

MINUTES OF MEETING
OF
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

September 10, 1976
10:00 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

PRESENT:

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Dr. R. Cathcart Smith, Chairman
Mr. Howard L. Burns
Mr. Arthur J. H. Clement, Jr.
Mrs. Wanda L. Forbes
Mr. Gedney M. Howe, Jr.
Mr. F. Mitchell Johnson
Mr. T. Eston Marchant
Dr. John M. Pratt
Mr. William F. Prioleau, Jr.
Mr. Y. W. Scarborough, Jr.
Mr. J. Clyde Shirley
Mr. I. P. Stanback
Mr. Arthur M. Swanson
Mr. T. Emmet Walsh

STAFF

Dr. Howard R. Boozer
Mr. Charles A. Brooks
Dr. George P. Fulton
Mr. William C. Jennings
Dr. Frank E. Kinard
Mr. Alan S. Krech
Mr. James R. Michael
Mr. James L. Solomon, Jr.
Mrs. Gaylon Syrett
Mrs. Judi R. Tillman

GUESTS

Dr. Hugh C. Bailey
Dr. John M. Bevan
Dr. Jack H. Boger
Mr. G. William Dudley, Jr.
Mr. N. Casey Frederick
Dr. George Gray
Dr. Richard D. Houk
Dr. Ruth L. Hovermale
Mr. L. Roger Kirk
Dr. William H. Knisely
Mr. J. Lacy McLean
Miss Dolores J. Miller
Miss Frances H. Miller
Dr. M. Clinton Miller III
Dr. Walter D. Smith
Dr. Cecil Walters
Dr. Robert H. White
Dr. W. Curtis Worthington, Jr.

MEMBER OF THE PRESS

Ms. Alice Hite

I. Introductions

Chairman Smith introduced Mr. Arthur J. H. Clement, Jr., who was appointed to the Commission on August 26 by Governor Edwards to succeed Dr. Davis; and Dr. John M. Pratt, who was elected Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Medical University of South Carolina on August 13 to succeed Dr. Draffin.

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

Mr. Burns requested that page 3 of the minutes be amended to show that the Commission approved in principle only the recommendations of the Executive Committee concerning the proposed regional school of optometry, and that after further study the proposal be returned to the Commission for action before a recommendation is made to the Budget and Control Board concerning the proposed tri-state school (see minutes of July 8 meeting, page 3). Mr. Prioleau requested that the minutes be amended to show that he voted against approval

of the recommendations of the Executive Committee concerning the proposed school of optometry. It was moved (Shirley) and seconded (Marchant) that the minutes of the July 8, 1976, Commission meeting be amended as requested by Mr. Burns and Mr. Prisleau, and that they be approved as amended. The motion was adopted.

III. Consideration of Proposed 1977-78 Appropriation Request of the Commission on Higher Education

Mr. Michael stated that the proposed Appropriation Request of the Commission on Higher Education for 1977-78 was reviewed by the Commission's Executive Committee and, prior to the meeting, all Commission members were provided copies. He noted that a base figure of \$1,150,265 was established for the Commission for 1977-78 by the Budget and Control Board, amounting to an increase of \$30,409 or 2.7% over the Commission's 1976-77 appropriation. In addition to the base amount, the request includes salary increases (4 percent for Classified and 1.7 percent for unclassified employees) and fringe benefits totaling \$47,691, the rates as established by the Budget and Control Board. He noted that \$21,000 of the \$30,409 base increase has been assigned to the Southern Regional Education Board Contract Program in Veterinary Medicine, leaving a total base increase of approximately \$9,000 for other purposes.

In accordance with instructions from the Budget and Control Board, requested funds in excess of the base amount were listed in priority order. Also listed were reductions that would become necessary if the 1977-78 appropriation were 90 percent of the 1976-77 appropriation. He noted that greater detail than in past years has been required of most State agencies in their 1977-78 appropriation requests.

It was moved (Scarborough) and seconded (Walsh) that the Commission's appropriation request for 1977-78 be approved. The motion was adopted.

