

New Program Proposal
Bachelor of Arts in Film Studies
University of South Carolina-Columbia

Summary

The University of South Carolina-Columbia requests approval for a new degree program leading to the Bachelor of Arts in Film Studies, to be implemented immediately upon Commission approval.

The University's Board of Trustees approved the program proposal on June 22, 2000; the Commission received the final proposal on July 25. The Commission's Advisory Committee on Academic Programs reviewed the proposal at its quarterly meeting on October 18, 2000, and unanimously recommended approval of the new degree program without comment.

According to the proposal, the BA program in Film Studies will give structure to the University's disparate offerings in the field and will build on the existing minor in Film Studies, which USC began offering in 1997. Currently, the University offers coursework related to film studies in several different departments, including anthropology, English, history, Spanish, and theatre and speech, among others. The new BA will aggregate coursework from among the existing departments into an interdisciplinary course of study aimed at giving students the opportunity to "study the art of film from historical, cultural, and theoretical perspectives." Graduates from the program will be prepared to engage in graduate work in film studies or to work in museums and archives and possibly in advertising and marketing. It is important to note, however, that the proposed BA program in Film Studies is first and foremost a liberal arts degree with attendant emphases on theory and content across several liberal arts disciplines; it is not an applied degree, *per se*. The program will be administered through the Office of the Dean in the College of Liberal Arts.

The proposed new program will require students to complete 120 credit hours for graduation. Of this total, 53 to 62 credit hours come in the form of general education requirements, 30 hours are reserved for the major itself, 12 to 18 hours can be designated for cognate or minor requirements, and the remaining 7 to 22 hours are electives. The staff commends the University for integrating global and regionalist perspectives on film into the major, as represented in coursework such as "Comparing Cultures Through Film," "Topics in World Film," and "The French Film Experience." These courses and others like them will ensure that graduates receive a broad understanding of film as an art form that bridges national and cultural boundaries.

There are no other film studies programs currently offered in South Carolina. According to the proposal, Duke and Emory Universities offer such programs, but no public university in the region does so.

The University anticipates that new student enrollment will begin with 10 headcount upon implementation and will increase by approximately 10 students each year, leveling off near 50 headcount in year five of operation (2005-06). The University projects that each student will take approximately two courses or six semester credit hours per semester in the major.

No new faculty will be needed to implement the BA in Film Studies. The program will draw from a core of nine faculty from several disciplines in the College of Liberal Arts for teaching the coursework in the major. Only one new course will be developed specific to the major: Media Arts 371, "The Moving Image," will cover the "fundamentals of film and video production using traditional and digital means."

The University anticipates only one new cost relative to the proposed new program, that coming in the form of \$3,000 per year over the first five years of operation for additional clerical assistance in the Office of the Dean. USC plans on covering this new cost through reallocation of existing, internal resources. No new equipment is needed to implement the program, and library resources are said to be adequate.

Shown below are the estimated Mission Resource Requirement (MRR) costs and new costs not funded by the MRR associated with implementation of the proposed program for its first five years. Also shown are the estimated revenues projected under the MRR and the Resource Allocation Plan as well as student tuition.

Year	Estimated MRR Cost for Proposed Program	Extraordinary (Non-MRR) Costs for Proposed Program	Total Costs	State Appropriation	Tuition	Total Revenue
2000-01	\$43,633	\$0	\$43,633	\$0	\$18,712	\$18,712
2001-02	86,880	0	86,880	24,938	37,811	62,749
2002-03	130,513	0	130,513	50,630	56,522	107,152
2003-04	173,760	0	173,760	75,567	76,250	151,817
2004-05	217,393	0	217,393	100,835	95,348	196,183

These data demonstrate that if the University of South Carolina-Columbia can meet the projected student enrollments and contain costs as they are shown in the proposal, the program will not be able to cover new costs with revenues it generates by the fifth year of its implementation. Despite this projection, it is important to note that the program anticipates healthy enrollment trends, and indeed shows a revenue deficit of only \$21,210 in 2004-05.

