



**Advisory Committee on Academic Affairs (ACAP)
Meeting Minutes
June 11, 2026**

Attendees:

Clemson University: Jeremy King, Rob Essaf, Briana Peel, Chad Navis, Delphine Dean, Ken Webb
Coastal Carolina University: Gibbs Knotts, Teresa Burns
College of Charleston: Mark Del Mastro
Denmark Technical College: Marci Middleton
Francis Marion University: Allison Steadman
Lander University: James Colbert
Medical University of South Carolina: Suzanne Thomas
Piedmont Technical College:
South Carolina State University:
South Carolina Technical College System:
The Citadel: Cara Dombroski, Kevin Bower, Len Annetta, Christopher Dague
Tri-County Technical College:
Trident Technical College:
University of South Carolina Aiken:
University of South Carolina Beaufort: Brian Mallory
University of South Carolina Columbia: Trena Houpp, Susan Rathbun-Grubb
University of South Carolina Palmetto College:
University of South Carolina Upstate: Amanda Karls
Winthrop University: Tim Drueke, Lorrie Crochet

Commission Staff:

Angela Peters	Kentia Pitts
Jessica Berry	Christopher Glenn
Melissa Price	Tracy Solet
Darnell Holland	

All attended virtually

1. Welcome

Dr. Peters welcomed everyone to the meeting at 10:00 a.m.

2. Introductions, Quorum, and Freedom of Information Act

Ms. Solet announced attendance, established quorum, and confirmed the meeting was being held in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act.

3. Approval of Agenda

Dr. Peters called for a motion to approve the agenda. A motion was made and seconded. Dr. Peters called for a vote. **The motion passed unopposed.**

4. Approval of Minutes

Dr. Peters asked if there were any corrections to the proposed minutes from the April 23, 2026 meeting. Hearing none, Dr. Peters called for a motion to approve the minutes which was made and seconded. Dr. Peters called for a vote. **The motion passed unopposed.**

5. Chair Updates

Dr. Peters provided the following updates:

- a. Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures: Thank you to the committee members for providing feedback. The team is reviewing the comments and suggestions with the hope of providing the updated policies and procedures to ACAP at the Fall meeting.
- b. Productivity Policy: This policy is a separate initiative and Chair Hayes has assigned two CAAL members, Commissioners Oran Smith and Daniel Dukes, to assist the ACAP working group and CHE staff to review and revise the program productivity policy. CHE staff will take the lead but will work with ACAP and the Commissioners to develop a robust and impactful policy.
- c. Legislative Request for GPAs: Thank you to those who adjusted their schedules to provide the GPA information for each institution's top fifteen programs as requested by the legislature. The deadline to provide the data is June 15.
- d. Fall Strategic Innovation in Academic Affairs Forum: The virtual forum will be September 17, 2026. Dr. Jeremy King from Clemson and Ms. Allison Steadman from Francis Marion co-presenting on programs which support neurodivergent student success. More information will follow.
- e. Centers of Excellence Symposium: Thank you to Clemson University for hosting the symposium, which is being held today and tomorrow.
- f. CHE Campus Safety Conference: Thank you to Francis Marion University for hosting the conference, which is being held today.
- g. CHE Commission Meeting: Thank you to Dr. Thomas and the Medical University of South Carolina for hosting the commissioners and staff last week.

6. Program Modification Proposals

- a. Medical University of South Carolina, M.P. H. in Public Health
The institution's representative moved approval of agenda item 6.a., which was seconded. The program modification was presented and the floor opened to questions. Hearing none, Dr. Peters called for a vote to approve the program modification. **The motion passed unopposed.**
- b. University of South Carolina Columbia, M.A. in Journalism and Mass Communications
- c. University of South Carolina Columbia, M.M.C. in Journalism and Mass Communications
The institution's representative moved approval of agenda items 6.b. and 6.c., which was seconded. The program modifications were presented and the floor opened to questions. Hearing none, Dr. Peters called for a vote to approve both program modifications. **The motion passed unopposed.**
- d. The Citadel, B.S. in Secondary Education
The institution's representative moved approval of agenda item 6.d., which was seconded. The program modification was presented and the floor opened to questions. Hearing none, Dr. Peters called for a vote to approve the program modification. **The motion passed unopposed.**
- e. Lander University, B.S. in Exercise Science
The institution's representative moved approval of agenda item 6.e., which was seconded. The program modification was presented and the floor opened to questions. Hearing none, Dr. Peters called for a vote to approve the program modification. **The motion passed unopposed.**

- f. Clemson University, B.S. in Biomedical Engineering
The institution's representative moved approval of agenda item 6.f., which was seconded. The program modification was presented and the floor opened to questions. Hearing none, Dr. Peters called for a vote to approve the program modification. **The motion passed unopposed.**
- g. Clemson University, Ph.D. in Business Administration
The institution's representative moved approval of agenda item 6.g., which was seconded. The program modification was presented and the floor opened to questions. Hearing none, Dr. Peters called for a vote to approve the program modification. **The motion passed unopposed.**
- h. Winthrop University, M.M. in Music
The institution's representative moved approval of agenda item 6.h., which was seconded. The program modification was presented and the floor opened to questions. Hearing none, Dr. Peters called for a vote to approve the program modification. **The motion passed unopposed.**

