

MINUTES OF MEETING
OF
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
SEPTEMBER 1, 1994
Columbia College
10:30 A.M.

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Dr. Donald Crolley
Mr. Fred Day
Ms. Elaine Freeman
Mr. Austin Gilbert
Mr. Kenneth Goad
Dr. Gregg Jones
Mr. Ray Lathan
Mr. Willard Metcalf
Mr. Bill Stern
Mr. Edwin Tolbert
Ms. Debbie Whittle
Ms. Mildred Williams

MEMBERS ABSENT

Ms. Reba Kinon
Mr. Lewis Phillips
Dr. Raymond Ramage

GUESTS

Mr. Todd Barnette
Dr. Diane Bradstadter
Ms. Sue Brayton
Ms. Pat Calkins
Dr. David Cohn
Ms. Donna Collins
Mr. James Daniels
Dr. James Epting
Ms. Katherine Fanning
Ms. Wanda Hughes-Farrah
Dr. Conrad Festa
Mr. Sandy Gilliam
Mr. Stan Godshall
Dr. Ron Hampton
Dr. Tom Harrison
Ms. Wanda Hayes
Dr. Sally Horner
Dr. James Hudgins
Mr. Charlie Jeffcoat
Dr. Ed Jackson
Ms. Frankie Keels
Ms. Chris Logan
Dr. Harry Matthews
Dr. Michael McGee
Dr. Peter Mitchell
Mr. Larry Myers

Dr. Kenneth Orr
Dr. Fred Payne

GUESTS (continued)

Dr. Chris Plyler
Dr. Luns C. Richardson
Ms. Marilyn Sarow
Dr. Linda Salane
Dr. Ken Schuler
Mr. Glenn Shumpert
Dr. David Shannon
Mr. Charles Shawver
Dr. Henry Tisdale

STAFF

Mr. Michael Brown
Ms. Addie Caldwell
Mr. Charlie FitzSimons
Mr. Doug Holleman
Mr. Alan Krech
Ms. Lynn Metcalf
Mr. Fred Sheheen
Mr. John Smalls
Ms. Yolanda Solone
Dr. Lovely Ulmer-Sottong
Ms. Janet Stewart
Dr. John Sutusky
Dr. Aileen Trainer
Ms. Julia Wells
Ms. Janet Williams
Dr. Nancy Healy-Williams
Dr. Karen Woodfaulk

For the record, notification of the meeting was made to the media as required by the Freedom of Information Act.

Mr. Alan Krech introduced the guests to the monthly meeting.

Dr. Mitchell welcomed members of the Commission and visitors to Columbia College.

Advisory Council of Private College Presidents

1. Observations about State Postsecondary Review Entities

Dr. Mitchell suggested that as the Commission considers the recommendations of the Executive Committee which provide approximately one year for the examination of alternative methodologies for use in the state postsecondary review process, that careful thought be given to accelerating the timing to six months. Dr. Mitchell noted that a six month time frame would enable a committee to develop a report suggesting alternative methodologies which could then be presented to the U.S. Department of Education for a ruling as to whether the alternative methodologies were appropriate. Further, if the methodologies were found appropriate, time would still be available to incorporate them into the 1995-96 plan.

Dr. Mitchell stated that the law establishing state postsecondary review entities (SPREs) is flawed as it does not address the problem of fraud and abuse as effectively as it could. Moreover, Dr. Mitchell noted that the law generates a significant amount of paperwork for the institutions.

Dr. Mitchell urged a minimalist approach to regulatory activity and encouraged working with public and private colleges and universities in order to craft a better plan to ensure accountability in a structure that rewards creativity, innovation, effectiveness, and continuous improvement.

Mr. Sheheen stated that Dr. Mitchell's comments concerning the establishment of a committee to make suggestions to the federal government about ways to improve the SPRE program should be pursued. He noted, however, that it is important to not recommend to the federal government that SPRE be eliminated. Rather, suggestions to improve the program should be the focus of discussions.

