

MINUTES OF MEETING
OF
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

February 5, 1976
10:30 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

PRESENT:

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Dr. R. Cathcart Smith, Chairman
Mr. Howard L. Burns
Mr. M. Calhoun Colvin
Dr. Marianna W. Davis
Mrs. Wanda L. Forbes
Mr. F. Mitchell Johnson
Mr. Paul W. McAllister
Mr. T. Eston Marchant
Mr. William F. Prioleau, Jr.
Mr. Alex M. Quattlebaum
Mr. Y. W. Scarborough, Jr.
Mr. J. Clyde Shirley
Mr. I. P. Stanback
Mr. T. Emmet Walsh

GUESTS

✓ Dr. John Bevan
✓ Dr. Cyril B. Busbee
✓ Dr. Larry A. Jackson
✓ Mr. L. Roger Kirk
✓ Mr. Laine R. Ligon
Mr. J. Lacy McLean
Dr. J. Cordell Maddox
Dr. H. V. Manning
Dr. Charles E. Palmer
Dr. George Silver
Mr. Sterling L. Smith
✓ Dr. Robert H. White
Dr. Glenn E. Whitesides

STAFF

Dr. Howard R. Boozer
Mr. Horace F. Byrne
Mrs. Clara W. Evans
Dr. George P. Fulton
Mr. William C. Jennings
Dr. Frank E. Kinard
Mr. Alan S. Krech
Mr. James R. Michael
Mr. John J. Powers
Ms. Rosita M. Ramsey
Mr. James L. Solomon, Jr.
Mrs. Gaylon Syrett

MEMBERS OF THE PRESS

Mr. Hugh Gibson
Mr. Robert Hitt
Ms. Warren McInnis

I. Introductions

Dr. Smith introduced members of the Commission's Advisory Council of Private College Presidents, who had been invited to meet with the Commission in accordance with the Commission statute.

II. Approval of Minutes of January 8, 1976, Commission Meeting

Dr. Smith distributed copies of a letter which he had received from Mr. McAllister after the January 8 Commission meeting (see minutes, January 8, 1976, Exhibit F). Mr. McAllister requested that the letter be made a part of the January minutes. Dr. Smith noted that the sentence on page 3 of the minutes, "Mr. Scarborough stated that in his opinion the two-year branches of USC should not be allocated

funds on the same basis as the four-year branches, and that the money so generated be allocated to the remaining institutions," should be corrected to read: "Mr. Scarborough stated that in his opinion the four-year branches of USC should be allocated funds on the basis of the two-year branches, and that the additional funds so generated be allocated to the remaining institutions." It was moved (Walsh) and seconded (Quattlebaum) and unanimously voted that Mr. McAlister's letter be made a part of the minutes of the January 8, 1976, Commission meeting, and that the minutes be approved as corrected.

Mr. Johnson referred to page 2 of the January 8 minutes, wherein it was noted that the Budget and Finance Committee and Executive Committee had met immediately prior to the January 8 CHE meeting. He stated that prior to that Commission meeting the Committee on Budget and Finance met in secret without announcing a meeting in which major determinations were made concerning the financial affairs of the institutions, and that such a procedure was in violation of the policy of the Commission. He stated further that if the structure of the Commission is to be altered in the future so as not to include representatives of the institutions as members, if this practice is allowed to continue with members who have no direct connection with the institutions and who do not understand their purpose and intention, and if the financial officers and the chairmen of governing boards of the institutions cannot have an input, in his opinion the financial affairs of higher education in South Carolina will be totally dominated by the financial staff of the Commission. He stated that he had been assured by Dr. Smith publicly, and that it is in the record, that no committee meetings will be scheduled without the chairmen of the boards of trustees of the institutions being informed and having an opportunity to participate. He stated further that all recommendations made by the Executive Committee are approved by the Commission.

Mr. Quattlebaum stated that as a member of the Executive Committee he resented Mr. Johnson's remarks. He stated that he attended committee meetings when requested, but that it was not his position to notify others of the meetings. Mr. Johnson stated that his remarks were not directed toward any member of a committee but were intended as a statement of policy that notification of committee meetings should be automatically made by the staff.

