



**Meeting Minutes**  
**Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing (CAAL)**  
**May 11, 2023**

**Members**

Commissioner Bettie Rose Horne, Chair  
Commissioner Jenni Bryson  
Commissioner Eddie Dyer  
Commissioner Terrye Seckinger

**Commission Staff Present**

Dr. Mariam Dittmann	Ms. Bunnie Ward	Dr. Kristin Brooks
Dr. Rusty Monhollon	Dr. Argentini Anderson	Ms. Leslie Williams
Dr. Karen Woodfaulk	Ms. Ashton Talbert	Mr. Christopher Glenn
Dr. Corey Gheesling	Dr. Maggie May	Dr. Jessica Berry
Ms. Kenita Pitts-Howards		

**Guests**

Mr. Rob Essaf, Clemson University  
Dr. William Carswell, Francis Marion University  
Ms. Alissa Warters, Francis Marion University  
Ms. Minerva Brauss, Francis Marion University  
Mr. Marc David, Florence Darlington Technical College  
Ms. Christeen Stephens, University of South Carolina  
Ms. Stephanie Milling, University of South Carolina  
Mr. Lucas McMillan, Lander University  
Dr. James Colbert, Lander University  
Ms. Leslie Williams, Central Carolina Technical College  
Keshav Jagannathan, Coastal Carolina University  
Beth Bell, Clemson University  
Ms. Cathy Scott, Coastal Carolina University  
Jamia Richmond, Coastal Carolina University  
Ms. Sarah Griffin, Clemson University  
Dr. Suzanne Austin, College of Charleston  
Sebastian van Delden, College of Charleston  
Dr. Karin Roof, The Citadel  
Dr. Wes Hitt, Coastal Carolina University  
Mr. Brian Burton, Coastal Carolina University  
Dr. Peter King, Francis Marion University  
Mr. Scott Carr, Coastal Carolina University  
Ms. Emily Beck, College of Charleston  
Gibbs Knotts, College of Charleston  
Ms. Kim Thompson, University of South Carolina  
Dr. Suzanne Thomas, Medical University of South Carolina  
Dr. John Catalano, University of South Carolina

Dr. Teresa Burns, Coastal Carolina University  
Dr. Pam Steinke, University of South Carolina, Upstate  
Mr. Marcello Forconi, College of Charleston  
Mr. Whitney Jett, South Carolina Department of Education  
Mr. James Ritter, South Carolina Department of Education  
Dr. James Colbert, Lander University  
Dr. Jeremy King, Clemson University  
Ms. Trena Houpp, University of South Carolina, Columbia  
Dr. Mark Del Mastro, College of Charleston  
Dr. Eric Skipper, University of South Carolina, Beaufort  
Dr. Martha Moriarty, University of South Carolina, Beaufort  
Mr. Tim Druke, Winthrop University  
Dr. Donna Arnett, University of South Carolina, Columbia  
Ms. Allison Steadman, Francis Marion University

All Attended either In-Person or via Zoom

**1. Welcome**

Chair Horne convened the meeting at 10:07. Ms. Ashton Talbert confirmed the meeting was being held in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act and established a quorum.

**2. Approval of Agenda**

Chair Horne asked for a motion to approve the agenda. **The Committee approved the agenda.**

**3. Approval of the Minutes**

Chair Horne asked for a motion to approve the minutes. **The Committee approved the minutes.**

**4. Chair's Report**

Chair Horne made brief remarks to the Committee and those in attendance. Commissioner Horne stated that Commissioner Bryson will be attending an ACAP meeting at some point in the future. Commissioner Horne concluded her remarks noting that there is overlap between this Committee and the Committee on Strategic Initiatives and Engagement which will be further discussed at another time.

**5. Director's Report**

Dr. Dittmann stated that the Office of Academic Affairs has been very busy working on a lot of projects. Commissioner Horne asked Dr. Dittmann to provide the questions from Commissioners and the responses from the Institutions regarding the programs listed for approval on the Consent Agenda.

