

MINUTES OF MEETING
OF
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

June 10, 1976
11:20 a.m. - 3:05 p.m.

PRESENT:

COMMISSION MEMBERS

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

MEMBER OF THE PRESS

Ms. Warren McInnis

STAFF

Mrs. Dorothy Backman
Dr. Howard R. Boozer
Mr. Charles A. Brooks
Mr. Horace F. Byrne
Dr. George P. Fulton
Mr. William C. Jennings
Dr. Frank E. Kinard
Mr. Alan S. Krech
Mr. Cannon R. Mayes
Mr. James R. Michael
Ms. Rosita Minerva
Mr. James L. Solomon, Jr.
Mrs. Gaylon Syrett
Mrs. Judi R. Tillman

GUESTS

Dr. Keith Davis
Dr. Robert H. Hosken
Dr. Larry A. Jackson
Mr. Harold Jenkins
Mr. L. Roger Kirk
Dr. William H. Knisely
Mr. George Leventis
Mr. J. Lacy McLean
Mr. Andy Maloney
Dr. M. Maceo Nance
Mr. Frank Rogers
Dr. Robert H. White

I. Approval of Minutes of May 6, 1976, Commission Meeting

It was moved (Walsh) and seconded (Stanback) and unanimously voted that the minutes of the May 6, 1976, Commission meeting be approved, as written.

II. Report of Evaluation of the ETV Course, "The Teacher as Manager"

Mr. Krech noted that Commission members had been provided copies of the Table of Contents, Introduction, and Summary from a recently completed consultant's report which evaluated the effectiveness of "The Teacher as Manager," the ETV course that was cooperatively funded and sponsored by the Commission on Higher Education, the South Carolina Educational Television Network, The Citadel, Clemson University, the College of Charleston, South Carolina State College,

the University of South Carolina, and Winthrop College. He also noted that the Commission approved the development of this ETV course on April 5, 1973, and the course was completed in late summer of 1974 and first aired during the fall semester of that year. Over 1,300 students have completed the course. He stated that the staff is gratified that the formal evaluation indicates that this cooperative venture has made a positive impact.

III. Semi-annual Progress Report on Cooperative Institutional Arrangements in the Spartanburg Area

Dr. Kinard stated that in approving the initial complement of baccalaureate degree programs at USC-Spartanburg in May, 1975, the Commission stipulated that cooperative arrangements be developed between and among institutions in the Spartanburg area, including the University of South Carolina at Spartanburg, and Converse, Limestone, Spartanburg Methodist, Spartanburg Technical, and Wofford Colleges, and asked that semi-annual progress reports be furnished the Commission on this subject. The second semi-annual report, received by the Commission staff on May 21, 1976, is attached as Exhibit A.

IV. Semi-annual Progress Report on Cooperative Arrangements Between Sumter Area Technical College and the University of South Carolina at Sumter

Mr. Krech reported that on June 5, 1975, the Commission adopted a motion that "the chief administrators of the Sumter Area Technical College and USC-Sumter be requested to submit jointly a semi-annual report describing progress which has been made in further implementing cooperative efforts in all areas, with special emphasis on developments which eliminate unnecessary course duplication and on progress toward elimination of a dual library system," such report to be submitted at six-month intervals "until such time as the Commission requests that it be discontinued." The second semi-annual report, received by the Commission staff on May 11, 1976, is attached as Exhibit B.

V. Report of Federal Programs Committee - Annual Amendment to State Plan for Community Service and Continuing Education (Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965)

Mr. Burns, acting chairman of the Federal Programs Committee in Mr. Howe's absence, reported that the committee had reviewed the Fiscal Year 1977 Annual Amendment to the South Carolina State Plan for Community Service and Continuing Education (Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965), which was prepared in accordance with directions received from the U.S. Office of Education. He stated that the State Plan provides the basis for the selection of proposals to be funded under Title I in South Carolina in fiscal year 1977. Upon approval by the Commission, the document will be forwarded to Governor Edwards for signature and then to the U.S. Office of Education for approval. He noted that Commission members were provided draft copies of the Annual Amendment to the State Plan prior to the Commission meeting. It was moved (Burns) and seconded (Davis) that the Annual Amendment to the State Plan be approved, as recommended by the committee.