2. Update on Mission Statements in Statewide Plan

Dr. Mitchell noted that a final set of mission statements from the private colleges were provided to the Commission early last month. He stated that this completed the project which the independent colleges executed on a voluntary basis as evidence of good faith and desire to cooperate with all of higher education in South Carolina. Dr. Mitchell stated that

no action need to be taken on this agenda item.

3. Recommendations about Studies on Duplication and Collaboration as part of the Statewide Plan

Dr. Mitchell recommended that a two-year planning process be started in order to do a comprehensive review of duplication and opportunities for collaboration and that a report be provided on an annual basis. He stated that a two-year time frame for the process was needed because of the comprehensive nature of the study and because it takes time to develop a sense of trust and confidence among those who are involved with the process.

Specifically, Dr. Mitchell recommended that within a two-year time frame:

- a. An analysis of current and potential sources of duplication be undertaken by a joint committee comprised of the Commission on Higher Education Planning Advisory Council and the Advisory Council of Presidents associated with the Independent Colleges and Universities of South Carolina.
- b. An ad hoc committee, comprised of three representatives of the Public College Council of Presidents, three representatives from the Independent Colleges and Universities of South Carolina Council of Presidents, two representatives from the state technical system, and one representative each from Commission on Higher Education and Independent Colleges and Universities staffs explore and identify potential collaborative projects between and among the public and private colleges.

These items will be referred to the Committee on Planning and Assessment for appropriate action.

4. Tuition Grant Funding

Dr. Mitchell requested that the Commission renew its commitment to indexing tuition grant funding so that as increases in funding for public higher education occur tuition grant funding will benefit as well. He asked also that the Commission on Higher Education renew its commitment to work with the Tuition Grants Commission to make indexing a reality. Mr. Day referred Dr. Mitchell's request to the Committee on Business and Finance. Mr. Sheheen asked Mr. Smalls to add tuition grant funding and indexing to the next Committee on Business and Finance agenda.

5. Need-Base Student Aid

Mr. Sheheen noted that South Carolina is now the only state in the Country to not have a need-based student aid program. He stated that Dr. DiGiorgio suggested that a small working group including representatives from the Commission, the Council of Presidents, and the private colleges and universities, pursue the matter of need-based student aid in the next session of the General Assembly. Mr. Sheheen requested a motion to reaffirm the Commission's prior action with regard to need-based student aid and to instruct the staff to work with Council of Public College Presidents and the Council of Private College Presidents to form a working group to move need-based student aid legislation through the General Assembly. Mr. Sheheen's request was so moved (Williams), seconded (Freeman) and voted.

3.01 Report of the Executive Committee

a. Consideration of State Postsecondary Review Program-Review Standards

Following extended discussion of the SPRE review standards, it was moved (Gilbert), seconded (Lathan), and voted that:

1. The State Postsecondary Review Program (SPRP) Advisory Committee's recommendations for Review Standards be adopted for submission to the U.S. Department of Education for approval, and;
2. Over the next year, the SPRP Advisory Committee, or another group representative of the different types of Title IV institutions, study different methodologies, including confidence intervals, for establishing improved graduation rates for all institutions. The results of the study are to be presented to the Commission for consideration no later than September, 1995.

3.02 Report of Committee on Academic Affairs

There is no report.

3.03 Report of Committee Access and Equity

There is no report.

3.04 Report of Committee on Business and Finance

There is no report.

3.05 Report of Committee on Facilities

Mr. Gilbert moved that the facilities requests be approved

collectively as recommended by the Committee on Facilities. The motion was seconded, and it was voted to approve the requests as recommended by the Committee and documented below.

a. Consideration of Coastal Carolina University New Dorms-Construction

Coastal is proposing to increase the budget and revise the scope for this project previously approved for the issuance of a Request for Proposals (RFP). The estimated total project cost is \$7,200,000 consisting of \$650,000-architecture and engineering; \$500,000-site development; \$5,300,00-construction (60.92/ sq. ft.); \$450,000-equipment; and \$300,000-contingency. The source for funds is revenue bonds (housing).

The previously approved proposal called for an 87,000 gross square foot facility to house approximately four-hundred students, and included a main campus dining facility designed to accommodate a 4,000 headcount population.

