

MINUTES OF MEETING  
OF  
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION  
March 4, 1993  
10:30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dr. D. Glenburn Askins, Jr., Chairman  
Mr. Fred L. Day  
Ms. Elaine Freeman  
Mr. Robert C. Gallagher  
Mr. R. Austin Gilbert, Jr.  
Mr. Kenneth E. Goad  
Ms. Reba Anne Kinon  
Mr. Henry D. McMaster  
Mr. Edward T. McMullen, Jr.  
Dr. Raymond C. Ramage  
Mr. Edwin E. Tolbert, Sr.  
Mr. Joseph J. Turner, Jr.  
Mr. William J. Whitener  
Ms. Mildred R. Williams

MEMBERS ABSENT

Mr. Roger Henderson  
Mr. Marvin C. Jones  
Mr. Lewis Phillips

STAFF

Mr. Todd E. Barnette  
Mr. Fred W. Boynton  
Mr. Michael L. Brown  
Dr. Jeanette A. Deas  
Ms. Renea H. Eshleman  
Mr. Charles D. FitzSimons  
Mr. Ivan F. Guinn  
Mr. John J. Krause  
Mr. Alan S. Krech  
Dr. Harry G. Matthews  
Ms. Lynn Metcalf  
Dr. Gail M. Morrison  
Mr. Joseph V. Pendergrass  
Dr. Marilyn Scannell  
Mr. Fred R. Sheheen  
Mr. John E. Smalls  
Ms. Janet K. Stewart  
Ms. Edna Strange  
Dr. John C. Sutusky  
Ms. Julia E. Wells  
Ms. Carol Ann Williams  
Dr. Karen Woodfaulk

MEMBER OF THE PRESS

Mr. Bill Robinson

GUESTS

Dr. Barbara Anderson  
Mr. John Bannister  
Col Robert H. Barton, Jr.  
Dr. David A. Bell  
Mr. Cub Berrian  
Mr. Arthur M. Bjontegard  
Dr. Diane Brandstadter  
Mr. Robert Broadhead  
Dr. Betsy Brown  
Mr. Scott Brown  
Mr. George Carey  
Dr. Marvin G. Carmichael  
Ms. Dorothy Carter  
Dr. Collie Coleman  
Ms. Donna Collins  
Dr. James H. Daniels  
Ms. Katherine Fanning  
Dr. George D. Fields, Jr.  
Ms. Pearl Givens  
Ms. Sallie Glover  
Dr. John R. Goss, III  
Dr. I. M. Hubbard  
Dr. John D. Jacques  
Dr. John P. Johnson  
Mr. Carl Jordan  
Dr. Ruth Marshall  
Dr. Carolyn McIver-Smith  
Gen. George F. Meenaghan  
Dr. Peter T. Mitchell  
Dr. James C. Moeser  
Dr. Judith S. Prince  
Dr. Dennis A. Pruitt  
Mr. William T. Putnam  
Dr. Jerome V. Reel, Jr.  
Dr. George M. Reeves  
Mr. Eddie Shannon  
Mr. Charles Shawver  
Mr. Glen Shumpert  
Mr. Sterling Smith  
Dr. Paul Stanton  
Mr. W. E. Troublefield  
Mr. Jim White  
Mr. Mark Wright

For the record, notification of the meeting was made to the media as required by the Freedom of Information Act.

1. Approval of Minutes of Meetings of February 4, 1993

It was moved (Gallager), seconded (Williams), and voted that the minutes of the meetings of February 4, 1993 be approved as written.

2. Introductions

Mr. Sheheen introduced special guests: Dr. Barbara Nielsen and Ms. Jackie Rosswurm of the State Department of Education and Mr. Bob Polaich of the Education Commission of the States.

Dr. Askins introduced special guest: Dr. Frank Newman, President of the Education Commission of the States. Dr. Newman has assisted South Carolina in developing policies on the reform of education and the cooperative effort of linking higher education and K-12. Dr. Newman is the author of "Choosing Quality: Reducing Conflict Between the State and the University."