IV. Consideration of Annual Report Format

Mr. Krech stated that again this year the Commission's Annual Report must be submitted to the Division of General Services for printing during September. He noted that the report follows the same general State-prescribed format that has been used in past years. The Commission was provided copies of a draft outline of the table of contents; draft copies of the completed report will be mailed to Commission members when available. The staff recommended approval of the general format of the report. It was moved (Scarborough) and seconded (Walsh) that the staff recommendation be approved. The motion was adopted.

V. Report of Budget and Finance Committee -- Further Consideration of the Recommended Changes in Step 10 of the 1977-78 Appropriation Formula

Dr. Smith stated that, in accordance with Commission action taken at its July 8 meeting (see minutes of July 8, 1976, meeting, p. 228), Dr. Boozer consulted further with the presidents of the public senior colleges and universities concerning recommended changes in Step 10 of the Appropriation Formula. The recommendation of the Budget and Finance Committee was that the following wording of Step 10 of the 1977-78 Appropriation Formula be substituted for the 1976-77 wording:

"Compute the required student fee income deduction for Educational and General purposes at \$300 for each FTE university or regional campus student and \$200 for each FTE college student, the amount per

FTE to be doubled for the predicted percentage of out-of-state students. To this add the estimated revenue from sales and services (including application, laboratory, auto registration, and other service fees not required of all students) and anticipated income from federal or local governments to be received in support of 1977-78 Educational and General operations."

A comprehensive memorandum on this subject was mailed to the presidents of the public senior colleges and universities on July 27, a copy of which was also sent to each member of the Commission. Dr. Boozer's memorandum to the Commission of September 1, 1976, summarized the responses received from the presidents (Exhibit A) and transmitted copies of those responses to members of the Commission.

It was moved (Marchant) and seconded (Forbes) that the recommendation of the Budget and Finance Committee, as quoted above, be approved. Mr. Johnson read the following statement and made the substitute motion contained in it:

"Mr. Chairman, I have a few statements on the matter which I wish to make, as well as a motion; the motion is somewhat lengthy but it is tied to our decisions regarding Step 10.

"It is important that the Commission soon make a decision concerning the deduction (amount applied to educational programs in Step 10) which would be equitable for the several colleges and universities. Due to different practices in the past at the various institutions in the assessment of fees paid by students, the situation is one which the present language of the formula cannot satisfactorily handle. Therefore, a fixed deduction, although not satisfactory to a number of schools, marginally satisfactory to others, and perhaps satisfactory to a few, may be the only solution to achieve some fair degree of equity among the schools. The following [substitute] motion is offered to resolve the issue:

"For South Carolina residents the Commission approves the recommendation of a uniform student fee deduction for Educational and General purposes in Step 10 of the formula of \$300 for each FTE university or regional campus student and with one exclusion, \$200 for each FTE student in the other State colleges.

"Because certain institutions have built programs which rely to a considerable extent on the use of out-of-state fees, the uniform student fee deduction for out-of-state students will be one-and-one half times the FTE deductions stated above for South Carolina residents, that is \$450 for each FTE university and regional campus student and \$300 for each FTE student in the colleges.

"Because South Carolina State College has special problems due to its assignment of fees, it will deduct \$76 for each FTE in-state resident and \$114 for each FTE out-of-state student.

"Because Steps 1-12A were devised to provide uniform and equitable appropriations for the several institutions, because Steps 12B and 13 were added in order to provide special funding above the 'adequacy' level reached in Step 12A, and because no institution should be denied that 'adequacy' level in order to fund special Step 12B-13 needs in other schools, and in order to retain the objectivity inherent in Steps 1-12A of the formula, the following statement is offered as a part of the motion:

"Whenever total State appropriations for the colleges and universities are less than the total amount derived by Steps 1-12A of the formula for the several institutions and when the CHE is asked by the Legislature or Budget and Control Board to divide the appropriated money among the institutions, the CHE will respect the integrity of the formula by dividing the appropriated funds on the proportional basis determined by Step 1-12A of the formula. Therefore, whenever the State appropriation is less than the cumulative Step 12A amount, no funds will be awarded for Step 12B and 13 proposals; that is, no money will be taken off-the-top for Steps 12B and 13 projects prior to the proportional distribution of funds based on the Steps 1-12A derived totals. (Only very serious emergency conditions can be considered as cause to deviate from this plan.)"

