

MINUTES OF ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING
OF
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
JULY 3, 1996
10:00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ms. Rosemary H. Byerly
Mr. Bart E. Daniel
Dr. Colgate W. Darden, III
Dr. C. Edward Floyd
Mr. R. Austin Gilbert, Jr.
Mr. Frank Gilbert
Mr. Winfred S. Greene
Dr. W. David Maxwell
Gen. Thomas R. Olsen
Mr. Lewis Phillips
Mr. Bill H. Stern
Mr. Robert B. Whaley

STAFF

Ms. Camille Brown
Mr. Michael L. Brown
Ms. Renca Eshleman
Mr. Charlie FitzSimons
Mr. Ivan F. Guinn
Ms. Margaret L. B. Hicks
Mr. Douglas I. Holleman
Dr. R. Lynn Kelley
Mr. Alan S. Krech
Dr. David Loope
Ms. Lynn W. Metcalf
Dr. Gail M. Morrison
Dr. T. Michael Raley
Mr. Fred R. Sheheen
Mr. John E. Smalls
Dr. Michael Smith
Ms. Yolanda Solone
Dr. Aileen C. Trainer
Dr. Lovely Ulmer-Sottong
Ms. Julia E. Wells

GUESTS

Mr. Harry Bell
Mr. Arthur M. Bjontegard
Dr. C. Leslie Carpenter
Dr. James Carper
Dr. John Cormier
Ms. Susan DeWitt
Ms. Katherine Fanning

Mr. John L. Finan
Mr. Robert C. Gallagher
Dr. Carol Z. Garrison
Mr. Ralph Green
Dr. Wanda Hayes
Dr. James L. Hudgins
Dr. David Hunter
Dr. Jim Kirk
Col. Ben W. Legare
Mr. Manning N. Lomax
Dr. Harry G. Matthews
Dr. Michael McCall
Mr. J. P. McKee
Dr. Judy Prince
Mr. William T. Putnam
Dr. Dewitt B. Stone, Jr.
Dr. John C. Sutusky
Mr. W. E. Troublefield, Jr.
Dr. Lee A. Vickers
Mr. Ed Zobel

MEMBERS OF THE PRESS

Ms. Susan Biggers
Mr. T. C. Hunter
Mr. Bill Robinson

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

1. Introductions

Following the introduction of guests, each member of the restructured Commission introduced him/her self and provided some brief biographical information.

2. Organizational Issues

A. Meeting Schedule

The members reviewed the "Tentative Schedule of Commission Meetings in 1996." It was moved (Stern), seconded (Phillips), and voted to adopt the schedule until the end of the year.

B. Campus Visits

Following a brief discussion, it was moved (Whaley), seconded (Olsen) and voted to hold meetings at colleges and universities twice a year, once in the Fall and once in the Spring.

C. Commission "Rules and Procedures"

Mr. Sheheen proposed three changes to the "Rules and Procedures" under which the Commission operates. The first proposed revision was designed to reflect the change in the law with respect to the Chairperson's appointment and to provide a process for election of a Vice Chairperson.

It was moved (Maxwell), seconded (Phillips), and voted to change Section I.3. to read, "The Chairperson will preside at all meetings of the Commission. If the Chairperson is absent, the Vice Chairperson will preside. The Chairperson is appointed by the Governor for a term of four years with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Vice Chairperson will be elected annually in July and may serve no more than four consecutive years in that capacity." It was agreed by consensus to entertain nominations and to elect a Vice Chairperson at the meeting on July 11.

The second proposed revision was designed to move the appointment of standing committee members to July in order to make such appointments correspond more closely with changes in Commission membership.

It was moved (Stern) and seconded (Whaley) that Section III.2.b. be changed to move the month of appointment of standing committee members from January to July. Discussion as to the method of appointment of standing committee chairs ensued. It was then moved (Stern) and seconded (Whaley) to amend the motion to state that the Commission chairperson would appoint the standing committee chairs for the first year and that thereafter standing committees would elect their own chairs. The amendment was approved. The amended motion that Section II.2.b. read, "Members of standing committees will be appointed by the Chairperson annually, at the July meeting or as soon thereafter as possible. Members may be reappointed. In July of 1996, standing committee chairpersons will be named by the Commission Chairperson; thereafter, each standing committee will elect its own chairperson" was approved. The Chairman suggested that if each Commission member would indicate his/her preferences for standing committee assignments before the next meeting, he would try to name the standing committees on July 11.

The third proposed revision would have added a paragraph to Section IV.1 requiring Commission members to notify the Chairperson if they wished reimbursement for travel other than to official meetings prior to that travel. It was agreed to leave the reimbursement policy as stated in the current "Rules and Procedures" and to ask the Commission staff to provide "broad guidelines" on when Commission members will be reimbursed.

D. Staff Organization

1. Senior Management Personnel and Assignments

Mr. Sheheen briefly reviewed the basic divisional structure of the Commission staff, introducing each of the associate commissioners and describing the areas for which they were responsible.

2. Search Committee

It was moved (Floyd) and seconded (Greene) that a search committee be appointed and a search held for Commissioner of Higher Education.