At the request of the Chairman, Mr. Michael commented that the Commission on Higher Education, which is responsible for the administration of Title I, had previously approved the basic State Plan. Legislation requires that an Annual Amendment be developed to establish priorities for the allocation of Title I funds for the following year, as well as to give the Commission

an opportunity to make adjustments in the Plan itself. The priorities recommended by the committee for FY 1977 are the same as those used during the current year: government, environmental education, human services and health. In addition, a Special Demonstration Project designed to assess the needs, resources, and means available for delivery of continuing education will be initiated by the Commission with the assistance of the colleges and universities in the State. Mr. Michael noted that the U.S. Congress has placed increased emphasis on Title I. The motion to approve the Annual Amendment, as recommended by the committee, was adopted.

IV. Report of Legislative Relations Committee

Mr. Walsh, chairman of the Legislative Relations Committee, requested that Mr. Jennings report to the Commission concerning the General Appropriation Bill for 1976-77, as passed by the Senate. Mr. Jennings stated that the Bill is almost identical to the House version regarding appropriations to the colleges and universities. The summary provided at the May 6, 1976, CHE meeting (see minutes of the May 6 meeting, Exhibit C) remains valid except that \$45,000 was added to The Citadel's appropriation by the Senate. The Senate version recommends a total of \$149,682,559 for the colleges and universities. The Senate Bill also provides for a 4 percent general pay increase for State employees, of which only 1 percent is to be appropriated separately. The remaining 3 percent must come from regular appropriations to the State agencies and institutions. An additional 1 percent increase is recommended, beginning January 1, 1977, in the event additional revenue becomes available.

Mr. Jennings reported that the Senate has amended Section 127 of the Appropriation Bill (see minutes of the May 6, 1976, CHE meeting, p. 212) by making it inapplicable to institutions of higher learning. As the Appropriation Bill now stands, colleges and universities will not be required to obtain Commission on Higher Education and Budget and Control Board approval of the use of federal funds.

Mr. Michael distributed copies of an excerpt from the Permanent Provisions of the Code of Laws of South Carolina (Exhibit C). He noted that under Section 3 the Bill deletes the authority for third- and fourth-year programs to be added at USC regional campuses when enrollments reach 700 and 1,000 FTE students, respectively.

Mr. Michael stated that Section 6 established the Deans Committee on Medical Doctor Education, consisting of the presidents of MUSC and USC and the deans of medicine at both institutions, and representatives from the Governor's Office, the Veteran's Administration, and the Commission on Higher Education. The Commission is charged with the responsibility of supporting this coordinating and advisory committee. He noted that \$1,000 in the Commission's budget had been designated for the support of the committee.

Mr. Michael noted that under the Miscellaneous Section of the Appropriation Bill \$10,000 is designated for the continuation of the higher education study committee, the "Lake Committee" ["Legislative Committee to Study the Overlapping and Duplication of Academic Offerings and Opportunities in Various Geographical Areas of the State in State-supported Institutions of Higher Learning," chaired by Senator Robert C. Lake, Jr.]. The Bill contains a provision that any committee which was funded by the 1976-77 Appropriation Act will continue to operate under the same rules and regulations which governed it during the current year.

Mr. Michael stated that House Bill 3662, concerning the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education, was passed by the Senate on June 9. A resolution concerning this Bill was adopted by the Commission at its May 6, 1976, meeting (see minutes of May 6 meeting, pp. 210-211). Mr. Michael noted that Commission authority to approve or disapprove criteria for the establishment of new campuses was deleted from the new legislation.

VII. Report of Budget and Finance Committee

Mr. Colvin stated that the recommendations of the Budget and Finance Committee for revision of the Appropriation Formula for 1977-78 were set forth in a memorandum, dated May 19, 1976 (Exhibit D). Major differences between the 1976-77 Formula and the recommended draft 1977-78 Formula (Enclosure C of Exhibit D) were summarized in the memorandum.

Mr. Shirley presented the committee's recommendation concerning Step 2 of the Formula. He noted that a comparison was made last year of South Carolina's full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment computation factors with those employed in other Southern states (Exhibit D, Enclosure D). He stated that while South Carolina's factor for determining FTE undergraduate students is similar to that employed by most Southern states, the South Carolina factors for determining FTE graduate students are different from most. As a result of that comparison, South Carolina's divisor for determining FTE doctoral students was changed last year from 6 to 9 credit hours. He stated that the committee now recommends that the Formula and the CHE Report divisor for determining FTE master's level students be changed from 9 to 12 credit hours, thereby relating the South Carolina policy more directly to actual practice in South Carolina as well as making it more compatible with the policies followed by other Southern states and by the Southern Regional Education Board.

Mr. Johnson requested permission to read a prepared statement (Exhibit E). He stated further that the Commission should operate as an advocate of the institutions rather than an adversary, and that in his opinion the Formula should not be altered with dollars solely in mind. He suggested that, if the recommendation of the committee concerning Step 2 is approved, it be implemented gradually over a three-year period.

