

MINUTES OF MEETING
OF
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

May 1, 1975
10:30 a. m. - 1:25 p. m.

PRESENT:

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Dr. R. Cathcart Smith, Chairman
Mr. Howard L. Burns
Mr. Hugh M. Chapman
Dr. Marianna W. Davis
Mr. Gedney M. Howe, Jr.
Brig. Gen. Larkin H. Jennings, Jr.
Mr. F. Mitchell Johnson
Mr. Paul W. McAlister
Mr. T. Eston Marchant
Mr. Alex M. Quattlebaum
Mr. Fred R. Sheheen
Mr. O. Stanley Smith
Mr. I. P. Stanback
Mr. T. Emmet Walsh

STAFF

Dr. Howard R. Boozer
Mrs. Clara W. Evans
Dr. George P. Fulton
Mr. William C. Jennings
Dr. Frank E. Kinard
Mr. Alan S. Krech
Mr. Cannon R. Mayes
Mr. John J. Powers
Mrs. Rosita M. Ramsey
Mr. James L. Solomon, Jr.
Mrs. Oma L. Sturkie
Mrs. Gaylon Syrett
Mrs. Judi R. Tillman
Mrs. Cheryl M. Timberlake

GUESTS

Dr. James S. Barrett
Mrs. Ruby T. Bourne
Mr. Corwith Cramer, Jr.
Dr. Keith E. Davis
Dr. Jack J. Early
Mr. James G. Fraser
Mr. W. W. Halligan
Mr. Dan Henderson
Mr. Lachlan L. Hyatt
Dr. Joab M. Lesesne, Jr.
Mr. Chip McKinney
Mr. J. Lacy McLean
Mr. Samuel P. Manning
Sen. Paul M. Moore
Dr. Charles E. Palmer
Dr. George M. Reeves
Dr. R. Wright Spears
Dr. Charles B. Vail

MEMBERS OF THE PRESS

Mr. Ralph Greer
Mr. Robert Hitt
Ms. Warren McInnis

I. Approval of Minutes of April 3, 1975, Commission Meeting

Chairman Smith stated that Mr. McAlister had requested that revisions be made in Item VI (Other Business) on page 8 of the minutes of the April 3 Commission meeting. Substitute pages 7-9, reflecting those changes, were distributed.

Dr. Boozer noted that the following changes had been made:

At the end of the first paragraph, the last two sentences ("He read a statement concerning those recommendations (Exhibit G), and requested that it be made a part of the minutes. He stated that he was not proposing action by the Commission at this time.") were deleted, and the following sentence was substituted: "He stated that it would be unwise and untimely to make any change in appropriations recommendations at this time."

In the second paragraph, the first sentence was amended slightly to read, "Mr. McAlister read a statement (Exhibit G) and moved that it be adopted as a resolution by the Commission on Higher Education." "The motion was seconded by Mr. Johnson," was added following that sentence. "Mr. McAlister was agreeable to this deletion" was added as a new sentence at the end of that paragraph.

The following sentence was added after the second sentence in the final paragraph: "Mr. McAlister replied that if the motion was passed, it would be the action of the Commission and not his, but that he had been consistent throughout all appropriations deliberations that Clemson would appeal directly to the Legislature for restoration of funds."

It was moved (Quattlebaum) and seconded (Sheheen) and unanimously voted to adopt the amended minutes of the April 3, 1975, Commission meeting.

II. Report of Committee on Academic Program Development

Mr. Sheheen reported that the appointment of the Standing Committee on Academic Program Development had necessitated a change in the existing Procedures (adopted in 1968) to define the responsibilities of that Committee in the review process. The Committee adopted, on January 9, 1975, a tentative revision of the Policy and Procedures and referred it to the Council of Presidents of the Public Colleges and Universities for advice and comment. Some revisions were suggested by the Council of Presidents on March 17.

The Standing Committee, at a meeting on April 3 also attended by Dr. Vail, Chairman of the Council of Presidents, adopted revisions to the tentative draft, taking into account the suggestions made by the Council of Presidents. Mr. Sheheen further observed that major changes in the proposed Policy and Procedures with respect to those under which the Commission has operated for the past seven years are three in number:

1. The definition of "new programs" is essentially the same as in the past, except that CHE approval of "minors" is no longer required;

2. An Advisory Committee on Academic Programs, consisting of institutional deans, is formed to give advice and comment to the Standing Committee, in addition to the objective analysis the Committee will continue to ask the staff to prepare on each program;
3. The Standing Committee will meet to review programs in the first month of each quarter. Committee recommendations will normally be made to the Commission at its meeting in the second month of each quarter.

