

Minutes
Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing (CAAL)
February 8, 2018

Members Present

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

Staff Present

Dr. Argentini Anderson
Mr. Clay Barton
Dr. Sandra Carr
Ms. Lane Goodwin
Ms. Anna Grubic
Dr. Falicia Harvey, via teleconference
Ms. Trena Houp, via teleconference
Dr. John Lane
Ms. Julissa Nixon
Ms. Tanya Rogers
Dr. Regine Rucker, via teleconference
Ms. Peggy Simons
Dr. Lishu Yin

Guests

Dr. Connie Book, The Citadel, via teleconference
Dr. Ralph Byington, Coastal Carolina University, via teleconference
Dr. Lynn Cherry, College of Charleston, via teleconference
Dr. Michelle Cook, Clemson University
Dr. Tena Crews, University of South Carolina Columbia
Mr. Tim Druke, Winthrop University
Dr. Mary Anne Fitzpatrick, University of South Carolina Columbia
Dr. Thomas E. Hodges, University of South Carolina Columbia
Dr. Jeremy King, Clemson University
Dr. Peter King, Francis Marion University
Dr. Robert Knoeppel, Clemson University
Ms. Monica Kosanovich, Clemson University
Dr. Debbie Jackson, Clemson University
Dr. Brian McGee, College of Charleston, via teleconference
Dr. Al Panu, University of South Carolina Beaufort
Dr. Jeff Priest, University of South Carolina Aiken
Dr. Suzanne Thomas, Medical University of South Carolina, via teleconference
Dr. Regina E. Wragg, University of South Carolina Columbia

Welcome

Chair Seckinger called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m. Ms. Nixon confirmed the meeting was being held in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act.

Commissioner Munns requested additional discussion about ACAP review of agenda item 5 (Policies and Procedures) prior to CAAL and Chair Seckinger affirmed discussion would occur during consideration.

1. Minutes of October 26, 2017

Chair Seckinger requested a motion to accept the minutes of October 26, 2017, as distributed. The motion was **moved** (Munns) and seconded (Love) and the Committee **voted unanimously to approve the minutes as presented.**

2. Program Proposals

a. Clemson University, MAT, Teacher Residency in Early Childhood Education

Chair Seckinger introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Lynn) and **seconded** (Love) motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval.

Dr. J. King gave an overview of agenda items 2a – c. He explained that Clemson University (Clemson) proposed three combined bachelor's/MAT programs mainly designed for Clemson undergraduates. The proposed programs would allow students to begin graduate education the second semester of their senior year. Students would complete a teacher residency in a master teacher's classroom within a partner school district. The master teachers would serve as mentors for the students in the proposed programs. Dr. J. King also noted there is evidence that teacher residency programs have increased retention in other states. Dr. J. King stated the goal of the proposed programs is to address teacher shortages by increasing retention. Dr. J. King introduced Dr. Rob Knoeppel, (College of Education), Dr. Michelle Cook, and Dr. Debbie Jackson. Dr. Knoeppel introduced Ms. Monica DiSanowich, a doctoral candidate in Educational Leadership.

Chair Seckinger asked whether all mentors in the proposed programs will be master teachers. Dr. Cook confirmed all mentors in partner districts will be master teachers. She explained that master teachers will complete an application process as well as advanced coursework and summer institutes. Chair Seckinger commented that the teacher residency concept is very smart. She asked Clemson to detail some of the successful teacher residencies around the country. Dr. Cook answered that Clemson examined data from other states when they developed their proposed programs. Dr. Cook added that Clemson looked at retention and student achievement and found, for instance, in Memphis, 95% of the residents were still teaching after three years versus 41% of the hires statewide, and in San Francisco, that number was 80% of the residents versus 38% of the non-residents after five years. Dr. Cook relayed that in terms of achievement, most of the literature shows the students of teacher residents outperform students of non-teacher residents, including in comparisons to veteran teachers.

Chair Seckinger stated she liked the mentorship program and the economies of scale for teachers to obtain a master's degree since they can earn more money with that degree. She asked whether Clemson had obtained a grant for the proposed programs. Dr. Cook explained that earlier versions of the proposals referred to a very competitive US Department of Education seed grant Clemson applied for and was not awarded. Clemson will re-apply in the future if the proposed programs are approved.