3. Committee Reports

3.01 Report of Executive Committee

Dr. Askins reported on the following matter:

a. Consideration of a Cooperative Agenda for the Commission on Higher Education and South Carolina Colleges and Universities

Dr. Askins stated that he met with the Chairman of the Council of Public College and University Presidents to develop a cooperative agenda for 1993 between the Commission and the public higher education institutions. The primary purpose of the agenda is to further heighten the sense of cooperation and confidence between the Commission and the institutions.

The Executive Committee recommended that the Commission on Higher Education and the colleges and universities pursue the following primary goals:

1. Increase funding for higher education
2. Improve further the results of the Higher Education Program for Access and Equity
3. Promote the increasingly cost effective operation of South Carolina's colleges and universities
4. Establish higher education as a priority in South Carolina

The Executive Committee recommended that the Commission and the colleges and universities take the following courses of action respectively in 1993:

The Commission will:

1. Undertake no new studies involving the institutions without the approval of the entire Commission. Studies that are proposed by the staff or Commission members will be submitted through the Commission's committee process after cost, effect, and time are carefully considered. The colleges and universities will be given an opportunity to provide a reaction to study proposals in an orderly process.
2. The Commission anticipates no major new initiatives in fiscal year July 1, 1993 - June 30, 1994 but will concentrate on completing a number of studies and projects already underway. Exceptions will be in response to the Governor and the General Assembly.

The colleges and universities will:

1. Become more specific regarding their mission statements.
2. Withdraw all applications for doctoral programs (except for the three research universities) and will not submit any new doctoral degree proposals until a study regarding applicable policy is completed. The Commission will begin immediately a study of policies in other states regarding handling of doctoral programs and actual costs.
3. Continue to work with the Commission regarding the distribution of existing funds in a more equitable manner.
4. Look at higher education from a statewide perspective.

It was moved (Freeman), seconded (Ramage), and voted that recommendation of the Executive Committee be approved.

### 3.02 Report of Committee on Academic Affairs

Mr. Whitener, chairman of the Committee on Academic Affairs, reported on the following matters:

#### a. Consideration of Participation of Private Colleges and Funding Ideas for State Student Assistance Program

In December 1992, the Commission on Higher Education endorsed the concepts contained in the staff study entitled Proposed Undergraduate Need-Based

State-Supported Student Assistance Program. The Commission requested that the staff study the inclusion of the private sector and the identification of potential revenue sources to support the proposed program.

The Committee met on February 22, 1993, and approved the following recommendation: The Committee on Academic Affairs recommended to the Commission that 1) the General Assembly fund the proposed student aid program by establishing a dedicated source of new revenue to be allocated through an annual line item appropriation; and 2) the proposed program be implemented to serve students attending the State's public colleges and universities.

Mr. Whitener explained parliamentary procedures according to Roberts' Rules which confirmed the right of the committee chairman to participate in a vote.

It was moved (Whitener), and seconded (Williams) that the recommendation of the Committee be considered for the purpose of discussion.

After extended discussion, the motion was amended (Freeman), seconded (Williams), and voted as follows: The Committee recommended that 1) the General Assembly fund the proposed student aid program by establishing a dedicated source of new revenue to be allocated through an annual line item appropriation and 2) that the private institutions be included in the proposed program, provided that the appropriation from the proposed program to the private institutions be proportional to the FTE enrollment of students in the private institutions, not to exceed 25% of the total amount of the program.

**b. Consideration of Evaluation of Existing Program in Architecture**

Undergraduate and graduate programs in architecture, landscape architecture, and planning and construction were evaluated during the FY 1991-92 cycle of the Commission program evaluations. Site visits were conducted at Clemson University, the only institution in South Carolina offering such programs.

The consultant recognized the programs' harmonious relationship with the region and the State and their strong cohesive fit within the mission of Clemson.

Among the major strengths cited by the consultant and the accrediting team were the strong dedication and continued support from the administration, faculty, students, community, and alumni. The consultant recommended that all degree programs offered by the College of Architecture be continued and that no similar programs be established at other higher education institutions in the State at this time. The

program leading to the Master's in Architecture was judged to be exemplary.