Regarding Clemson University, M.S. in Public Health, Commissioner Seckinger asked a question regarding the REACH Act. It was noted that the REACH Act requirement only pertained to Bachelor's degrees.

Regarding South Carolina State University, B.S., Civil Engineering, Commissioner Dyer inquired if there was a national accreditation agency for this program. Based on his research, there are not many schools that offer this option and was not able to find an accrediting body. Commissioner Seckinger inquired if this program would incorporate upfitting. Dr. Dittmann will follow up with South Carolina State University to have these inquiries answered.

This concluded Dr. Dittmann's report. Commissioner Horne requested that we try something new for the next CAAL meeting; rather than having Dr. Dittmann provide an oral summary of the questions and answers, this information will be provided to the CAAL Committee prior to the meeting for review.

## 6. Program Proposals

Motion made to approve the Consent Agenda removing items 7H, 7I, and 7U. **Approved by Committee.**

Commissioner Seckinger asked Dr. Burns from Coastal Carolina University to please define Cultural Responsive Teaching as it relates to items 7H and 7I. Ms. Cathy Scott from Coastal Carolina University provided a definition and noted that the definition aligns with the South Carolina Department of Education requirements (section 3 and ADEPT requirements). Commissioner Seckinger requested that Coastal Carolina University provide the South Carolina Department of Education documentation for review. Commissioner Horne asked for a vote for the two items. **Items passed.**

Commissioner Horne asked if there were any further questions regarding item 7U after receiving answers from the University of South Carolina Columbia. Hearing none, Commissioner Horne asked for a vote. Commissioner Seckinger abstained from the vote for item 7U. **Item passed.**

## 7. New Center Proposal

Commissioner Horne asked if The Citadel would like to make any remarks regarding the Anita Zucker Institute for Entrepreneurial Educational Leadership. Dr. Roof noted that the focus of the Center is to bring professional development to school leaders throughout the state and assist with leadership areas. It was stated that the Center is fully funded for the next five years with various requirements, workshops, and collaborations in research. Commissioner Horned asked for a vote. **Item passed.**

## 8. REACH Act

Commissioner Horne asked if there were any questions related to Lander University adding HIST 112. Hearing no questions, Commissioner Horne asked for a vote. **Item passed.**

Commissioner Horne asked if there were any questions related to the University of South Carolina Columbia adding HIST 470. Hearing no questions, Commissioner Horne asked for a vote. **Item passed.**

Commissioner Horned asked if there were any questions related to the University of South Carolina Upstate removing HIST 102 and adding HIST 106. Hearing no questions, Commissioner Horne asked for a vote. **Item passed.**

Commissioner Horned asked if there were any questions related to the Clemson University Modules Approval. Commissioner Seckinger inquired as to how Clemson determines that a student completed the readings if they are online. Clemson explained this process is handled at the Admissions Office where they conduct the review to ensure the requirement is met, working on a case-by-case basis of reviewing Transfer student transcripts. Clemson also uses tools to track time spent on various components, when a student logged in/out, and what they may have clicked on. Commissioner Seckinger noted that the Committee cannot blanket approve the modules for all institutions and Commissioner Dyer agreed noting that each institution will need to seek approval. Commissioner Dyer also suggested that at some point, if

students are required to do all this work, they should receive 1-credit hour, which can be tabled and discussed at a later date. Commissioner Horne asked if there were any additional questions. Hearing none, Commissioner Horne asked for a vote. **Item passed.**

**9. Academic Program Approval Process**

Dr. Corey Gheesling provided an updated presentation **for information** on the academic affairs approval process. Discussion was had between the Commissioners. Commissioner Seckinger stated that she was not in favor of this. Commissioner Dyer provided some insight as to how some items are handled in the Committee on Finance and Facilities and suggested that the Committee table the discussion until the June CHE Business Meeting and continue discussing over the summer with a hopes to vote in the fall. Dr. Gheesling stated that the policy would hopefully be sent out next week for Commissioners to reivew and verify any information as needed.