Chair Seckinger asked whether the school districts will pay students while they are in the year-long teacher residency. Dr. Cook answered that school districts will not financially support the students. Chair

Seckinger then asked about Furman University's (Furman) program in which students are paid for their time in the classroom. Drs. Jackson and Cook provided their summary of the Furman model and why its components do not apply to Clemson. Chair Seckinger commended Clemson on the focus on mentoring their education students. She suggested extending the proposed program by a semester to allow students to get paid while in the classroom.

Drs. Jackson and Cook discussed Clemson's relationship with seven Clemson-area school districts and the memoranda of understanding (MOUs) in place with those districts. Dr. Cook said the MOUs include data collection components. Chair Seckinger complimented Clemson's GPA requirement for the proposed programs, stating that students need a 3.4 GPA and 90 credit hours to be eligible for the proposed programs. She said when students are competent in their content, they can focus on classroom management. Chair Seckinger then asked if Clemson would address school environment with students in the proposed programs and requested that be studied in the first years of implementation. Dr. Cook explained that Clemson has developed a process to match students with schools. They ask students in what type of environment they would like to work and with whom they work best.

Chair Seckinger asked for clarification on the debt service administration noted in the financial statement. Dr. Jackson explained the students pay that debt as part of their tuition. She likened the practice teaching fees to the lab and book fees in other programs. Commissioner Munns requested Clemson clearly articulate program fees in addition to tuition. He stated that he would rather have fees included in tuition. The Committee and Clemson representatives then discussed different program fees in higher education and cost to educate.

Commissioner Love asked how many students stay in the state and what will be the eventual economic impact of the proposed programs. Dr. Cook answered that most of Clemson's College of Education students are from SC and will stay in SC. She also explained that individual students who complete the proposed programs with a master's degree will have paid off the proposed programs' cost after two years at master's level pay. Dr. Cook also stated that master teachers receive training in instructional leadership which will lead to other pathways for them. Dr. Knoepfel added that school districts spend millions of dollars on retraining, induction and recruitment of teachers. Dr. Cook stated it costs school districts approximately \$18,000 to replace a teacher. Dr. Knoepfel noted that literature supports that retention of a good teacher positively impacts students' high school completion, workforce preparation, and literacy.

Chair Seckinger requested state standards get predominant mention in program proposals. Dr. Cook replied that state standards are the focus of students' education throughout their time at Clemson. She said that program proposals feature national standards due to accreditor requirements. Dr. Jackson added that national standards need to be mentioned because not all Clemson students will remain in SC long-term. She also noted that the standards are part of the undergraduate curriculum, not the proposed graduate programs.

Commissioner Munns thanked Clemson for providing great answers to his questions before the Committee meeting and requested the responses become part of the record. He stated he likes the program and acknowledged the proposed programs would not have adverse effects on South Carolina State University's existing program. He commented on Clemson's acquisition of mentors as key to the proposed programs' success.

Chair Seckinger requested Clemson provide CHE an assessment of the proposed programs along with recommendations for state-wide replication.

The Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the Master of Arts in Teaching degree in Teacher Residency in Early Childhood Education at Clemson University, to be implemented Fall 2018.

b. Clemson University, MAT, Teacher Residency in Elementary Education

Chair Seckinger introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Love) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval.

Commissioner Munns explained that his questions were the same as those of the previous proposal and had been answered. Considering the teacher residency, Chair Seckinger asked for clarification on the use of online coursework versus students' face-to-face time. Dr. Cook explained that the students in Clemson's current SCDE-approved innovative program have face-to-face courses and the proposals were written to allow hybrid/blended courses. The Committee and Clemson representatives discussed the difficulty encountered when using check boxes to distinguish between hybrid and blended courses.

Chair Seckinger stated she has a strong concern about social justice mentioned in the proposal. Dr. Jackson and Commissioner Munns mentioned that social justice is noted in the undergraduate degree portion of the program, however, Dr. Jackson agreed that Clemson representatives will take Chair Seckinger's recommendation back to the faculty since faculty develop the curriculum.

The Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the Master of Arts in Teaching degree in Teacher Residency in Early Elementary Education at Clemson University, to be implemented Fall 2018.

c. Clemson University, MAT, Teacher Residency in Secondary Education

Chair Seckinger introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Lynn) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval.

Dr. Cook stated the program is very similar in scope to the other two proposed programs. Chair Seckinger again commended Clemson on students' need to have a 3.4 GPA to enter the program. Dr. Jackson informed the Committee that students in the proposed program will be double majors and obtain a degree in their content area. Chair Seckinger referred to page 25 of the proposal and mentioned the GPA required in the undergraduate program. Dr. Jackson responded that a student with a C average will not be eligible for the proposed program.