In summary, the Bachelor of Arts in Film Studies at USC-Columbia is an important new liberal arts program designed to provide students with a broad-based, interdisciplinary study of film as art. The proposal makes a cogent argument that the critical and contextual thinking skills that can be derived from such a program are indeed extremely important given the prominence of visual imagery in today's world. The curriculum incorporates breadth and depth in appropriate measures and is scholarly in its composition, attributes befitting a baccalaureate liberal arts program at a comprehensive research university.

Recommendation

The Committee recommends that the Commission approve the program leading to the Bachelor of Arts degree in Film Studies at the University of South Carolina-Columbia, for immediate implementation, provided that no "unique cost" or other special state funding be required or requested.

New Program Proposal
Ph.D.
Major in Nursing
Medical University of South Carolina

Summary

The Medical University of South Carolina requests approval to offer its own autonomous program leading to the Ph.D. in Nursing. The proposal was approved by the Board of the Medical University on August 10, 2000, and was received at the Commission on Higher Education on August 14, 2000. The proposal was discussed and approved unanimously by the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs (ACAP) at its regularly scheduled meeting on October 18, 2000. Comments made at that meeting by USC-Columbia's representative in support of the proposal were important because of USC's prior record of concern about the proposal. If approved, this program will be implemented in August 2001.

In 1986 after a statewide review conducted by external consultants, the Commission approved the offering of a single Ph.D. in Nursing program at USC-Columbia. In 1992, MUSC requested its own Ph.D. in Nursing. Referring to the logic contained in the 1986 decision concerning the expense and the relative lack of need for two such programs in a state as small as South Carolina, the Commission was prepared to decline to endorse the proposal. At that time, MUSC's representative requested that the proposal be removed from further consideration until conversations could be held with USC-Columbia. Since 1995, the USC-Columbia Ph.D. in Nursing program (the only Ph.D. in Nursing program in South Carolina) has had participation from the MUSC graduate faculty in Nursing through a "cooperative" arrangement, sanctioned by the Commission, which had earlier declared that MUSC's Nursing faculty was prepared to participate in doctoral programming. After five years of this cooperative program, MUSC is again requesting, as they had done in 1992, their own, autonomous Ph.D. program.

USC-Columbia initially expressed a number of concerns about the proposed program since the program at USC-Columbia has never met its targeted numbers of graduates and student enrollment of 25-27 FTE per year. In recent years, graduates of the Ph.D. program have numbered from none to seven. Despite USC's earlier expressed concerns, during the discussion of the MUSC proposal at the October 18, 2000, meeting of the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs, USC's institutional representative indicated support for the MUSC program proposal, stating that USC's support arose from the fact that the nursing faculty of the two institutions had been unable to cooperate suitably with each other in the delivery of the cooperative Ph.D. program.

In accordance with CHE *Guidelines for the Approval of New Programs*, MUSC hired an external consultant, Dr. Barbara Germino, Associate Professor of Nursing, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, to review its proposal. Dr. Germino's report

states that the state of South Carolina can adequately "support" two Ph.D. programs in Nursing. No financial data and no exact student data are provided in support of this claim. Dr. Germino cites the differences in philosophy and institutional types (comprehensive research institution vs. health sciences center) as critical for making these two Ph.D. programs very different in emphases.

Dr. Germino also notes that the program at MUSC will be philosophically focused on the study and care of vulnerable populations. This statement is reiterated in MUSC's other documentation to underscore the differentiation between the proposed MUSC autonomous program and the current USC program. However, because of the nature of the discipline, it can be argued that little difference is possible between curricula in Ph.D. programs in Nursing. Likewise, a Ph.D. program in nursing necessarily places some degree of focus on research on and care of vulnerable populations since, by definition, nursing as a discipline deals with vulnerable populations and individuals.