Mr. Marchant stated that, in his opinion, the recommended change in the divisor for determining FTE master's level students would destroy the continuity of the results presently being obtained. He noted that the average master's load is 6.4 credit hours at USC, 5.7 at Clemson, and 4.7 at Winthrop, and stated that, in his view, it is neither correct nor fair to compare South Carolina's FTE definitions with those in other states without regard for other factors, and further, that raising credit hours for master's level FTE students would not relate to actual practice or to equitable funding.

Mr. Jennings stated that the average master's loads quoted by Mr. Marchant are the average loads of all students taking master's degree work at those institutions, rather than the normal load taken by a full-time master's degree student. He emphasized that most other states use 12 credit hours as a normal, full-time load when computing full-time equivalent master's level students.

Dr. Keith Davis expressed the view that the Commission does not have sufficient financial information available to evaluate data from other states. Mr. Quattlebaum stated that the information contained in Enclosure D of Exhibit D is misleading, and that taking a portion of another state's Formula and applying it to South Carolina gives inaccurate results. Dr. Boozer stated that according to the Southern Regional Education Board, which collects information annually from each state and converts it to assure uniform definitions and divisors, the average 1975-76 appropriation per FTE student at USC and Clemson was \$2,300, which was the highest average appropriation for universities in all of the Southeastern states.

It was moved (Shirley) and seconded (Walsh) to approve the recommendation of the committee that the Formula and the CHE Report divisor for determining FTE master's level students be changed from 9 to 12 credit hours. A substitute motion was made (Marchant) and seconded (McAlister) that there be no change at this time in the definition of FTE students at the master's level. A second substitute motion was made (Davis) and seconded (McAlister) that each recommendation of the committee be considered separately, after all recommendations have been reviewed and discussed. The second substitute motion was approved.

Mr. Shirley stated that in Step 4 of the Formula the projection of teaching faculty salaries from 1975-76 to 1976-77 is recommended at 5 percent (the percentage increase contained in the House version of the 1976 Appropriation Bill). Projection from 1976-77 to 1977-78, as in the final year of the current Formula, provides only for merit increases of 2.5 percent, since any general increase for that year will be appropriated separately by the General Assembly.

Mr. Colvin stated that the committee considered it essential to establish realistic Formula student/faculty ratios (Step 3) which are reasonably in line with prevailing practice in South Carolina and elsewhere. Actual fall 1975 ratios of the South Carolina institutions, as reported in the CHE Reports, were compared with the corresponding ratios of the 1976-77 Appropriation Formula. This comparison indicated that a number of increases and some decreases should be made in Formula ratios. The committee recommended that the Commission adopt the changes summarized in Enclosure E of Exhibit D and embodied in the 1977-78 Formula draft.

Mr. Marchant stated that while he agreed in general that the ratios should be adjusted to reflect actual practice, in his opinion they should be increased only where no professional problems exist. He stated that the recommended ratio change for the School of Public Health at USC would be detrimental to the program, and requested that the committee reconsider its recommendation.

On invitation of the Chairman, Dr. Keith Davis stated that the master's program in Public Health has been in operation at USC for slightly more than a year and, in his opinion, that is not sufficient time on which to base a change in student/faculty ratio such as the committee proposed. He stated that a ratio of 7:1 is common in most health fields at the master's level, as compared to the committee's recommendation of 20:1. He indicated that he felt it inappropriate to make a change in the Formula on the basis of only one year's experience.

Mr. Swanson stated that under Step 7 the committee recommended smaller annual increases in the allowances for operation and maintenance of physical plant and for utilities, reflecting abatement in inflation and smaller energy cost

increases. In the 1976-77 Formula, annual increases for operation and maintenance of plant were allowed at 8% for 1974-75, 8% for 1975-76, and 8% for 1976-77. In the 1977-78 Formula the committee recommended 8% for 1975-76, 6% for 1976-77, and 6% for 1977-78. Also in the 1976-77 Formula, annual increases for utilities were allowed at 15% for 1975-76 and 15% for 1976-77. In the 1977-78 Formula the committee recommended 8% for 1976-77 and 8% for 1977-78.

Mr. Johnson stated that in the past it has been recommended that a survey of physical facilities be made to more accurately determine actual needs for maintenance and utilities. Dr. Smith noted that Mr. Johnson's memorandum of February 17, 1976, recommending that such a survey be made, was sent to all Commission members.