This concluded Dr. Gheesling's update.

**10. Other Business**

Chair Horne asked if there was any other business.

**11. Adjournment**

Chair Horne asked if there was any other business before the Committee. Being none, the meeting adjourned at 11:23 a.m.



**Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing**  
**Questions from Commissioners to Institutions for May 11, 2023**

7A. Any articulate agreements yet with comprehensives?

Central Carolina Technical College is still in communication with several four-year institutions regarding the progress of the proposed AAS, Teacher Education degree. CCTC faculty and administration are awaiting the final approval of the degree before they are able to develop articulation agreements with the four-year institutions.

Attached are letters of support from two institutions (USC Columbia & USC Aiken) as well as two potential articulation tracks from the University of South Carolina-Aiken at Sumter.

7B. Clemson Construction and MGT. How will program effectiveness be determined?

At Clemson, we have an extensive portfolio of tools and processes oriented towards program effectiveness, which is a primary concern of our Board of Trustees as well.

This portfolio comprises the following elements:

- a) A graduate program review process run by our Graduate School that utilizes a self-study, independent data, and external reviewers that is run with a cadence that ensures each graduate program is formally reviewed (at least) every 7 years.
- b) All academic programs go through an annual assessment process involving student learning outcomes, student achievement, and program outcomes. Our Office of Assessment provides formative feedback on these reports, and summary results for programs are made available in a democratized Tableau dashboard. For this particular program, some of the program outcomes slated to be tracked are demand (measured by applications and yield), job placement of graduates, and dissertation-based journal publications.
- c) Graduate program graduate placement is tracked with the University's subscription to Academic Analytics' Alumni Insight module-- we currently track graduating cohorts from each graduate program on a rolling 10-year basis.
- d) The Office of Institutional Effectiveness maintains a democratized interactive Tableau dashboard that tracks program productivity on an AY-by-AY basis according to CHE



methodology for all programs and allows easy identification of those falling short on an enrollment- or completion-basis.

e) This fall, the Office of the Provost is launching an all-level recurring academic program review process examining productivity, annual assessment, and financials. This program will alternate between academic colleges each year but sweep in recently approved programs in any college that are due for a 3-year internal review that is requested by our Board for new offerings they approve.

f) Our Office of Institutional Effectiveness also maintains a portfolio of developmental Tableau dashboards related to degree program market share, and degree-linked labor force data (growth, employment, salaries) at different geographical scales. These are not employed regularly in a systemic fashion regarding program review, but they are available, and they are tapped from time-to-time.... frequently on the front-end of program development as a means to assess the landscape regarding program viability.

7C. Clemson Public Health Masters: I don't question the nature of the training, but what I would like to know is who hires the graduates, where do they work, with whom do they work (patients? Policy makers? Academics?) and what is a typical day like. How do they determine the program is meeting the need it's designed to address?

**Who hires the graduates and where do they work?**

Graduates would be hired by health-related organization and program directors, chief operating officers, executive management and, with experience, they could advance into these positions. Graduates could work for rural health centers, federally qualified health centers, hospitals, public administration entities (e.g., city and county government), non-profit organizations, Clemson extension, other community-based programs operated by academic institutions, DHEC, etc. We anticipate that graduates from the rural health concentration will work in these types of entities within rural settings.

**with whom do they work (patients? Policy makers? Academics?)**

Graduates would work with administrators, policy makers, academics, program evaluators, and research directors

**what is a typical day like?**

The MPH program is designed so that working professionals can participate in the program. A typical day within the MPH program would include 3-4 evening classes a



week for full-time students and 1-2 per week for part-time students. Students would also participate in weekly group discussions, and have homework associated with each class. A typical day for a graduate from this program would be coordinating and directing rural health improvement programs and/or our quality improvement programs. This could include supervising staff, creating and managing budgets, designing and implementing proven effective programs, collecting and assessing evaluation data, and sharing program impacts with community stakeholders.