Since housing and food service are operated as auxiliaries, there will be no formula funding impact from this facility. It was moved (Gilbert), seconded (Lathan), and voted that the project be approved as proposed provided that the final amount for the project not exceed \$7.5 million.

b. Consideration of Clemson University

1. Surrine Hall Renovations

Clemson University is proposing to renovate the roof system and replace the original terra cotta roof of Surrine Hall. The estimated total project cost is \$500,000 consisting of the following: \$40,000-architecture and engineering; \$400,000-roofing; \$20,000-labor; and \$40,000-contingency. The source for funds is excess debt service (tuition).

2. Lease Renewal University Square

Clemson University is proposing the lease renewal for 21,744 square feet at University Square. The total annual rate of this three-year lease is \$217,740 (\$10 per square foot). Clemson will continue to pay utilities and janitorial. The Office of Property Management of the Division of General Services has reviewed the lease and found its terms and conditions to be acceptable.

c. USC-Aiken Administration Building Asbestos Abatement Budget Increase

The University of South Carolina-Aiken is proposing to begin construction on the previously approved asbestos abatement of the Administration Building. This specific request is to add \$780,000 to the previous project budget in order to commence

work. The estimated total project cost after the proposed increase is \$1,320,118.83 consisting of the following: \$125,000-architecture and engineering; \$1,075,000-asbestos abatement; and \$120,118.83-contingency. The sources for funds are \$440,000 University Asbestos Trust Fund, \$200,000 excess debt service (tuition), \$140,000 county, and the \$540,118.83 capital improvement bond allocation which was approved by the State several years ago.

d. University of South Carolina-Beaufort
Improvements of Existing Facilities

The University of South Carolina-Beaufort is proposing improvements through renovations and a 4,600 square foot expansion to existing facilities. The estimated total project cost is \$1,250,000 consisting of the following: \$100,000-architectural and engineering; \$420,000-construction (64/sq. ft); \$680,000-renovations (\$37/sq. ft.) and \$50,000 reserve, \$137,725 excess debt service (tuition), \$158,483 institution bonds (tuition), and \$20,000 auxiliary reserve.

No tuition increase will result from the partial funding of this project with institutional bonds. This project will impact formula funding for approximately 4,600 square feet by approximately \$24,283.

e. University of South Carolina-Columbia

1. Sims Roof Replacement

The University is proposing the replacement of the roof of Sims dormitory. The estimated total project cost is \$300,000 consisting of \$25,000-architecture and engineering; \$243,000-roofing, and \$32,000-contingency. The source for funds is housing revenue.

No funding formula implications will result from this project.

2. Williams Brice Addition

The University is proposing to construct a 12,800 square foot building onto the north end of the Williams Brice Stadium. The facility will be planned and designed to accommodate new new football coaches, meeting rooms, a video production center, and permanent Ticket Office. The building will offer the potential to add retail space in the future.

Approval is requested to establish this project with a budget \$1.3 million consisting of \$170,000-architectural and engineering fees \$986,000-construction (\$77/ft.); and \$144,000-contingencies. The \$1.3 million represents the total amount of funds the Athletics Department is able to dedicate to this project at present. The source of funds is Athletic Department reserve funds.

There is no formula funding implication.

f. Master Plan Initiation

- (a) Core Block Parking Structure
- (b) Sumwalt Renovations
- (c) Jones Physical Sciences Center-Sixth and Seventh Floors
- (d) McMaster Renovations/New Construction

It was moved (Gilbert), seconded (Metcalf), and voted to approve the McMaster renovations and new construction as proposed provided that any scope change involving demolition must come before the Commission for approval.

3.06 Report of Committee on Planning and Assessment

There is no report.

3.07. Report of the Commissioner

Mr. Sheheen reminded the Committee that the Retreat would be held on September 19th, and 20th in North Charleston.

Mr. Lewis Phillips has been appointed to serve on the Commission on Higher Education until July 26, 1998.

Mr. Sheheen introduced Dr. McGee who provided a brief report concerning the University of South Carolina's athletics department financial support to the University and the Midland Area (Attached).

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:25.

Respectfully submitted,

Addie Caldwell

Addie Caldwell
Recording Secretary