Mr. Swanson stated that in the opinion of the committee Step 10 should be improved in the method of dealing with student fees in order to assure that each institution contributes a fair and equitable share of its student fee income as a partial offset to State appropriations. He noted that the Council of Presidents of Public Colleges and Universities recommended on April 30, 1976 (Enclosure G, Exhibit D), that per student ceilings of \$250 for colleges and \$325 for universities be placed on the amounts of student fee income to be deducted in Step 10. In the opinion of the committee, this does not specify a reasonable level of contributions from all institutions and does not, therefore, produce inter-institutional equity. The committee recommended uniform fee deductions of \$300 per FTE student for universities and \$200 per FTE student for colleges. Since university regional campus fees for educational purposes are at the university level, \$300 was also recommended for the regional campuses. Further, since out-of-State fees are approximately twice the amount of those for South Carolina students, the committee recommended that the uniform \$300 or \$200 fee per FTE student be doubled for the predicted percentage of out-of-State students when computing Step 10.

President Knisely requested permission to comment on behalf of the Council of Presidents of Public Colleges and Universities, in President Jackson's absence. He stated that since each of the institutions has used its student fee income in a different way, it was hoped that Step 10 would not be placed in a homogeneous structure at this time. He stated the view that if it is necessary to adopt a uniform structure, it should be done in several phases.

President Nance stated that the radical change recommended by the committee is in direct conflict with the constitution and bylaws of South Carolina State College with respect to the authority of the Board of Trustees to set fee structures and, in his view, it is the responsibility of the Board of Trustees to assess fees to provide for needs other than educational and general operations of the College. He noted that because using State funds for athletic programs is prohibited by law, the College will not be able to conduct a full intercollegiate athletic program if the funds previously used for that purpose must now be used for Educational and General operations. He requested that the committee reconsider its recommendation.

Dr. Boozer noted that a year ago the Commission spent considerable time discussing its perception of the importance of having a uniform deduction per FTE student for educational and general operations. In the past, under Step 10, when an institution increased the general student costs, the amount of the

increase was deducted from the institution's general appropriation, and Step 10 was, therefore, a disincentive for changing the fee structure. The recommendation of the committee would allow the institutions to retain the amount of the increase. He stated, in response to President Nance's comments concerning the institution's prerogative to set fees for particular purposes, that the committee and the staff do not perceive the recommendation as infringing on that prerogative or as a diversion of those funds.

Mr. Johnson asked why the staff and the committee do not perceive it in the interest of the institutions, since that is the purpose of the Commission. He stated that the Commission is not supporting the institutions by going to them and asking how the Commission can help resolve their problems, and that the Commission should have the interests of the institutions in mind instead of being an adversary, as it frequently is.

Dr. Boozer stated that the staff is approaching this problem in response to the Commission's instructions to the staff to establish a standard deduction that would permit an institution to raise its fees without having the amount of the increase deducted from its appropriation for Educational and General operations.

President Nance stated that if the General Assembly, by recommendation of the Commission on Higher Education, cannot appropriate sufficient funds for the operation of the educational programs of the institutions, in his opinion it is incumbent upon the administrations of the institutions, through their boards of trustees, to determine the course of action and, if necessary, increase fees to accomplish those goals.

Mr. McAlister stated that such a provision requires not only a change in the Formula but a legislative change as well. He suggested that, due to differences among the various institutions concerning student fee income, the 1976-77 figures in Step 10 be frozen, and that the boards of trustees of the institutions increase the fees proportionately, if the legislation permits. He stated further that if any institution increases its fees during 1977-78, the amount of the increase should not be deducted.

Mr. Jennings noted that if the Commission decides to continue to use the same procedure in Step 10 that has been used in the past, it will be continuing a process which has resulted in inter-institutional inequities. Mr. Johnson expressed the hope that the Executive Committee will do everything possible to eliminate Step 10 entirely and to work with the institutions to determine how those funds can be used.

It was moved (Colvin) and seconded (Swanson) to approve the recommendations of the committee concerning Step 2 that the Formula and CHE Report divisor for determining FTE master's level students be changed from 9 to 12 credit hours. A substitute motion was made (Johnson) and seconded (Marchant) that the change from 9 to 12 credit hours be implemented over a period of three years, increasing the divisor to 10 credit hours in 1977-78, to 11 credit hours in 1978-79, and to 12 credit hours in 1979-80. The substitute motion was approved.

It was moved (Colvin) and seconded (Shirley) to approve the recommendation of the committee concerning Step 4 that teaching faculty salaries be projected from 1975-76 to 1976-77 at 5%, and from 1976-77 to 1977-78 at 2.5%. The motion was adopted.