Apart from Dr. Germino's report, at the time of the Commission's most recent 1999 statewide review of nursing programs, those external nursing consultants who visited MUSC were asked to provide to the Commission's staff as part of their work an independent analysis of the feasibility of the Ph.D. in Nursing at MUSC as an autonomous program. Their report indicates that MUSC has demonstrated an institutional ability and readiness to undertake this academic task with commitment. The consultants' report suggests that South Carolina should have two Ph.D. programs in order to meet the needs for more Ph.D.-trained faculty members for all the baccalaureate and above programs of nursing in South Carolina. Further, the consultants' report warns that not to approve the Ph.D. in Nursing at MUSC now will create a lasting crisis for South Carolina's nursing programs which require Ph.D.-holders as faculty members. Neither Dr. Germino's report nor that of the CHE nursing consultants discusses the increased costs to the state for adding a new nursing Ph.D. program. Likewise, neither report addresses the fact that South Carolina will be the only state of 3.5 million residents or fewer with two publicly supported Ph.D. programs in Nursing. Finally, both reports indicate that a second Ph.D. program in the state will only "complement," not "duplicate" the existing Ph.D. in Nursing at USC-Columbia.

The MUSC program proposal states that the major justification for the program's development is to supply Ph.D.-prepared nurse educators to the baccalaureate and above Nursing programs in the academic institutions in South Carolina and the southeastern region of the country. The proposal also states that the goal of the program is to supply educators, researchers, and scholars.

Despite considerable discussion in recent years about the proliferation of Ph.D. nursing programs in the country (of which there are now 78), the MUSC proposal does not mention the difficulties which many of these programs report in meeting their enrollment or graduation estimates. The proposal expresses the confidence of the Medical University faculty in the College of Nursing and the Medical University's administration in the program's ability to capture a student audience on the basis of the magnetic appeal that the city of Charleston generally possesses and the attractiveness of the Medical University as a health education and research center. In the first year of the program's implementation, five of the ten students in the program are estimated to be

coming into the program from the existing USC/MUSC cooperative program, according to the proposal.

The fact that five students are estimated to be coming from the USC cooperative program in the first year alone is not noted as an issue of concern for any negative impact on enrollments or graduations from the existing USC program which might be created by the implementation of the new program proposal at MUSC. According to the proposal, the difference in the focus/philosophy of the two programs—i.e., MUSC's emphasis on the study and research of vulnerable populations—will simply make the two programs "complementary" of one another.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that the USC program has never yet realized its 1986 estimated annual student enrollment in the Ph.D. program of 25-27 FTE. During the years of the cooperative program, five of the students in the cooperative Ph.D. program have been students from the Charleston area in the MUSC option. It is conceivable, therefore, that the USC program might be placed in jeopardy with regard to meeting the Commission's program productivity standards with a competing program in the state.

According to the proposal, the student interest in this program is considerable. In individual conversations with staff of the Commission, MUSC officials underscore this point. The degree of optimism in student interest in the program is significant since most of the 78 Ph.D. programs in the country have reported very modest numbers in their programs and, increasingly, greater difficulty in getting students to enter these programs. Various reasons are given for the difficulty in meeting the modest anticipated enrollments in the 78 existing Ph.D. in Nursing programs. The two reasons most frequently cited are: 1) the rapid increase in the 1990s of Nursing Ph.D. programs, so that the small numbers of eligible, interested persons are spread more thinly across the programs which exist; and 2) a decreased desire on the part of masters-prepared nurses to enter Ph.D. programs. The decreased desire is said to be the result of the high income that a masters-prepared nurse can make (often in excess of \$80,000 per year).

The proposal indicates that fully half of the ten students enrolled in the proposed program in the first year will be new; the other five will come from the existing MUSC "option" of the USC Ph.D. program. The proposal states that the enrollment in the program will begin with 10 students (6.3 FTE) and will grow to 22 (31.3 FTE) by the fifth year of its operation. According to an addendum supplied on December 15, 2000, the program will be expected to graduate an average of three students per year once it is fully implemented. This number will meet the CHE's program productivity standard.

