

MINUTES OF MEETING
OF
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

August 2, 1973
10:30 a. m. - 12:30 p. m.

PRESENT:

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Mr. John K. Cauthen
Mr. Gedney M. Howe, Jr.
Mr. F. Mitchell Johnson
Mr. T. Eston Marchant
Dr. Harrison L. Peebles
Mr. Alex M. Quattlebaum
Mr. Y. W. Scarborough, Jr.
Mr. Fred R. Sheheen
Dr. R. Cathcart Smith, Chairman
Mr. I. P. Stanback
Mr. T. Emmet Walsh

GUESTS

Dr. William Adams-Smith
Dr. A. S. Belcher
General J. W. Duckett
Dr. Robert C. Edwards
Mr. A. D. Hutto
Dr. Larry Jackson
Dr. H. A. Jenkins
Mr. Mac Johnson
Dr. William M. McCord
Mr. J. Lacy McLean
Dr. William H. Patterson
Mr. O. Stanley Smith, Jr.
Mr. P. C. Smith
Dr. Walter D. Smith
Dr. Theodore S. Stern
Dr. Charles B. Vail

STAFF

Dr. Howard R. Boozer
Mr. William C. Jennings
Dr. Frank E. Kinard
Mr. James R. Michael
Mr. T. Scott Derrick
Dr. Charles S. Davis

I. Approval of Minutes of July 12, 1973, Meeting of Commission on Higher Education

Chairman Smith noted that Dr. Boozer officially assumed duties with the Commission on July 1, 1973, instead of August 1, 1973, as stated in Item I of the Minutes of the July 12 meeting of the Commission. A motion was made (Sheheen) and seconded (Stanback) and unanimously adopted that the Minutes of the July 12, 1973 meeting of the Commission on Higher Education be approved with the correction of Dr. Boozer's date of employment.

II. Appointment of Dr. Charles S. Davis as Special Consultant to the Commission

Chairman Smith announced that Dr. Charles S. Davis has been appointed Special Consultant to the Commission for a period of one year beginning August 2, 1973.

III. Consideration of Appropriation Formula for 1974-75

Mr. Jennings presented to the Commission the following proposed schedule for review of the appropriation requests from the colleges and universities:

- October 9 - Meeting of the Commission with college and university presidents to review individual appropriation requests
- October 10 - Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Commission to review college and university appropriation requests
- October 16 - Meeting of the Commission for final review and recommendations on college and university appropriation requests
- October 24 - Presentation by the Commission to the Budget and Control Board of college and university appropriation requests

A motion was made (Marchant) and seconded (Sheheen) that the proposed schedule for review of the college and university appropriation requests be approved. The motion was passed unanimously.

In general discussion it was noted that the regularly scheduled Commission meeting on October 4 possibly could be eliminated because of the additional meetings in October. Dr. Smith will report further on this at the September meeting.

Following adoption of the schedule Mr. Jennings explained the thirteen steps comprising the proposed 1974-75 appropriation formula.

In general discussion on Step 2, which differentiated courses into upper and lower divisions to determine faculty-student ratios, it was pointed out that the academic vice presidents unanimously supported the 1973-74 formula approach which did not differentiate between upper and lower divisions. A number of presidents also felt there should be no formula distinctions between upper and lower division courses, except for extension or branches of the universities.

Mr. Walsh stated that he could not accept as valid the reasoning that it does not cost less to teach lower division courses than upper division courses, feeling there should be a strong demarkation between the two. It was suggested by Mr. Walsh that this point be studied further in the next year. Mr. Johnson spoke in favor of eliminating the distinctions now but felt that as the community college concept developed the situation could be re-evaluated.

Following further discussion a motion was made (Cauthen) and seconded (Johnson) that differentiation in the faculty-student ratios at the upper and lower divisions, except for extension or branches of the universities, be postponed indefinitely, and that faculty-student ratios adopted in the 1973-74 formula also be used for 1974-75. The motion was passed unanimously.

In discussion on Step 5, faculty support, it was the consensus of the Commission that a justification study should be made to determine the rationale for the differences in percentages between the universities, colleges and regional campuses for faculty support (proposed for 1974-75: 40% for universities; 35% for colleges and regional campuses). In this connection a motion was made (Sheheen) and seconded (Johnson) and unanimously adopted that a study be made prior to next year's formula adoption to determine if there is a justification, and if so what are the factors, for the different percentages for faculty support for the universities, colleges and regional campuses.

Following discussion on Step 6, percentage of instructional costs added for libraries, it was suggested by Mr. Quattlebaum that the staff make a detailed study of all libraries in the higher education institutions in the state to determine the position of each in relation to national standards. It was agreed that this could be done.

Other suggestions for further refining the formula included finding a better solution for funding public service activities (now included in Step 8 with a number of other items) and by motion (Sheheen) which was seconded (Stanback) and unanimously adopted to add in Step 13 that colleges as well as universities may request funding for other separately budgeted research.