Commissioner Love asked whether students could be graduate assistants in the proposed program. Drs. Cook and Jackson answered that students in the proposed program would not have time to be graduate assistants due to their teacher residency requirements.

The Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the Master of Arts in Teaching degree in Teacher Residency in Secondary Education with emphasis areas in English, History, Mathematics, and Science at Clemson University, to be implemented Fall 2018.

Chair Seckinger mentioned she is looking forward to getting Clemson's feedback on the program.

d. Clemson University, Ed.D., Education Systems Improvement Science

Chair Seckinger introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Love) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval.

Dr. J. King explained the proposed program focuses on working professionals who have or are completing their Ed.S. degree. He said the proposed program will address systemic problems and may be the first of its kind integrating improvement science with education.

Chair Seckinger stated she and Dr. Lane worked hard with Clemson on the proposed program. She thinks the proposed program is good and innovative. Commissioner Love commented she is pleased to see education leadership and ethics class in the curriculum. Commissioner Munns stated the questions he asked ahead of time were answered. Dr. Jackson noted Clemson expects students will improve education through collaboration with school districts and state agencies. Dr. Knoepfel added it will be exciting to collaborate with core institutions to share information and become more efficient. He went on to thank the Commission for the agency's feedback. He added the committee discussion will help Clemson identify issues they would like to study in their MAT Teacher Residency programs. Chair Seckinger thanked Commissioner Lynn for his work with Clemson and the Commission on the proposed program. Dr. Lynn thanked Chair Seckinger and Dr. Lane for meeting with Clemson.

Dr. Lynn asked Clemson to clarify the proposed program in relation to South Carolina State University's (SCSU) existing programs. Dr. J. King reported that Clemson and SCSU's Provosts have been in communication. Provost Jones told Dr. J. King that SCSU is fully supportive of the proposed program. Commissioner Love invited Coastal University, The Citadel, and Winthrop University representatives to comment on the proposed program. Mr. Druke stated Winthrop is excited to get the program going and is pleased to begin with its first cohort. Dr. Crews said that the University of South Carolina (USC) has an Ed.D. in the improvement area and introduced Dr. Thomas Hodges, Associate Dean from USC's College of Education. Dr. Hodges commented that USC, as a selected participant with The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, has an online program in education improvement. Chair Seckinger expressed the hope that Clemson, USC and other institutions would collaborate on delivering education in the state.

The Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the Doctorate of Education in Education Systems Improvement Science at Clemson University, to be implemented Summer 2018.

3. Consideration of University of South Carolina Beaufort Mission Statement Change

Chair Seckinger introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Love) and **seconded** (Munns) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval.

Dr. Lane introduced USC Beaufort (USCB) Chancellor Al Panu and Dr. MaryAnne Fitzpatrick, representing the USC system. Chair Seckinger asked whether USCB had obtained a grant for the proposed computational science program, which Dr. Panu confirmed.

Chair Seckinger invited Dr. Panu to discuss the two proposed master's program proposals. He stated USCB became a baccalaureate-granting institution in 2004 and has made great strides since that time. He also explained that the transition to a baccalaureate-granting institution is reflected in the graduation numbers. Dr. Panu explained that he met with stakeholders when he arrived at USCB two-and-a-half years ago and heard the incredible need for the master's degree program, particularly in education and computational science. He then described the strengths of the existing undergraduate computational science program, stating all the graduates have been employed and sought after because the program services the direct IT industry and is applicable to a business and an engineering setting. He also noted that the faculty is very strong, very recognized, and very competitive, which helped the institution receive the grant.

Dr. Panu continued by stating the local school district is growing significantly and community stakeholders have strongly expressed the need for master's level teachers. He recounted that within 48 hours, USCB's education chair received 400 responses from those interested in an education master's program. Dr. Panu explained that USCB is only interested in offering select programs in response to expressed community needs.

Chair Seckinger invited Dr. Fitzpatrick to address USCB's proposed mission change from the USC system's perspective. Dr. Fitzpatrick provided background information on the USC system structure along with the BOT appointment structure and academic affairs review process. She reported the USC system board is very supportive of USCB's proposed mission statement change. Commissioner Lynn asked whether a student from USCB can move to USC C. Dr. Panu answered that due to separate accreditation, students can transfer between USC campuses because of MOUs.