The Committee recommended that the Commission grant full approval to the following programs at Clemson University with the University requested to pay particular attention to suggestions for improvement contained in the report:

B.A., B.S., Architectural Studies  
M.S., Architecture  
Master's in Architecture  
Bachelor's in Landscape Architecture  
Master's in City and Regional Planning  
B.S., Master's in Construction Science and Management

The Committee also recommended that the Commission award a Commendation for Excellence to the program leading to the Master's in Architecture.

Dr. Askins presented Dr. Jerome Reel, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and Dr. John Jacques, Head of the Department of Architectural Studies, a Commendation for Excellence because of the Master in Architecture program's strengths and prominent national and regional reputation.

c. **Report on Academic Programs Study: Part A**

A review has been undertaken of all academic programs approved by the Commission to ensure that they are in compliance with the Minimum Standards for Degree Productivity Policy. The Commission's Minimum Standards for Productivity Policy was applied to programs that have been implemented for more than five years to determine which programs fell below the established productivity standards. Approximately five percent of the programs are not in compliance and will have to request exemption from the policy by presenting an appropriate justification for doing so to the Commission.

The Committee submitted this report for information only.

d. **Report on Admission Standards for First-time Entering Freshmen**

Three separate staff reports on course prerequisite compliance, minimum admission standards, and SAT scores for first-time entering freshmen at eleven of the twelve four-year public institutions and the five regional campuses of the University of South Carolina have been presented. (MUSC does not admit freshmen.) As the three sets of data are all related to admissions standards and measures of achievement for first-time entering freshmen, this year the three reports have been combined.

Overall findings show that enrollment figures for first-time entering freshmen have declined, as have the numbers of SAT scores reported. Prerequisite compliance rates, minimum admission standards, and SAT scores have increased. Some institutions, such as the College of Charleston according to officials there, have purposely limited enrollment for first-time entering freshmen in order to raise admission standards. One institution, Winthrop University, presents a different picture, with noticeable increases in enrollment and increasing standards for, and achievement of, first-time entering freshmen.

This report is presented for information only.

**e. Consideration of Admissions Standards Study**

In 1988 two policies were put into place in an effort to raise admission standards for first-time entering freshmen at the public senior colleges and universities in South Carolina. The first established a number of high school courses that students must complete successfully prior to admittance, and the second required that the public senior colleges and universities establish minimum admission standards for entering freshmen. The standards that were developed are based on Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores.

With regard to the prerequisites policy, the compliance rates since the 1988 implementation of the policy have steadily improved with the exception of one or two institutions. Minimum admission standards have remained relatively steady over the past four years, although four institutions did raise admission standards once during that period, and three have indicated their intent to raise standards effective Fall 1993. Of particular concern are the exceedingly low SAT scores accepted by the USC two-year institutions.

**Policy Recommendations**

Recommendations regarding next steps for reconsidering the current policies for minimum SAT score requirements for admitting first-time freshmen at the State's public senior institutions are guided by the following considerations:

- o The setting of statewide admissions policy in terms of requiring minimum SAT scores is rare in the Southeastern region.
- o While the objective of increasing admission standards is certainly a worthy one, the Commission should take care to ensure that any policy established does not incur unintended consequences such as mitigating against institutional missions to serve the needs of the State or a particular region therein or against

institutional endeavors to increase the diversity of their student populations.

- o Minimum SAT score requirements, and correspondingly, average SAT scores for first-time entering freshmen, have changed very little in the past four years and appear low compared to other states from which data has been collected.
- o Convincing research exists indicating that SAT scores alone are not the best predictors of student success in college and that additional information should be used when making admission decisions.
- o Institutional retention and graduation data should be a factor as the Commission reconsiders admission policies.
- o There is a variance in the way average SAT scores are reported to the Commission.

Given the above considerations, and recognizing that admissions criteria are established by the individual institutions, the Committee on Academic Affairs recommended that the Commission should refrain from suggesting specific admission standards but should continue to monitor admission practices in South Carolina institutions of higher education. As a part of that monitoring process, the Commission will look for evidence that the standards set by an institution are in keeping with the mission of that institution. Accordingly, it is expected that those institutions that have indicated that their primary mission is to serve potential students in a specific region of the State would have different (and less restrictive) admission standards than institutions which have indicated that their primary mission is to serve potential students from a broader geographical region. Further, it is expected that institutions seeking national and/or international stature would have different (and more restrictive) admission standards than other institutions in the State.