**How do you determine the program is meeting the need it's designed to address?**

Short term – exit survey with graduates to assess employment status

Long-term – we track graduate program completer's employment with our subscription to Academic Analytics' Alumni Insight module. Alumni surveys will be used to gather more detailed information regarding career advancement; data from SC Rural Health to assess retention of public health professionals in rural communities; input from internship preceptors regarding graduates and contribution to community capacity to improve health outcomes.

As noted in response to the question about our proposed PhD Construction Science and Management program, we have an extensive portfolio of tools and processes oriented towards program effectiveness, which is a primary concern of our Board of Trustees as well. This portfolio includes:

a) A graduate program review process run by our Graduate School that utilizes a self-study, independent data, and external reviewers that is run with a cadence that ensures each graduate program is formally reviewed (at least) every 7 years.

b) All academic programs go through an annual assessment process involving student learning outcomes, student achievement, and program outcomes. Our Office of Assessment provides formative feedback on these reports, and summary results for programs are made available in a democratized Tableau dashboard. For this particular program, some of the program outcomes slated to be tracked are demand (measured by applications and yield), job placement of graduates, and dissertation-based journal publications.

c) Graduate program graduate placement is tracked with the University's subscription to Academic Analytics' Alumni Insight module-- we currently track graduating cohorts from each graduate program on a rolling 10-year basis.



d) The Office of Institutional Effectiveness maintains a democratized interactive Tableau dashboard that tracks program productivity on an AY-by-AY basis according to CHE methodology for all programs and allows easy identification of those falling short on an enrollment- or completion-basis.

e) This fall, the Office of the Provost is launching an all-level recurring academic program review process examining productivity, annual assessment, and financials. This program will alternate between academic colleges each year but sweep in recently approved programs in any college that are due for a 3-year internal review that is requested by our Board for new offerings they approve.

f) Our Office of Institutional Effectiveness also maintains a portfolio of developmental Tableau dashboards related to degree program market share, and degree-linked labor force data (growth, employment, salaries) at different geographical scales. These are not employed regularly in a systemic fashion regarding program review, but they are available and they are tapped from time-to-time....frequently on the front-end of program development as a means to assess the landscape regarding program viability.

7D-K. Speak about the institutional decision to pursue a host of secondary education programs at one time. Is this a significant shift in mission? How closely are you working with the local districts? Do you have an advisory committee representing various interests? How will you support this many new teachers entering the schools who need mentors? How are you distinguishing between BS and BA degrees? Good work on assessment and documenting need.

Excellent proposal on Bachelor of Professional Studies to meet needs of the nontraditional Ss. (esp, some college but no degree.)

Q) Please speak about the institutional decision to pursue a host of secondary education programs at one time. Is this a significant shift in mission?

This is not a significant shift in mission. We have had a successful MAT program and have heavily recruited our own undergraduates into that MAT program. Previously, students would graduate from CCU with an undergraduate degree in a content area or discipline and begin the MAT a few weeks after earning their bachelor's degree. In line with national trends, we wanted to provide a 4-year route to licensure through CCU, and these programs comprise the same programs we recruit from and provide licensure for in the MAT. Since we have already been training many CCU secondary education majors through





the MAT, we expect that the 4-year routes will also be successful. We wanted to place these pathways in the disciplines to act hopefully as a recruiting tool: for example, a biology major who sees a way to earn a 4-year teaching degree within the biology department may be more inclined to choose teaching. We chose to add them all at the same time so that the transition from the MAT to the 4-year model was available to as many interested students as possible, once all approvals are in place.

Q) Do you have an advisory committee representing various interests?

Yes, we have a Teacher Education Advisory Committee (TEAC) that provides feedback on all our initial licensure programs. This group is comprised of CCU faculty and leadership (both in the disciplines and in education), local teachers and principals, community members, and current students. The committee meets twice per year to review data and provide feedback on programs, assessments, and local district needs. Additionally, both the TEAC committee members and our cooperating teachers/principals are invited to share their views with us using other mechanisms, including Zoom drop-in sessions, surveys, and email communication.