Commissioner Munns asked whether the Committee was considering the original proposed mission statement, or the one handed out at the meeting. Chair Seckinger referenced two proposed changes to the draft mission statement and stated the Committee would vote on an amended revised mission statement. The Committee, USCB and USC representatives discussed revised wording for the amended proposed mission statement. Chair Seckinger mentioned mission creep and the statewide marketplace. Dr. Panu mentioned that USCB is currently the only public comprehensive in SC not offering master's degrees. Dr. Crews offered mission statement language similar to the University of South Carolina Upstate which says to offer a selected master's degrees in response to regional demand. Dr. Panu agreed with Dr. Crews's suggestion. Dr. Fitzpatrick added that the lack of select master's degrees at USCB affects student transfer rates. Commissioner Lynn asked for clarification on the ease of transferring from USCB to USC C. Dr. Fitzpatrick responded that transferring between USC system campuses is as easy as shifting between colleges on the same campus. Commissioner Lynn asked whether the easy transfer process applies to other institutions in the state and Dr. Fitzpatrick stated the transfer process is not the same for non-USC system institutions.

Dr. Lane suggested alternative language which the Commission and SACSCOC would approve: "select master's degrees in response to regional demand." Dr. Panu agreed to the revision. Chair Seckinger stated she is considering this mission statement change and overall wants to ensure institutions fulfill their stated missions. Dr. Panu agreed and added that the proposed computational science program will be a collaborative, statewide initiative with many other institutions.

Commissioner Munns asked for clarification on what the Committee is considering. He also expressed concern about USCB's rise in tuition over the past 10 years, along with the institution's retention and

graduation rates. Commissioner Munns asked whether any upcoming master's programs will drive cost or negatively impact retention and graduation rates. Dr. Panu stated that part of USCB's rise in tuition was in response to the institution's transition from a two-year institution to a four-year institution. Commissioner Munns asked whether the proposed master's programs would lead to an increase in tuition. Dr. Panu answered that they will not cause tuition to rise and USCB will begin to be very market driven and very focused on the lower cost. Commissioner Munns asked whether the proposed master's programs will have a different tuition rate than USCB's undergraduate programs. Dr. Panu confirmed that the master's programs would have a different tuition rate. Dr. Panu also stated that the proposed master's programs would not affect undergraduate tuition.

Commissioner Munns asked about USCB's student retention. Dr. Panu explained that retention rates are lagging indicators. USCB currently has 18 degree programs on campus, up from ten, six years ago. He said students transferred from USCB due to the lack of majors available on campus. Dr. Panu then said he focused heavily on retention when he joined USCB and USCB's retention rate is comparable to many institutions in its sector. Commissioner Munns asked whether the two upcoming proposed master's programs would dilute USCB's continued efforts to retain undergraduates. Dr. Panu denied that would be the case if USCB continued to monitor student retention. Commissioner Love asked whether Dr. Panu had any projections on USCB's future graduation rates. Dr. Panu answered that USCB focuses on retention more than on graduation rates because the number of degree programs really impacts the graduation, noting that the institution loses students because it does not offer certain degrees. Dr. Panu stated that USCB is steadily improving on retention rates and believes the rates are better than those at comparable institutions.

Commissioner Love asked to whom USCB is comparing itself, even out of state. Dr. Panu answered that USCB compares itself to other institutions within the comprehensive sector. Dr. Lane mentioned the comparison data USCB provided and Dr. Panu provided examples of USCB's peer institutions: Elizabeth City State University, Georgia Southwestern State University, Louisiana State University Alexandria, Mississippi University of Women, University of Arkansas Pine Bluff, West Liberty University, Lander University, and Langston University. Dr. Lane added the institutions mentioned are demographically similar to USCB, not necessarily similar in the number of years they have offered baccalaureate programs.

Commissioner Lynn asked about the upcoming proposed programs and Dr. Panu, Commissioner Lynn, and Chair Seckinger discussed the proposal cycle and Commission program review process. Commissioner Munns confirmed that formal submission of master's program proposals is contingent upon Commission approval of the proposed mission statement change.

Chair Seckinger proposed an amended motion, Commissioner Munns seconded.

Commissioner Love asked whether removal of "multicampus campus" from the mission statement would pose a problem for USCB. Dr. Panu replied that USCB can find other places to put the phrase. Dr. Fitzpatrick recommended USCB put the phrase and number of students in the USCB's institutional characteristics.

The Committee voted **unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission USCB's mission statement change.

Dr. Panu thanked Dr. Lane for his close work with USCB on their mission statement revision.

Commissioner Lynn left the call at 1:58 p.m.

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

Chair Seckinger introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Munns) and **seconded** (Love) a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for approval.