To facilitate and improve the Commission's monitoring process, the Committee recommended that institutions implement the following recommendations:

1. Minimum SAT admission scores should not be required at the five two-year USC institutions except for those students who declare their intent to pursue a four-year degree program offered by a four-year USC institution at a two-year USC institution. This recommendation should be implemented with the Fall 1993 cohort if approved by the Commission.
2. Minimum entry ACT score requirements should be established. Although the number of students for

whom ACT scores are reported is small (325 students, or three percent of the total reported), this number has increased from the number reported in 1991 and will continue to increase as the number of out-of-state students enrolling in South Carolina institutions increases. Commission staff will work with institutional representatives to establish a standard format for reporting minimum ACT score requirements. This recommendation should be implemented with the Fall 1994 cohort if approved by the Commission.

3. According to the institutional responses to the August 1992 questionnaire concerning minimum admission standards, most institutions indicated that the basis for their admission policies was to admit only those students who could successfully complete an undergraduate program at their institutions. Accordingly, institutions should use retention and graduation data when considering revisions to their minimum admission standards, and the Commission should consider institutional retention and graduation data as a part of its monitoring process.

In addition, this data should be used to provide information on students admitted under an alternative admissions program. As this information is not currently collected by the Commission, beginning with their Fall 1994 annual reports to the Commission on minimum admission requirements, institutions should include data showing retention and graduation rates for students admitted beginning Fall 1993 under an alternative admissions program.

4. Beginning with their Fall 1993 annual reports on minimum admission requirements, institutions should report and provide the rationale for the current status of admission standards and any modifications in requirements.
5. Uniform reporting guidelines for the annual SAT/ACT average score reports should be established as follows: Beginning Fall 1994 average SAT/ACT scores should be reported for all first-time entering freshmen except for foreign students and non-traditional students, that is, students who are 21 years of age or older. SAT/ACT scores for students admitted on a provisional basis should be reported separately from students admitted on a regular basis.

It was moved (Whitener), seconded (Williams), and voted that the recommendations of the Committee be approved.

f. Consideration of Evaluation of Academic Libraries



Program reviews in disciplinary areas for all four-year public institutions have triggered substantial commentary from the external evaluators on the appropriateness of library resources for producing effective, desirable learning outcomes in students enrolled in these programs. Because of this, the Commission authorized the undertaking of a statewide study of library resources in 1991-92.

The Committee recommended:

1. The recommendations of the consultants' report be adopted.
2. The Commission establish the statewide Library Directors' Forum, to include USC's Law and Medical School Library directors, at the earliest opportunity as a consultative body which reports to the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs as described in Recommendation #2.
3. The Library Directors' Forum (working through the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs) be charged with developing for the Commission's consideration a detailed statewide library enhancement plan to be submitted in the following approximate states:
  - 3a. Request and assess facilities' reports; develop a feasible timetable for implementation of statewide electronic network, using the Clemson/USC-Columbia/Coastal plan as the basis for linkage; submit criteria to be considered for the statewide implementation of new library programs/services which evolve on individual campuses; consider the merging of neighboring institutional libraries. (Consultant Recommendations 1, 4, 11, 14) (Target Date: June 1993)
  - 3b. Establish increase funding guidelines for libraries within the ACRL guidelines outlined by the consultants' report; identify and recommend that purchase of compatible software for the assessment of library collections; develop a timetable for the total computerization of card catalogues in all public postsecondary institutions; consider reciprocal book borrowing privileges at every public campus; consider reciprocal book borrowing privileges at every public campus. (Consultant Recommendations 3, 4, 5, 6) (Target Date: June 1994)
  - 3c. Supply costs and timetable for implementing a long-range conservation/preservation program; report on individual institutions' record for

redefinition of levels and pay grades of library support staffs; submit plan for criteria and procedures for the electronic sharing of databases and tests (if the latter is feasible); develop guidelines for incentives for compliance with the plan. (Consultant Recommendations 4, 8, 9, 13) (Target Date: June 1995)