Q) How closely are you working with the local districts?

We work closely with our five local partnering districts, where we place our students for both internships and for employment. When looking at the new programs, we asked for feedback from cooperating principals and our Teacher Education Advisory Committee. All were supportive of the new programs, given the fact that candidates would receive the necessary content and pedagogy training for entrance into the classrooms, just as they do with our other programs.

Q) How will you support this many new teachers entering the schools who need mentors?

We have five partner districts, and usually have a healthy number of volunteers at the secondary level for our candidates. Also, with many program completers graduating and working in our local partnering districts, they are generally open to hosting a student as their way of "giving back." Since we expect that many of the teacher-candidates will be students that would have done the MAT program, we don't expect that the number of students in these programs will overwhelm our capacity to place students in classrooms or to provide mentors.



Q) How are you distinguishing between BS and BA degrees?

BS degrees traditionally require at least 2 full years of lab science classes as well as the concomitant math requirements, or advanced math requirements in the case of a BS in Math or Math Education. For the secondary education degrees, the BA degrees require only the science needed to satisfy our core curriculum/general education requirements. The BS degrees in Biology, Chemistry, and Physics all require sequences in these disciplines, in line with the requirements for licensure in general science. The BS in Math Education requires advanced math in addition to the science required for the core curriculum.

70-P. Remind us of the difference between BA and AB.

CofC has a long-standing cognate A.B. degree that accompanies any undergraduate major provided the following criteria are satisfied per our undergraduate catalog:

In order to graduate with an A.B. degree, the student must: (1) complete all required courses in any major; (2) achieve in either Latin or Ancient Greek advanced proficiency, demonstrated by the completion of two courses in one of these languages at the 300 level or above (LATN 305, LATN 321, LATN 322, LATN 323, LATN 371, LATN 372, LATN 373, LATN 390, LATN 490 or two courses from GREK 321, GREK 322, GREK 323, GREK 324, GREK 325, GREK 326, GREK 371, GREK 372, GREK 390, GREK 490)\*; (3) complete two in classical civilization (see listing below).

*\*Note: The Classics A.B. major requires both Greek and Latin languages.*

Years ago, CHE staff informed us that we had to include the "A.B." reference for every undergraduate major program proposal we submitted in order to ensure correct CHE inventory listings. This in spite of the fact that the A.B. is already established as a cognate for any existing and future undergraduate major, which means that technically excluding it from a proposal does not exclude its possibility for the major in question. Yet we have included reference to the A.B. consistently per your office's guidance. If that view/desire has changed, and the reference only causes confusion for the reviewers in Columbia, we are happy to exclude it moving forward (I will admit that the A.B. question arises quite regularly from CHE). Please advise and thank you for your guidance as always.

70. What is the relevance here of the U S Labor need for nurse practitioner cited on p 5?



Nurse practitioners are advanced practice nurses who are trained to provide comprehensive healthcare services, including diagnosing and treating illnesses, prescribing medications, and performing procedures. Biochemistry provides the foundation for understanding how the human body works at a cellular and molecular level, including the metabolic pathways that are involved in human health. Thus, biochemistry plays a crucial role in the profession of nurse practitioners as it helps to understand the underlying biochemical mechanisms and implications of various diseases, medications, and treatments.

Since it is impossible to formulate a degree that covers every aspect of medical professions, we have developed a biochemistry-focused degree that would give students the time to explore interests outside this program of study, if interested. This Biochemistry BA will give students a strong and rigorous background in biochemistry, which is sufficient for some health-related jobs and for graduate or medical school applications. In addition, its relatively low amount of credit hours will allow students interested in other disciplines to complement their studies with classes offered by other departments. For example, someone interested in a career as nurse practitioner may take microbiology or cellular biology classes from the biology curriculum, or pair our Biochemistry BA with a Biology degree with focus on human health classes.