7. Other Business / Discussion

- a. In-depth Review of Newly Implemented Academic Programs
Review Year: 2026

Dr. Peters thanked the institutions for providing the data for the report and for working with CHE staff in advance to review the findings. Dr. Peters noted this is the first time CHE has conducted in-depth reviews of new programs, and stated the purpose is to examine academic programs to reduce duplication, increase effectiveness, and to support economy and mission alignment across our public institutions. Dr. Peters gave a brief summary of the report's findings stating several of the programs had already been terminated, which left 84 programs reviewed. Of those, 39 are being recommended for continuing approval and 45 programs are being recommended as under review. Dr. Peters stated the strongest performers were the College of Charleston and The Citadel, each with a 100 percent compliance rate, followed by the University of South Carolina Columbia with an 88 percent compliance rate. In summary, most of the programs have appropriate staffing, curriculum design is sound, the assessment process is working, licensure and accreditation, where applicable, are strong, and most of the programs are financially viable. The primary concern is regarding enrollment and performance, with 56 percent of programs meeting standards and 46 percent not.

Discussion was had regarding the following:

- Was the main driver for an unmet status based on enrollment not meeting projections?
- A request was made to add language to the report noting whether productivity standards would have been met had enrollment projections been met.
- A request was made for the rubric used for the in-depth review.
- Requests were made to change the term "standard" to "expectation" or "projection" as there is no universal standard of measure but instead is based on the institutions' program projections.

- A request for clarification was made to distinguish the different metrics for in-depth reviews and for program productivity reviews. As productivity standards are so prominent right now, ensuring these terms are disambiguated is important.
- If initial enrollment projections have proven unrealistic and the program is marked for under review, will there be a mechanism to revise the projections?

In response, Dr. Peters noted:

- Enrollment not meeting projections was the main driver of an unmet status but also, some institutions did not collect graduate employment data.
- The addition of productivity language to the in-depth review report would be confusing as each report uses separate rubrics for standards or benchmarks.
- The rubric is in the policy, and the data, justification, and evidence were provided by the institutions for the report. CHE looked at two things: the institution's stated goals in the program proposal versus what was achieved. If justification was provided for a huge discrepancy, credit was given in the grading.
- The word "standard" will be changed to "projection".
- Adjusting the initial enrollment projection may be done in the action plan submitted for a program under review but that may not mean the program is granted continued approval status which is up to the commissioners.

Dr. Peters explained the report will go to CAAL on June 18 with the recommendation for 39 programs to continue their approval process and 45 programs to be placed under review. If CAAL approves the report, it will go to the full Commission in August. If approved by the Commission, the 45 programs under review will have 90 days after Commission approval to provide action plans or improvement plans addressing every unmet projection in the report. Pursuant to current policy, programs can remain under review for up to four years, at which time CHE can recommend continuing approval based on demonstrated improvement or can identify programs for termination. The demonstrated improvement would be based on the program's initial projections, not on current productivity thresholds.

Additional questions were raised regarding:

- Will a program under review be subsequently graded in the next review cycle against the action plan submitted versus the initial projections?
- Due to the delays in conducting both recent reviews, some programs currently have under review status for both the in-depth review and the productivity review. Which is the priority?
- Will the improvement plan for the in-depth review be the same format as the one used for productivity?
- In several instances, the conclusions drawn by the program reviewers were not obvious. Will there be an opportunity to request more detailed information on the grading process which will help the institutions in writing their action plans?

In response, Dr. Peters stated:

- She did not know if a program under review would be graded on the action plan or the initial proposal during the subsequent review cycles but encouraged the inclusion of detailed information in the action plan.
- She did not know which takes priority, the in-depth review or the program productivity. She believes the Commission's priority is a developing a new program productivity policy so they can determine the fate of the programs which are under review for a year from the most recent productivity report.
- She would have to let the institutions know regarding the format of the action plans but believes the policy indicates the type of action plan required.
- She would work on getting the information from the reviewers.

Dr. Peters advised everyone to see how the report is received and how the Commission votes, but to remember to address every single unmet area in the action plans. She reminded the committee members that this is the first time this report has been done and the recommendations will be presented, but, the commissioners have the authority to revise or amend as we have seen them do recently.

Dr. Peters asked if there were any new items to be discussed. Dr. Middleton from Denmark Technical College introduced herself and stated her service on ACAP would officially begin July 2028 *[sic]* and asked for a copy of the PowerPoint presentation from the meeting. Dr. Peters welcomed her and agreed to provide the presentation.

8. Adjournment

With no further discussion, Dr. Peters called for a motion to adjourn, which was made and seconded. **The meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.**