4. In recognition of the role that the USC-Columbia plays as a state resource, the Commission commended the institution for maintaining its library budget during difficult fiscal times.
5. In recognition of the vital role that our technical colleges are playing in the State and of the inadequacies noted in their library collections, the Commission recommended to the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education that it monitor the development and quality of the technical college libraries as a priority.
6. The Commission requested the staff to revise and strengthen the appropriate section in the Policy and Procedure Concerning New Programs manual, working in conjunction with the Library Directors' Forum, to assure that adequate evaluation of library support for new programs is provided in the program proposals.
7. The Commission refer the issue of the composition of the Executive Committee of the Library Director's Forum to the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs for an appropriate recommendation.

It was moved (Whitener), seconded (Williams), and voted that the recommendations of the Committee be approved.

**g. Consideration of Report on Distance Learning**

The Advisory Committee on Academic Programs was charged by the Commission with the responsibility of coordinating offerings of, and establishing priorities among, courses to be offered through ETV's distance learning capabilities, especially as these might exceed ETV's delivery capabilities. The final version of the "Distance Education Policy Statement" and the final version of the "Distance Education Procedure Statement" were presented.

Mr. Sheheen complimented Dr. H. McLean Holderfield, State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education and chairman of the ad hoc committee on distance education, Dr. Ruth Marshall, Director of Higher Education at ETV, and other members of the Advisory

Committee's ad hoc committee on distance education for their excellent work.

It was moved (Whitener), seconded (Day), and voted that the policy and procedure statements be endorsed and the ad hoc committee on distance education be commended for their work.

**h. Consideration of Process for Considering New Program Proposal Requests Involving Changes in Institutional Mission**

When institutions submit proposals to establish new programs, some of the programs in question may be construed to constitute a change in what has been the customary mission of the institution by raising the level of degree to be offered. The Commission's planning processes have not resolved the issue of who has ultimate authority over defining institutional mission nor has the process of review and refinement of institution missions initiated under the Commission's planning processes yet been completed.

When asked whether the review process for institutional missions should be completed prior to the Commission's consideration of proposals for new programs which have not up to now been a part of the institution's mission, the Commission's Committee on Planning referred the matter to the Committee on Academic Affairs for a recommendation.

The Committee on Academic Affairs recommended to the Commission the following:

1. Institutions seeking approval to offer programs at levels above those which have been previously approved should be required to request of and receive from the Commission through its Planning Committee and related planning processes approval for a change in status (i.e., new level of degree offered), prior to submitting the program proposal;
2. The Policies and Procedures Concerning New Programs manual should be amended to require that changes in the level of program to be offered by any given institution be approved by the Commission through its planning processes prior to the submission and consideration of the program proposal;
3. The five master's programs presently scheduled for consideration in April should be exempted from this policy to the extent that they be considered on schedule, and if approved by the Committee on Academic Affairs and the Commission, approved with implementation authorized only at such time as the Committee on Planning and the Commission determine whether graduate programs at the master's level should be offered by USC-Aiken, USC-Coastal, and USC-Spartanburg.

It was moved (Whitener), seconded (Williams), and voted (11-1) that the recommendation of the Committee be approved.

i. **Summary of Annual Reports from Centers of Excellence**

A summary of the objectives and achievements as described in the 1991-92 annual reports for the three Centers of Excellence (USC-Coastal, Furman, and USC-Columbia) that received EIA funds during that period was presented.

This report was submitted for information purposes.

3.03 **Report of Committee on Access and Equity**

Mr. Tolbert, chairman of the Committee on Access and Equity, reported on the Eighth Annual Conference on Access and Equity held on February 18-19, 1993 at the Embassy Suites Hotel in Columbia.

The total number of participants was 229 with 42 colleges and universities represented. The co-hosting institutions, Midlands Technical College and the University of South Carolina, joined with the CHE staff to present an excellent Conference that was one of the best ever.

The staff received comments and suggestions for revision of the Access and Equity Program from Conference participants. The staff is now preparing recommendations for the revision of the Program which should be presented to the full Commission in May, 1993.