President Stern commented in concluding discussion that when the formula was initially established it was agreed that the boards of trustees of the institutions would have complete authority and responsibility to determine how the lump sum appropriations yielded by the formula would be used in their respective institutions and he wished to reaffirm the position that this authority be retained by the individual boards. Chairman Smith stated that this position has not changed and there was never any doubt that the boards of trustees would retain this authority.

In conclusion, the following statement and motion was made by Mr. Marchant:

"I assure all concerned that we at the University of South Carolina have some concern about the details of the formula similar to those expressed by other institutions. However, while I think we all recognize the potential imperfections, I think the present formula is considerably better than what I might call the previous emotional justifications for the budgets, and as a result I want to go on record as indicating that the University of South Carolina supports the present proposed formula, as amended today, with the stipulation that we should continue to make substantial improvements to bring the formula closer to representing both the similarities and dissimilarities of the state universities and colleges. I so move that the proposed present formula, as amended today, be approved."

Mr. Sheheen seconded the motion which was passed. Mr. Quattlebaum was opposed and asked to be recorded as voting no because he feels the Commission is not taking as active a part in the refinement of the formula as it should.

IV. Report of the Health Affairs Committee of the Commission

Prior to the report of the Health Affairs Committee on the designation of an applicant to apply for Veterans Administration funds for medical education, Chairman Smith made the following statement:

"At this time I want to make a short personal statement as I call for the recommendation of the Health Affairs Committee, composed of Fred Sheheen, Chairman, Gedney Howe and Hugh Chapman, who unfortunately could not be here today.

"I believe that it is self-evident that the people of this state are by an overwhelming majority vitally and intensely desirous of making a significant improvement in the availability, the quality, and the cost of medical care. Even though some may not be personally confronted with this difficulty at the moment, they most certainly are aware of acquaintances who do face such a problem. It is not enough to say that the problem has been blown up out of proportion by social planners and/or politicians. This problem can become a very real one to any of us without warning and with the speed of lightning. So, like it or not, the leadership of this state has had to face up to this situation.

"Therefore, it is apparent that we are generally in agreement that something better needs to be done to attempt to overcome this question of supply and demand for health care. The means by which this State chooses to solve this dilemma has really been the bone of contention. If the solution had been obvious or

easy it would have long since been adopted.

"The search for a solution has been long and arduous. We have studied, digested, regurgitated, swallowed, and digested again to the point that the body politic is becoming, indeed, sick of the study process and is in dire need of being admitted to the intensive care unit for definitive action.

"The time has now come to decide upon a course of action and act. We have arrived at a fork in the road and must choose which path we shall take.

"I trust that today this Commission will once again forthrightly face up to our responsibilities. I doubt that we will have unanimity, but after all that is what a democracy is all about."

Following Chairman Smith's statement Mr. Sheheen, Chairman of the Health Affairs Committee, presented the Committee's report (Exhibit A) and a letter from Mr. Chapman, a member of the Committee who could not be present, supporting the report (Exhibit B).

Following presentation of the Committee's report a motion was made (Sheheen) and seconded (Howe) that the report be adopted by the Commission.

Before vote on the motion Dr. Peeples read a statement on the position of the Medical University in the area of health education in the state and the need for a second medical school (Exhibit C). In conclusion, Dr. Peeples stated that by consensus, members of the Board of Trustees have urged him not to support a resolution or statement that would encourage a second medical school unless the needs for a second school had been amply demonstrated, and that he did not feel these needs had been amply demonstrated. Dr. Peeples stated that he would therefore abstain from voting on the motion to adopt the report of the Health Affairs Committee, which recommended that the University of South Carolina be authorized to apply for Veterans Administration funding for a second medical school provided certain stipulations in the report were met.

In commenting on the report, Mr. Marchant stated that he would have preferred a direct, clear and unencumbered recommendation on the subject but would hasten to add that the vitally important and overriding point is whether or not an attempt is going to be made through the federal route for more and better health care delivery for the people of the state. Mr. Marchant further stated that if the motion to adopt the report is approved he would pursue the matter with the Board of Trustees to determine the most expeditious way to handle it, and recommend that they accede to the

provisions of the report with the stipulated conditions. Mr. Marchant expressed the hope that the stipulations set forth in the report would not jeopardize either the application processes of the University of South Carolina nor the implementation processes. In conclusion, Mr. Marchant stated he did not think it was appropriate for the Committee to get into and include in the report the two new University of South Carolina programs, School of Public Health and Post Graduate School of Medicine, which were approved and funded by the 1973 General Assembly and will be presented to the Commission at a later date for approval.

Mr. Sheheen stated recommendations in the report on the governance of health education in the state were an attempt to set up an interim arrangement until the question of permanent governance of health education in the state is resolved.

Mr. Sheheen's motion to adopt the report of the Committee was passed. Dr. Peeples abstained from voting.

V. Executive Session

A motion was made (Sheheen) and seconded (Howe) and unanimously adopted that the Commission go into Executive Session to discuss personnel matters.

Elizabeth T. Jumper
Elizabeth T. Jumper
Secretary