"Because a confidence gap can be created between the institutions, the public and the CHE when those parties entrusted with the implementation of the State's public higher education programs are not properly involved in the planning process, it is further moved that the Budget Committee of the CHE accept as standard procedure the scheduling of a meeting each year with the Presidents of the colleges and universities prior to the Committee's presentation to the full Commission of any proposed formula changes or adjustments, such meeting probably to be held in July. At this meeting the Committee will hear from each of the Presidents concerning his institution's general needs for the next budget year, and it will review with the Presidents its own preliminary ideas and plans regarding formula changes, adjustments, or any changes in budget procedures. The meeting should be long enough to allow each President ample time to present a summary of the needs of his institution and to comment on the Budget Committee's preliminary ideas and plans for the next budget year.

"That is my statement and my motion. I think its acceptance, in its totality, would strengthen our hand in our budgeting efforts and would improve our working relationships with our colleges and universities."

Mr. Prioleau seconded the motion. He stated that while considerable effort has been made in recent years to correct inequities in the Appropriation Formula, the change recommended by the Budget and Finance Committee would still amount to unequal distribution of funds. He stated his view that because 50 percent of The Citadel's cadet corps is composed of out-of-State students, the recommended change would have the effect of setting the average uniform student fee deduction at The Citadel at \$300, an amount equivalent to that of the universities. He therefore supported the substitute motion which provided that "the uniform student fee deduction for out-of-state students be one-and-one half times the FTE deductions . . . for South Carolina residents."

Mr. Johnson stated that although out-of-State students pay twice as much as South Carolina residents, program costs to the State for out-of-State students are not twice that for South Carolina students. Mr. Scarborough stated that if the substitute motion were approved, the universities would be required to deduct less in Step 10, thereby increasing their appropriations, with the result that The Citadel's appropriation would be a smaller proportion of the total amount of State funds available for higher education. Mr. Howe stated that in his opinion the original motion would be in the best interest of all the institutions. He suggested that The Citadel request and justify funding under Step 12 for special costs resulting from its being a military college. Mr. Prioleau stated that he

would support the recommendation of the Budget and Finance Committee if the motion contained a provision that the Commission would support special funding under Step 12 for The Citadel, as Mr. Howe suggested. Mr. Walsh agreed with Mr. Howe and Mr. Swanson that the substitute motion would not be in the best interest of the State at this time. The substitute motion was disapproved.

The motion to approve the recommendations of the Budget and Finance Committee was adopted, with the provision that South Carolina State College be authorized to phase into the new Step 10 procedure by including for 1977-78 \$75 rather than \$200 for each FTE South Carolina student and \$150 rather than \$400 for each FTE out-of-State student, and with the understanding that if The Citadel requests and justifies funding under Step 12 for special costs inherent to it as a military institution such a request will have the support of the Commission.

VI. Report of Committee on Federal Programs

Mr. Howe, chairman of the Committee on Federal Programs, asked Mr. Solomon to comment on the proposed revisions in the South Carolina State Plan for Title VI-A (Undergraduate Instructional Equipment Grants Program) for 1976-77. Mr. Solomon stated that all of the proposed revisions are in Section 7, "Relative Priorities," and Section 8, "Determination of Federal Shares." He stated that the revisions are recommended to clarify procedures used in determining priority ranking of applications and to set forth the method used in breaking a tie between or among two or more applicants. The revisions adopted by the Commission will be incorporated in the 1976-77 State Plan for Title VI-A and submitted to the U.S. Commissioner of Education for final approval.

Mr. Howe reported that the committee recommended approval of the proposed revisions. It was moved (Howe) and seconded (Shirley) that the recommendations of the committee be approved. The motion was adopted.

VII. Report of Committee on Academic Program Development

Mrs. Forbes, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Academic Program Development, presented the committee's recommendations concerning the following programs:

a. Ph.D. in Biometry - Medical University of South Carolina

The committee recommended approval of the program with the stipulations that the curriculum be strengthened in the behavioral and social sciences and that the proposed focus (biostatistical aspects of medical research and biostatistical aspects of health care delivery systems) be maintained.