3.05 **Report of Committee on Facilities**

Ms. Kinon, chairman of the Committee on Facilities, reported on the following matters:

a. **Consideration of a Study of Parking Adequacy at South Carolina's Public Colleges and Universities**

A study of parking adequacy at South Carolina's public colleges and universities has been conducted. It was decided that the best approach would be one which permitted analysis by the user categories of faculty and staff, residential students, and commuter students. The numbers would be used to calculate the number of parking spaces needed for each group of users applying published guidelines or ratios of users per parking space.

An analysis indicates that the vast majority of our colleges and universities have an inadequate supply of available parking. The summary data must be tempered by the fact that the analysis rests on promulgated parking standards or ratios. These are only guidelines.

The Committee recommended:

1. Each institution is called upon to review this analysis of its parking adequacy and forward a response to Commission staff no later than July 1, 1993. The purposes of this review are to refine the surplus or (deficit) calculated

and, if applicable, develop an outline of proposed future remedies.

2. The Commission on Higher Education will attempt to be more diligent in its review of facility proposals to better identify implications which might create new capital requirements as a result of their approval. To this end, an additional criterion should be added to the "Justification" criteria contained in the Commission's Policies & Procedures for the Review and Approval of Permanent Improvements and Lease Requests. This criterion is as follows:

Explain the degree to which the proposed project heightens existing needs or creates a new demand for additional capital projects not yet proposed. For example, when new student housing is proposed, is existing food service capacity adequate to feed these students? Is existing residential student parking adequate? Is the existing infrastructure adequate to accommodate the proposed project?

3. Upon completion of the campus master planning survey to be conducted this year, policy recommendations will be formulated as appropriate to address parking.

It was moved (Kinon), seconded (Whitener), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be approved.

**b. The Citadel - Barracks Replacement**

The Citadel is asking to increase the budget of this previously approved project by \$10,606,306 to a new total of \$11,771,306. The architectural and engineering work to replace the four barracks has been completed, and the College is now ready to proceed with construction of the first replacement barracks. It is estimated that the entire barracks replacement, including this first new facility, will cost approximately \$49.8 million.

The new budget will consist of \$10,686,306 in barracks revenue bonds, \$853,763 in excess debt service (barracks revenue bonds), \$131,237 in barracks operating revenue, and \$100,000 in capital project funds.

The Committee recommended that this project increase be approved as proposed.

It was moved (Kinon), seconded (Tolbert), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be approved.

**c. Clemson University**

**1) University Office Building Construction**

Clemson University is seeking approval to construct a 37,600 gross square feet office building and 200 space parking lot at a cost of \$3,260,00 consisting of: \$200,000 - A & E; \$350,000 - Site Work; \$2,440,000 - Construction; \$60,000 - Labor Costs; and \$210,000 - Contingency. This project will

be financed with plant improvement bonds. This facility will be located on Highway 76 on the edge of campus and will replace space being leased in three facilities.

The Committee recommended that this project be approved as proposed.

It was moved (Kinon), seconded (Tolbert), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be approved.

2) **Byrnes Hall - Replace Elevators**

Clemson University is requesting permission to replace elevators in Byrnes Hall. The total estimated cost for this project is \$270,000 which is to be funded with Housing Improvement Fees.

The Committee recommended that this request be approved as proposed by the University.

It was moved (Kinon), seconded (Whitener), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be approved.

3) **Wannamaker Hall - Renovate Restrooms**

Clemson University is requesting permission to establish a project to renovate restrooms in Wannamaker Hall. The total estimated cost for this project is \$355,000 which is to be funded with Housing Improvement Fees.

The Committee recommended that this request be approved as proposed by the University.

It was moved (Kinon), seconded (Whitener), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be approved.

**D. MUSC - Building E Renovations for Animals - Budget Increase**

The Medical University has requested authorization to increase the budget of this previously approved project by \$870,000, from \$700,000 to \$1,570,000. This increase is funded with \$755,000 in excess debt service and \$115,000 from physician generated fees. The improvements were necessary to meet federal requirements until new space is completed in the Biomedical/Animal Research Facility currently under construction.

The Committee recommended that this requested increase, which funded work already completed under emergency procurement, be recognized and approved.

It was moved (Kinon), seconded (Whitener), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be approved.