Mr. Sheheen noted that two amendments to the revised Policy and Procedures Concerning New Programs which had been adopted by the Standing Committee on April 3 should be made:

1. In Section 5 of the Procedures, wherein the responsibilities of the proposed Advisory Committee on Academic Programs are defined, it should be made clear that those programs prior review of which is already required by the Advisory Committee on Graduate Teacher Education should be exempted from review by the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs, as is the case for those programs review of which is required by the Health Education Authority; and
2. In response to a request from Dr. Charles E. Palmer, Executive Director of the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education, a sentence should be added specifically stating, as has been the case and is the intent in the future, that programs from institutions under jurisdiction of the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education shall not be considered unless these have been approved by the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education.

It was moved (Sheheen) and seconded (Quattlebaum) that the Policy and Procedures as adopted by the Standing Committee and with the two amendments proposed be adopted to replace the existing Policy and Procedures on this subject. The motion was approved. A copy of the amended Policy and Procedures as adopted is attached as Exhibit A.

III. Consideration of Academic Programs

a. Master of Criminal Justice - University of South Carolina
The staff recommended approval. It was moved (Chapman) and seconded (Stanback) and unanimously voted to adopt the staff recommendation.

b. Baccalaureate Degree Programs - USC-Spartanburg
Dr. Kinard noted that:

1. The University's Board of Trustees, the Spartanburg Branch having attained an enrollment in excess of 1,000 FTE students in Fall, 1974, had given its permission to University staff to plan for the addition of senior-level courses as permitted by Act 1268 of 1972;

2. The USC Board of Trustees approved, at its meeting of January 25, 1975, the implementation in August, 1975, of 12 baccalaureate degree programs at the Spartanburg Branch, subject to the approval of the Commission;
3. President Patterson had transmitted to the Commission on March 10, 1975, a request that 10 of these programs be approved by the Commission;
4. During Commission consideration of this proposal on April 3, 1975, Mr. S. Smith indicated that he was in receipt of a letter dated April 1 from President Lesesne of Wofford College, protesting that insufficient consultation with the private sector had taken place and requesting that cooperative arrangements between the private and public sectors in Spartanburg be considered;
5. The Commission on April 3 deferred action on the programs proposed for USC-Spartanburg until the May 1, 1975, meeting.
6. The University now requests that nine proposed programs be approved, having elected to withdraw the proposed program leading to the Bachelor of General Studies at this time. The nine now proposed are: 1. Business Administration; 2. Biology; 3. Education (specifically Early Childhood, Elementary, Secondary, and Physical Education); 4. English; 5. History; and 6. Psychology.

Dr. Kinard reported further that a number of productive meetings, formal and informal, had been held on this matter, involving representatives of all of the concerned institutions and the CHE staff. Among these were a meeting of private college presidents and University and CHE staff on April 14, meetings of the chief academic officers of all Spartanburg-area institutions and CHE staff on April 15 and on April 29, and a meeting of private college presidents and CHE staff on April 21. He noted that the chief academic officers of the Spartanburg-area institutions had agreed on three immediate areas of possible cooperation, and that detailed discussions on the feasibility of each of these was continuing: sharing of library and audiovisual resources, sharing by joint appointment or otherwise of faculty, and cross-registration of students between and among institutions.

Dr. Kinard also noted that the presidents of the private colleges in the area had requested a further delay of 60 days before further CHE consideration of these programs. The staff, in considering this matter, agreed that some additional delay may be necessary in view of the fact that serious negotiations between institutions in Spartanburg did not begin until April; but that an unreasonably long additional delay would create possible hardships for current or potential students at USC-Spartanburg. The staff therefore recommended that approval of the requested programs be deferred for an additional 30 days, with final action to be taken by the Commission on June 5, 1975.

Chairman Smith noted that the Executive Committee had carefully considered this recommendation and supported it.

It was moved (Sheheen) and seconded (McAlister) that the staff recommendation be adopted.

Mr. Marchant stated USC's position that meaningful and adequate consultations had been accomplished since April 3 and that another 30-day delay would be detrimental to all concerned, including the private sector. It was moved (Marchant) to table the motion and that the Commission approve the programs as recommended by the staff at the April 3 meeting of the Commission.