In response to an inquiry from Mr. Burns with reference to cost, Dr. Knisely stated that additional costs to the State will be minimal. Dr. Clinton Miller stated that it is estimated, based on the current student load and the current faculty time and resources, that the program can be implemented for approximately \$12,000 the first year, \$25,000 the second year, and \$36,000 the third year. He stated that it is anticipated by MUSC that training grants can be obtained from federal sources to offset expenses incurred.

It was moved (Forbes) and seconded (Marchant) that the recommendations of the committee be approved. The motion was adopted.

b. Ed.S. in Curriculum and Instruction - Winthrop College

The committee recommended approval. It was moved (Forbes) and seconded (Marchant) and unanimously voted that the recommendation of the committee be approved.

c. Ed.S. in Home Economics Education - Winthrop College

The committee recommended approval. It was moved (Forbes) and seconded (Howe) and unanimously voted that the recommendation of the committee be approved.

d. M.S. in Nutrition Education - South Carolina State College

The committee recommended that the program be approved with the following stipulations: 1. that two optional tracks be provided (Nutritional Health Care and Food and Nutrition); 2. that South Carolina State College change the name of the program to a Master of Nutritional Science Degree (MNS) in order to reflect the precise nature of the program; 3. that the enrollment be restricted to ten students during the first year, and that the progress of the program be reviewed annually by the staff of the Commission; 4. that substantial clinical experience be provided in nutrition through arrangements with medical schools, hospitals, nursing homes, and State health agencies, both within South Carolina and in other states; 5. that practical experience in the behavioral sciences, exposure to various kinds of institutional settings, and instruction in human and social interrelationships be introduced; 6. that discussions be initiated and periodic planning sessions be conducted with colleagues at Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College and Orangeburg Regional Hospital concerning the problems of nutrition, the need for clinical facilities for training nutritional personnel, the need for vocational and technical training in food services, and the prospects for greater cooperation and coordination among the three institutions within the Orangeburg-Calhoun community; 7. that consideration be given to collaboration with Clemson University and Winthrop College, perhaps through affiliate appointments or visiting professorships; and 8. that three institutions offering graduate-level work in nutrition coordinate their curricula and assist each other as appropriate and practical, through an informal advisory group consisting of one representative from the nutritional programs of each of three institutions, a member of the South Carolina Nutrition Committee and a staff member from the Commission on Higher Education to serve as the convener. It was moved (Forbes) and seconded (Stanback) and unanimously voted that the recommendations of the committee be approved.

e. M.S. in Personnel and Industrial Relations - Winthrop College

The committee recommended that the program be approved. It was moved (Forbes) and seconded (Marchant) and unanimously voted that the recommendation of the committee be approved.

f. B.S. in Special Education - College of Charleston

The committee recommended that the proposal be approved, with concentrations only in Emotionally Handicapped and Mentally Handicapped (or Retarded). It was moved (Forbes) and seconded (Johnson) and unanimously voted that the recommendations of the committee be adopted.

g. A.Ag. in Agriculture (Major in Horticulture) - Midlands Technical College

The Committee recommended that the program be approved. It was moved (Forbes)

and seconded (Scarborough) and unanimously voted that the recommendation of the committee be adopted.

h. A.I.T. in Aircraft Maintenance Technology - Trident Technical College

The committee recommended that the proposal be approved. It was moved (Forbes) and seconded (Marchant) and unanimously voted that the recommendation of the committee be adopted.

i. A.Bus. in General Business - Williamsburg Technical, Vocational, and Adult Education Center

The committee recommended that the program be approved. It was moved (Forbes) and seconded (Scarborough) and unanimously voted that the recommendation of the committee be adopted.

j. A.I.T. in Industrial Management - York Technical College

The committee recommended that the program be approved. It was moved (Forbes) and seconded (Stanback) and unanimously voted that the recommendation of the committee be adopted.