**e. USC-Columbia**

1) **Housing Renovations - Establish Project**

USC-Columbia is requesting permission to perform interior renovations to Preston and Sims dormitory facilities. Total

project cost is \$1,200,000, to be funded from Housing Operating Revenues.

The Committee recommended that this request be approved.

It was moved (Kinon), seconded (Day), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be approved.

2) College of Nursing, TV Studio/Teleconferencing Center

USC-Columbia is proposing to renovate 3,400 gross square feet in the College of Nursing building to provide a television studio/teleconferencing center. This project will cost an estimated \$276,500 consisting of the following: \$30,000 - A & E; \$136,000 - Renovation; \$70,000 - Equipment; and \$13,950 - Contingency. The source of funds is appropriated State.

The Committee recommended that this renovation request be approved as proposed.

It was moved (Kinon), seconded (Whitener), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be approved.

f. USC-Sumter - Administration Building/Land Acquisition

USC-Sumter is requesting authorization to accept title to its Administration Building and the property on which it sits. This property is currently owned by the Sumter County Commission on Higher Education, which will transfer the property to the University at no cost.

The University has had an informal policy in recent years that title to all newly constructed facilities, or facilities which received major renovations, would be transferred to the University along with the land underneath the structures. The University's Legal Department is studying the issue of property ownership system-wide. Once it has determined the exact properties that need to be transferred, the University is planning to take appropriate action. This matter will be reviewed further pending receipt of the report of the Committee to Study Two-year Education in October 1993.

The Committee recommended that this acquisition be approved as proposed. Further, the Committee asked that staff report the findings of the USC Legal Department and the Committee to Study Two-Year Education to the Committee on Facilities prior to February 1994.

It was moved (Kinon), seconded (Tolbert), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be approved.

g. Winthrop University - Conservatory of Music Renovation/Addition - Budget Increase

Winthrop University is requesting approval of a budget increase to the Conservatory of Music Renovation/Addition project. The \$400,000 increase will be funded with excess debt service, adding

to the \$1,900,000 in capital improvement bond funds authorized in the 1988 Capital Bond Act.

The Committee recommended that this request be approved as proposed.

It was moved (Kinon), seconded (McMullen), and voted that the recommendation of the Committee be approved.

#### h. Greenville Technical College

##### 1) Nursing/Science Building - Budget Increase

Greenville Technical College is asking to increase the budget of this previously approved project by \$1,544,711, from \$5,000,000 to \$6,544,711. The increase will fund an additional 11,000 square feet for this new facility. The increase brings the total funding from local funds (Greenville County appropriation) to \$3,844,711, adding to the \$2,700,000 in funds allocated in the 1991 Capital Improvement Bond Act.

The Committee recommended that this increase be approved as proposed.

It was moved (Kinon) and seconded (Ramage) that the recommendation be approved.

Mr. Gallagher expressed concern about a major capital improvement to a building when the State doesn't have title to the property. A substitute motion was made (Gallagher), seconded (Williams), and voted that the budget increase be approved provided that it is legally appropriate.

##### 2) Sale of 32.31 Acre Tract

Greenville Technical College is requesting authorization to sell a 32.31 acre tract of land located near Simpsonville along I-385. The land has an appraised value of \$1,961,000, which by State policy is the minimum for which it can be sold.

The Committee recommended that Greenville Technical College be authorized to dispose of this property in accordance with State policy.

It was moved (Kinon), seconded (Whitener), and voted that the recommendation be approved.

#### 4. Report of the Commissioner

Mr. Sheheen reported that the Ways and Means Committee is considering the distribution of the \$30 million non-recurring cut to higher education in FY 1993-94. Dr. James Moeser, University of South Carolina, presented a formal endorsement for presentation to the General Assembly. The endorsement called for 1) full funding for higher education; 2) if the \$30 million non-recurring funds is not available, all state agencies share equally in the loss; 3) protect higher education proportion of catalogue sales tax.



Dr. Askins urged the Commission members to contact their congressional representatives on this matter.

It was moved (Williams), seconded (Day), and voted to support Dr. Moeser's endorsement.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Janet K. Stewart".

Janet K. Stewart  
Recording Secretary