It was moved (Colvin) and seconded (Walsh) to approve the recommendation of the committee concerning Step 3 that the changes in student/faculty ratios, as summarized on Enclosure E, Exhibit D, and embodied in the 1977-78 Formula draft, be adopted.

A substitute motion was made (Marchant) and seconded (Johnson) that the ratio for Public Health remain at the 1976-77 level of 13:1 for undergraduates and 7:1 for master's level students. The substitute motion was approved. A second substitute motion was made (Marchant) and seconded (Johnson) that the ratios for business administration and for law also remain at the 1976-77 levels. Dr. Davis requested that Mr. Marchant reconsider the second substitute motion since, in her opinion, the changes in those two disciplines are not significant. It was moved (Walsh) and seconded (Davis) and voted to table the second substitute motion.

Mr. Marchant noted that journalism was included in the general category of liberal arts rather than being recognized as a separate discipline. It was moved (Marchant) and seconded (Prioleau) that a new category for journalism be established with ratios of 17:1 for undergraduates and 9:1 for graduates in lieu of the ratios under liberal arts of 20:1 and 11:1, respectively. It was moved (Walsh) and seconded (Colvin) and voted to table the motion.

It was moved (McAlister) and seconded (Marchant) that no changes be made in the present student/faculty ratios in architecture at Clemson University. It was moved (Walsh) and seconded (Davis) and voted to table the motion.

It was moved (Walsh) and seconded (Davis) that the changes in student/faculty ratios, as summarized in Enclosure E, Exhibit D, and embodied in the 1977-78 Formula draft, be adopted, except that the ratios for Public Health remain at the 1976-77 level of 13:1 for undergraduates and 7:1 for master's level students. The motion was approved.

It was moved (Colvin) and seconded (Walsh) that the recommendation of the committee be adopted which would provide, in Step 7, smaller annual increases in the allowances for operation and maintenance of physical plant and for utilities. The motion was approved.

It was moved (Davis) and seconded (Prioleau) that no changes be made in Step 10 as contained in the 1976-77 Formula. Mr. Walsh stated that the present application of Step 10 introduces considerable inequity among the institutions, and suggested that the motion contain a proviso that would allow the Commission to reconsider Step 10 at a subsequent meeting. Dr. Boozer suggested that the staff be instructed to work with each institution to assure comparable uniform interpretation of Step 10. The motion that no changes be made in Step 10 was approved. It was moved (Walsh) and seconded (Burns) that the staff be requested to continue its discussions and investigation of Step 10 and bring new facts to the attention of the Commission at a subsequent meeting. The motion was approved.

It was moved (Johnson) and seconded (Marchant) that teaching faculty support at the master's level at the State-supported colleges be raised from 35 percent to 40 percent in order to equalize the colleges in their master's programs, in that aspect, with the universities in Step 5. It was moved (Walsh) and seconded (Swanson) to table the motion. The motion to table the original motion was disapproved. The motion to increase teaching faculty support at the master's level at the State-supported colleges to 40 percent was adopted.

Mrs. Forbes stated that in her view student fees for master's programs should be increased. Mr. McAlister agreed, and requested that the Commission consider this matter in its study of Step 10.

Dr. Knisely stated his concern that the Commission appeared to agree that the major purpose of higher education is the job market, and expressed the hope that the Commission would not lose sight of other very important purposes of higher education in addition to the education of students for particular types of jobs.

It was moved (Colvin) and seconded (Stanback) that the Commission adopt the 1977-78 Appropriation Formula, including the recommendations of the Budget and Finance Committee for changes in Steps 2, 3, 4, 7, and 10 as amended; and the above-noted change in Step 5. The motion was adopted, with no dissenting votes. (The 1977-78 Appropriation Formula, as adopted, is attached as Exhibit F.)

Mr. Jennings distributed a proposed schedule for review of college and university 1977-78 appropriation requests (Exhibit G), developed in consultation with the State Auditor's Office. It was moved (Davis) and seconded (Stanback) and unanimously voted that the schedule be approved.

VIII. Other Business

It was moved (Walsh) and seconded (Shirley) and unanimously voted that a letter of appreciation be written to President Jackson for his cooperation and service to the Commission in his position as chairman of the Council of Presidents of Public Colleges and Universities during the past year.

Dr. Smith announced that the Commission will hold its next regular meeting at the Medical University of South Carolina on July 8. The Commission will hold meetings on the campuses of the colleges and universities in alternate months, beginning with the July meeting (see minutes of meeting, May 6, 1976, p. 212).

The committee on Academic Program Development will meet during the evening of July 7 in Charleston.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gaylon Syrett
Gaylón Syrett
Recording Secretary