Dr. Smith stated that he would take full blame as Chairman of the Commission, and that he will make every effort in the future to see that Commission members are notified of committee meetings. Mr. Walsh stated that he did not recall an agreement that every institutional representative would be notified of every committee meeting. He added that such a practice would destroy any real committee work, and further that, in his opinion, the Chairman's apology was not necessary, nor were Mr. Johnson's remarks valid. Mr. Shirley stated, and Mr. Walsh concurred, that if the Commission does observe such a policy it should either be changed or the Commission should acknowledge the fact that all business will be conducted by the entire Commission without committee recommendations.

III. Consideration of Funding of Title I Proposals

In Mr. Howe's absence, Mr. Burns reported, on behalf of the Committee on Federal Programs, that the Commission's Advisory Council for Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Community Service and Continuing Education) had reviewed 11 final project proposals from a total of 23 submitted by the

institutions, and recommended that 7, arranged in priority order, be considered for funding for 1976. Because the total amount required to fund the 7 top-rated proposals considerably exceeded the funding capacity of the program in the State for 1976, Council members unanimously agreed to restrict their recommendations for funding to the first six proposals and to authorize the Title I staff to lower the federal allocation on each of those by a percentage adequate to bring them within the funding capacity of the program. The six proposals, totaling \$148,148, recommended to the Commission for fiscal year 1976 funding were: 1. Eau Claire Community Project (ECCP), Columbia College (\$31,123); 2. A Mass Media Approach to Some Problems of the Aging, Newberry College (\$15,750); 3. Substance Abuse: A Multidimensional Approach, College of Charleston (\$13,715); 4. Emergency Department Nurse Training Program, USC (\$38,254); 5. Individual Community Continuing Education (ICCE), Coastal Carolina College (\$33,240); and 6. A Training Program on Code Administration, USC (\$16,102).

Funds approved by the Commission for Title I projects for the current fiscal year are sufficient to support items 1 through 4. It was recommended that the CHE Special Demonstration Project on Community Service and Continuing Education be deferred and that the funds previously approved for that project be used during the current year to support items 5 and 6. It was moved (Burns) and seconded (Quattlebaum) and unanimously voted that the \$50,000 originally allocated for the Special Demonstration Project be rescinded. It was further moved (Burns) and seconded (Marchant) and unanimously voted that funding of items 1 through 6 be approved.

IV. Consideration of Capital Improvement Request (College of Charleston)

Mr. Michael reported that the College of Charleston had submitted a Form E-1 "Application for Approval of a Permanent Improvement Project" for a new residence hall to provide facilities for approximately 266 students. The cost was estimated at \$2,131,000, to be funded through Housing Bonds at no cost to the State. Facilities in existence and approved for construction will house 793 students. The College's objective is to house 30 percent of its enrollment, projecting residence hall requirements of 1,325 beds for 1976 and 1,502 beds for 1977. Currently the College is housing 326 students in temporary facilities and projects 436 living in temporary facilities in Fall, 1976. Mr. Michael noted that in January, 1970, the Commission recommended to the Governor and the General Assembly that the College of Charleston become a State-supported institution on July 1, 1970. The recommendation presumed that 10 percent of the student body would be out-of-State residents and that of the South Carolina residents, 70 percent would be commuters. Although the provision of residential facilities was not addressed, the Commission expressed the belief that costs to the student would be comparable to those charged at other State-supported institutions. The staff recommended approval of the request. It was moved (Prioleau) and seconded (Scarborough) that the request be approved.

Mr. Walsh noted that both Governor Edwards and the Lake Committee had recommended recently that there be an absolute moratorium on any new construction. He stated that if the Commission is charged with coordinating on a Statewide basis, such expansion cannot be justified when vacancies exist elsewhere in the State system, such as the 1,500 dormitory vacancies at Winthrop College, and that in his view the taxpayers of South Carolina should not be required to build new facilities which would duplicate others not being used.

Mr. Michael stated that there is no official moratorium on construction other than that imposed by provisions regarding the issuance of Capital Improvement Bonds, and that this does not affect projects funded from other sources. He

also noted the practical difficulty of diverting students from one institution to another. In discussion it was pointed out that the Governor recommended a moratorium on new programs (with no specific reference to construction) but the Lake Committee specifically recommended a moratorium on construction.