VIII. Report of Executive Director

Dr. Boozer announced that the presidents of the public senior colleges and universities will meet with the Commission on Tuesday, October 12, to make presentations concerning their appropriation requests for 1977-78. That meeting will begin at 10:00 a.m. and adjourn by 4:30 p.m. The Executive Committee will meet at 8:30 a.m. on Wednesday, October 13, to develop its recommendations to the Commission. The full Commission will meet again at 10:30 a.m. on Wednesday, October 20, to consider the recommendations of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee is scheduled to present the Commission's recommendations to the Budget and Control Board on October 27. As in past years, the Chairman encouraged Commission members who are able to do so to plan to attend the October 27 hearing, to be held from 10:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. in Room 219 of the Edgar A. Brown Building.

IX. Other Business

A. Health Education Authority. Dr. Boozer stated that a letter had been received from Dr. Pratt, dated August 30, which reported that the Board of Trustees of the Medical University of South Carolina recently voted to request that the Commission expand by two the membership of the Health Education Authority, thereby permitting MUSC and USC to have two representatives each as members of HEA. This would enable the two universities with medical schools and major programs in health education to have on the Health Education Authority faculty or staff representation as well as representation from their boards of trustees. In response to that request, the staff recommended that the Commission approve the enlarging of membership of HEA to include two representatives each from MUSC and USC. It was moved (Stanback) and seconded (Walsh) and unanimously voted that the recommendation be approved.

b. ETV Course, "Teacher as Manager." Dr. Boozer reported that the Dean of the School of Education at Syracuse University has inquired of the South Carolina Educational Television Network (SCETV) concerning the availability of the television course, "Teacher as Manager," for use in 125 school districts in the Central New York area, beginning in January, 1977. In response to that inquiry, Mr. Robert E.

Wood, Director of the Division of Education at SCETV, recommended that the course be made available at a cost of \$100 per lesson or a total of \$2,600 for the course. He further recommended, for an enrollment of less than 50, a minimum charge of \$80 per lesson, or a total of \$2,080. It is estimated that the cost to SCETV will be \$1,950 per course. Dr. Boozer requested that the Commission approve the recommendation of SCETV and that he be authorized to advise Mr. Wood to proceed with arrangements with Syracuse University. It was moved (Swanson) and seconded (Shirley) and unanimously voted to approve the recommendations.

C. Optometric Education. Dr. Boozer suggested that the agenda of the November Commission meeting include further discussion of the proposed regional school of optometry (see minutes of July 8, 1976, CHE meeting, pp. 222-24, as amended above on pp. 229-30). Mr. Burns stated that in his view the Commission was not provided sufficient information with reference to the proposed school prior to the July 8 meeting, and requested that in the future pertinent data be made available to Commission members several days in advance of its next meeting. Dr. Boozer stated that in past years Commission members were provided, prior to each meeting, all materials relating to the agenda of its next meeting. It was hoped, through the use of committees, that the full Commission would be relieved of the responsibility of studying all reports and proposals in detail. He stated that it is the hope and intent of the staff to provide the Commission with as much detailed data as it desires without overburdening it, and that it is the purpose of the staff to work with and assist the Commission in a constructive way.

Mr. Prioleau requested that no action be taken concerning the proposed school of optometry until the Commission considers the matter further at its November meeting. Mr. Prioleau also requested that Commission members be provided copies of a letter, dated September 3, 1976, which he received from Dr. E. Darrell Jervey and Dr. Charles R. Duncan, President and Legislative Chairman, respectively, of the South Carolina Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology Society. Dr. Boozer indicated that he would mail copies of the letter to Commission members immediately.

D. The Lake Committee. Mr. Prioleau read a newspaper item which appeared in the Columbia State on August 26 (Exhibit B), concerning the legislative committee created to study duplication and overlapping in institutions of higher education in South Carolina, chaired by Senator Robert C. Lake, Jr. The newsstory contained the following paragraphs:

"Sen. Allen R. Carter, D-Charleston, said he opposes Lake's bill, saying there is not enough information yet to draft an effective measure. Carter said Wednesday he believes a 'disinterested' party such as the Legislative Audit Council should gather facts on higher education institutions and technical education centers before another bill is written.