The Chair recognized the Hon. Samuel P. Manning, member of the House of Representatives, District 32, Spartanburg County. Mr. Manning stated that he supported the four-year program at USC-Spartanburg and felt it would be beneficial to all the institutions of higher learning in the area. He requested that a statement he made on the floor of the House on June 21, 1973, be distributed and made a part of these minutes (Exhibit B). Mr. Manning's statement was made during the debate on the Senate Amendment to H-1801 (the Bill requiring "All State Supported Institutions of Higher Learning to Submit Their Budgets to the State Commission on Higher Education . . ."), and reflected his concern with reference to the effect that that legislation might have on the implementation of third- and fourth-year courses at university branches.

The Chair recognized President Lesesne, who stated that his position should not be interpreted as an attempt to block the development of the Branch as a four-year institution, but rather that this development should not occur until cooperative arrangements had been made between the independent colleges and the public institutions. He noted that this is a Statewide issue which has surfaced in Spartanburg because of the diversity of institutions in proximity to each other. In response to a question, President Lesesne stated that the presidents of the independent colleges in Spartanburg believed that a delay of 60 days would be more realistic than a shorter period, given primarily the fact that May is a busy month for all college officials.

Mr. Sheheen stated that although this is a critical issue, with the resources available to the area, plus those of the Commission, it appeared that the problems should be resolved within thirty days, and noted the staff position that neither the University nor the private institutions nor the people in the area would suffer undue hardship if action on the programs were deferred for an additional thirty days.

Mr. Marchant withdrew his motion to table. Mr. Johnson observed that a delay of sixty days would appear to be a fair and reasonable period of time, and asked how the programs might be harmed by such a delay. Mr. Marchant stated that such a delay would be traumatic to the people of the area, who

needed to know whether baccalaureate degree programs would be available in the fall, and what these would be. He observed that he believed that integration of the programs at the private and public institutions could be worked out more effectively after approval than before.

The Chair recognized Dr. Keith E. Davis, Provost of the University, who noted that no money would be saved by further delay of the programs, because the University has in general already hired the faculty for 1975-76 necessary to staff the programs which have been proposed for implementation, because no new facilities will be required, and because the University has already developed the minimum core majors for a four-year institution at Spartanburg. He urged the Commission to approve the proposed programs, and pledged the good faith cooperation of the University administration in every legitimate way with the private institutions in the area.

The Chair recognized the Hon. Paul M. Moore, District 4, Spartanburg County. Sen. Moore observed that cooperation between the public and private institutions in the Spartanburg area has not always been as close as might be, and that there were many students in the area who showed an interest in postsecondary education who could not afford to attend private institutions. He stated that he is opposed to any actions which might be harmful to private institutions, but that USC-Spartanburg has met the criteria required by law to become a four-year institution. He observed that consortia are costly to taxpayers, and that arrangements requiring students to commute between campuses would be unsatisfactory. He expressed his concern that further delay would place students who have completed third-year courses in the position of not knowing whether, or where, they might attend college in the fall of 1975; and he urged the Commission to approve the programs proposed without further delay.

The Chair recognized the Hon. Daniel S. Henderson, of Spartanburg, member of the Board of Trustees of the University of South Carolina, who stated that interest in this matter throughout the Spartanburg area was intense, and who urged that the Commission not delay further the approval of the proposed programs.

The Chair recognized Mr. Lachlan L. Hyatt, of Spartanburg, who observed that in his opinion a further delay of thirty days would constitute, in effect, a delay of a full year. He indicated his view that the problem is a local one and that leadership in the Spartanburg area can and should see to it that the matter is resolved in a community framework. He questioned, in the light of the provisions of Act 1268 of 1972 authorizing University Branches to add junior- and senior-level courses, and in the light of the opinion of Attorney General McLeod given on June 28, 1973, relative to the Commission's role in that matter, whether the Commission has the authority to address the matter of proposed programs.

Dr. Smith noted that the University of South Carolina had submitted the request for approval of new programs, and that the Commission had not sought to interject itself into this matter. Mr. Sheheen stated that the legal question concerns not only the specific programs proposed but the authority of the Commission and the statutes with respect to higher education in the State in general. He observed that the universities had always submitted for Commission approval programs proposed for the regional and for the main campuses; and noted the action of the USC Board of Trustees on January 25 in adopting regulations guiding the regional campus system. Those regulations include the statement that, "New programs will require approval of the Board of Trustees and the Commission on Higher Education." He also noted that the position of the Commission is that all public institutions must submit proposed new programs to the Commission for approval, in accord with the enabling statute, and that the staff has assured the Commission that the programs under consideration will not be unduly harmed by the recommended delay of thirty days.