Mr. Johnson noted that the dormitory under consideration would be funded through Housing Bonds at no cost to the State. Mr. Walsh stated that faculty, library books, and other facilities would have to be provided, and that there would be no way to avoid the fact that it would cost the State money, and further, if the dormitory were not fully occupied, the State would still have to meet the obligation of the Housing Bonds. Mr. Johnson stated that the students are already enrolled at the College, housed in buildings that are to some extent fire hazards, that there would be no additions to library holdings, and that issuance of Housing Bonds has already been authorized by the General Assembly.

Dr. Davis asked if nearby motels had been leased by the College of Charleston, as previously planned. Mr. Johnson stated that two motels have been purchased by the College through the issuance of faculty and student Housing Bonds in the amount of \$1,800,000, without cost to the State, and that 326 students presently live in the motels.

Dr. Bevan of the College of Charleston noted that although the Commission projected in 1970 that there would be 1,400 full-time equivalent students at the College by 1975-76, there are at present 4,100 full-time equivalent students and that 4,600 are anticipated next year. He stated that even though 82 percent of those students are from Charleston, some local students need to live in dormitories in terms of their own personal development, and that all students need the freedom of choice offered by other institutions. He stated that a commuting institution should have a core of students, amounting to about 25 percent of the student body, who live in dormitories and provide college spirit and the basis for common goals and common activities. He noted that it is hoped that housing can be provided for 25 to 30 percent of the students over the next five years.

Mr. Walsh stated that when the Commission recommended in 1970 that the College of Charleston become a State-supported institution, the Commission was assured that the College did not anticipate having resident students. Dr. Davis noted that the College of Charleston is not a college for commuters only but a four-year liberal arts institution. Mr. Burns stated that the problem is one of timing, in deference to the requests that few changes be made until the Commission develops a master plan for higher education.

Mr. Quattlebaum inquired concerning the effect a year's delay in construction of the dormitory would have on the College of Charleston. Dr. Bevan stated that a delay would not have a detrimental effect on the academic programs but on the community. He noted that security in temporary housing continues to be a problem.

Mr. Shirley asked if colleges are obligated to provide student housing, since students now are considered legal citizens at the age of 18. Mr. Marchant stated that the Lake Committee report is not established policy at this time and that, in his opinion, if the Commission implemented the recommendations of the report or guided itself rigidly by those recommendations, it would be abdicating some of its own authority. The motion to approve the Capital Improvement request was adopted, with one dissenting vote.

V. Report on Budget and Control Board Recommendation for 1976-77 CHE Appropriation

Mr. Michael reported that the Budget and Control Board will recommend that the Commission's appropriation for 1976-77 be that of the reduced appropriation for 1975-76 (\$1,114,352), with a slight increase (\$5,504) for a total recommended appropriation of \$1,119,856. He noted that \$2,870 of the increase must be set aside for the 1976-77 increments of the salary increases granted for the current year. The balance has been added to "Other Operating Expenses." The appropriation covers the following: Personal Services (\$369,060), Other Operating Expenses (\$127,804), and Service Programs (\$622,992). The Personal Services appropriation provides for the per diem costs of Commission members and the salaries for the staff of 19. Mr. Michael noted that the number of staff members is not sufficient to meet adequately its responsibilities, and further, that the workload will increase if the recommendations continuously received from the presidents, the legislators, and others are to be given serious consideration.

Other Operating Expenses include \$26,202 for rent and \$40,200 to maintain the M.I.S. Computerization Project at the current level of funding. The remaining \$61,402 must pay for staff and Commission travel; telephone; repairs for office machines and the two automobiles; printing; office, library, and motor vehicle supplies; postage; rent for the photo-copier; and all other expenses except salaries and service program costs.

An additional \$30,000 requested for the M.I.S. Computerization Project was denied by the Budget and Control Board. In the absence of the increase, planned progress on that project will not be possible. A net increase of \$78,050 for contract programs is required for the increased cost to the State of spaces now under contract through SREB in veterinary medicine and optometry. Further, two new spaces will be added in veterinary medicine at a cost of an additional \$10,000. The Budget and Control Board denied the request for this additional cost which will have to be met by reducing the amount available in the non-contract student aid program. The Service Program appropriation includes the Defense Scholarship Loan Fund (\$187,000); SREB Fees and Assessments (\$64,000); SREB Contract Programs (\$370,250); and the Non-contract Student Aid Program (\$1,742). Mr. Michael expressed the hope that the General Assembly will restore some of the funds to the Non-contract Program which have been reduced from \$89,792 to \$1,742. It was moved (Scarborough) and seconded (Marchant) and unanimously voted to approve the line item adjustments as recommended by the staff.