The curriculum consists of a minimum of 62 semester hours of coursework (for students who already possess a master's degree in nursing) and a minimum of 12 semester hours of dissertation work. A student will be able to complete the program in three years of full-time study. Students may enter the Ph.D. program at one of two academic junctures: either directly after a baccalaureate degree or after the master's degree. For admission to the program each student must be a licensed RN in the State of South Carolina with at least a baccalaureate degree in nursing and must have an acceptable GRE score.

In the late 1980s, the panel of external nurse consultants cited as one of the strengths of USC for having the Ph.D. program placed there was its mission as a comprehensive graduate institution with a wide-range of research faculty in the social and behavioral science faculties (e.g., sociology, anthropology, political science, public administration) and in the basic sciences (mathematics, computer science, biology and chemistry). While MUSC has its own richness in the biomedical sciences, its institutional environment lacks virtually any presence in the social and behavioral sciences. The proposal does include mention of the fact that the College of Charleston will be involved in some manner for developing core courses for the program, but the proposal does not state what this involvement will be. In a separate document provided January 4, 2001, it is stated that discussions have taken place with the College of Charleston's faculty to offer only the Philosophy of Science course either through cross registration or through an institutionally-specific course at MUSC, with design input from the nursing faculty, but taught by a faculty member from the College of Charleston.

Because MUSC has been cooperating with USC for five years, MUSC already offers a number of courses in the proposed Ph.D. program in Nursing. According to the proposal, only four new courses unique to the Ph.D. program—all of them core courses--will be needed to complete the program offerings at MUSC for the Ph.D.

A total of six (1.5 FTE) faculty members are budgeted to be used in the program. This presents a very small proportion of the full-time, tenure-track faculty members in the College of Nursing involved in the Ph.D. program. To this figure, however, must be added persons who will teach the required statistics courses but whose appointments are in the Department of Biometry and Epidemiology and the faculty from the College of Charleston teaching the Philosophy of Science and perhaps other courses if these are developed.

According to the proposal, the Medical University's library is adequate to support the Ph.D. in Nursing. The proposal indicates that material is available on-line through DISCUS (not principally a research-oriented set of databases), other electronic databases of a specifically healthcare-related focus, and a computerized environment. Mention is also made of Charleston's shared libraries arrangement, although no other public or private institution of higher education in Charleston has a graduate/research library focus or graduate/research offerings in the health sciences.

According to the proposal, no new facilities are necessary for the Ph.D. in Nursing.

The costs of the program directly to the institution are said to be relatively low. According to the proposal these are calculated to be \$944,287 over a five-year time period. These are divided among faculty salaries (\$777,724), administration (\$92,076), clerical/support (\$47,941), and supplies and materials (\$26,546). No costs are associated with the library, equipment, facilities, or "other" categories.

Throughout the proposal, the Medical University takes the position that since only four new courses need to be added to the curriculum and since a total of only 1.5 FTE faculty will be needed to offer the program, the entire cost of the program at MUSC will

be minimal to the institution. No "unique" funding is either required or requested from the State to mount this program.

Shown below are the estimated Mission Resource Requirement (MRR) costs to the state, associated with implementation of the proposed program for its first five years. Also shown are the estimated revenues projected under the Mission Resource Requirement and the Resource Allocation Plan as well as student tuition.

Year	Estimated MRR Cost for Proposed Program	Extraordinary (Non-MRR) Costs for Proposed Program	Total Costs	State Appropriation	Tuition	Total Revenue
1999-00	\$304,416	\$0	\$304,416	\$0	\$68,845	\$68,845
2000-01	\$606,138	\$0	\$606,138	\$178,532	\$136,603	\$315,135
2000-02	\$910,553	\$0	\$910,553	\$354,012	\$205,449	\$559,461
2000-03	\$1,212,275	\$0	\$1,212,275	\$532,544	\$273,208	\$805,752
2002-04	\$1,516,691	\$0	\$1,516,691	\$708,025	\$342,052	\$1,050,077

These data demonstrate that if the Medical University of South Carolina meets the projected student enrollments and contains costs as they are shown in the proposal, the program will still generate more costs in each year of the first five years of its operation than it will cover from tuition and State appropriations through the MRR.