7P. Reference to letters of support, but no letters were attached to the copy I'm reading from. However, in spite of long, descriptive narratives that mention the need nationally and state-wide, there is really no discussion or listing of the kinds of jobs students can qualify for, in what numbers, likely wages, or the like. Obvious by their absence

Pages 4-5 under "Employment Opportunities" for both proposals ([https://che.sc.gov/sites/che/files/Documents/Meetings/Meetings%202023/CAAL/CAAL%20May%2011/7P\\_CoC%20BA%20BS\\_ESS.pdf](https://che.sc.gov/sites/che/files/Documents/Meetings/Meetings%202023/CAAL/CAAL%20May%2011/7P_CoC%20BA%20BS_ESS.pdf)) does explicitly refer to "Employment Opportunities," the named occupations, and projected annual job openings, plus median earnings.

7Q. Just curious: why change ESOL name which is well known?

To answer the question about changing the ESOL name, please find the memo from the State of S.C. Department of Education dated June 7, 2022:

<https://ed.sc.gov/newsroom/school-district-memoranda-archive/multilingual-learner-program-terminology/multilingual-learner-program-terminology->



[memo/?fbclid=IwAR2AOzBSIOGcJxs0pS9UWC2\\_rJQKnTUhwzayqA4jod4nUkjYMJ-QlcT\\_Df0](memo/?fbclid=IwAR2AOzBSIOGcJxs0pS9UWC2_rJQKnTUhwzayqA4jod4nUkjYMJ-QlcT_Df0)

On page 1, paragraph 2 it states:

“Previously referred to as the English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) program, the English language acquisition or development program in South Carolina will be referred to as the Multilingual Learner Program (MLP). ESOL teachers will now be referred to as Multilingual Learner Program Specialists (MLPS).”

On page 1, paragraph 1 it states:

“The South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) is taking an asset-based approach by referring to English learners (ELs) as multilingual learners (MLs). A ML brings diverse cultural identities and new perspectives to strengthen classrooms and communities. MLs achieve the South Carolina College and Career Readiness Standards while navigating between native and instructional languages. MLs provide the global perspective that is needed of the South Carolina Graduate and emphasize the advantages of bi-/multilingualism to honor students’ identities as strengths rather than deficits.”

7R. Will the declining enrollment in bachelor’s and master’s enrollment jeopardize enrollment in the doctorate? What’s the thinking on no dissertation?

We believe enrollment for the PsyD program will be strong, as there are more students applying for doctoral programs than master’s programs. Though we have seen some decline in applications for our master’s programs recently, the numbers remain strong. This year we received eight applications for every available slot in the master’s programs.

There is a capstone project that is the equivalent of a dissertation. This is patterned after other national PsyD programs and will require students to contribute original research to the broader literature in Psychology.

7S. Four years in the approval process? Why? Where is the Reach compliance statement? Since they were instrumental in suggesting and encouraging the program, will the Savannah plant help provide resources?

Response pending

7T. no questions



7U. If there is no other master's in dance in S.C. doesn't this suggest one is not needed since performance seems to be the primary requirement? Why would one's undergraduate degree not need to be in dance? Letters of support don't indicate specific openings, opportunities, jobs. The stats support need for artists in general, not dancer specifically.

**If there is no other master's in dance in S.C. doesn't this suggest one is not needed since performance seems to be the primary requirement?**

The primary requirement of the degree is not performance. It is a broad curriculum in dance studies that includes theoretical, practical, and creative practice coursework that will enhance any professional's practice whether they specialize in teaching, performance, and/or choreography. This model is a common model for initial graduate degrees in dance (M.A.). The target population for this degree program is quite broad and could attract student's various backgrounds, including dance educators in South Carolina who may be interested in additional content at the master's level to increase their salaries as indicated by the data provided in the proposal. Currently, there are currently no opportunities for graduate study in dance so these dance educators must pursue another graduate study in another area or attend an institution out-of-state. We believe it is important to provide an in-state option for graduate study in dance.