Dr. Boozer commented that several of the recommendations recently made by Governor Edwards and the Lake Committee will require additional resources if the staff is to carry them out. He stated that the staff is fully occupied now and, as additional responsibilities are assumed, the need for additional resources to carry out those functions must be recognized. Failure of the Budget and Control Board to increase the funds in the Commission's budget for the SREB Contract Programs has the effect of cutting out another student aid program funded by the State. He stated further that the Commission has recommended for the past two years that three additional staff positions at the research associate level be authorized -- in academic programs, fiscal affairs, and health affairs -- and each year that request has been disapproved. He noted that it is the hope of the staff that, if the revenue projection improves, there might yet be the prospect that the three additional staff positions will be funded.

Dr. Smith stated that whenever new legislation gives additional responsibilities to the Commission, funds should be appropriated accordingly.

VI. Meeting with Advisory Council of Private College Presidents

President Cordell Maddox of Anderson College, Chairman of the Commission's Advisory Council of Private College Presidents, read a statement (Exhibit A), in which he indicated that fewer private colleges in South Carolina are operating at deficits than three years ago when the Tuition Grants Program began, and enrollments at the private colleges have increased significantly for the first time in ten years. He recommended on behalf of the Advisory Council (1) that full funding of the Tuition Grants Program be of first priority; (2) that a master plan for higher education be developed as soon as possible; (3) that the 1202 Commission be enlarged to ensure proportionate representation from the private sector; and (4) that the Commission strengthen its efforts to curtail duplication of programs in South Carolina. He also expressed concern that the private colleges in the State have been forced to increase tuition and housing costs for 1976-77.

Mr. Burns inquired concerning the recent trend toward enrollment increases at the private colleges. Mr. McLean stated that enrollments have increased only in the past two years, a fact attributed largely to the Tuition Grants Program. He noted that the differential between tuition at public institutions and at private colleges averages \$1,350; and that the average grant is \$1,260 in 1975-76. He added that the average grant awards will be about 20 percent less in 1976-77 due to a reduction in appropriations.

Mr. Shirley inquired concerning the percentage of applicants who are awarded grants. Mr. Laine Ligon, Director of the Tuition Grants Program, stated that approximately 9,000 completed applications were received last year and that 5,672 grants were awarded. He noted that 10 to 15 percent of the applicants are ineligible because of lack of need. He indicated that eligibility is generally well known by student aid officers at the public institutions.

VII. Report of Executive Director

Dr. Boozer reported that he was appointed in May, 1975, by Governor Moore of West Virginia to a Task Force on Postsecondary Education of Military Personnel, sponsored by the Education Commission of the States and chaired by Governor Edwards of Louisiana. He attended a meeting of the Task Force in Denver on January 22 and 23, at which key members of the military branches of the Department of Defense who are involved in voluntary education programs were also present. The Task Force is developing recommendations to ECS and to the military services concerning matters related to the civilian education of military personnel.

Dr. Boozer reported that he was on the program of a National Seminar on January 27 and 28 in St. Petersburg, Florida, sponsored by the Inservice Education Program of the Education Commission of the States and the State Higher Education Executive Officers Association. This foundation-funded program sponsors seminars and workshops for state officials and board members concerned with the coordination, governance, and financing of postsecondary education. He noted that staff members of the Commission have been represented at several of these seminars (comprehensive planning, academic program planning, financing, and related matters) of central concern to this Commission.

VIII. Other Business

Dr. Smith reported that he had attended a meeting of the Charleston Consortium on January 22, held at Blacklock House at the College of Charleston. He stated that he was favorably impressed by the progress being made by the Consortium, especially by the efforts to share facilities such as libraries and to coordinate faculty and other resources.