In response to a question, Dr. Kinard stated that in his opinion the negotiations begun in April could be focused on contractual arrangements which would be mutually acceptable to the institutions, and that with an additional thirty days, firm arrangements could be proposed. He noted that if legal problems should yet arise that could not be resolved within the specified period, these could at least be identified.

Mr. S. Smith noted that President Lesesne had not specifically asked him to bring the matter of private college involvement before the Commission, but that he had chosen to do so. President Lesesne requested that the record show that he had become aware of the specific programs proposed only through the agenda of the Commission's April meeting, that he had consulted with Mr. McLean, and had then written his letter of April 1 to Mr. S. Smith, just prior to leaving on an out-of-state trip.

An amendment was moved (Marchant) and seconded (Jennings) that the programs be approved with a thirty-day delay in implementation. Mr. Sheheen noted that the original proposal from the University called for implementation of the proposed programs in August, 1975, and asked what the effect of the proposed amendment would be. Mr. Marchant replied that one effect would be reassurance of the student body and of the constituency in Spartanburg who needed such clarification.

Mr. Walsh noted that the Commission is not questioning the right of USC-Spartanburg to add senior-level courses, but is concerned that programs continue to be submitted to the Commission for approval as required by law. He observed that in the future, when programs are proposed in an area where several institutions are located, detailed prior consultation would help to alleviate such problems. He indicated that he shared the concern expressed by the Council of Presidents in a formal memorandum

to the Commission dated May 27, 1974 (Minutes, June 6, 1974, Exhibit A), in which the Council stated, "The State is threatened with a proliferation of two- and four-year institutions which, if not checked, will soon dilute our efforts in higher education so as to reduce severely the quality of our institutions, or so tax the State that our citizens will find that their institutions of higher education have become impossible burdens."

It was moved (Burns) to table the amendment. The motion to table was approved with two dissenting votes.

The motion to adopt the staff recommendation was approved, with nine voting in favor and four opposed. Mr. Marchant requested that his dissenting vote be recorded.

IV. Report of Executive Director

Dr. Boozer recalled for the members that in July, 1974, the Commission was assigned the responsibility for administering Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, Community Service and Continuing Education. He reported that the Commission staff and the Federal Relations Committee, chaired by Mr. Howe, have become aware of the need for an advisory council concerned with the Title I program to assist in the required in-depth work on proposals. He noted that he and Mr. Powers recently attended a national meeting concerning Title I, and that this is the framework in which most other states operate. He requested that the Commission authorize the Chairman to appoint such an advisory council. It was moved (Quattlebaum) and seconded (Chapman) to approve the request. The motion was adopted.

V. Other Business

Dr. Boozer introduced Mr. Corwith Cramer, Jr., Executive Director of the Sailing Education Association (S.E.A.), Boston, Massachusetts, an organization which operates a college-level educational program, the Sea Semester, involving land-based preparatory courses and a voyage on the schooner R/V Westward, sailing from the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute on Cape Cod, Massachusetts. Dr. Boozer noted that the Westward is in Charleston Harbor during the week of April 28 - May 3, en route from Antigua to Woods Hole. During this week special tours have been arranged for the student apprentices, and Mr. Cramer will show a film and deliver a lecture on the Sea Semester on May 2 at the College of Charleston, to which members of the Commission have been invited.

He noted also that the selection of Charleston for a port of call by the R/V Westward was facilitated by Dr. Fulton, who helped to establish the Sea Semester at Boston University and who presently serves as a member

of the Board of Trustees of S. E. A. Since qualified applicants for the Sea Semester exceed the capacity of the R/V Westward, consideration is being given to the procurement of a second vessel based in the southeast. The College of Charleston has expressed an interest in the Sea Semester and is exploring the possibility of introducing the program for students in South Carolina and other southern states. The Southern Regional Education Board is also interested in the program.

Mr. Cramer delivered a brief lecture and presented slides on the Sea Semester for the Commission, and responded to questions from members.

Dr. Smith reported the death of Mr. Michael's mother on May 2, and suggested that the Commission send flowers. He suggested also that flowers be sent on behalf of the Commission to Miss Barbara Boozer in Lexington County Hospital, where she is recovering from an accident on April 7 in a school-sponsored track event. Both suggestions were approved by acclamation.

Dr. Smith announced that Mr. Wienges had resigned from the Commission, effective April 23, 1975, due to his election that day to the Board of Trustees of the University of South Carolina. It was moved (Sheheen) and seconded (Burns) that the Commission present a framed citation of appreciation to Mr. Wienges. The motion was adopted.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:25 p. m.

Respectfully submitted,



Gaylon Syrett
Recording Secretary