**Why would one's undergraduate degree not need to be in dance?**

Prospective students would still have to provide evidence of sufficient experience in the discipline to avoid additional coursework to fulfill disciplinary deficits. While an undergraduate degree is ideal, some individuals may have a degree in another area and a dance minor, which is usually at least 18 credit hours. Another possible scenario is an undergraduate degree in another area in addition to substantial professional experience in the field teaching dance, choreographing, and/or professional performance experience. The proposal states: while students do not need to possess an undergraduate degree in dance, they must demonstrate substantial educational coursework and/or professional experience to avoid completing additional coursework outside of the requirements for the M.A.

**Letters of support don't indicate specific openings, opportunities, jobs. The stats support need for artists in general, not dancer specifically.**

The survey included before the ACAP meeting includes interest from individuals within the profession in SC. The table in the proposal provides statistics about employment



opportunities within South Carolina and the nation. Only one letters addressed the arts in general; the others expressed the need for this program for dance educators.

7V. Assessment of Student Learning objectives is clear, but program assessment is not. The portfolio documents student growth but not program success. The six-month out assessment of students would be better directed at their employers, to learn more objective information.

As required by our program review policy, programs not subject to a professional program accreditation must have an external review conducted at least every seven years (ACAF 2.20). As part of the self-study for this external review, programs must look at student placement post-graduation and some also conduct student exit surveys and may also survey employers yearly. I shared the comment below from the Commissioner about the assessment of students being better directed at their employers. I also want to reiterate that this proposed program is a redesign of the existing Cyber Intelligence program that was pursued mainly due to immediate feedback from prospective employers in the state. The program used the feedback received from employers to revise this program and will continue to seek such feedback to evaluate the program.

#### **Program Evaluation of Student Success**

To determine program outcomes, the Cyber Policy and Ethics program faculty will prepare a self-study which will allow our unit to evaluate the status, effectiveness, and progress of academic programs; recognize and reflect on program strengths and weaknesses; identify important directions in the disciplines or professions that need to be addressed; and assess the relationships among and contributions to other academic programs and the overall mission of the University. One part of this study will be the inclusion of student data such as: awards and honors, and placement of graduates. We will also include summaries of student exit interviews, alumni surveys, and employer feedback surveys. We plan on administering exit surveys to those graduating each term and yearly feedback surveys to alumni and employers as our program grows. We plan on also partnering with the Career Center and the Alumni Center to help with tracking of graduates and career placements post-graduation. The results of these student measures will be aggregated on a yearly basis, shared with the program's planning committee and will be included in the unit's self-study report.

7W. Did I overlook the REACH compliance Confirmation Statement? Didn't see it anywhere

The founding documents (REACH Act) Requirement is listed on p. 12 in the curriculum table and on p. 36 (the last page of the proposal).



## 8A. Citadel Center

## 9. REACH

LU, USC-C, and USC\_U don't say how they test or document learning

Clemson: excellent. Would they be willing to collaborate with other institutions on their process? Maybe Palmetto College could offer it?

Indeed, we'd be happy to work with other institutions to share what we're doing, our approach, design, and perhaps even our content if the IP people say it's ok.

I think what we cannot do, at least without some machinations and greater thought, is host a platform for other institutions using the same infrastructure as we use internally-- this all runs through our Canvas LMS system and access to that requires a Clemson ID and Clemson 2FA that are, ultimately, transacted utilizing secure hashes from our identity vault that is fed from either our Banner SIS system and/or Peoplesoft HR system. Additionally, it would seem best that each institution ultimately be responsible for ensuring and affirming that any remediation of their students is satisfactory in their judgment. We are, of course, always happy to work with our colleagues at any institution if we can help get them closer to what we're doing (if that's what they want) or discuss opportunities for collaborative approaches-- though these will likely require different and novel IT platforms.