Dr. Lane explained the Commission provides an annual report on admission standards for first time entering freshmen each year in fulfillment of §59-103-45 paragraph 3, §59 104-10a. Dr. Lane acknowledged Dr. Rucker, who attended via teleconference. He commended her authorship and collaboration with the institutions to ensure accurate reporting, and plans for forthcoming.

Commissioner Munns noted the value of the report for continuous and future reference.

The Committee **voted unanimously to commend favorably** to the Commission the Fall 2015 *Annual Report on Admission Standards for First-Time Entering Freshmen*.

5. *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 introduced the item, and the Committee **moved** (Love) and **seconded** (Munns) a motion to review and discuss the agenda item.

Commissioner Munns recommended a page-by-page review of the tracked changes version of the revisions and Chair Seckinger agreed. Dr. Lane thanked Ms. Houpp for her work. Commissioner Munns referred to page 3, item 2a, 5 and suggested replacing "may not" with "might not" to confirm with identified local protocols if keeping the clause at all. With the Committee's consent, Dr. Lane proposed that staff make the replacement throughout the document.

Commissioner Love referred to page 3, number 4 and asked about the intent behind stating proposed programs may be publicized for recruitment purposes only after CAAL approval. Committee members, institutional representatives, and staff discussed the importance of the approval process and timely and accurate student recruitment. The Committee agreed to replace "publicizing" with "marketing" upon remaining discussion.

Commissioner Munns referred to page 4, number 6. Commissioner Munns suggested re-wording the paragraph to focus on assessment of program implementation.

Dr. Lane explained that in January 2017, the Commission approved a revised program productivity policy, including an early look at implementation for all new programs approved since 2015. He said programs will be reviewed either four or six years after implementation depending on the degree level. He then stated programs would be reviewed after two years with the language in question.

Commissioner Lynn asked how much harm would be done if the current approval process remained.

Ms. Houp added that the four- and six-year review compares the four-to-six year data for new programs to their proposal projections. Dr. Lane replied that review would occur biennially thereafter. Ms. Houp added that the language in the revised program approval policies being considered would create a review in the interim before the productivity review. Commissioner Lynn objected and stated more than one assessment would create a burden for the institutions.

Chair Seckinger explained her rationale for requested the additional, earlier program assessment after implementation. Commissioner Love asked what difference post-implementation assessment would make for a program that may fail regardless. Commissioner Munns acknowledged that the review will generate the discussion and is part of the Commission's regulatory responsibility.

Commissioner Love asked whether the review would be a staff review or would go to Committee members. Dr. Lane emphasized the difference between the six-year review and the new proposed post-implementation review. In this case, the two-year review is limited to enrollment costs and recruitment efforts.

Commissioner Love then clarified her question, asking if staff would notify CAAL of red flags based on the data. Dr. Lane stated that Commission staff would notify the Committee of red flags as well as celebrate institutional successes.

Commissioner Lynn asked whether the post-implementation review would harm institutions' projections in program proposals. Dr. Lane confirmed that institutions are already providing conservative recruitment and program cost estimates. Commissioner Lynn argued that the post-implementation review might not give institutions the chance to take advantage of lessons learned. Commissioner Munns responded that the during the assessment, institutions can respond as to why they believe the program should continue or not continue. Chair Seckinger assured Commissioner Lynn that the post-implementation assessment is not meant to be punitive, but helpful.

Commissioner Munns requested ACAP provide feedback on this proposed revision. Dr. Lane stated that staff will work with Commissioner Munns on his language recommendation.

Commissioner Love reiterated her concern stating that programs are not very mature until the three- to five-year mark. Chair Seckinger noted that the review would technically occur at the three-year mark.

Commissioner Munns referred to page 4, number 9, the mission statement change revision, stating that he thought the addition was redundant since approval processes inherently have denial as an option and then stated he would defer to Chair Seckinger on the revision.

Commissioner Munns referred to the "may not" in page 5, item 17. He stated that the revision is overly restrictive and the Committee should leave itself latitude to accept new programs from institutions on probation. Commissioner Munns suggested the "may not" become "might not" and Chair Seckinger agreed.

Commissioner Love referred to page 5, number 14 and inquired about the meaning of "fill" which was corrected to "fulfill."

Commissioner Munns referred to “may” on page 8, item number 6b. Chair Seckinger noted that all references to “may” in the document would be replaced with “might.”