Dr. Bevan agreed that the climate in the Charleston Consortium has improved considerably in the past several months. Dr. Boozer stated that the Consortium, developed in the late sixties and dormant for a time, was reactivated in the fall of 1973. In the past the Director of the Commission on Higher Education served as chairman of the Consortium Executive Committee, consisting of the presidents of the five institutions in the Charleston area. Dr. Boozer stated that although he recommended in 1973 that the Executive Committee elect a chairman from among the five presidents, it had chosen not to do so and he continued to serve as chairman. Recently he urged the Committee to reconsider his recommendation, and at its meeting on January 22, President Stern was elected chairman of the Executive Committee. Dr. Boozer stated that efforts have also been made to engender interest in consortium arrangements in other parts of the State where there are institutions in proximity, such as in the Spartanburg and Columbia areas.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Kirk stated that when Governor Edwards referred to the composition of the Commission on Higher Education in his State of the State address on January 27 he was aware of the recommendations which the Lake Committee would make and, in effect, was endorsing those recommendations. When the Governor spoke of the Commission's control of or right to approve or disapprove programs and courses, his intent was not course approval but that the Commission should have the right to set minimal curriculum standards.

Mr. Marchant asked if the Governor's desire would be that the Commission become a governing board or remain a coordinating agency. Mr. Kirk indicated that after considerable discussion concerning a governing board over all educational agencies and institutions in the State, the consensus was that the creation of a board with programmatic control, but not total governing power, would be desirable. He stated that the Governor's principal desire is to ensure maximum use of the available resources for education.

Dr. Smith noted that the Lake Committee had recommended that three representatives be appointed to the Commission from each Congressional District, and that each successor be appointed from a different county within a District. He stated that in his view a more desirable method of selection would be the appointment of three representatives from a District without the restriction to counties. Mr. Kirk stated that members are appointed to the State Board of Education on a rotating basis by county and that there are both advantages and disadvantages to this method.

Mr. Stanback inquired concerning the recommendation to abolish the positions of ex officio members on the Commission. Mr. Kirk stated that it was generally felt that the Commission should represent not the individual institutions but the entire State concerning higher education. Mr. McAlister stated that he hoped the Commission took note of Mr. Kirk's reply. He added that in his opinion the Commission would not be in the dilemma it is in today if it had not overlooked the opportunities of being statesmen and facing problems on many occasions when he had urged it to do so.

Dr. Smith stated that it might be appropriate while Mr. Kirk was present for the ex officio members to comment on the recommendations of either the Governor or the Lake Committee concerning the membership structure of the Commission. Mr. Shirley stated that it might be unwise for the Commission to address itself to those recommendations before the executive and legislative branches of the State Government have had an opportunity to react to them. He noted that the Commission is not involved in writing the code which governs it, other than making recommendations when requested. He suggested that the Commission contribute suggestions concerning changes that might be made, consolidate its suggestions to formulate a statement of consensus, and request an audience with the legislative committees on education. Mr. Walsh concurred with Mr. Shirley's suggestion.

Mrs. Forbes was recognized and read the following statement:

"The question was put to this body at our last meeting, 'Who speaks for higher education?' In this instance, let us emphasize HIGHER aspects of education. I should like to propose that the Commission on Higher Education pass a resolution commending Dr. William H. McCord for his recent laudable decision whereby he declined what he referred to as the non-job which he was offered.

"This Commission has been engaged since September at least, and in good faith, in some rather exhausting financial gymnastics. The Commission has taken very seriously, I think, its responsibility in relation to the monies which the taxpayers of South Carolina invest in higher education. This was therefore a rather amazing set of circumstances, as I see it. Dr. McCord's reaction was, and I quote from a newspaper account, 'I am not worth \$75,000 doing nothing.'

"Yet, we heard, also at our last meeting, that the Commission had done great damage in recommending that it be given more authority in cutting off non-productive programs. Are we not to wonder also about non-productive academic positions?

"I hope we will not neglect the opportunity to publicly commend Dr. William H. McCord for his service and for the integrity he has demonstrated."

It was moved (Forbes) and seconded (McAlister) that the Commission on Higher Education notes the commendable action Dr. McCord has recently taken in not accepting the position of President Emeritus of the Medical University of South Carolina. Mr. Marchant suggested that the Commission defer action on the motion until a time when Dr. Draffin can be present. Mr. Johnson and Dr. Davis concurred. Mr. Johnson stated that such an action would be the business of the board of trustees of the institutions. A substitute motion was made (Marchant) and seconded (Colvin) that the motion to commend Dr. McCord be carried over to the March meeting of the Commission, and that Dr. Draffin be advised that the motion would be on the agenda. The substitute motion was approved.

On motion made (Marchant) and seconded (Colvin) and unanimously voted, the meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gaylon Syrett
Gaylon Syrett
Recording Secretary