In summary, certain positive dimensions of this program proposal for an autonomous Ph.D. in Nursing program should be highlighted, as follows:

- Unanimous agreement comes from MUSC's and the Commission on Higher Education's nurse consultants as to the desirability and feasibility of this program, although costs to the State are not mentioned in either of these reports.
- Both the Board of Trustees and the Administrative Council of the Medical University solidly back the proposal, regarding both the desirability of the program for the institution and the assurance of institutional support for redirecting necessary funds for the implementation of the program.
- From an institutional point of view, it is relatively common for a free-standing health center like MUSC to offer a Ph.D. program in Nursing.
- The University of South Carolina, once very concerned about this new program proposal, now supports it fully, since the two institutional nursing faculties have been unable to renegotiate a cooperative agreement satisfactory to both parties.
- The Medical University maintains that the program will cost the University itself very little. The facilities, library materials, clinical sites, and equipment are in place. Only 1.5 FTE faculty will be used for the program. Only four new courses will be added to the curriculum.

- A new, first-ever in South Carolina, endowed chair in Nursing will be .4 FTE devoted to this program.

Certain comments of caution from a statewide perspective also deserve to be mentioned. These are:

- There is a limited pool of eligible persons in a small state's professional population, and there is evidence of underenrollments in other Ph.D. in Nursing programs in many areas of the country.
- The existing Ph.D. program at USC-Columbia is not operating at capacity.
- No other state with a population of 3.5 million or less has two publicly supported Ph.D. programs in Nursing; South Carolina would be the first.
- The program proposal will cost the state a considerable amount through the MRR's funding base, the costs for each of the first five years of the program's implementation will exceed the revenue from state appropriations and tuition.

Despite these cautions, the Medical University's wholehearted support for the program and the support that the proposal has generated from the University of South Carolina suggest that it may succeed. The future success of this program will be measurable within a five-seven year period. Because the proposal is so explicit about its role in supplying future faculty members, it will be useful to monitor the numbers and percentages of the graduates of the proposed MUSC Ph.D. in nursing program who become faculty members in the baccalaureate and graduate programs of nursing of the State.

Recommendation

The Committee recommends that the Commission approve the proposal to establish a program leading to the Ph.D. degree in Nursing at the Medical University of South Carolina for implementation in August 2001, provided that no "unique cost" or other special state funding be required or requested.

New Program Proposal
USC NanoCenter
University of South Carolina

Summary

The University of South Carolina requests approval to establish the USC NanoCenter to be implemented immediately.

The Board of Trustees approved the proposal on October 19, 2000. This proposal was submitted for Commission review on August 15, 2000. The proposal was reviewed and voted upon favorably by the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs at its meeting on October 18, 2000. During the Program Planning Summary stage at the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs meeting of July 18, 2000, Clemson University and the Medical University of South Carolina indicated that there was also interest at these institutions in developing research programs in nanotechnology. At the October meeting, Clemson University indicated that discussions had been held with USC concerning cooperation and collaboration on nanotechnology research and Clemson was pleased with the tenor of the conversation. USC indicated that competition for the large amount of nanotechnology research funding available should not be within the state but should be with other states in the Southeast. Collaboration among the three research institutions will be part of the mission of the proposed center.

The Center was originally named the Carolina NanoCenter, but the University agreed to the request of Clemson and MUSC to change the name to the USC NanoCenter.

The purpose of the center is to establish a site for coordinated research, education, and technology transfer focused on nanotechnology. Nanoscale science and technology is a rapidly emerging field of science that examines materials and their properties in the size range of 1-100 nanometers (one billionth of meter). The University proposes to establish the USC NanoCenter in order to build the scientific, engineering, and biomedical foundations that will be needed for the State to establish itself as a leader in nanoscience technology and compete for federal and other national research funds.