Commissioner Munns expressed concern about the requirement of a signed waiver from students for the technical colleges’ non-transferable programs. He recounted that at the December CAAL meeting, the SC Technical College System (SCTCS) representatives reported that the requirement would be overly burdensome to the institutions. Commissioner Munns requested ACAP review the revision. Chair Seckinger responded that the stipulation had been added to the document to protect the state from litigation. Commissioner Munns countered that the stipulation as written would unnecessarily increase administrative costs at the institutions. Chair Seckinger stated the stipulation could be removed from the document if the SCTCS would agree to put a disclaimer about non-transferable programs on their institutions’ websites.

Commissioner Love requested the Commission’s counsel review the entire document. Dr. Lane noted that Chair Seckinger had counsel review the document thoroughly and Chair Seckinger stated _____ a final review.

Commissioner Munns noted that item D8 on page 11 was added after ACAP’s last review of the document. Commissioner Munns and Chair Seckinger discussed whether the item is appropriate for a policies document. Chair Seckinger explained that the Commission must make sure institutions teach students the SCDE standards. The biology standards are not found in textbooks and the Commission should assist in providing documentation to institutions. Commissioner Munns stated that would increase costs and require staff resources that are not available. Commissioner Munns requested ACAP review the revision. Chair Seckinger stated the item could be set aside for re-wording. Commissioner Munns agreed and suggested the language be placed in another document. Dr. Crews commented that USC’s College of Education had concerns about the language as well and believed that a lot of it is already taken care of through its accrediting body. Chair Seckinger again discussed the state biology standards and stated the clause would be re-written. Dr. Wragg explained that the College of Education complies with SCDE guidelines, which will now include a section that all educator preparation units must complete to show evidence of how they address the SC state standards. She requested that the Commission reconsider this requirement as it would add another task for educator preparation programs and limit their capacity.

Commissioner Munns referred to page 13, item E6 concerning centers. He requested ACAP comment on whether reviewing all centers would be onerous to the institutions. Dr. Lane stated that ACAP discussed the various formal and informal uses of the term center at institutions. Commissioner Munns invited new criteria for which centers need CAAL review and Chair Seckinger and Dr. Lane agreed. Committee members and staff then discussed definitions for centers. Commissioner Lynn asked staff to keep in mind the research institutions have more physical centers and would be more affected by a required review. Commissioner Love asked whether other states have developed any best practices around centers. Dr. Lane answered that out-of-state peer agencies are wrestling with the same issue. Commissioner Munns requested ACAP comment on the potential revision to review all centers.

Commissioner Munns requested clarity about the requirement for new or total budget sources on page 42. Dr. Lane said staff intend to include annotated versions of the forms along with instructions for completion. Commissioner Munns and Chair Seckinger agreed to include both sets of costs.

Commissioner Munns suggested that institutions provide an explanation of the accrediting standards for proposed program curriculum and requested ACAP comment on such a requirement. In response, Chair Seckinger discussed the importance of SCDE standards.

Commissioner Munns requested input from ACAP on developing better descriptions for hybrid courses. Dr. Lane provided historical context for the current hybrid course descriptions. He added ACAP comment will allow the Commission to compare its descriptions with SACSCOC. Commissioner Munns replied he is interested in whether programs have zero face-to-face contact between instructors and students and to inquire about those courses.

Commissioner Love asked when the proposed policies revision would be implemented. Ms. Houp explained that the next cycle begins August 1, 2018; therefore, the full document returning to ACAP would not delay implementation. Commissioner Love agreed with an August 1, 2018 implementation date and requested the revised policies apply then without any retroactivity. Chair Seckinger replied there would be no retroactive requirements.

Commissioner Love then inquired about the post-implementation reviews and objected to any reviews that appear to be an unfunded mandate. Chair Seckinger responded that she understood that program review is a mandate and encouraged next steps with the post-implementation process.

Chair Seckinger requested the portions of the revision still in question be set aside and the Committee vote on the rest of the revised document. Commissioner Munns recommended highlighting the items to be discussed at ACAP. He also suggested the Committee vote electronically on whether the recent revisions look acceptable, and that counsel review the entire document. Commissioner Lynn and Commissioner Love objected to voting on a partial document without ACAP review. The Committee continued to discuss the timeline and what would go to ACAP for comment. Commissioner Munns deferred to the Chair Seckinger concerning what would go before ACAP. Chair Seckinger instructed Commission staff to pull out the issues discussed during this meeting for ACAP input. She also stated counsel would review the document.

6. *Report on Program Modifications, October 20, 2017 – February 1, 2018*
(For information, no action required)

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

7. Other Business

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:06 p.m.