program and CERRA to make that relationship as productive as it can be. He noted Dr. Jones has offered to present best practices at CHE. Chair Seckinger instructed Dr. Lane to share Dr. Jones's availability to present with Commissioner Kuhl who is in charge of scheduling presentations. Dr. Lane agree to follow up with Commissioner Kuhl.

Without further discussion, the Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the revised guidelines for teacher education competitive grants for FY 2018-19.

4. Annual Evaluation of Associate Degree Programs, FY 2013-14
(For information, no action required)

Chair Seckinger introduced the item for information only. Dr. Lane thanked Dr. Walker for her work on the report. Dr. Lane introduced Dr. Walker to summarize the report's findings. Dr. Walker presented the FY 2013-14 annual evaluation of associate degrees. The information was provided to CHE in aggregate form by the South Carolina Technical College System (SCTCS). Dr. Walker reported that 93% of SCTCS's programs are in good standing as defined by SCTCS. She also reported the University of South Carolina (USC) had 391 associate degrees graduates across USC Salkehatchie, USC Sumter, USC Union, USC Lancaster, with a few degrees at Ft. Jackson and USC Beaufort. Commission staff made two recommendations at the end of the report: 1) to increase veteran access to USC associate degrees; and 2) to work on sharing CHE data and following models more similar to some peer coordinating agencies, including those in Kentucky, Illinois, Maryland, and Tennessee.

Chair Seckinger noted SCTCS is hitting the market very well, with only two-percent of the programs identified as canceled and four-percent on probation. Commissioner Munns noted that he did not see a formal recommendation in the report. Dr. Lane stated there are no formal recommendations, as Dr. Walker followed the model of previous iterations of the report. Commissioner Munns expressed concern that all programs on probation are STEM and asked what can be done to get these programs off probation. Dr. Walker responded that Commission staff would need to consult with SCTCS prior to answering that question. Commissioner Munns encouraged staff to get that information from SCTCS and Dr. Lane assured him staff would complete the task.

5. *Report on Program Modifications, September 1 – October 19, 2017*
(For information, no action required)

Chair Seckinger introduced the item for information only. Dr. Lane thanked Ms. Houp for her work with the report.

6. *Consideration of 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*

Chair Seckinger noted the item was deferred because the revisions are still being reviewed by legal counsel.

Commissioner Munns again recommended that the Commission not consider approved programs as provisional or conditional because of the unintended consequences expressed earlier. Chair Seckinger agreed to clarify the language about adding the follow-up review.

7. Other Business

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 1:16 p.m.