The need for the center is based on the new federal initiative in nanotechnology. On January 21, 2000, President Clinton outlined a \$497 million initiative in this rapidly emerging field of science and technology. The Governor's Science and Technology Council has recommended that the research universities develop programs in the "synthesis and characterization of new functional materials" of which nanostructured materials is an important component. The proposal further indicates that nanotechnology research funds will probably go to regional areas of the country and that South Carolina's competition for funds will come from North Carolina, Georgia, and Florida. By

establishing the USC NanoCenter, the proposal indicates that the State will have positioned itself to compete for funds through a coordinated statewide effort. There are presently no other such centers in the State.

The Center will begin with a research focus and thus will not have any degree programs initially associated with it. The center will be interdisciplinary in nature and will draw on USC faculty from the College of Science and Mathematics, the College of Engineering and Information Technology, the College of Pharmacy, the School of Medicine, and the School of Public Health. The proposal indicates that the center "will partner with faculty and facilities at Clemson University and the Medical University of South Carolina to unify the major nanoscale science and technology research in the State."

The center will have three main objectives: research, education, and technology. The center will not only conduct nanoscale research but will assist in generating grants for federal and industrial sources as well as foster interdisciplinary and inter-institutional collaboration. Educational opportunities will be offered to both undergraduate and graduate students through courses and research experiences. Technical outreach will also be provided to state institutions and K-12 schools. The University indicates that business and industry will be major beneficiaries of the technology transfer that will occur through the center and will lead to the development of numerous commercial ventures in the State.

The USC NanoCenter will be an administrative unit of USC and the director will report to the Vice President of Research. Currently there are approximately 20 faculty in several departments whose major research interests focus on nanoscale science and technology. USC estimates that an additional 30 new faculty will be required over the next five years to develop and support the proposed center adequately. The University proposes to hire seven faculty in year one, seven in year 2, six in year three, and five in years four and five. The first hire will be the center director. The salaries and personnel lines have been committed by the University. Funds for these positions will come from the National Science Foundation EPSCoR (Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research) 2000 Cooperative agreement. This agreement indicates that the University will hire seven new tenure track faculty whose expertise is in nanoscale science and engineering. The remaining 23 positions to be filled in years two through five will come from replacement of retiring faculty and loss of current faculty in other units. Faculty positions will be filled at the department level with a commitment to support the center's activities.

The proposal indicates that approximately 15,000 square feet of laboratory space, 2,000 square feet of instrument space, and 2,000 square feet of office space will be needed. A portion of the center (office and a portion of the research space) will be housed in the Sumwalt Building. The proposal indicates that additional space will need to be found on campus and that renovations will need to occur in some spaces.

Additional equipment will be needed particularly for the new faculty. USC is committing funds for equipment in its budget. However, there is no estimate provided on how much may be potentially required in equipment costs. Other equipment facilities on campus such as the Electron Microscopy Center and the Microelectronics Fabrication Facility will also support the proposed center. The proposal indicates that a discussion of library resources does not apply. However, if 30 new faculty are going to be hired to conduct research and teach within this field, then adequate library support must be provided.

Funding for the center will come from a variety of sources. In its initial start up year, the University will provide \$2.3 million, the State will provide \$0.6 million (EPSCoR match), and the National Science Foundation will provide \$1.2 million in EPSCoR support. The University has received a special appropriation of \$1 million from the General Assembly to support the proposed center. The University intends to seek this \$1 million appropriation annually from the legislature. The total operating budget for the first five years of the center is estimated to be \$7.5 million. Some of the operating expenses will be covered through pending grants with federal agencies.

Recommendation

The Committee recommends that the Commission approve the proposed USC NanoCenter for immediate implementation with the understanding that the University intends to seek \$1 million per year from the S.C. General Assembly to support the center and with the further understanding that the Center shall be named the USC NanoCenter.