...

"But Lake said the committee has already found a great deal of overlapping. He said a bill similar to his is necessary.

"We heard in this committee from the commissioner of higher education, and the general consensus was the commission couldn't do anything because it was hamstrung by the trustees

from each institution trying to protect their own interests,' Lake said. 'The college trustees are the ones who fought this bill last year, the University of South Carolina Board of Trustees Chairman T. Eston Marchant fought this bill in the legislature through his law partner, Sen. Walter J. Bristow.

"Marchant doesn't want to come off the commission because he wants to protect USC, but this bill was designed to eliminate this partisan situation."

Mr. Prioleau stated that he believed Mr. Marchant, who unfortunately had to leave the meeting early, felt as he did, that the Commission would have no meaning without the institutional representatives and that the General Assembly was wise in its decision to have a representative of each senior institution on the Commission to work with the gubernatorial appointees, a representative of SBTCE, and others. He stated that as an *ex officio* member, he has, in his view, intended to represent The Citadel by virtue of being Chairman of its Board of Visitors and that he does not believe he is "hamstringing" the actions of the staff of the Commission by doing so. Further, it is his opinion that loyalty of the staff is necessary if a state agency or commission is to function successfully and properly and do a conscientious job. He stated that he was shocked and disappointed to read that a staff member of the Commission would make such a statement at a meeting of a legislative committee, and requested that Dr. Boozer look into the matter and report back to the Commission at its next meeting.

On invitation of the Chairman, Dr. Boozer stated that his own views were, for the most part, consistent with Mr. Prioleau's comments. Dr. Boozer stated that his only contact with the Lake Committee had been in a formal presentation to the Committee in October, 1975, attended by Chairman Smith and several members of the Commission and staff. (Copies of that presentation were distributed to all Commission members in October, 1975.) He reported that, in response to a request by Senator Lake that a member of the Commission's staff be assigned to provide information to the Committee, he had assigned Dr. Kinard to attend Committee meetings and provide information when requested by Senator Lake and the Committee. He stated that Dr. Kinard had had no part in writing the report of the Committee or in formulating its recommendations. He noted that Senator Lake has again requested that a staff member of the Commission assist the Committee in its continued work this year, and Dr. Kinard has been assigned again to sit in on the meetings and provide assistance when it is requested. He stated that he thought it appropriate for Dr. Kinard to comment.

Dr. Kinard stated that he wished to deny absolutely the implication of the news-story as far as he was concerned, and further, that to his knowledge no staff member of the Commission had made such a statement to a member of the Lake Committee. He noted that he and Dr. Boozer had discussed the problems of this type of situation before it was agreed that he provide assistance to the Lake Committee last year, and again recently. He stated that the request that technical expertise be provided to the committee was, in his view, a legitimate request by an important legislative committee, and one that should be met by the Commission. He noted that when he was asked in a closed session of the Committee whether, in his opinion, the trustee members of the Commission had difficulty in dealing with a Statewide view as opposed to an institutional view, he had responded that in some cases they did have difficulty, and that was the extent of his comment on the subject.

Mrs. Forbes commented that when she attended the October, 1975, meeting of the Lake Committee there was, in her opinion, much to be desired in the way the Com-

mittee treated the representatives of the Commission. Mr. Shirley stated that, although the ex officio members of the Commission represent their institutions, he has seen very little evidence that they are specifically and exclusively fulfilling that role, and that in his view each ex officio member is aware of the needs of all the institutions and of the State as a whole.

X. Presentation by Francis Marion College

President Smith welcomed the Commission to Francis Marion College and introduced members of his staff who were not present earlier in the meeting: Dr. Hugh C. Bailey, Vice President for Academic Affairs; Mr. N. Casey Frederick, Vice President for Administrative Services; and Miss Dolores J. Miller, Assistant to the President. President Smith made a slide presentation and invited members and guests to accompany him and his staff on a tour of the campus and to a luncheon in the student center. The Chairman expressed to President Smith and Mr. Johnson the appreciation of the Commission for the generous hospitality that had been extended.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Gaylon Syrett
Gaylon Syrett
Recording Secretary