Mr. Daniel asked for clarification of the motion. Dr. Floyd indicated that, since this was a new Commission, he felt that everything should be examined from the top down. He further stated that the current Commissioner could certainly apply for the position and, if it was decided that he was doing a good job, could be selected. The motion was approved by a vote of 6 to 4, with Floyd, Greene, Whaley, Daniel, Byerly, and Stern in favor and Olsen, Darden, Phillips, and Maxwell opposed. Dr. Floyd requested that he not be on the search committee, and Mr. Gilbert indicated that he would appoint the search committee after lunch.

3. Commission Budget

Mr. Sheheen reviewed the Commission budget for the information of the new Commission. There was question about the "Professor of the Year" money, and staff confirmed that the funds had been increased from \$5,000 to \$15,000 to provide for a separate winner from the two-year institutions as well as to provide some awards for finalists in the selection process. A second question dealt with where the Commission might obtain funds to provide support for outside experts to assist with performance funding measures. Mr. Sheheen indicated that funds could be found in the Commission budget.

E. Committee Structure

Mr. Sheheen briefly described the current committee structure for the Commission and, at Mr. Gilbert's request, explained a proposed new structure with standing committees as follows: 1) Fiscal/Facilities/Planning and Assessment; 2) Academic Affairs and Student Services; 3) Access and Equity/Licensing/Veteran's Affairs/Special Projects; and 4) Executive Committee (consisting of the Commission Chair and Vice Chair, along with chairs of standing committees). After considerable discussion, it was agreed that Commission members would indicate their preferences to the Chairman, who would appoint the members to one or two committees depending upon their ability to participate in such work. Dr. Carol Garrison referred the Commission to the law and asked whether the Commission was going to use the Executive Committee as the standing Committee on Planning as required. Mr. Sheheen explained that the former Executive Committee had delegated that responsibility to a standing committee

chaired by the Vice Chair of the Commission. After some discussion, the new Commission decided to continue to delegate planning matters to a standing committee until such time as this procedure caused problems. It was moved, seconded, and voted to approve the new committee structure. It was agreed that Commission members would leave their committee preferences with the Chairman at the end of the meeting so that he could make assignments at the next meeting.

While no action was required, Mr. Sheheen mentioned that it would be helpful if committees could plan their reporting schedule on a staggered basis to avoid overly lengthy Commission meetings.

1. New Attendance Requirements for Members

Mr. Sheheen referred the Commission members to the attendance requirements that had been approved by the General Assembly, and briefly reviewed those requirements. It was agreed that Commission would review those new requirements and develop rules for their implementation as appropriate.

F. Executive Session

It was moved (Stern), seconded (Whaley), and voted that the Commission go into executive session to discuss personnel matters.

Following the Executive Session, the meeting continued as follows:

G. Review of Current Statutory Authority of the Commission, Not Including Provisions of the New Legislation

Using a series of overheads, Mr. Sheheen provided a basic orientation on the composition, statutory authority, and general procedures of the Commission.

H. Review of New Legislation, Mandates, and Timetable

1. Section-by-Section Review

With the assistance of Mr. Sheheen, the Commission members reviewed the requirements of the 1996 Commission legislation. A timetable for implementation of performance funding was presented. There was a question as to whether the criteria for performance funding could be changed, based on experience with them. Mr. Sheheen indicated that this would be possible, but would require taking the new criteria back through the Administrative Procedures Act. In response to a question, Mr. Whaley indicated that the committee that drafted the report on which the legislation was based believed that institutions that failed to meet standards should be given time and credit for incremental improvement before they would be penalized financially.

2. Plan for Developing and Implementing Performance Funding Provisions

A question was raised as to how the Commission would involve the business community in the development of the performance funding measures. Mr. Gilbert described his plan to write letters to appropriate constituencies requesting the names of individuals to serve on three committees, each of which would develop measures for three of the nine

critical success factors. Some constituencies that would be included would be CHE members; former CHE members; public college and university presidents and USC deans; trustees statewide including members of the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education; faculty through the Conference of University Faculty Chairs; the business community, including the Business Advisory Council and others; the House and Senate Education and Finance Committees; the Office of the Governor; and CHE staff for administrative support.

Dr. Garrison proposed an alternate plan whereby four committees would be created, each to represent a different type of institution as described in the legislation. Each committee would examine all of the critical success factors and performance indicators for its type of institution, and would feed its proposed measures to a steering committee that could ensure coordination across sectors. Mr. McCall indicated that he supports Dr. Garrison's proposal. Dr. Garrison added that the four committee chairs might be included on the steering committee.

The Commission agreed that the staff would write up proposals for consideration at the meeting on July 11. Mr. Sheheen closed this part of the discussion by pointing out that a number of constituent groups that were not specifically mentioned should have input into these committees.

3. Discussion of Implementation of New Institutional Budget Review Provisions

Mr. Sheheen pointed out that there is a new provision of the law that requires all of the institutions and the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education to submit annual budget requests to the Commission. He further stated that there is a variety of interpretations of the intent of this provision, ranging from the suggestion that the Commission would approve these budgets to the suggestion that it would only receive these budgets for comment and review. Mr. Whaley indicated that it was his understanding that the Commission was to do more than simply review and comment on the budgets. The Commission members agreed that the staff should write up a range of alternatives for handling the budgets and that these alternatives should be ready for discussion at the July 11 meeting.

All business having been completed, the meeting was adjourned.